



President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (concluded)

1. Mr. BLACKMAN (Barbados): Mr. President, during the past nine months, this world body has been singularly fortunate in being able to enlist your services to preside over its work at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, the eighth and ninth special sessions and now the tenth special session on disarmament. You have lived up to the confidence reposed in you, as attested by your outstanding performance, and that is why we are sanguine that under your guidance, progress on the thorny question of disarmament will be made at this special session.

2. That the tenth special session of the General Assembly was convened as a result of the initiative of the non-aligned States, which have been the authors of so many creative proposals, is a significant step forward in the disarmament debate, for not so long ago chauvinistic voices were raised in the cry that the subject of disarmament was so esoteric that it was beyond the ken of ordinary mortals who do not inhabit those countries that we call great Powers.

3. There can be no doubt that an outbreak of nuclear hostilities would trigger such ecological disruption in countries that are not participants in such maniacal activities as to ensure widespread loss of human lives and perhaps permanently destroy their means of sustenance. It is the right of innocent men and women throughout the world who live with the threat of being incinerated hanging over their heads like a sword of Damocles to speak out in an effort to avert such a fate.

4. During this debate we have heard many times of the enormous squandering of resources on armaments. My delegation believes that this monstrous irrationality must be publicized over and again until world opinion is so mobilized as to force vested interests in the arms race to call a halt to the mad rush, like that by the Gadarene swine towards the precipices of disaster.

5. Barbados is scandalized that the world has been diverting \$400 thousand million at today's prices to military purposes. Altogether approximately 6 per cent of the world's total production of goods and services is diverted to military ends. While national arms inventories are not published, there are more or less accurate estimates of the size of the arsenals of some countries.

6. Figures given by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute indicate that the number of missile-deliverable warheads of the two nuclear Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, increased from 3,700 in 1970 to nearly 12,000 in 1976. Their combined explosive power is believed to be equivalent to 1.3 million Hiroshima-size bombs. So-called tactical nuclear weapons are four times as numerous as strategic nuclear warheads, and their explosive power is equivalent to about 700 million tons of TNT, or to some 50,000 Hiroshima-type bombs.

7. If the quantitative aspects of the arms race stagger the imagination, the qualitative dimension of the race is no less disconcerting. In spite of the agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic arms, ever more sophisticated arms are being produced. For example, ceilings have been set on the number of anti-ballistic missile sites, but programmes are being pushed ahead to increase the capacity of the anti-ballistic missile systems for destruction.

8. A hypothetical visitor from some other world might well conclude that all of mankind's basic needs were already satisfied when decisions were made to spend astronomical sums on armaments. Our interplanetary visitor would be appalled to learn of the existence of legions of illiterate and semi-literate people and to discover that in the world as a whole there are almost as many soldiers as teachers.

9. Our interplanetary visitor would find, no doubt to his chagrin, that the World Health Organization had laboured to collect \$83 million to eradicate smallpox from the world in 10 years, while that amount would not suffice to buy a single strategic bomber, and he would be sickened to the stomach to learn that more than a thousand million people in 66 developing countries live in areas where malaria is endemic. Our interplanetary visitor would, moreover, debunk the conventional wisdom of the halls of academe that Thomas Hobbes' theory of the state of nature of man is devoid of historicity, because he would observe at first hand that the life of most of the world's people is nasty, brutish and short as they struggle in the toils of inadequate nutrition, unsanitary water and poor housing.

10. When the "squandermania" on arms is juxtaposed with the privations suffered by the majority of the world's people, it becomes evident that there is a logical nexus between disarmament and development. The colossal misallocation of resources caused by military expenditure exacerbates the hardships borne by the world's poor people.

11. In discussing the disarmament problem as it relates to development, the developing countries should take note

of a caveat, for as it is seen that the force of the developing world's position is incontestable, and a more constructive way to use the world's resources would be to produce butter rather than guns, to use the time-honoured jargon of the world of the economists, voices that now dissent from the obvious linkage between disarmament and the solution of development problems will be raised in favour of this proposition. At this point great caution must of necessity be exercised by the developing countries lest through some semantic device the connexion between disarmament and development is interpreted to mean that all development assistance must be postponed until general and complete disarmament is accomplished, and valuable time is wasted in an enervating cycle of explanation and refutation.

12. Not so long ago, from this very rostrum, voices could be heard pooh-poohing the proposal for the establishment of a new international economic order. But, recognizing shortly thereafter that some short-term interests could be served by embracing arguments for restructuring the world's economy, they soon opportunistically joined the chorus of other voices that called for the new international economic order, but sought to bring new and entirely different meanings to some of the proposals in order to retard or obstruct their realization.

13. Developing countries must not fall into this kind of subjectivistic trap in a game of Alice in Wonderland where the same verbal formulations have a myriad meanings depending on the speaker, and the substance of the problem becomes irretrievably lost in a flood of verbosity.

14. None of my foregoing remarks should be construed as implying that the problem of disarmament is susceptible of facile solutions. Indeed, the very opposite is the case. In attempting to examine the problem of the increased militarization of the world, it is suggested that a dualistic approach to analysis be utilized. This analysis leads Barbados to postulate the existence of an internal and external dynamic of the problem. An identification of what my delegation calls the external dynamic of world militarization may serve a heuristic purpose in clarifying this problem.

Mr. Rossides (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair

15. The external dynamic is the organon or organizing principle which motorizes the dialectical relationship between countries and is expressed in a constellation of problems such as imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism. Imperialism derives from the anachronistic notion of spheres of influence, and historically this has given rise to much bellicosity in the world. It manifests itself in the kind of national egocentricity in which countries perceive themselves as centres of gravity with other satellite countries rotating within their orbit. Competing imperialisms represent a root cause of world militarization today.

16. In southern Africa, where racist minority régimes trample upon the rights of black majorities, the arms race is accelerating as freedom fighters find it necessary to defend themselves against barbarous tyrannies aided and abetted by imperialist countries from which arms flow in defiance of United Nations resolutions.

17. In Cyprus, an invasion took place and part of that country has for all practical purposes been annexed, while Belize remains suspended in the limbo world of colonialism because of the intransigence of the neighbouring country, Guatemala, which rattles its sabres and makes threats of intervention if the people of Belize are granted their right to self-determination.

18. In East Timor, the big Powers engage in the same predatory activities, playing upon the weakness of small Powers in wanton disregard for all international morality.

19. It will be seen, therefore, that the external dynamics of world militarization have their genesis in territorial expansion, the plundering of the resources of small countries and the mythology of racial superiority.

20. The internal dynamics of world militarization stem from the establishment of autonomous arms-producing complexes, whose raison d'être is an insatiable drive for profit maximization. Profiteering in the arms trade and arms production becomes an end in itself, as an élite within arms-producing countries uses all the means at its disposal further to entrench itself and even stretches its tentacles beyond its national frontiers to collaborate with other élites, having as their objective their own self-perpetuation or functioning simply as compradores.

21. Barbados hopes that this tenth special session will make some advance towards creating solutions to both the internal and the external dynamics that propel the world towards increased militarization.

22. Already steps, albeit small, have been taken to cope with some of the problems; the highest priority must be given to the elimination of all nuclear weapons, and Barbados therefore supports any efforts which are designed to halt nuclear proliferation. But such support does not exclude our firm and unshakable belief that nuclear technology should be universally accessible to be used for peaceful purposes and that adequate safeguards should be established to prevent such technology from being used for the production of more nuclear weapons.

23. At the same time, it must be unequivocally asserted that Barbados' opposition to the proliferation of nuclear weapons does not imply support for the ill-founded thesis that the more States that acquire nuclear capability, the greater the threat of war. Nuclear proliferation *ipso facto* will not constitute a *casus belli*, but will be determined by whether the nuclear Power concerned respects the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations with regard to the sovereign equality of States, non-interference in the affairs of other States and a firm commitment to the pursuit of peace.

24. The Government of Barbados applauds every initiative undertaken to bring the spread of nuclear weapons under control. Thus Barbados has become a signatory to the Treaty of Tlatelolco,¹ which makes Latin America a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

25. But the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in any

¹ Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326).

region, laudable though it is, cannot be a substitute for general and complete disarmament. It is, by its nature, an act of faith and a demonstration that some leaders have the will to begin the arduous task of checking the cancerous spread of nuclear weapons both vertically and horizontally. The efforts of such statesmen may, however, come to grief should nuclear Powers decide to unleash a war on each other.

26. There are cynics who contend that the call for general and complete disarmament is unrealistic and an attempt to create paradisiacal conditions on earth. They say that war is as inevitable a part of the human condition as is sickness or death.

27. The view that there is some element of human nature that exists *sub specie aeternitatis*, which impels men, willy-nilly, to their self-destruction is an unwarrantably pessimistic outlook. On the contrary, the history of man reveals one unbroken leitmotiv in the role of the *dramatis personae* who occupy the stage of life in any epoch and that is the aim of the preservation of life. Methods of violence have often paradoxically been used to achieve that end, but on balance the conclusive empirical justification for such a belief is the fact that there are more human beings living on the planet Earth than at any other time in human history, in spite of centuries of war.

28. It is necessary to emphasize the fallacious nature of the argument that man is caught up in a chain of relentless determinism that originates from a flaw in his make-up and he is a passive and helpless victim who can only fatalistically accept his predestined end. This way of thinking has produced widespread paralysis among men of goodwill and has slowed down the process towards disarmament.

29. Barbados believes that man, as a moral agent, can exercise volition in relation to events and thus significantly alter them. We say with the Greek philosopher Protagoras, an early exponent of man's potential for moving towards a state of perfection: "Man is the measure of all things, those that are, that they are, and those that are not, that they are not." It is, therefore, a categorical imperative for all States to work towards the objective of disarming the world without delay.

30. When we address the problem of making disarmament operational, the prior issue of security always looms before us because it may well be asked, as indeed it invariably is: How can we expect men to lay down their arms without guaranteeing their security?

31. International security is attainable if States are prepared to order their affairs in a manner that is consistent with civilized norms of conduct. The *locus classicus* of principles which, if followed honestly and applied in good faith, could bring about international security is the Charter of the United Nations.

32. All too often there is a double standard employed with respect to the Charter. We must move away from the position according to which the provisions of the Charter are deemed worthy of application only when certain coun-

tries are conducting their relations with other countries which they feel compelled to treat in a civilized manner for some reason that is extrinsic to the principles of the Charter itself.

33. A beginning on the road to international security can be achieved if States resolve to take United Nations resolutions seriously by ensuring that they are implemented. This special session affords us the opportunity to make such a beginning in the field of disarmament.

34. Barbados once again reaffirms its commitment to the goal of general and complete disarmament. We believe that priority should be given to reducing the threat of war by a reduction of the huge stockpile of nuclear weapons, and consequently we call on all nuclear Powers to meet without delay and work out a programme to achieve a progressive dismantling of their arsenals that would be compatible with their security and, ultimately, the removal of all nuclear weapons.

35. To achieve this requires an educated public which can discipline vested interests in arms production. We therefore urge Governments to undertake the task of informing their people about the problems surrounding disarmament, in schools, in churches and in every place where men and women gather.

36. The programme of action for the elimination of all arms must include a study on demilitarization of the world economy with the minimum dislocation in terms of jobs and standard of living.

37. Whatever has been said about nuclear weapons applies also, as far as this is feasible, to conventional weapons. Our ultimate goal must be a weapon-free world. Only when the instruments which reflect the pathology of violence that stunts the development of men are totally destroyed can we, in the words of Frantz Fanon, the great Caribbean authority on the debilitating effects of violence, "produce a kind of *persona* that is generically unique in the history of man".

38. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The United Nations, like its predecessor, the League of Nations, owes its existence to the horrors of one of the two world wars. Both organizations were established in order to strengthen peace and avoid new conflagrations. The Geneva body, however, was incapable of achieving that objective. It is incumbent on the Members of the United Nations, now so numerous and disparate, and in particular on the most powerful of them, to see to it that this Organization is not similarly unsuccessful.

39. Disarmament is necessary, but can only be achieved slowly. It has in fact been a subject of international discussion for a long time—more than a century and a half. Let us recall, as a curious fact of diplomatic history, that already in 1816 Great Britain and Russia considered, but with no result, the possibility of the simultaneous reduction of their armed forces. Let us also recall that disarmament was considered at the Peace Conferences at The Hague in 1899 and 1907, but again without result.

40. In those days the problem was not as complicated as it is today. It has become much more serious now with the considerable increase in the number of independent States and, above all, with the existence of various means of mass destruction and in particular with the emergence and refinement of nuclear weapons and guided missiles, in addition to new, more sophisticated types of conventional weapons.

41. Although this is a meeting of the General Assembly specially convened to consider disarmament—thanks to a most welcome initiative in those States known as the non-aligned countries—this question will not be resolved, if it is ever resolved, for many years.

42. Our mission, as representatives of our countries, can only be to examine the results of the work and efforts which have already been made in the field of disarmament; to express our points of view generally or more or less specifically on behalf of our Governments, for the information of all, and to indicate certain guidelines for the future. All this information, taken together, will be considered subsequently by other bodies and by the General Assembly itself until the time comes for the convening of the world conference on disarmament, which is already being planned and will be held under the auspices of the United Nations.

43. The large number of proposals, initiatives, plans and recommendations, emanating not only from Governments and international entities but also from non-governmental institutions of various kinds, is proof of the interest and urgency of the problem of disarmament, on the solution of which depend peace, tranquillity and the very existence of the peoples.

44. The countries of this hemisphere have always given proof of their pacifism and interest in disarmament, as is shown by the following examples.

45. When, in 1947, the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Continental Peace and Security was held in Brazil, of which the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,² or the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, was the result, that Conference declared in its resolution XI that: "no stipulation of the Treaty... should be interpreted as justifying excessive armaments or may be invoked as a reason for the creation or maintenance of armaments or armed forces beyond those required for common defense in the interest of peace and security."

46. In 1967 the countries of Latin America set a worthy example to the rest of the world in the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, or the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the name it was given because it was in that part of the Mexican capital that it was opened for signature and because it is to Mexico that we owe the preparation of that instrument, which is another reason that country was chosen as the headquarters of the organization established under the Treaty.

47. Another positive contribution by Latin America is the Declaration of Ayacucho, signed at Lima, on 9 December 1974, in which eight Latin American countries

committed themselves to creating conditions which would make possible the effective limitation of armaments and put an end to their acquisition for the purpose of war.

48. To that we would add that according to the information given to us in his statement by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Venezuela [2nd meeting], the President of his country has asked the other signatories to the Declaration of Ayacucho to explore the possibility of all the countries of Latin America assuming a commitment as regards conventional weapons.

49. The President of Venezuela felt that these efforts should be made in New York, but very few Latin American Ministers for Foreign Affairs have come to this session of the Assembly. However, on 21 June the General Assembly of the Organization of American States is meeting in Washington and it is possible that Venezuela will take that opportunity to have consultations on this subject and perhaps arrange to have an item on it included at the last minute in the Assembly's agenda as an important and urgent matter.

50. Similar activities are being carried out in other regions. This is very important. What has been done and is being done in different regions will undoubtedly be reflected in the work of the world Organization on the problem of disarmament.

51. Nevertheless, very little has been achieved so far. Although the importance of what has been done cannot be denied—and this is true especially of the agreements that have been reached between the two super-Powers on nuclear questions—the fact is that there is still a fear, indeed a growing fear, that there will be a general conflagration. One cannot even glimpse the possibility of a change for the better in the gloomy world picture.

52. The speeches that have been made in this debate by the representatives of the two super-Powers and of other States with considerable military power have not been very encouraging.

53. Instead of slowing down or being in one way or another curbed, the arms race has been increasing day by day until it has reached alarming proportions.

54. The hotbeds of tension in various regions of the world continue to be breeding grounds for new, limited wars and have even been the cause of the outbreak of such wars. These situations could very well lead to a serious clash between the powerful countries, for it is a fact that some of them are not ignorant of what has been happening. Indeed it could not be otherwise; problems today are not confined to given places or regions but transcend borders, since in one way or another they affect the interests of other peoples.

55. There are many, both within and outside the United Nations, who feel that without the deterrent effect of nuclear weapons—in other words, without the existence of those weapons—there would already have been a third world war.

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 21, No. 324, p. 93.

56. The ideological differences and the interests that separate the West from the East are such that the balance between the super-Powers is maintained at a relatively stable point only because neither of those super-Powers wishes to expose itself to the catastrophic consequences of a nuclear confrontation. Today one no longer hears the phrase "balance of power"; rather the phrase used is "balance of terror".
57. Furthermore, the development and perfecting of conventional weapons has matched the progress in nuclear weapons and that, too, has helped to stabilize the *status quo* and the balance between the super-Powers.
58. In other words, if the day arrives when the nuclear-weapon arsenals are completely destroyed and nuclear weapons are no longer manufactured anywhere in the world, that will not necessarily mean that the threat of a confrontation with incalculable but certainly disastrous consequences will automatically disappear. The parties to the confrontation would suffer those consequences more than anyone else. The effects—although certainly very serious and regrettable—would be felt less deeply by many peoples and their economies would be less badly damaged.
59. Like many other delegations, we believe that détente is necessary for the establishment and maintenance of a climate favourable to disarmament negotiations.
60. In our opinion, disarmament must be general and complete only in the case of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction. In regard to disarmament as it applies to conventional weapons, we favour a balanced limitation.
61. We make that distinction because we believe—and let us hope that we are not mistaken—that nuclear disarmament and disarmament in respect of other weapons of mass destruction is feasible, and also because we are convinced that this would be of enormous benefit to mankind. But that does not apply to general and complete disarmament in respect of conventional armaments. In the latter case, what is really required and what in fact can be achieved is not the total elimination of weapons in all States—that would seem to be a Utopian dream, at least in the present circumstances in the world—but limited disarmament, disarmament limited to levels that would make it difficult, if not impossible, to use these weapons to settle disputes or for other international purposes. Exceptions, of course, could be legitimate defence and military co-operation required by the Security Council or a regional body in the exercise of its peace-keeping functions.
62. If the United Nations acts in a responsible manner and out of a true desire to establish justice in the world and ensure respect among the various peoples, then, in addition to eliminating completely and finally the production, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction, it must seek the means of reducing or eliminating the possibility of war by a general and balanced limitation of conventional weapons to levels that are both reasonable and appropriate, bearing in mind each State's need to ensure its independence and sovereignty, to protect its institutions and to promote the peaceful co-existence of its people.
63. Under both international and national law, security is the essential feature of a State's existence. And security is based not only on international law and national law considered theoretically; with respect to the former, security is also based on the positive texts from which it is derived, such as the Charter of the United Nations and the constitutions of regional organizations such as the Organization of American States.
64. Without the appropriate means to defend its internal and external security, no State can exist, nor can any kind of governmental system be imagined. In this respect, the Head of State of France made the categorical statement here that: "No State, weak or strong, rich or poor, is ready to abdicate responsibility for its basic security" [3rd meeting, para. 24].
65. International control is an element which cannot be dispensed with in any disarmament system. Without control, any commitment would be meaningless and no progress would have any significance.
66. With regard to negotiations, we are also in favour of drawing a distinction between those aimed at nuclear disarmament and disarmament relating to other means of mass destruction and those relating to other weapons.
67. In the first case, the negotiations should take place in a body established by the General Assembly and composed of members of the Security Council, countries that have sufficient human and material resources to manufacture nuclear weapons, and other militarily important States. We do not think it desirable for all States to take part in negotiations on such highly technical questions as the cessation of nuclear tests and of the production and stockpiling of nuclear weapons, the destruction of arsenals, the dismantling of installations, and so forth. The body we have in mind would replace the Geneva Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, whose membership and procedures are not satisfactory to some Governments.
68. All the States members of the body to which I am referring should increase their efforts to reach positive and concrete agreements leading to the desired goal: nuclear disarmament, general and complete disarmament in that domain. It should be general because the agreements entered into should lead eventually to conventions or treaties that would be binding, without exception, on all present or potential possessors of this type of weapon and on all other States. It should be complete—both qualitatively and quantitatively—in the sense that the treaties or conventions should provide for the total and final elimination of each and every type of nuclear weapon that now exists or that might be invented, perfected or manufactured later. This applies also to other means of mass destruction.
69. As regards the balanced limitation of conventional weapons—some call these weapons conventional, others call them traditional or classical weapons—as all States

in varying degrees possess such weapons, negotiations could take place in a broader body where the various regions and trends of thought could appropriately be represented, as well as the most powerful countries, that is, those constituting the negotiating body on nuclear weapons.

70. Time and time again we have heard references here to the astronomical figures associated with the arms race. In 1969 the total amount of money invested by all countries in the world was \$180,000 million. Nine years later, in 1977, the amount had more than doubled—\$400,000 million a year. That is nearly a million dollars a minute! As the arms race gains momentum, the millions pile up.

71. That vast expenditure of resources in this unbridled and seemingly absurd arms race can be explained by the suspicion and mistrust which today characterize relations among men and among peoples. It is the result of fear, regarding real or imaginary threats of international aggression or attacks on the public order or on the stability of Governments. The result is a vicious circle which will disappear only if we manage to establish a system of collective security which is truly effective, both in its methods and in the guarantees it provides. That is the great challenge which the United Nations must confront in the field of disarmament.

72. Clearly expenditures can be reduced gradually if there is a resolve to put an end to the arms race and to carry out disarmament plans.

73. The savings thus brought about—if disarmament becomes a fact—can be used to meet other needs, and, in the case of the most economically favoured countries, to increase their assistance to the developing countries.

74. One of the characteristics of disarmament is its connexion with economic and social development. As a country disarms it will have more funds available to devote to its own development and to the development of those countries in urgent need of development, which are in the majority in our world.

75. The ideas which I have set forth represent an outline of the position of my country on the subject of disarmament. On the basis of these ideas my delegation is ready to vote in favour of, and perhaps even sponsor, any draft declarations or resolutions considered at this special session of the General Assembly which we find acceptable.

76. Although the news media are generally sceptical about the results of this General Assembly session, people in many parts of the world are hoping that positive steps will be taken towards peace. That means that we have a special obligation to see that our work is as fruitful as possible, so that it can eventually—the sooner the better—give rise to agreements which will lessen and perhaps even eliminate the fears and anxieties associated with the prospect of a nuclear war.

77. The work done here over the past few weeks, the work done by the General Assembly in past regular ses-

sions, and in any future special sessions, as suggested by some speakers, the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, the work done so well by the Preparatory Committee for this special session under the skilful leadership of Mr. Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina, and the equally important and useful work done by other organizations which are, in one way or another, related to the Organization and by non-governmental organizations also concerned with these problems of such great significance for the future of mankind, all constitute a legacy of information which should be transmitted eventually to the world disarmament conference.

78. With unconcealed pessimism, Hans J. Morgenthau has said that men do not fight because they have weapons; they have weapons because they need them to fight. If that were true, our efforts would be meaningless.

79. Without wishing to go so far as the philosopher who said *homo homini lupus*, nor wishing to go to the other extreme, to the psalmist, King David, who said that man was only little lower than the angel, it is a fact that goodness, loyalty and mercy have never been the essential features of human nature.

80. But we are not and do not wish to be pessimistic. Beyond the ambitions and rivalries of men and peoples there is the instinct of preservation of the individual and of the species. If our intelligence does not respond to the appeals of wisdom, perhaps that instinct will save present and succeeding generations from disaster.

81. If that does happen one day, as we hope and pray it will, then disarmament will certainly have been a decisive factor in bringing about two other equally great events: the removal of the spectre of war, and a great spurt in economic and social development throughout the world.

82. Mr. MONTIEL ARGÜELLO (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Government of Nicaragua enthusiastically welcomed resolution 31/189 B adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session by which it decided to convene a special session devoted to disarmament, because it believed that the arms race represents, more and more every day, the most serious danger to world peace and security and a threat to the very existence of life on our planet, while at the same time swallowing up an unimaginable quantity of human and material resources which could be put to better use in promoting the social and economic advancement of the peoples.

83. Nicaragua pursues an international policy of strict commitment to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly those relating to non-intervention, the non-use of force and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means; it has preferred to use the resources available to it not to acquire armaments but rather to further the well-being of its people, in spite of the fact that on many occasions it has been the object of subversive movements encouraged and assisted from outside. We are confident that the love of peace and the deep democratic convictions of the Nicaraguan people will achieve victory against subversion and terrorism, without any need to increase military spending.

84. We have come to this session full of hope and expectation and with the greatest possible desire to co-operate with other delegations in the search for solutions which, on the basis of general consensus, will ensure conditions of security enabling mankind to enjoy the benefits of general and complete disarmament. We are very well aware that it will not be possible to bring about a total and final solution at one fell swoop, but we expect to make considerable progress. In our view it would be counterproductive to set partial and over-precise targets linked to a specific timetable. There would only be discouragement if, for some reason or other, the targets were not met by the deadlines. The important thing is to create the necessary political will to achieve the final objective.

85. The problem we face is not a new one, but, so far, the results achieved have been meagre. Agreement has been reached only on partial measures relating to specific types of arms or to specific geographical areas. As a Latin American, I can mention with pride, a pride which I consider to be justified, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which prohibits nuclear arms in Latin America. The purpose of that Treaty was to guarantee that that part of the world would be kept entirely free of nuclear arms, and to prevent the proliferation of such weapons, thus giving the world an example of will and common destiny. It is also with pleasure that I mention the strategic arms limitation talks between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I trust that those talks will lead to positive agreements.

86. Disarmament and development constitute the most urgent problems facing the world today. There is an interdependence between them, as is stated in section A, paragraph 5, of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade:

"The success of international development activities will depend in large measure on improvement in the general international situation, particularly on concrete progress towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control. . . ." [See resolution 2626 (XXV).]

87. During the general debate we have heard statements from a large number of delegations, and it has been possible to observe consensus in principle as to the desirability of, and the need for, disarmament. The major differences have been ones of emphasis on various specific types of weapons, on the attribution of responsibility for the arms race, and the measures which should be adopted in order to halt that race and reverse its course, as well as differences as to the existence of a relationship between disarmament and development.

88. In the view of my Government, nuclear disarmament, as well as disarmament in the field of other weapons of mass destruction, deserves particular priority because of the extraordinary danger which such weapons pose. They could lead to the unleashing of a conflict of incalculable dimensions as a consequence of an accident, an error of calculation or a failure in communication. The conventions on bacteriological and toxin weapons³ and on environmen-

tal modification techniques for military purposes⁴ are measures of a partial nature, but they do open the way to other broader and more general measures. When I use the term "particular priority" I am not suggesting that there has been exclusiveness. The arms race existed before nuclear weapons did, and there are other very important areas which should not be overlooked.

89. We believe that the problem of disarmament should be placed in its proper perspective, and in the present state of international relations that can only be based on practical and conventional control exercised by an international organization. Otherwise every State, quite rightly, would fear that it was reducing its military capacity without being sure that other States were following suit.

90. Furthermore, international tension and the existence of conflicts and disputes do not constitute an appropriate environment for the adoption of disarmament measures. The arms race is at once the effect and the cause of international tension. Every effort should be made to embark upon, or to intensify, negotiations which would lead to constructive agreements that States would refrain from actions likely to aggravate situations of conflict. In particular, our Organization, whose primary purpose is to maintain international peace and security, should continue and intensify its activities in this important area.

91. I remember saying in this Assembly a few years ago that we should never forget that true peace does not consist solely of the absence of violence but should be based upon justice—justice not only for individuals within a given State but also for States within the international community. Just as domestic peace cannot be achieved so long as social injustice persists, so there can be no international peace so long as irritants exist in the form of differences between super-developed States and States whose people are not only struggling against poverty, disease and ignorance, but are also deprived of an equitable share of resources and goods. This is another area in which our Organization should intensify its activities.

92. We should also promote respect for one of the basic principles of our Organization, namely, the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States. Failure to observe that principle—and such failure has become more noticeable recently—helps to promote the arms race, both among the interventionist countries and among those countries which are the victims, or fear that they may become the victims, of such intervention. We should abandon the use of the problem of disarmament as a means of propaganda for the purpose of putting the blame for the arms race on countries with ideologies different from ours. That simply serves to distract attention from the real problem and makes it more difficult to find a solution to that problem.

93. I believe that I have enumerated the major principles which my Government deems indispensable for the general and complete disarmament which we all sincerely hope will become a reality. If effective international control is not established, if international tension persists, if conflicts and disputes are not resolved, if economic injustice per-

³ Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (resolution 2826 (XXVI), annex).

⁴ Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques (resolution 31/72, annex).

sists, if intervention continues to be regarded with indifference, and if disarmament continues to be used for propaganda purposes, there is nothing which can prevent the continuation of the arms race, and all efforts to stop it will be in vain.

94. Therefore, we believe that the problem of disarmament should be dealt with not in isolation but in conjunction with the other problems which I have mentioned. Certainly the task is a difficult one, but we must tackle it with determination. In so doing, we will do most praiseworthy work which will redound to the benefit of all mankind.

95. Mr. PIZA-ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Costa Rica is attending this tenth special session of the General Assembly barely one month after a change of Government which occurred under the strictest democratic procedures; a change not only of its leaders but, more profound, a new emphasis on achievement of the common good in the ideas, aims and, above all, the modes of action which will govern the country's advancement, as long as the people desire it.

96. It is natural, then, that there should be some curiosity within and outside our world Organization as to what the consequences of this change will be with regard to our foreign policy both on the specific subject of disarmament and on the other fundamental international problems which are discussed at their highest level in the United Nations. As I have the honour of representing my nation and its President in this world forum, I shall try to satisfy this curiosity at least in general terms.

97. First and foremost, I represent, as representatives must know, a very special nation and people which, rising above their natural limitations and their internal ideological or political differences, have achieved a high level of stability, peace, freedom and justice which cannot be altered simply as the result of incidental changes of Government. I represent a very special nation and people which have created an advanced and genuinely democratic system of government in which all citizens and parties participate freely, with complete mutual respect based on the common conviction that only the sovereign people has the right to choose its leaders and decide its own future. I represent a very special nation and people which have achieved a balanced and steady rate of economic and social development, which far exceed their apparent potential, through the rational use of their resources to promote production, and, above all, through the constant improvement of education, health, social security and justice, within an effective legal system that fully respects the universally recognized human rights and freedoms. These efforts are reflected, *inter alia*, in the fact that the Government spends 34 per cent of the national budget on education, 30 per cent on health and social security, and over 50 per cent on social development in general.

98. I represent a very special nation and people that 30 years ago decided to entrust its internal security to a constitutional régime and its external defence to international order and solidarity, totally eliminating their small military forces by a constitutional prohibition and leaving in place, with no attempt at subterfuge, a small Civil Guard for the

protection of the citizens. That Civil Guard today consists of less than one policeman for each 1,000 inhabitants—which may not really be enough—and its total cost, including men, equipment and materials, for a country of almost 2.5 million people represents less than 1 per cent of the public budget or less than 1.5 thousandth of the national product and less than \$2 annually per person. Compare that to what is occurring in many parts of the underdeveloped world, where military budgets absorb up to six times the total for all the other public services.

99. If figures mean anything at all, I should like to add that Costa Rica earmarks more than 40 times more for education, 35 times more for health and 60 times more for social development in general than for the forces of public order, that is to say, police to maintain order and security only, since military expenditures are literally zero.

100. I believe that it was important for me to mention these facts concerning my country, not to weary you with boasting but because I wish to assure you that the great principles of our international policy, based on the same principles which underlie our democratic achievements, are not the legacy of any particular political party in power but the mature and well-considered result of our national tradition and conscience which already forms an inseparable part of our way of life. Some of the representatives here, or the representatives of their Governments who may have heard the statement made by our President Mr. Rodrigo Carazo on 8 May last, may have had personal experience of this living reality of a country that is truly disarmed, which works in peace, and at the end of the working day can rest with an easy conscience.

101. Although the change in the Government that I now represent here is far-reaching and decisive in terms of standards, procedures, and the emphasis and pattern of our activities both domestic and international, yet we remain firmly devoted to our great traditions of peace, freedom, dignity and justice in both domestic and international policies.

102. We shall therefore continue to strengthen our full support for the major principles of international law; we shall also continue to support and place our faith in this world Organization and, closer to home, in the Organization of American States and the Central American community. We shall continue our efforts to see that the outworn idea of unlimited national sovereignty, born of different historical circumstances, eventually yields to effective international jurisdiction, represented by the United Nations in general, and in particular by the International Court of Justice and other similar bodies. We shall continue to strive to ensure that, in conjunction with respect for the legal equality of States, pluralism and détente, self-determination of peoples, and non-intervention by any State in the internal affairs of other States, we hope that there will be steady progress towards international solidarity, respect for the dignity and freedom of the human person, the sovereignty of the people, which can be brought about only as the result of representative democracy, and the institutional need for effective international collective action to guarantee peace and security between States, together with human rights within States.

103. In this latter connexion, we shall never cease to make efforts which our country has made at every level for many years to ensure the full application of the conventions on human rights; the establishment of international courts of justice with binding jurisdiction in special fields, modelled on the Strasbourg example; recognition of man as the direct subject of international law, with access to its jurisdiction, which is the only way effectively to guarantee his fundamental rights; the establishment of a high commissioner's office or similar authority for human rights at the world level. Similarly, we shall continue to fight tenaciously within our continent to see to it that the Inter-American Declaration is implemented immediately and that the Regional Court for Human Rights begins to function without delay—and President Carazo in his inaugural statement formally offered our country once again as the permanent headquarters, as it was for the Central American Court of Justice, which was the first international court in history.

104. In these connexions the change we envisage will be reflected principally in a greater decisiveness and aggressiveness as we defend our basic principles, and the direct participation we shall give, or seek, in various international programmes and organizations likely to promote those ends.

105. Furthermore, the change will chiefly stress the independence of our foreign policy, that is non-aligned and without any preconceived notions of any kind, and of course without prejudice to the special feelings of solidarity which bind us to those communities to which we naturally belong. Specifically, I refer to the Latin American group, the Iberian-American union, the Western hemisphere, the Western world and all the poor nations of the world. We shall stress the defence of our legitimate resources and sovereign rights on the earth, in the air and in the sea demanding the same respect for those rights as we ourselves pay to the legitimate sovereign rights of other nations.

106. The convening of this session and the statements that we have heard here show that there is a striking convergence of views on six fundamental points. First, disarmament is the crucial problem of today's world. We must put an end to the arms race once and for all and bring about total disarmament, on which the survival of mankind depends. Secondly, all civilized peoples and their Governments say that they want total disarmament. Thirdly, in spite of the fine words and good intentions and many pacts and declarations that have been issued, especially since the Second World War, the arms race has escalated to an inexplicable level. Existing nuclear arsenals are enough to destroy mankind four times over and the two nuclear Powers alone have quadrupled those arsenals in the 10 years that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex] has been in existence. Fourthly, while two thirds of mankind are lacking what is needed for a decent life and one third lives in abject poverty, the world spends nearly \$400 thousand million a year on arms—more than the developing countries spend together on health and education and 14 times more than all the assistance they receive from the developed countries.

Fifthly, in spite of this frightening situation and the growing risks of nuclear armaments, it is the poor countries of the world which are spearheading the conventional arms race. Their military expenditure absorbs more than 60 per cent of their public budgets and is more than six times greater than their total expenditure for services provided to their peoples. Sixthly, it also seems that there is agreement to the effect that the problem of disarmament is not something to be resolved exclusively by the Powers concerned, because it is a problem that affects all mankind and for that reason this Organization should tackle it at the highest level.

107. I respectfully invite reflection on the series of contradictions implicit in the outline I have just given you, and particularly on the seriousness of the reservations and the reluctance which are frequently concealed and sometimes actually apparent in the very words in which these fine intentions are proclaimed.

108. Here we have come precisely to speak about these things and at least to raise the possibility of viable and concrete solutions. It is little but it is enough. We believe in the value of words as a driving force, slow perhaps but sure, in history. It is with words that we have built and continue to build the United Nations; it is with words that we are framing international law.

109. However, words are of value only when they strengthen the spirit and the impulse to action, and that only when they are sincere, generous and effective—sincere because inspired by good intentions, generous because offering more than it is hoped to receive, effective because they lead to appropriate and effective action.

110. There is a proverb which says, "the words of the wise man reflect what he has in his heart", and another which says, "the road to hell is paved with good intentions". If we truly want the thousands of words which have been uttered at this session and the millions more which have been lavished before on the subject of disarmament and peace really to be valuable driving forces for a better world, that world that we all want to bequeath to our children, let us be really sincere and generous and let us really proceed to appropriate and effective action.

111. We are not unaware that the problem of disarmament is difficult and complex, even from the theoretical standpoint, and all the more so in its practical implications.

112. We recognize that the immediate achievement of total nuclear disarmament, which is something that impatient people call for, is not possible in the present state of the world, and even if it were, until we have at our disposal the means of effective international control and other complementary means such as a genuine, recognized international authority and a genuine established international executive power, it would be Utopian. Indeed, it might even turn into a kind of two-edged sword and become a danger in its turn, because, on the one hand, even if nuclear arsenals disappeared as if by magic, the fact is that the technology for constructing them would still be in existence,

while, on the other hand, pure and simple denuclearization might dispel the fear of a holocaust, a fear that from day to day is the only guarantee, albeit precarious, of world peace.

113. Let us recognize also the impracticability of total conventional disarmament until we achieve an international order which will guarantee to States their external security and internal tranquillity, and the complications which arise if we consider, on the one hand, the legitimate right of peoples to resist oppression and even to have recourse to violence when there is no other institutional way available for them to impose their will and, on the other hand, the fact which is wrong but inevitable, that oppressors in their turn always repress by force any threat to their power. To whom, then, if not to an international authority, even one that has the right to err, could we confer the power of judging and resolving those twilight-zone, borderline, ambiguous cases, that are the kind that occur most frequently?

114. Let us also admit that there has been a great lack of sincerity, generosity and effectiveness in the approaches to this very problem and the search for a solution to it.

115. There is no sincerity in making proposals for disarmament and peace, in lavishing praise on the United Nations and in making reference to the majesty of international law by way of throwing up a smoke-screen to conceal clear examples of aggression, penetration or domination, be they political, economic, ideological or mere matters of prestige. There are many such cases.

116. There is no sincerity in making reference to domestic or international security or to the great principles such as that of non-intervention in order to conceal the repression of freedom and the rights of citizens, whatever the political or ideological justification that is invoked.

117. There is no sincerity in referring to the rights and principles of one side alone—rights and principles which are recalled only to censure and blame régimes which do not share our views or do not serve our ends, and which are carefully shelved when it is a matter of applying them to ourselves.

118. In this sense, it seems to us that there is a fundamental problem of sincerity and good faith which has even succeeded in contaminating some of the resolutions of the United Nations and of other international organizations solely because of the irrationality of mechanical made-to-measure majorities. We must demand sincerity, objectivity and impartiality from States, whether Members or non-members of our Organization, but we must also insist on these qualities in our Organization and in ourselves, because we are the people who embody its will. Those who are on our side politically and ideologically are not all good or always good; those against us are not all bad or always bad.

119. And there is no generosity in making high-sounding declarations of principles and attractive promises and offers of negotiation, if they are full of reservations or hesi-

tations, and above all in calling upon others to be the first to commit themselves, to be the first to submit, to be the first to disarm. Disarmament, like all major problems of mankind, is fundamentally a question of political will, generosity and good faith.

120. In all this, the major, though not the exclusive, responsibility falls on the nuclear Powers and, among them, on the two greatest.

121. It would be wrong to fail to recognize that so far these major Powers have also laid claim to the relative merit of having achieved a balance which, although based on negative considerations, such as mutual distrust and fear, has succeeded at least in removing the "subjective" danger of a nuclear war.

122. However, these same negative considerations are to blame for keeping mankind in a state of anguish and of stimulating the arms race, of increasing the eagerness of other States to enter the so-called atomic club and thus to turn themselves into insuperable obstacles to the affirmation of peace and the elimination of the objective danger of universal disaster.

123. In a fundamental paragraph of his statement, Mr. Mondale, Vice-President of the United States of America, said: "the United States will not use nuclear weapons except in self-defence; that is, in circumstances of an actual nuclear or conventional attack on the United States, our territories or armed forces, or of such an attack on our allies" [2nd meeting, para. 65].

124. For his part, Mr. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, stated: "the Soviet Union will never use nuclear weapons against those States which renounce the production and acquisition of such weapons and do not have them on their territories" [5th meeting, para. 84].

125. To sum up, both speaking of the two most powerful States on earth, have just forces to tell us in different voices that they do not renounce recourse to their nuclear arsenals—one, in case of legitimate self-defence, but with such a scope that it practically cancels that limitation; the other, against another nuclear Power, as if only that Power and not the whole of mankind would suffer the consequences of such an act.

126. We, of course, would hope that both, in a complete response to the vast concern of this Assembly, would make a solemn undertaking purely and simply to renounce nuclear war and the arms race once and for all until the other necessary instruments for total disarmament under effective international control are established.

127. We know that from day to day this response is impossible. But we shall always continue to ask for what it is possible to offer: an absolute and unconditional renunciation of nuclear war except in the case of proved legitimate self-defence, and then subject to the prompt intervention of the United Nations. But this, certainly, applying to legitimate self-defence the juridical principle of proportionality

of the means employed, would be equivalent to undertaking not to use nuclear arsenals except in legitimate self-defence against a nuclear attack.

Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) returned to the Chair.

128. Nor would it be exaggerating to ask the nuclear Powers to comply with international undertakings already entered into by them such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, already mentioned, which unfortunately events have proved to be ineffective, precisely because of the undertakings they have already entered into, that they once and for all suspend the nuclear arms race and the race in weapons of mass destruction, especially bearing in mind that they can never use all those they have. Use of a quarter of those weapons would leave no one in the world to use the other three quarters.

129. However, nothing has been done. And something must be done now to reduce or at least to limit the production and distribution of conventional weapons, which show the highest index of growth in the arms race. It has been said that conventional weapons absorb 80 per cent of expenditures on arms and that the consumption of such weapons by developing countries is highest and getting higher every day in a kind of competition that would be ridiculous if it were not tragic, so tragic that in the international field it is those developing countries that have been the protagonists in more than 100 wars which, in the 30 years since the end of the Second World War, have caused more deaths than did that war. And, internally speaking, today in the world there is a desolate picture of despotic military régimes in which repression and violation of the most elementary human rights go hand in hand with poverty, disease and ignorance.

130. If the consumption of conventional weapons is justified for reasons of security, internal or international, it should at least be possible to limit it to what is strictly necessary for such purposes. In this sense, the nations which manufacture arms, particularly the developed countries, bear major responsibility but not exclusive responsibility. We consider this to be one of the fundamental fields in which it is urgent and would be advantageous to have the active intervention of the United Nations.

131. Finally, the vast disproportion we have indicated between what the world is spending on the arms race and military expenditures in general and what it is spending on economic and social development, particularly in the poorest countries, compels us to stress the need to begin to reduce these expenditures and to allocate a substantial part of the resultant savings to reducing what is in our view the most important cause of international tension, which is the ever-widening gap between the developed and the under-developed countries, which we now call "developing" countries because with that euphemism we paint the distressing reality of their poverty in a rosy colour.

132. We say a proportion of these savings but not all of them because we believe that, along with assistance to development, it would also be right and highly fruitful for peace for another important proportion to be devoted di-

rectly to recompensing the countries which agree to disarm and in fact do disarm and thus give incentive to others to follow suit.

133. In this last context we announce the presentation of a concrete proposal, which would complement those already approved by the General Assembly, to call upon the States of the world at once to reduce their military expenditures by at least 10 per cent and to constitute with the resultant savings a fund, part of which would go to economic and social development assistance and part to recompensing nations that reduce military expenditures by at least 1.5 per cent of the public budget and by at least 0.5 per cent of their national product concurrently, without taking into account their level of development.

134. Costa Rica presents to the Assembly as a contribution to the task of disarmament these specific proposals for immediate action, and above all the example of its own reality, as a demonstration that it is possible, without any loss of dignity or independence, to do this and even much more.

135. We are aware that these proposals do not remove the danger we can see hanging over the human race, but we do believe that they constitute firm steps towards disarmament that would contribute a great deal to creating an international climate of diminished fear and distrust and that they would be positive signs of good faith and readiness to make new advances in the future.

136. This depends, of course, on many other things, and above all on the sincerity and generosity with which we are ready to create an effective international jurisdiction and provide it with the juridical, human and material resources necessary for it to perform its task of imposing and guaranteeing peace, with all its consequences. It also depends upon the capacity we demonstrate to ensure that disarmament shall be effective.

137. Mr. President, before I conclude permit me to congratulate you upon your election as President of this session of the Assembly. The fact that we have you conducting these proceedings means not only recognition of your efforts and those of your country in bringing about, along with other countries and with the enthusiastic acceptance of all, the holding of this fundamentally important meeting on disarmament; it is also a guarantee of the success we are already beginning to glimpse.

138. I should like to extend my congratulations and those of my country to the Secretary-General, whose untiring efforts for disarmament, peace and international security are too well known for me to limit them by enumerating them.

139. Permit me also to greet and express my gratitude at the honour of the presence of the first lady of my country, Mrs. Estrella de Carazo, who has headed the delegation accompanying the Youth Symphony Orchestra of Costa Rica, and the presence of these young Costa Ricans who, having shown their skill at the Kennedy Center in the District of Columbia and at the White House, upon the special invitation of the wife of the President of the United States,

as well as in other parts of the United States, are going to end their tour with a concert that will be given here.

140. In fact, way beyond the words I have uttered here, limited as they have been, Costa Rica wants these young people, our "army", with our "weapons", which are their musical instruments, to speak to you of disarmament in the unlimited language of music and to show you a little of the much that can be done with good faith, through which the Lord will grant us peace.

141. Mr. CHISSANO (Mozambique): Mr. President, it is with great admiration for you that I exercise this privilege of addressing the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which is meeting under the leadership that you have so capably maintained over the three previous sessions. The delegation of the People's Republic of Mozambique salutes your tested competence in steering the work of all those sessions with the utmost efficiency and dedication. We also salute your country for its distinguished role in bringing together the non-aligned movement to initiate this unprecedented event.

142. Our special tribute goes to the Secretary-General, whose untiring dynamism and unquestioned commitment in facing up to the challenges of his responsibilities are indeed very well demonstrated in his tackling of the increasing problem of disarmament.

143. The People's Republic of Mozambique devotes article 24 of its Constitution to the principles of the general and universal disarmament of all States, the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace free of nuclear arms, and a commitment to pursue a policy of peace, with resort to force only in case of self-defence and legitimate defence.

144. Very recently in this Assembly, during the thirty-second session, the President of the People's Republic of Mozambique, Mr. Samora Moises Machel, on this issue emphatically made the following statement:

"Disarmament is a fundamental necessity if we are to achieve co-operation between States in peace and security. We are greatly concerned at the development of weapons research, and of research into the development of increasingly powerful and inhuman lethal arms capable of the irremediable destruction of life on earth.

"Consequently, the People's Republic of Mozambique defends the principle of general and universal disarmament and of the immediate cessation of the arms race, embracing all types of weapons of mass destruction. In this context, too, the People's Republic of Mozambique congratulates the European peoples for their successes in their policy of European détente, while at the same time expressing its conviction that that process must not be limited to one part of the world alone, but, rather, should be affirmed universally as a constant factor in international relations.

"We wish to affirm our full support for the convening of a special session of the General Assembly of the

United Nations to deal with this question, as an important step towards the holding of a world disarmament conference."⁵

145. We are pleased to see that the special session has become a reality and we hope that the world conference on disarmament will take place soon and at the right time for it to be subsequently useful and relevant.

146. It was not light-heartedly that we defined these principles as essential guiding factors for the Mozambican people and for our country's foreign policy. For 10 years, we waged a popular national liberation struggle which was the final stage of our secular resistance to colonialism and imperialism. During this difficult but rewarding experience in the history of the Mozambican people, we came to know face to face the horrors of a dehumanizing colonial domination. During this same time of bitter war, we were exposed to the terror and destruction of a war of colonial and imperialist aggression.

147. Ours was a struggle for the conquest of the total and complete independence of our country, which meant, conquering the right to choose our own destiny and the right to choose our own friends. We fought for and conquered the right to develop our own culture and our economy, as well as the right to social and political advancement of our people.

148. Our victory over Portuguese colonialism, which was the most retrograde and degrading type of colonialism and international imperialism, gave rise to the liberation of the Mozambican as an individual, the rightful assertion of his personality and the recovery of his native land with all its natural resources for the greater benefit and enjoyment of the people.

149. All these gains were the result of the sacrifices and the shedding of the blood of thousands of men, women and children of Mozambique who were ruthlessly victimized by napalm bombs and other types of armaments of mass destruction indiscriminately utilized against our people by the Portuguese colonialists and their imperialist cohorts.

150. For these hard-fought justifications, we must preserve our victories, consolidate our independence, develop our country's economic potential and enhance its social and cultural growth. One of the determining elements in making these goals attainable is the existence of a climate of universal peace and international security.

151. Colonialism and all other systems of subjugation and plunder of the peoples by imperialist Powers have been and still are the main causes which determine the arms race, world wars and the proliferation of local conflicts and confrontation.

152. On the other hand, the fact that the ex-metropolitan or ex-colonial Powers try hard to maintain their influence over former colonies with the ulterior motive of continuing the exploitation of the latter in order to maintain their state of under-development leads in certain countries to an at-

⁵ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings*, 17th meeting, paras. 83-85.

mosphere of tension between their people who are craving for true liberty and their respective Governments which, unfortunately, give in to pressures from their former colonial masters and other imperialist Powers. This kind of situation that prevails in our continent, especially as it relates to the subsistence of the last bastions of racism and colonialism in Africa, is a matter of great concern for us.

153. The existence of racist régimes in South Africa and Rhodesia not only constitutes a threat to peace and security in the zone but most of all represents an imminent danger to world peace and security. Further to aggravate this situation, the imperialist Powers continue to strengthen those régimes militarily, while at the same time improving conditions in South Africa for the development of nuclear weapons.

154. As a consequence of the aggressive policies of South Africa and Rhodesia, some African States have become innocent victims of daily recurring military aggressions designed to destabilize their economic progress and development, as well as desperately to suppress their total support for the national liberation struggles being waged by the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa.

155. The basic fact remains that the root of this situation of tension existing in southern Africa is the continued presence in the area of colonialism, racism and imperialism. It is the presence of these systems which explains the piling up of armaments in Africa. It is their presence which forces the independent States in the zone, notwithstanding their limited resources, to allocate an enormous amount of money to armaments for their defence alone. It is colonialism, racism and imperialism which compel these States to ask for military assistance from their allies in order to safeguard their own independence which is being threatened dangerously every day.

156. Hence, as a primary consideration, disarmament in Africa means no less than the eradication of colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism. That is why support for national liberation movements by all means, including the provision of armaments, is an important element in the pursuit of the cause of disarmament itself. Any national liberation war is a war meant to bring peace.

157. We mentioned Africa as just one example, but this situation could be applicable comparably to the Middle East, where the existence of zionism and imperialist practices leads to the stockpiling of armaments. In the case of the Middle East, disarmament implies the total elimination of zionism, the restitution of the occupied Arab lands and the re-establishment of the rights of the Palestinian people. In Korea, disarmament means the withdrawal of American troops and their arsenal of arms, and the subsequent peaceful reunification of the country. Other similar situations in many other regions of Africa, Asia and Latin America could be described.

158. At this juncture we should like to recall that the major responsibility for this situation falls on the shoulders of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries. Unfortunately, from what we are witnessing today it seems that

their attitude has not changed much. While our efforts are being directed to the search for a lasting solution of the problem of the existing danger of another war of world proportions, we note with dismay that not far from this forum a meeting of NATO has taken place, the objectives of which are obvious to all of us who are acquainted with the aggressive character of that Organization.

159. How should we interpret this behaviour by the members of NATO? One is tempted to ask whether they are truly interested in all the efforts put into convening this special session of the General Assembly devoted to general and complete disarmament, which means peace, security, liberty and the progress of peoples. We do not think they are. Analysing the outcome of the said meeting one concludes that the members of NATO have pledged themselves to reinforce their military capacity and reorganize their co-ordination in all military domains. Could they not have chosen a better time to meet for that purpose?

160. The other aspect, which is even more disturbing to the peoples of Africa and to the whole of mankind, is that there has been mention of extending their activities to the southern Atlantic.

161. The intention of NATO to continue to subjugate our continent is clear. France, Belgium, the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany and Great Britain—the leaders of colonialism on our continent since time long past—now present themselves as the protectors of independent Africa. Less than three years ago, all those countries supported Portuguese colonialism materially and diplomatically while we were fighting for our national liberation and independence. Even now, those same countries are still supporting in one way or another the racist régimes of South Africa and Rhodesia, and one of them, France, is still occupying illegally the Comorian island of Mayotte, an integral part of an independent African State, and intervening to suppress the freedom of the people of the Western Sahara.

162. Yet it is France that accommodates a conference at which the establishment of a so-called pan-African defence force is recommended. We in Mozambique do not believe that a colonialist country can defend or contribute to the defence of the independence of Africa. We believe that such a force, made up of Africans and created on the initiative of Europeans, would serve no other purpose than to defend European colonialist and imperialist interests. Such a force is meant only to destroy the unity of the African States. In other words, it is meant to reconquer the entire African continent. That is why we energetically denounce those imperialist manoeuvres.

163. We remind the NATO countries directly involved in those manoeuvres that those countries that had to fight hard for their independence do not need their advice in order to know who is the enemy of Africa. We know all those who were on our side during the difficult moments of our struggle for national independence. We should never forget that at the top of the list of those friends stand all the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union and Cuba, which some Western countries are trying to make us

believe are our enemies. Having fought for our independence, we do not need to be told its value. We know that, and we shall always know how to preserve our independence.

164. It is within the framework of our independence that we want to establish good relations with the whole world. The attitude of France, Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States of America and Great Britain is in complete contradiction of the efforts which we are making at this session to create a climate of confidence among all States. May they take our criticism as constructive, so that they correct their mistakes.

165. More concerned than ever with the problem of the proliferation and the alarming spread of nuclear arms in various parts of the world, the People's Republic of Mozambique avails itself of this opportunity to remind the international community of the very well-known dangers associated with any nuclear explosion. We hereby reaffirm that the creation of nuclear-free zones would contribute greatly to the establishment of a climate of security for the countries in such zones. The People's Republic of Mozambique hopes that the declaration which was approved by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity in 1964, the objective of which was to safeguard the African continent against nuclear weapons, will be effectively observed and applied.

166. Within this context, we welcome the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which is intended to protect Latin America from nuclear armaments.

167. The People's Republic of Mozambique also supports all measures which may lead to the denuclearization of the rest of the world. As we have already stated, the denuclearization of the Indian Ocean and its transformation into a zone of peace is one of the principles enshrined in our Constitution. We want to see that vast ocean, in which ships of various nations navigate, free from nuclear arms proliferation and also foreign imperialist military bases.

168. The increasing military tension in that ocean is an infringement of the sovereignty of the countries of the region which could lead to the escalation of the armed conflicts on a much wider scale, at which point the nuclear Powers could for some reason make use of armaments with great lethal power. The dismantling of the imperialist bases and the reduction of strategic weapons and forces located on that ocean are long overdue. Concrete steps should be taken quickly in order to remedy the situation before it is too late. Because of its importance as an international waterway for world commerce and trade, the Indian Ocean cannot be made a closed lake, neither should it be converted into a focal point of permanent tension or a stage for power-play. With this preoccupation in mind, we believe that, in conformity with the wish expressed by the coastal countries and the principles declared by the non-aligned countries, the convening of a world conference on the Indian Ocean is necessary.

169. On the problem of weapons of mass destruction, we note with great apprehension the present involvement of certain NATO countries in increasing production of their

destructive weapons and, more particularly, in increasing their power and scope, as if they were not content with the atrocities committed in the last two world wars.

170. The colonial and imperialist wars in Africa, Indo-China and the Middle East were used for experiments with chemical, toxic, bacteriological and related weapons of mass destruction. Those notoriously criminal experiments carried out against mankind move us to condemn vehemently and vigorously the imperialist manoeuvres designed to undermine the efforts exerted to halt the production of new types of weapons of mass destruction, such as the neutron bomb, and to bring about the total elimination of those which already exist.

171. My country equally repudiates the utilization of techniques for the modification of the environment for military purposes. This kind of weaponry endangers our ecosystem; that could lead to ecological catastrophe, costing millions of lives.

172. Imperialism attempts—in vain—to convince us that hunger, misery, disease and even illiteracy—or, to put it collectively, under-development—are the outcome of the current inflation. Obviously, imperialism is engaged in a ridiculous campaign to camouflage the burden that the war industry places on the budget of States.

173. Several preceding speakers have referred to the arms race as having compounded financial difficulties globally, particularly in the case of under-developed countries which, unwillingly, are driven by circumstances to divert substantial portions of their expenditures to armaments, even for limited purposes of self-defence. I shall therefore refrain from citing statistics; previous speakers have already eloquently brought out the disparity between the astronomical budgetary allocations in the field of armaments and the meagre share of the production of fundamental goods that is allocated for humanity.

174. The development of a national awareness and the struggle of the peoples for their real political and economic independence represent a threat to the monopolies of the imperialist countries. That is why they do not hesitate to engage in sinister plots and plans, with the aim of maintaining an entire continent under their strict domination.

175. In this complex situation, we believe that only by the creation of a truly peaceful and secure climate of liberty would there be any possibility of channelling funds towards the promotion of the establishment of mutually advantageous economic, cultural and social co-operation among nations, without any double-dealing intentions on either side.

176. The People's Republic of Mozambique advocates the encouragement of any and all initiatives that would contribute to general and complete disarmament, for which the non-aligned countries and the socialist countries, together with the rest of the peace-loving countries of the world, have been struggling. Within this framework it is our desire to see all nuclear Powers actively engage in serious negotiations leading to general and complete disarmament.

ment. Thus, we congratulate the Soviet Union and the United States of America on the positive gains that have been demonstrated so far in their continuing bilateral negotiations, and we are anxious to see these efforts culminate in the near future in more adequate, comprehensive and lasting agreements.

177. As far as the mechanisms for negotiations are concerned, we consider that all countries Members of the United Nations should participate to a considerable degree in the discussion of the problems that arise and in the decision-making process. We support the view that the existing organs should be closely connected with the General Assembly. A careful study of the proposals presented by the movement of non-aligned countries could undoubtedly pave the way for acceptable solutions in this domain.

178. Advancement in the realm of nuclear-energy technology is indisputably one of the fascinating triumphs of human endeavour. The development of science and technology is the heritage of mankind and, as such, should be utilized to create better conditions of life for everyone, everywhere in the world.

179. Today is the last day of the general debate of this tenth special session. Looking back, we find grounds for optimism. The majority of the speakers in this Assembly have unequivocally and sincerely expressed their desire and determination to work for the success of disarmament. Many valuable and positive ideas have been voiced throughout their speeches. We hope that we shall reach a just consensus which will be reflected in the final documents. Most of all we hope that those countries which for a long time have been systematically erecting obstacles will this time listen to the voice of reason and, consequently, co-operate in the process of implementing the decisions which will be taken by all of us.

180. Mr. HUSSAIN (Maldives): Mr. President, in view of the fact that in 1961 Yugoslavia, under the inspired leadership of President Tito, was one of the founders of the noble philosophy of non-alignment, it is a very pleasant and appropriate coincidence that this important and historic session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is taking place under the chairmanship of a distinguished Yugoslav statesman. It is a particular pleasure for my delegation to take part in this general debate under your skilful and wise guidance. Indeed, presiding over the last three sessions of the General Assembly, you have given an outstanding example of justice, wisdom and skill.

181. The Republic of Maldives, a member of the movement of non-aligned countries, recalls that the idea of a special session on disarmament was initiated at the first summit of non-aligned countries at Belgrade in 1961. Non-aligned nations, comprising the majority of the people of the world, are particularly conscious of the fear and helplessness that have been brought about by the arms race. It is a many-sided race which touches the life of every human being in the world. Therefore, the very fact that a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is being held, a session in which all Member

countries are participating on an equal basis, is proof of everyone's concern and desire to become actively involved in the search for a way to bring a solution to this problem. This special session constitutes a far-reaching decision of the utmost importance to international relations. It is the hope of all Member countries to establish constructive co-operation among nations to ease world tension in order to find a solution to the accumulated problems that depend so much on international relations. We must pledge ourselves to remove the distrust that exists among nations as a result of a spiralling arms race. We cannot afford to ignore the colossal waste of human and material resources. These resources must be utilized to provide better conditions of living to the peoples of the world.

182. People of different ideologies and experience would call the threat created by the arms race by different names. My country, Maldives—one of the smallest Members of this Organization—in common with Member countries of the same size and ideology, sees the arms race as one of the greatest perils in the world today. The world as a whole recognizes the fact that the threat of war is more imminent today than at any time since the Second World War. My delegation attaches great importance to this session, bearing in mind the grave dangers that have developed in the arms race and the build-up of arms in different corners of the world. Our country, being small and peace-loving, is placed in a very special, indeed unique, situation. The heritage of our people has taught us a tranquil life style. Our people learned the value of peace and harmony a long time ago. Therefore, we cannot in our wildest dreams imagine being caught in the web of the destructive toys created by man.

183. Today, the peoples of the world are gradually becoming enslaved by the creations of man. Values of life and courage are becoming somewhat less than superior to automated and remote-controlled weapons in the event of war. Nations of the world are unconsciously being drawn into the temptation of building arsenals of such weapons instead of developing well-disciplined armies and making friends with other nations. The possession of sophisticated weapons has come to mean that even the most cowardly can go to war.

184. Let us ask ourselves where all the arms sales between nations are taking us? Are we not preparing ourselves for war? Why all the arms build-up? If there is no war and we have huge amounts of sophisticated weapons would there not be a possible human temptation to indulge in a war? Or perhaps would we not be tempted at least to try out the possessions just to prove that they are mere possessions? All these factors paint a rather frightening picture as the countries which produce modern war machinery are either waging a war of publicity or winning great markets for their products. The rest of the world is becoming a victim to that human temptation. Today, friendship agreements between countries are upheld through gifts of arms. Why can we not make friends by exchanging more peaceful gifts?

185. Today, the world is evolving through the nuclear age. We still remember, as if it happened only yesterday,

the atomic bombs that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. The devastation caused among the people of Japan and the traumatic experience to which they were subjected have taught us the essential horrors of nuclear power when used for destruction. We have to accept the fact that nuclear weapons, by their very nature, now involve the question of the survival of the human race. At the same time, nuclear and thermonuclear weapons threaten the very existence of the human race on a global scale.

186. We are talking about a power, the devastations of which radiate over several decades. It causes physical disorders and psychological disturbances. Nuclear weapons not only cause immense damage and loss of life but completely deny the very existence of the human being, destroying not only life but also the very essence of being and everything that makes up the nobility of human life.

187. The United Nations, at the very first session of the General Assembly, in 1946, condemned nuclear weapons. On that occasion, the very first resolution was highly appreciated. A number of partial steps have been taken in the struggle for complete disarmament by the United Nations and through international negotiations, both multilateral and bilateral. But tangible progress towards disarmament is not evident. Even while open anxiety exists, the worldwide nuclear and traditional arms race gathers momentum. Immense over-all technical improvements have been made in the accuracy of delivery of strategic and tactical nuclear warheads which, frighteningly, are leading to a first-strike nuclear strategy.

188. Among the subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, resolution 1653 (XVI) adopted at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly in 1961 is worth recalling. It was almost two decades ago that the international community viewed the arms race, particularly in the nuclear and thermonuclear fields, as having reached a dangerous stage requiring all possible precautionary measures to protect humanity and civilization from the hazard of nuclear and thermonuclear catastrophe.

189. It is now 17 years later and nuclear technology has been growing at an incredible pace. All the threats that existed then have grown to frightening proportions. Had the international community adhered faithfully to the declarations of that time, it is the opinion of my delegation that the need for a session of the General Assembly specially devoted to this subject would not have existed.

190. From time to time the news media have reported events that have shocked the defenceless majority of the world. Those events take place because of accidents or mishaps involving nuclear devices. One such recent report in fact made some of the most technologically advanced countries of the world uncomfortably tense. That was just one incident which had a more fortunate outcome than might have been the case. It happened in a region where wealth and technology were at hand to carry out search and research. What would have been the fate of the people if such an incident had occurred in a poor country with hardly any technical know-how, let alone such a country

trying to prevent its ill-fated destiny? Perhaps there would not have been a single living being to report such a happening before the entire country was wiped off the globe. The fact is that the majority of the world is in that helpless and defenceless situation. Even at this very moment, nuclear or thermonuclear creations of man are either circling above these countries or travelling under the oceans that surround them. It is here that the United Nations could undertake the very important task of more actively informing the peoples of the world and ensuring that they know the facts pertaining to possible incidents that could threaten the lives of people, so that they would be able to prepare themselves.

191. Since the world has begun to condemn the production of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, less and less information is being released to the world by the nuclear countries which produce such arms. Information on new developments or the strength of such weaponry is not easily available. Perhaps the world knows comparatively little of the actual nuclear capability and advancements made by those countries.

192. "To err is human": the facts I have illustrated earlier threaten all of us. Even the most technologically advanced countries of the world are debating today about a safe storage system for atomic waste. Let us then consider for a moment the remote possibility of human error. The result could be the loss of many innocent lives. How then could we justify such an event? It is for this reason alone that we are duty bound to call for a general and complete prohibition of the production of nuclear or thermonuclear arms. We in the Maldives strongly believe that for general and complete disarmament to become a reality the utmost importance must be attached to the case of nuclear weapons. All Members of this Organization should join hands in total unanimity to support the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. Representatives that do not belong to nuclear-weapon countries should stand steadfast in calling upon nations to make regional restrictions such as the designation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The Maldives takes special pride in having joined hands with the countries of its region to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace free from big-Power rivalry and conflict. We believe that General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) declaring the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace attaches extreme importance to its implementation as a means of establishing the true independence and security of the States in the region.

193. We would like to see all nations of the world voluntarily reduce their arms expenditures. We must stop ourselves from singling out nations and talking about what they have not done. On the contrary, let us talk about our own countries and the positive measures we are going to take voluntarily. We must be more positive and sincere about disarmament. We do not have time or money to waste when the peoples of the world are crying out for food and shelter and for medical care and education. The nations of the world must stop wasting the vast resources of our planet on the means of destroying human life. This special session of the General Assembly offers a wonderful opportunity to the international community to cultivate a

genuine hope for greater progress towards disarmament. We shall not be calling for a disarmament revolution but for an effective and peaceful resolution to the problem. This problem must be solved in a new spirit. We must refuse to accept old policies of force and domination by some nations over others. We must seek genuine and just international relations through a democratic system.

194. Since all nations do not have equal capabilities, the major Powers of the world must take initiatives which will inspire confidence among nations in order to achieve speedy disarmament. Such motives will gradually lead to equity through a universally acceptable distribution of responsibilities with mutual respect, among both the super-Powers and the non-nuclear countries.

195. My country believes that this important session of the General Assembly has sparked off a genuine and positive interest in the international community which takes advantage of the already existing conditions necessary to solve the problem of disarmament. Therefore, this unique opportunity to take joint action through common agreement to solve the problem of world disarmament will be fully utilized by all nations, large and small, according to their capabilities. Our actions and common agreements will thereby provide brighter prospects for a safer future for mankind.

196. Mr. MAKOBERO (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like, first, to associate my delegation with the remarks of other representatives in congratulating you on your election to the presidency of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

197. The wise, skilful and diplomatic way in which you guided the work of the thirty-second session and of the special sessions devoted to Lebanon and Namibia is the guarantee of the success of this session.

198. I want to take this opportunity also to tell Mr. Waldheim, Secretary-General of the United Nations, of the high esteem in which the Government of my country holds him as a result of his tireless efforts to maintain peace among nations and to establish a new international political and economic order which will provide justice for mankind as a whole.

199. The wise guidelines the Secretary-General laid down at the opening of this session will serve as a solid foundation for our discussions, and will guide our work towards conclusions which I hope will allay the anxiety of mankind as a whole. At this moment of uncertainty as to the future of our fragile earth, the eyes of the world are turned towards us.

200. As was clearly stated last week by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria, the non-aligned movement "far from being a third bloc equidistant from the other two blocs in a polarized world, is a dynamic force whose global mission is manifest in all important events" [12th meeting, para. 4].

201. No event could be more important than this special

session devoted to disarmament. The idea to convene it was first mooted at Belgrade in 1961, at the first Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, but that idea might not have come to anything if Marshal Tito, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, who has defended forcefully and with perseverance the ideals of the movement of non-aligned countries, had not revived it at the summit conference of that group at Colombo in 1976. It is an honour for me to pay a well-deserved tribute to this great Yugoslav leader for his contribution to the establishment of understanding and peace among nations.

202. For the first time in the history of mankind all independent and sovereign States on our planet are meeting here to study, define and establish ways and means of ensuring our survival and that of succeeding generations. An impressive number of heads of State and of Government have, by their presence, exalted this special session, thereby demonstrating the importance which they attach to the need to slow down the arms race and to facilitate the process of development.

203. Representatives of non-governmental organizations throughout the world have come to urge Member States to ensure that mankind is preserved from the scourge of war. The occasion is a timely one, and it must be seized while there is still time to avoid a repetition of the events at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Everyone agrees that if there were a recurrence of those events, which are recalled with sadness, there would probably be no survivors to speak to future generations about them, and probably no future generations to assess their devastating effects.

204. It must be acknowledged that since 1945 efforts and contacts have been made, agreements have been concluded, and conventions and treaties have been signed in an attempt to avert the danger of another world war. However, what has been accomplished is nearly insignificant by comparison with what needs to be done to remove the danger of a new war, particularly a nuclear war.

205. In fact, the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water,⁶ the tripartite Moscow treaty of 1963, while reducing the danger of radioactive contamination, did not really amount to a step towards a reduction in the arms race. Even less could it lead to disarmament. In fact, it did not prevent the continuation of underground nuclear tests, or contribute to the destruction of the nuclear weapons in the possession of the three nuclear Powers which signed it. As a result, other States, which did not at that time have the same capability in nuclear-weapon technology, continued atmospheric tests.

206. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons complicated the procedure of international trade in nuclear materials and techniques. None the less, over the 10 years following its signature in 1968 it has been unable to prevent the number of nuclear Powers, and of countries which possess the technology to manufacture atomic bombs, from increasing to over a dozen. Contamination continues, on the pretext of acquiring atomic energy for "peaceful purposes".

⁶ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964, p. 43.

207. More than ever, all nations are devoting enormous amounts of money to weaponry.

208. Addressing the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, Mr. Muganga, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of the Republic of Burundi, referred to the frenzied arms race in the following terms:

“The question of disarmament is of vital importance to the safeguarding and strengthening of international peace and security. Solution of this problem will allow the peoples of our planet to devote themselves to the needs of development and progress. At the present stage of negotiations, however, my delegation notes with regret that little tangible progress has been achieved. On the contrary, new forms of weapons of mass destruction are being perfected and are still appearing as the number of countries capable of achieving nuclear capability constantly grows. Year after year, military budgets increase. Each year \$300 thousand million are spent on military expenditures, and a number of experts devote all their time to research on new methods of destruction . . .”⁷

209. What is the reason for this contradiction between the desire for disarmament and the firm determination to acquire ever-improved weaponry?

210. In my delegation's view, the obstacles to disarmament and the reduction of the arms race can be summed up in five points: first, the determination of some States to maintain the *status quo* and retain hegemony over others; secondly, distrust among nations and their constant concern for their security; thirdly, failure to find adequate solutions to conflicts persisting in certain areas of the globe; fourthly, the perpetuation of colonialism, an infamous system of exploitation of man by man; and fifthly, injustice in international economic relations.

211. It is obvious that in international relations the great Powers are constantly attempting to manoeuvre in order to maintain the present situation in their favour and to struggle against anything that might bring about any change in their world hegemony. Now, the reduction of the arms race and the process of disarmament strike precisely at the best means at their disposal—military hegemony everywhere in the world.

212. The great Powers must recognize and accept that the balance of forces is the *sine qua non* for success in the disarmament process and that the dismantling of military bases located on the territories of others is absolutely necessary. All nations, whether large or small, fear one another and must arm themselves as much as possible in order to ensure their security. Security based on rivalry in armaments is, however, precarious. Collective security is the best guarantee, as was indicated by the Secretary-General in his opening statement at this special session, when he said:

“The past years have revealed the difficulty of halting an arms race the momentum of which has seemed hitherto to be beyond the capacity of man to control. Na-

tions acquire arms because, as our President has said, they distrust each other and because they hope to gain protection from attack. But a security based on arms is precarious at best, since arms perpetuate distrust and fear among nations and create a permanent risk of war. Mutual confidence and shared objectives are the only means that will serve in the place of arms to attain the security which every nation and all peoples rightly demand.” [1st meeting, para. 46.]

213. Nothing seems more illusory than to come here and talk about disarmament in countries involved in armed conflict in the Middle East, Cyprus and within the divided Korean nation, while some States Members of our international Organization are encouraging these conflicts and fanning them by deliveries of arms of all types. In my delegation's view, a just and equitable political solution must be found.

214. The racists who have usurped African territories are outdoing each other in bravado in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Namibia to subjugate forever the black man on the soil of his ancestors. So long as the international community does not unite to combat and vanquish these unrepentant colonialists, it will be an illusion to talk about disarmament on the African continent and, therefore, in the entire world, for what affects us will have world-wide repercussions.

215. The gap between the wealthy countries and the poor countries is growing wider than ever. The rich become richer and the poor become poorer. This gap in the apportionment of the world economy also runs the risk of being at the root of armed conflicts between nations.

216. The Director-General of UNESCO, in addressing this Assembly a week ago, drew the attention of the representatives to this special session to this danger, which is no less serious than the arms race, when he quoted:

“ . . . ‘peace can never be viewed as the mere absence of armed conflict but . . . it essentially implies a process of progress, justice, mutual respect among peoples designed to guarantee the establishment of an international society in which everyone finds his proper place and has his share in the intellectual and material resources of the world, and that peace based on injustice and violations of human rights cannot last and inexorably leads to violence.’ ” [6th meeting, para. 299.]

217. We are meeting here to attempt to find ways and means which can do away with the obstacles in the way of the search for peace.

218. At this stage of our work, my delegation is not in a position to express its views with regard to the contents of the final document, which is still in the process of being drafted. I should, however, like to state clearly the position of the Republic of Burundi with regard to the programme of action to be implemented in order to halt the arms race and to lead to general and complete disarmament.

⁷ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings*, 30th meeting, para. 130.

219. It is necessary for the three great nuclear Powers—the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland—to reach an agreement in their negotiations so that shortly a treaty will be signed completely banning nuclear arms tests and a protocol agreement concluded relating to nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, which should form an integral part of the treaty. Once this treaty is signed it is necessary, for the cause of peace, that Member States—particularly those already possessing nuclear weapons or the necessary technology to acquire them—sign and ratify it as soon as possible.

220. With regard to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the States possessing these weapons must commit themselves not only not to use them against non-nuclear-weapon States, but also to destroy them, for that is the best guarantee that they will not use them and that the non-nuclear-weapon States will not feel the need to acquire them.

221. To use weapons of mass destruction is a crime against humanity. All States possessing such weapons should destroy them, which would obviate the need to acquire them of States not yet possessing such weapons.

222. The peoples of Africa, Latin America, the Middle East and South-East Asia, while in the process of building up their young nations politically and economically, have, against their will, been drawn into conflicts between blocs. It is said that if a third world war should occur, it would begin somewhere in Africa, the Middle East, South-East Asia or Latin America, rather than in regions where deadly weapons are being manufactured and where conflicts first emerged.

223. The Republic of Burundi is unequivocally in favour of the denuclearization of these regions, the dismantling of foreign military bases on their territories and the establishment of zones of peace in their territorial waters.

224. It is the fervent hope of my country's delegation that the representatives gathered here will make every effort to produce an effective programme of action capable of leading to general and complete disarmament. In so doing, they will have confounded the pessimists who claim that the United Nations is unable successfully to promote a genuine process of disarmament.

Statement by the President

225. The PRESIDENT: We have just concluded the general debate. An impressive number of speakers, eminent statesmen from all parts of the world, have taken part in it. Within less than three weeks, we have listened to statements by the leaders and representatives of 126 Member States, among them four Heads of State, 16 Prime Ministers, 4 Vice-Presidents and Deputy Prime Ministers and 49 Ministers for Foreign Affairs. We have also heard the Directors-General of UNESCO and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

226. The presence of such a large number of prominent

world statesmen illustrates in itself the great importance of the tenth special session and what the entire world expects of it. This, the largest gathering in the history of our Organization devoted exclusively to disarmament, has underscored the importance which all Governments of States Members of the United Nations Organization and world public opinion as a whole attach to this highly complex issue confronting all of us today.

227. In the statements we have heard during the general debate, elaborating the positions of all participants, we have had the opportunity to perceive the different dimensions, the multifarious consequences of the arms race and the staggering increase of military expenditures in the world. The figures and comparisons made in this area in the general debate sometimes produced a dramatic effect.

228. Never in history has man possessed such destructive power to annihilate himself and the environment in which he lives. The warnings issued by a number of outstanding world leaders to the effect that it is high time for the international community and the United Nations to apply themselves in all earnestness to halting the present-day arms race and to putting an end to the further stockpiling of lethal weapons, have met with full understanding in the General Assembly. The statements delivered in the general debate have naturally warned us against the numerous difficulties standing in the way of achieving our goal. Without excessive illusions and without exaggerated pessimism, a number of speakers—while fully appreciating the present moment in the history of mankind and giving us an adequate dose of realism—have pointed to the need for the United Nations to exert maximum efforts to replace the vicious circle of rivalry, distrust and ever more astronomical military budgets, with an atmosphere of mutual confidence and understanding.

229. I should like to add that I have gained the impression that all the speakers who took part in the general debate, although at times assessing the situation each from his or her specific angle, have made an effort to render a constructive contribution to this important international discussion on the causes and consequences of the arms race and on the ways and means of discontinuing it.

230. In the general debate, as well as during the preliminary work of the Preparatory Committee, a number of constructive and interesting proposals, suggestions and ideas have been advanced on how to proceed with a genuine and intensive international dialogue on specific disarmament measures. A detailed analysis of these proposals and suggestions would show that there are substantial possibilities for having such a dialogue finally take place and for conducting disarmament negotiations on a basis acceptable to all, so as to open new prospects for the realization of the inviolable aspiration of all countries in the world to live in peace based on confidence and mutual co-operation.

231. Whether we shall succeed in finding this acceptable common ground, whether we shall respond to and fulfil the expectations raised by this special session, will be determined during the time left at our disposal, which is less than three weeks. Arduous tasks still await us. However,

with the encouragement and goodwill expressed in the general debate, I feel confident that we shall, in the days to come, reach an agreement on vital issues appearing on the agenda of the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

232. In conclusion, I wish to voice my hope and confi-

dence that, following such a substantive and constructive general debate, our efforts will produce fruitful and tangible results.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.