



*President:* Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

**AGENDA ITEM 8**

**General debate (continued)**

1. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): Mr. President, my delegation shares the sense of significant expectation that characterizes the special session on disarmament. We feel it is particularly appropriate that once again you have been asked to preside over our efforts, a recognition both of your personal attributes and of your country's contribution to the promotion of peace. We are greatly encouraged by President Tito's inspiring message [2nd meeting].

2. We owe a debt of gratitude to the Chairman and members of the Preparatory Committee for the patient persistence with which they carried out their important work. A special word goes to Mr. Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina for the dynamic leadership role he exercised. It is certainly not for lack of trying on his part that the area of disagreement, even on paper, still remains so large. Perhaps never before has so much concentrated attention been expended on disarmament efforts by so many over a protracted period. Regrettably, from the outset, we must candidly admit that there are few tangible results to show in return for the enormous effort expended.

3. One of the predictable but less rewarding results is the accumulated documentation before us, which by time-honoured tradition surfaces only on the eve of the session, almost as if to ensure that no one will be able to study it in depth. In essence it consists of a voluminous compendium of good intentions, most of them so far unfulfilled, and hiding substantive divergences in vague formulations. The main product of the Preparatory Committee is emasculated by the modern disease of square brackets. This is a reflection not only of the complexity of disarmament questions, but also of our patent inability, under present methods and attitudes, to provide adequate solutions.

4. Nevertheless, although our mood is sombre, our efforts cannot cease, and we take consolation from the fact that we still have ahead of us a short but hopefully intense and productive period of negotiations, with the participation of an impressively high level of national representation. My delegation therefore still nourishes the hope that our end result will have eliminated at least some of the present fundamental differences of approach, and will really constitute a new impetus, renewal of effort in many directions.

5. In the course of this session we do not feel that we need devote any time to glossing over the few but impressive-sounding arms-control agreements that have been negotiated, either openly at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, or secretly in bilateral talks, over the past two decades or so; we do not need, either, to hear eulogies on past proposals that have been advanced and immediately rejected because of their one-sided approaches which naturally foredoomed them to failure. We need instead to hear of concrete plans that can be devised so as to promote the progress that so far has evaded us.

6. We have listened and will continue to listen with respect and attention to the statements of those with special responsibility for progress, in the expectation that important solutions to one or two outstanding points are attainable soon. But we feel that at this session we must go beyond the kind of declarations that have been heard year in and year out in this forum, each one no less impressive than that of preceding years, in which high hopes were raised, only to be frustrated by subsequent events.

7. We have called for practical agreement on disarmament measures, but the record of actual achievement is rather bleak. It provides little comfort. The results are diametrically opposed to stated intentions. After a quarter century of negotiations we have moved as far away from the declared objective of general and complete disarmament as the number of times its desirability has been solemnly reaffirmed every year.

8. For each annual reaffirmation made here, numerous reports appear describing new weapons systems deployed or under consideration. Regrettably, we must note that in the two years since the decision to hold this session was adopted, expenditure and qualitative advance have continued without restraint; an impressive number of more advanced weapons systems have appeared, to the extent of permitting decision-makers the awesome responsibility of an ample choice either to deploy, defer or discard production, with the first option seemingly the most frequently preferred. It would be a serious set-back to our efforts if the same inexorable process were to continue even after this session has come and gone, in complete disregard of necessity, logic or morality. Reason appears to have lost its compelling prevalence.

9. The problems are formidable, and they are getting progressively worse. The evidence needs no stressing. Others have already mentioned many examples. Some stand out, and merit repetition: negotiated arms-control agreements between the super-Powers have not halted the arms race, let alone initiated a process of nuclear disarmament.

ment; new weapons systems are already rendering laboriously-negotiated agreements obsolete; numerical controls on missiles are not curtailing qualitative improvements; the threshold between conventional and nuclear weapons and between tactical and strategic weapons is becoming more difficult to determine; the "unthinkable" is being thought about more and more as systems are improved, and so-called first-strike capability or limited nuclear wars are openly discussed; relatively obsolescent but still very highly sophisticated conventional weapons are being traded in sensitive areas with insufficient restraint; and the negotiating body has not even shown itself capable of including all nuclear-weapon States and other highly interested countries although the problem is of universal concern.

10. I apologize for contributing to the collective yawn with which, according to an article in *The New York Times* of 28 May, experienced negotiators have greeted this special session. I realize that it is not for a small country such as Malta to give counsel to the mighty, but we do have a stake in survival. It would be remiss of us not to point out that this unacceptable situation is being consolidated as a modern phenomenon, all efforts against which have so far failed to produce the required change. The major Powers are now engaged in what is literally a race to death in which the entire planet is at risk. The release, for whatever reason, of any one of the existing tens of thousands of nuclear weapons could cause unprecedented destruction and slaughter which would respect no national frontiers.

11. Faced with this reality and this evidence, it would be regrettable if at this special session we contented ourselves merely with the adoption of one more resounding declaration, perhaps acquiring a few minor changes in the negotiating machinery and embarking on studies which might distract us from our main responsibility and in any case are likely only to prove what we already know, or at least strongly suspect.

12. Our problems are accumulating and getting out of hand; our tools are few and under tremendous pressure. In the circumstances, we have radically to re-evaluate our approach and reassess our orientation, our priorities and the use to which we are putting our scarce resources. We also have to examine the enduring obstacles, and review our performance periodically. And time, as always, is not on our side.

13. As a matter of fundamental importance, it seems to my delegation to be incontrovertible that in individual countries as well as throughout the world the overwhelming urge of the present time is for peaceful economic and social development. This urge is perhaps more pronounced in the developing world than in the more industrially advanced countries, but it remains universal. Viewed in the light of this objective, it is evident that a continuing arms build-up is not only highly dangerous in itself but also absurdly wasteful of scarce resources, unresponsive to the wishes of the people and therefore unsustainable in the long run by even the richest societies, irrespective of their political or economic system. Furthermore, the objectives of peaceful economic progress cannot be attained through

an almost instinctive process of military confrontation; on the contrary, their attainment is hampered by this policy.

14. This has been amply borne out by the evidence before us. Others have quoted the supporting statistics, which I do not have to repeat. If we can at least recognize that our past approaches have not succeeded in securing our objectives, the next step is to analyse the reasons and explore new avenues. This has already been done by a number of speakers who have preceded me, and constructive suggestions have been put forward which my delegation will wish to study carefully. Some seem to be very promising and to a considerable extent are convergent in their approach. I can say at once that my delegation welcomes initiatives which do not predicate an unnecessary prolongation of the present unsatisfactory situation and would not distract us from our main responsibilities. We favour proposals that tend to strengthen the role of the United Nations and its independence and democratic representation in disarmament negotiating machinery.

15. My delegation also has a few observations to make from the perspective of a small unarmed country. We do not underestimate the complexities of the problem. We realize that the question of disarmament has to be seen in the context of perceived security interests which have deep-seated roots in long-established patterns of action, and are abetted by powerful national vested interests. These two factors, strong by themselves, also complement each other, and are generously fed by ideological propaganda. They assume tremendous importance since their area of application has been extended by the major Powers to their respective spheres of interest, which now comprehend our entire planet. The possibilities can be destructive if militaristic approaches continue unchanged; but we should not overlook the fact that they can also be enormously beneficial if economic and social co-operation replaces military approaches. The demand for economic and social progress throughout the world is practically insatiable. It requires all our available resources, intellectual and natural, and it pays rich and rewarding dividends, both economically and politically. We can therefore aim consciously to reverse our priorities and alter the present pattern from military to economic and social avenues.

16. This could be our common platform, and it is in this context that the concept of a link between disarmament and development offers tremendous possibilities even from the purely economic point of view. It becomes not simply another aspect of development co-operation, but a key incentive in any approach to disarmament. A gradual redeployment of the human and financial resources at present devoted to armaments research and production in favour of overdue economic and social advances for the international community will not fail to generate the necessary economic demand to support the structural redeployment in the developed economies. Resource allocation, after all, depends on demand established according to national planning, which is regulated by governmental processes based on popular support.

17. At the same time, the inherent wisdom of a policy of redeployment of resources from armaments building to development co-operation cannot be over-emphasized. It is

an insurance policy for the future. The present international economic situation is inequitable and therefore precarious; we can no longer indifferently ignore this fact since it contains perhaps the germ of the greatest destabilizing element within and among nations in the remaining quarter of this century. By spending less on arms and more on housing, on rural and urban development and on industrialization, and ensuring a more equitable distribution among nations of the world's wealth, we should literally be doing more to guarantee each nation's internal and external security than the existing proliferating arsenals could ever do.

18. For these reasons my Government strongly endorses those proposals which are aimed at releasing the real resources now being used for military purposes and using them for economic and social development throughout the world, particularly for the benefit of developing countries. The Maltese delegation made specific suggestions to this end in 1971. In the light of those suggestions, while we shall study attentively all the proposals put forward, we shall support in particular the suggestion for the creation of an expert group to study the relationship between disarmament and development. In addition, we feel that we can anticipate the result of the study and start giving effect to its objectives without delay. That could be a first step of tremendous significance.

19. There would, of course, remain the most enduring impediment—the attitudinal, or traditional. The point has been well made that the state of armaments today is such that the only thing it can assuredly guarantee is destruction for all. This is theoretically convincing to most. It is also uncontested that the plateau of military deterrence already reached is at an unnecessarily high level, but has not brought about increased security. However, it should be made at least to give the world a breathing-space which will allow the super-Powers to move from theory to practice. We must consider what process—gradual, as it inevitably must be—can best guarantee an eventual massive reduction in arms without, at any stage, putting the security of any country in jeopardy. Certainly, détente cannot thrive if it is perpetually maintained on a policy of massive deterrence. This requires not only that we consolidate gains that may accrue from our efforts to date, but also that we explore all other avenues that may lead to more rapid progress.

20. It is evident that universalist approaches have to be complemented by regional efforts, which do not necessarily have to comply with established universalist patterns, or with patterns applicable to other regions, where different circumstances may prevail. There are many initiatives of this kind already under way, and new ones should be encouraged. Each one of us has an important contribution to make at the national, regional or universal level. I believe that for a start the major Powers can help through a reciprocal policy of military restraint and through intensified efforts to solve some of the most intractable problems inherited from the last war. But it is mainly up to other countries to take political initiatives in their own regions which will reduce the possibility of confrontation.

21. One of the most promising approaches of recent times is the creation of zones of peace. However, we are told that this concept is one about which the major Powers appear to be intellectually unconvinced. I see no reason why it should be considered less clear than others which in the past have been accepted without question. It is perhaps true that the pronouncements of national leaders of a particular region in favour of this concept may not yet have crystallized into a common definition or approach. But these pronouncements, which in essence are public expressions, at the highest level, of unease at the unsatisfactory *status quo*, deserve encouragement, not censure, and they need a platform of discussion before they can produce results.

22. I would stress that this aspect needs particular attention because probably the greatest danger of a nuclear confrontation between the major Powers is likely to occur not as a result of a suicidal attack by one against the other, but rather through an escalation of a regional conflict in which the major Powers are ranged on opposite sides.

23. Let me provide an example and allow me to explain briefly what my country has done in the face of this situation. One of the most volatile and typical of these regions is the Mediterranean, which has also become the cockpit of the major Powers, where the deadliest concentration of armaments is constantly being replenished; and which, let us not forget, provoked the latest occasion for a nuclear alert, sending a shiver of apprehension throughout the world.

24. Situated right in the centre of the Mediterranean, Malta is naturally concerned. We are particularly susceptible to the strong influences of the winds of change in our region. This places on us a special responsibility which we will not shirk. We have taken a hard look at the past, so as to be able to plan for the future. We have seen that neither we, nor our neighbors, have derived benefit from the fratricidal wars that divided and devastated us in the past. Malta has the dubious distinction of being the island most heavily bombed during the last war. In addition, the people of Malta inherited an economy not geared to the needs of the indigenous population, but rather one which relied mainly on servicing the requirements of our overlords in their military establishment and adventures.

25. Without rancour, but irrevocably, Malta has turned its back on this turbulent past. My country will no longer be used for military purposes. The watershed in our history is scheduled for March 1979, when the last foreign soldier on our soil will leave, in a transition peacefully negotiated. From then on we will strive to bring the countries in our region closer together. Thus, to the maximum extent of our own limited resources, we shall have done what we can at home, and put our convictions into practice. We extend a friendly invitation to others to do the same. The results are encouraging. For instance, already, in less than a decade, we have developed such friendly contacts with the countries in our immediate neighborhood that our traditional pattern of trade has been completely transformed. It is, we believe, through confidence-building measures of this scope and magnitude that areas of confrontation can be

decreased, and their problems gradually resolved. Consequently we favour similar measures in sensitive areas of interest to others.

26. From our contacts, over the past several years, with national leaders, political parties, trade union representatives, non-governmental organizations, and youth and student societies in the countries bordering the Mediterranean, we have been strengthened in our belief that they share our aspirations for a peaceful Mediterranean, free from outside interference and military forces. There are democratic forces working at the political grass roots, seeking to replace confrontation with concord. We have sought to translate these aspirations into a programme of action at the regional level, utilizing every opportunity open to us.

27. To this end we devoted strenuous efforts at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which eventually brought results. For the first time in history, Canada, the United States and the Soviet Union will join European and Mediterranean countries in a six-week session in Malta during February 1979, to discuss active co-operation in social, economic and cultural matters.

28. It will be my Government's intention to make this occasion a starting-point for a new, dynamic process of co-operation. Our scope would be to direct it towards securing more stable and harmonious relations, progressing to political consultation between the countries of the Mediterranean region. For this we would seek the active contribution of all participants, in order to promote success. We gave detailed explanations of our concrete proposal during the meetings of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. I will not repeat them here, except to point out that we left out no country without whose participation success would be unattainable.

29. It would encourage regional progress if this session were to declare the objective of the Mediterranean as a zone of peace, free of nuclear weapons. Through military disengagement and political concertation with such objectives in mind, the major Powers would eventually be able to shed some of the heavy responsibilities that they may have felt it necessary to assume in the past. A decrease in the possibility of military confrontation and the cumulative easing of tension would benefit not only that region but the world at large and the community of nations including, of course, the super-Powers.

30. We have never neglected the universal level. Our stand is a matter of record. But permit me to recall that from this very podium, in 1967, I proposed, after lengthy consultations with a large number of countries, an agreed title for a new item<sup>1</sup> on which the international community still has to take a decision, after marathon discussions. Our proposal had as a basic approach our national philosophy of planned and peaceful co-operation, regulated through appropriate institutions. It was conceived as a genuine partnership of equals between developed and developing

countries in a new field of human endeavour, and gave rise to a new legal concept—the common heritage of mankind. The progress so far achieved is known to you all, and each one can judge whether we are living up to what was originally proposed and is still required. At least on the credit side the militarization of the ocean floor has been prevented, but only because the international community acted in time. Allow me to recall that it was also my country that first raised the questions of radiological weapons, the military application of lasers and excessive transfer of conventional weapons in sensitive areas. None of these initiatives came from the super-Powers, too preoccupied with their heavy responsibilities, too hesitant about the uncertainties of change.

31. But this has been the approach Malta has always favoured, arising from its past experience and future perspective. Partnership, not division; economic co-operation, not military sabre-rattling. We are now in the last quarter of this century, and we have the opportunity to shift our former methods of automatic military confrontation into political and economic processes designed to build up an increasing fund of confidence, co-operation and mutual respect on as broad a front as possible. Only by this means shall we really be advancing the cause of human rights and dignity throughout the world. Only if we do this can we rekindle in the minds of men everywhere the dying embers of hope. And unless we do this, we shall be belying our very function in this forum, for we would be neither permanent or representative—as we should be—of the aspirations of “the peoples of the United Nations”, to quote the Charter. Herein lies our greatest hope for the future and our present responsibility at this session.

32. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Many speakers who have preceded me have characterized this special session of the General Assembly on disarmament as a unique event. At the same time, they have also warned that it may well turn out to be another failure in the protracted and so far largely barren course of disarmament negotiations unless it can prepare the way for significant progress towards halting the nuclear-arms race and effecting genuine measures of disarmament. This warning needs to be heeded by all of us. The serious tone imparted to the debate by the participation of so many heads of State and Government encourages the hope that a constructive and purposeful start will be made at this session towards real disarmament.

33. It is with special pleasure that, on behalf of my country, I pay tribute to the leadership of President Tito, the doyen of world leaders, who since the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Belgrade in 1961, has made unremitting efforts to bring about a special session of the General Assembly devoted exclusively to disarmament. In his inspiring message, the President of Yugoslavia has warned the world to take measures which would avert the threat of a world holocaust and lead mankind towards a new era of promise and fulfilment of its deepest aspirations.

34. What could be more fitting than that you, Mr. President, a most distinguished and gifted son of Yugoslavia,

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1583rd meeting, para. 188.

which has made a major contribution to the cause of disarmament, should be elected unanimously to preside over this momentous session? In your presidential address [1st meeting] you have admirably summed up the task before us. You have called for new and realistic approaches to halting the present escalation of the arms race, to moving towards the limitation of nuclear weapons with a view to their ultimate prohibition, to freezing and reducing the military expenditures of the great Powers and to channelling the resources thus saved for increased assistance to the developing countries. It is with reference to these goals that we have set for ourselves that the world will judge the results of our endeavours.

35. The Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, has quite rightly called on the session: "to map the way towards a world in which... countries will rely on joint endeavours rather than destructive parity, and in which resources will be used in the most rational rather than the least rational way to promote the common good." [*Ibid.*, para. 38.] To this end, he has urged us to develop a strategy for disarmament in terms of a comprehensive framework within which long-term goals may be set and principles and priorities established. The Pakistan delegation agrees fully with the Secretary-General's approach. We also endorse his constructive proposal for an international study in the field of arms control and disarmament.

36. The Preparatory Committee for the special session has greatly facilitated the task of organizing our work and also our consideration of the substantive aspects of disarmament. My delegation takes pleasure in acknowledging the important contribution the Committee has made under the able and proven leadership of Mr. Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina, a most outstanding personality in the galaxy of distinguished representatives in the United Nations. His unanimous election to preside over the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the present session is not only a tribute to his high standing in the world Organization but also an expression of universal confidence in his ability and skill to steer the Committee through what we expect will be difficult and complex negotiations, to a constructive outcome.

37. The three decades since the Second World War have not been propitious for the achievement of real disarmament, despite the extensive discussions held here and in other forums on the question. We do not discount the value of the agreements and measures which have been adopted so far in the disarmament field. But apart from the Convention on the Prohibition of Biological Weapons,<sup>2</sup> these agreements are either in the nature of non-armament measures or designed largely to maintain the *status quo*. The currency of declarations and decisions in the disarmament field has been considerably devalued by a surfeit of rhetoric and recrimination. Indeed, in practice, disarmament has meant not a cessation of the arms race but its controlled expansion.

38. The nuclear era has coincided with the era of decolo-

nization. With few exceptions, the peoples of the third world are now represented in the community of nations and are making their presence felt in almost all areas of international concern. The field of disarmament, however, is an exception in so far as it does not fully reflect their impact on international relations. The interests of the third world have been gravely prejudiced by the ever-escalating arms race.

39. This special session should address itself not merely to transforming the climate of dissatisfaction with the current impasse in disarmament negotiations. It must be, in the words of the Secretary-General, "an effort of totally new dimensions". This is the first opportunity we have had to formulate an integrated and universal strategy for disarmament. Our decisions should fully reflect the interests and preoccupations of the countries of the third world as well as the changes which have occurred in international relations over the last 30 years. Therefore, the disarmament objectives which we establish must form an integral part of a new international order based on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

40. From the earliest years, the United Nations set for itself the goal of achieving comprehensive disarmament, both nuclear and conventional. But the prevailing cold war and deep mutual distrust between the two power blocs effectively frustrated efforts at achieving any real reduction of armaments. Unable to address themselves to the core of the problem, the two sides turned towards the exploration of partial or collateral steps towards disarmament such as a moratorium on nuclear-weapon tests. Then the wheel turned full circle. An even more ambitious goal than comprehensive disarmament, namely, general and complete disarmament was proclaimed by the United Nations as the objective of the negotiations. The results, however, have belied the high hope of that universal aspiration. So far they have been minimal. The partial test-ban treaty, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the sea-bed treaty, the Convention on the prohibition of biological weapons and the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which is an exclusively Latin American achievement, are the most notable among a few other non-armament agreements.

*Mr. Alzamora (Peru), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

41. In the light of this arid history, the question of a disarmament strategy assumes paramount importance. In this context, the realistic approach suggested by President Giscard d'Estaing [3rd meeting], offers, in the view of my delegation, the possibility of injecting clarity into a confusing picture. The goals that we now set for ourselves must fully take into account the present state of international relations and the legitimate security interests of all States, but without losing sight of the goal of general and complete disarmament towards which all nations must ultimately move.

42. The first and foremost objective of any disarmament strategy must remain the reduction of the arsenals of the two super-Powers, to the minimum levels considered necessary for mutual deterrence. The primary responsibility for the success or failure of our efforts rests on them. It is encouraging that their spokesmen have addressed them-

<sup>2</sup> Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (resolution 2826 (XXVI), annex).

selves to concrete measures to end the deadly competition in stockpiling nuclear and conventional armaments. The negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms seem to us to be but the first few steps along a thousand mile journey. Nevertheless, we welcome the serious parleys between the two super-Powers to reduce the combined total of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles within the framework of the second round of negotiations and their readiness to travel much farther along the road to a third round which would lead to a substantial reduction of strategic nuclear weapons and stricter limitations on their qualitative development.

43. We welcome equally the optimistic statements made by the two super-Powers about the prospect for the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. This accord should have been reached 15 years ago, immediately after the signing of the partial test-ban treaty<sup>3</sup> or at least in the wake of the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex] under which the nuclear parties solemnly pledged themselves to the non-nuclear States to make progress towards nuclear disarmament. The long delay has led to a qualitative intensification of the nuclear-arms race and development of even more infernal weapons, making the problem of nuclear disarmament more intractable than ever. In this context, we hope that an early agreement will be reached for a mutual renunciation by the super-Powers of new types of nuclear weapons such as the so-called neutron bomb.

44. The prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons has been one of the principal concerns of the General Assembly. The priority to be accorded to concluding a convention or the question will no doubt be given active consideration at this special session. To ensure that such a prohibition does not imperil the security of either side, the convention should be complemented by agreed measures to reduce the conventional forces and armaments of the States concerned to mutually acceptable levels.

45. Pending the conclusion of an agreement to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons, we would hope that the super-Powers would explore the possibility of reaching an interim accord on non-first use of nuclear weapons. The People's Republic of China has affirmed that under no circumstances would it be the first to use nuclear weapons. The two super-Powers have made qualified declarations about the non-use of such weapons. We would hope that they will enter into serious discussions to resolve the problem of current imbalances in forces and conventional armaments which appear to constitute a major impediment to the unconditional prohibition of the first use of these weapons of mass destruction. The statement of Chancellor Schmidt [5th meeting] that a break-through has been achieved in the negotiations on the question of mutual reduction of forces in Central Europe has raised our hopes of a non-first-use commitment by all the nuclear-weapon Powers.

46. Such complexities do not exist in prohibiting the use, or the threat of use, of nuclear weapons against States lo-

cated in what President Giscard d'Estaing termed the non-nuclear areas. One nuclear-weapon State, China, has categorically declared on more than one occasion that it will not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. We welcome the assurances conveyed last week by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Gromyko [*ibid.*], that the Soviet Union will not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States which have renounced the production and acquisition of such weapons and do not have them on their territories. President Giscard d'Estaing has declared that nuclear-weapon States should, in particular, preclude, according to a formula to be defined, the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against States that are part of a nuclear-free zone. He also expressed his readiness to give contractual and binding form to such a commitment. We express the hope that the other nuclear Powers will be no less forthcoming in the matter of such assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States.

47. It must be made clear, however, that the question of security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States is essentially a multilateral undertaking and not a bilateral transaction. The assurances are an integral part of the conditions designed to strengthen the non-proliferation régime by promoting the climate of confidence so essential to the disarmament process. To be credible, unilateral declarations eschewing the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons must be incorporated in a Security Council resolution and invested with binding force under a legal instrument.

48. A common formula on security assurances has so far proved elusive on account of the divergent strategic military doctrines and interests of the major nuclear Powers, primarily in Europe. At Pakistan's insistence, the General Assembly, however, approved a formulation in resolution 31/189 C which would, for the time being, exclude from the purview of a "negative" guarantee those non-nuclear-weapon States which are "not parties to the nuclear security arrangements of some nuclear-weapon Powers". These States parties are covered by the nuclear umbrellas of their respective military alliances and, therefore, have a measure of security against the nuclear threat as compared to the other non-nuclear-weapon States, including most of the countries of the third world which are outside such security arrangements. Resolution 31/189 C is specifically meant to deal with the situation of the latter. The non-nuclear States outside such security arrangements have a legitimate right to obtain assurances against the threat or use of nuclear weapons without having to enter into military alliances. My delegation hopes that the General Assembly's formulation on security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States outside NATO and the Warsaw Pact and other States under the nuclear umbrella of one super-Power or the other will be accepted by the nuclear Powers at this special session.

49. In Security Council resolution 255 (1968) three nuclear-weapon Powers declared their intention to come to the assistance of a victim of nuclear aggression in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Here we have the elements of an incipient positive guarantee to non-nuclear States against the use of nuclear

<sup>3</sup> Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964, p.43).

weapons. Pakistan, along with other non-nuclear States, has on a number of occasions pointed out the shortcomings of that tripartite declaration that seriously detract from its credibility. At the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States in 1968 and on subsequent occasions we have underlined the need to strengthen Security Council resolution 255 (1968) in a manner which would more adequately articulate the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations pertaining to the right of individual and collective defence. More specifically, my delegation considers it necessary to provide for the contingency of failure of the Security Council to act by stipulating the responsibility of a permanent member of the Security Council to act individually should disagreement preclude the joint action envisaged in the Security Council resolution.

50. Pakistan's support for the objective of non-proliferation has been active and unwavering. We share the concern to preserve and strengthen the non-proliferation régime. However, certain developments since the adoption of the non-proliferation treaty we fear have exercised a negative influence. The sponsors of the non-proliferation treaty have yet to live up to their commitment to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race. No effective or credible guarantees have been extended to strengthen the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. What is more serious still, no steps have been taken to prevent derogations from the central objective of the non-proliferation régime, which is to ensure that there should be no addition to the number of nuclear-weapon Powers beyond that fixed by the treaty. An apparently deliberate ambiguity is being created about the status of certain States by references to the aim of preventing "further" proliferation and the emergence of "additional" nuclear-weapon Powers. The primary danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons does not arise from countries which have placed their nuclear facilities under the international safeguards system but from those whose programmes are not fully safeguarded. The first task, therefore, is to bring those unsafeguarded facilities under international control and to account for the fissile material accumulated from them.

51. Pakistan shares the concern voiced by Yugoslavia, Brazil, Argentina and others in this debate that, instead of addressing the immediate causes and manifestations of nuclear proliferation, the nuclear supplier countries are embarked on measures to restrain and hinder the transfer and development of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, especially in the developing countries. Such an approach is contrary to the obligations undertaken by the suppliers under the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency and the non-proliferation treaty.

52. The last session of the General Assembly unanimously adopted, in resolution 32/50, a set of principles to govern international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear technology. Those principles uphold the right of all States to develop their programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear technology in conformity with their own priorities, interests and needs and to have access to and be free to acquire nuclear technology, equipment and materials for that purpose under agreed and appropriate international safeguards applied through the International Atomic

Energy Agency on a non-discriminatory basis. We consider that those agreed principles must be upheld and applied by all States. For its part, Pakistan will scrupulously adhere to them.

53. For developing countries, nuclear energy and the use of the nuclear fuel cycle are as important, if not more so, as for the industrialized nations. That was the conclusion reached at two international conferences on the subject held last year respectively at Persepolis<sup>4</sup> and Salzburg.<sup>5</sup> Several countries, including some Western European States, have initiated steps to develop the technologies of nuclear reprocessing and fast breeder reactors with the aim of achieving, as Chancellor Schmidt said, energy independence [5th meeting]. Every country has to bear in mind that the price of uranium has increased eightfold since 1972 and could be raised again. Offers of guaranteed fuel supplies have not been deemed adequate.

54. Accordingly, this special session of the General Assembly should strongly urge the supplier countries to review their policies and to adhere to the principles contained in resolution 32/50 of the General Assembly. It should also reiterate the importance of faithfully implementing international agreements and contracts for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy in conformity with their terms and provisions. Furthermore, this session must reverse the trend and call for the adoption of a special programme to promote nuclear technology for peaceful purposes in the developing countries.

55. The creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world is now acknowledged to be one of the most effective ways of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and of promoting regional and world security. Pakistan notes the decision of the Soviet Union to ratify Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco<sup>6</sup> and France's intention to adhere to Additional Protocol I in the near future. We also welcome the desire of all the nuclear Powers to encourage the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other regions of the world and their willingness to enter into the obligations similar to those entailed by the protocols to the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Practical steps are required at the regional and global levels to implement the proposals of nuclear-weapon-free zones in Africa, the Middle East and south Asia. The danger of proliferation is only too clearly present in these regions.

56. The conditions necessary for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone exist in south Asia. Each south Asian State has unilaterally declared that it will not produce or acquire nuclear weapons. The next step is to translate these declarations into multilateral and binding form.

57. South Asia is a large enough geographic area to qualify for the status of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. The States of the region share a common history. There is continuous

<sup>4</sup> Conference on the Transfer of Nuclear Technology, held from 10 to 13 April 1977.

<sup>5</sup> International Conference on Nuclear Power and its Fuel Cycle, held from 2 to 13 May 1977.

<sup>6</sup> Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p.326).

interaction among them in the political, security and other fields. In regard to any real or perceived threat from any of the nuclear-weapon Powers, whether near or far from that region, we have every reason to believe that these nuclear-weapon Powers would be prepared to respect the nuclear-weapon-free status of a south Asian zone once it is established, and would undertake obligations similar to the provisions of Protocols I and II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco in respect of that zone. None of the regional States is now opposed to the proposed zone in south Asia. The doubts and reservations that may be nurtured by one or two of them could be set at rest through mutual consultations.

58. In the meantime, Pakistan is prepared to consider entering into a joint declaration with the Governments of the south Asian States to renounce the production or acquisition of nuclear weapons.

59. While nuclear weapons have remained the focus of world attention, in view of their capacity for mass destruction, it is conventional weapons that have been and will continue to be the most widely used in conflicts. The major proportion of arms expenditure is devoted to the accumulation and development of ever more destructive conventional armaments. We share the concern about the escalation of the global expenditures on these weapons. The primary responsibility for disarmament in this field, as in the case of nuclear disarmament, rests with the super-Powers.

60. The concern currently expressed about the transfer of arms, especially to third-world countries, needs to be viewed in the correct perspective. As President Giscard d'Estaing said, every State has "a legitimate right to security" [3rd meeting, para. 34]. Vice-President Mondale made the same point in saying that "no nation can be asked to reduce its defences to levels below the threats it faces" [2nd meeting, para. 43]. A policy designed to control the trade in arms must therefore take into account the security requirements of the States concerned, especially those States which do not produce the armaments required to defend themselves. An arbitrary policy of arms denial to one State would introduce instability in various regions, and would provoke rather than prevent armed conflicts, no less than would a deliberate policy of arming another State to the teeth.

61. The suggestion of the President of France for a combined meeting of arms-importing countries in a region and all supplier countries would be useful, we believe, in evolving measures for limiting the acquisition of conventional weapons. But to be equitable these efforts must be guided by certain principles. First, the objective of conventional arms supplies or restraints must be to promote peace and security globally as well as in the various regions. Secondly, a military balance which ensures defensive capability should be maintained among regional States and for this purpose both the levels of transfers and indigenous production of armaments needs to be taken into account. Thirdly, those States which are in a preponderant military position should initiate arms limitations. Fourthly, the right of each State to maintain a level of forces essential for its security must be recognized.

62. We hope that these principles will be endorsed by this Assembly in the context of measures to limit the conventional arms race.

63. Disarmament cannot be promoted in an atmosphere of tension and conflict. It is essential to take measures to decrease international tensions and to build confidence among States, globally and in different regions. Such measures should include respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the resolution of international disputes and conflicts and the exercise of restraint on the part of States in the deployment of troops, military manoeuvres and acts of provocation.

64. We hope that this session's recommendations will lead to concrete agreements on the reduction of armaments and tensions, especially in those regions where disputes and differences still threaten peace and security. We have noted President Giscard d'Estaing's proposal for a conference in Europe. The concept of mutual and balanced force reductions could also be pursued, though on a more modest scale, in other regions of the world. Pakistan, for its part, would be prepared to enter into discussions with its neighbours on ways and means of reducing military expenditures and building a climate of security and mutual trust in our region.

65. My delegation attaches great importance to the goal of establishing a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean as a measure which has interrelated implications for regional as well as global peace and security. Both those aspects need to be addressed simultaneously. There is no doubt that the limitation and eventual elimination of the military presence and rivalry of the super-Powers from the Indian Ocean is central to the concept of a zone of peace. At the same time, peace cannot be ensured unless the littoral and hinterland States also exercise restraint and take the necessary measures to create conditions of security in the region. Integral to peace and security is a commitment to peaceful coexistence, the peaceful settlement of disputes, and an agreement on the levels of the naval forces of the littoral States as well as the denuclearization of the entire Indian Ocean region.

66. Over the last three decades the unprecedented increase in arms expenditures has been matched by the growing accentuation of international economic disparities and recurring crises. Those resources are being diverted not only from the urgent and beneficial uses in social and economic development within the countries incurring such massive expenditures but also from globally recognized objectives in the field of development co-operation. Today, a sum amounting to less than a mere 4 per cent of the \$400,000 million devoted every year to armaments is being spent on development co-operation. It is time that we undertook a study of the opportunity-costs of those expenditures, bringing out the extent to which economic and social development is impeded by the arms race. It has taken only \$1,000 a day over a period of 20 years to eradicate smallpox, while \$1,000 million a day is being spent on conventional and nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. It is no accident that the economic disparities and injustices which exist in the world today are

a mirror of the disproportion in military power and arms budgets.

67. The measures required to reverse that situation involve, on the one hand, the conversion of arms-related activities and expenditures to those designed to serve human welfare and progress and, on the other hand, the promotion of equity in international economic relations which, by removing a primary motivating factor of the arms race, will contribute to the process of disarmament.

68. Pakistan, along with other developing countries and some developed countries, has for the last two decades emphasized the relationship between disarmament and development. We welcome the proposals made in this context by the President of France [3rd meeting], the Prime Minister of Sweden [2nd meeting] and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union [5th meeting]. We are particularly attracted by the equitable and practical nature of the proposal made by President Giscard d'Estaing, in that it makes contributions to development an integral element of expenditures on armaments. We assume that this and other similar proposals are based on the premise that additional resources should be provided for development co-operation by diversion from arms expenditures. We would propose that the General Assembly should at this special session establish an intergovernmental committee of experts to examine and elaborate the proposal for an international fund, as well as other proposals. In the meantime, we would strongly commend the proposal of Mr. García Robles of Mexico, that resources released from arms expenditures should be contributed directly to the United Nations Development Programme for the development of the developing countries [3rd meeting].

69. This special session represents above all the desire to instill the spirit of universality into the disarmament process. Disarmament, as the President of France emphasized, must be in the interest of all and be promoted with the active participation of all. The United Nations, as the only representative world forum, must henceforth play a central role in this endeavour and monitor and facilitate all disarmament efforts. For that purpose, the General Assembly could entrust the First Committee with the task of deliberating and evolving over-all solutions to disarmament problems, or it could reconvene the Disarmament Commission with that mandate.

70. At the same time, we are in favour of preserving the negotiating role of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, but its relationship with the General Assembly needs to be made more direct and explicit. It is necessary also to democratize its procedures and working methods and to introduce such changes as will increase its effectiveness and create the necessary conditions for the participation in its work of all nuclear-weapon States. A limited increase in the Conference's composition would be appropriate, as it would more fully reflect the larger membership of the United Nations.

71. Of course, changes in the modalities for negotiations, though important to inject the new spirit of global endeavour into the disarmament field, are not a decisive

factor. Progress in disarmament depends on the political will of States, particularly the major military Powers, to halt the arms race and to reverse it, and to seek security at lower levels of armaments.

72. When the first atom bombs were exploded 30 years ago it was realized even then that this new power must be leashed, so that it might be utilized only for beneficent purposes and never again bring destruction on mankind. It would have been relatively easy then to dismantle such few nuclear weapons as had been produced and to devise effective measures to prevent their further production and development. Proposals and counter-proposals with that declared objective were put forward at the time by the United States and the Soviet Union but, unhappily, were not seriously pursued. Instead, in the prevailing atmosphere of mistrust and incipient conflict, attempts were intensified by the United States to retain the strategic advantage it enjoyed as the only possessor of the new weapons, and by the Soviet Union not to be left behind.

73. The two Powers have now attained approximate parity in nuclear armaments and have the capability to annihilate each other, to destroy all civilization and perhaps to make the planet uninhabitable forever. Yet the nuclear race goes on inexorably, adding more and newer weapons to existing stockpiles, improving their accuracy, destructiveness and invincibility. The progress of technology seems to have given to the arms race almost a volition of its own and a momentum apparently beyond the control of nations and Governments.

74. At the same time, the world seems to have learned to live with the idea of the "balance of terror". In the policies of some Governments, the so-called strategic balance has come to be considered as an effective, and perhaps the only practical, means for ensuring the world's security. We believe that such a balance is inherently unstable, cannot provide security on a lasting basis and will call for the diversion from more productive and urgent uses of an ever-increasing proportion of the world's material and human resources. The United Nations was founded with the objective of putting an end to war forever, by the creation of institutions for settling disputes among nations by peaceful means and preventing the recourse to armed force. The system of collective security envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations remains, alas, a distant goal. The Security Council has been prevented, by an indiscriminate use of the veto, from acting as an effective instrument for the settlement of disputes among States. As a result, in the three decades since the end of the Second World War, the world has rarely been at peace and on more than one occasion near the brink of nuclear conflagration. In the Middle East, in southern Africa and in other parts of the world, conflict and causes of conflict persist even though the possibilities also exist of resolving those conflicts to the benefit of all the peoples concerned. Recent scientific discoveries can bring great benefits to mankind, but they also pose the threat of intensifying the arms race.

75. We stand today at the threshold of a new period in mankind's history. In every sphere, economic and social,

political and military, there is need for rethinking present assumptions and for creating a new world order based on peace, justice and progress. We take heart from the fact that so many distinguished heads of State and Government have come personally to address this special session, and that in their statements one finds a broad consensus on the nature of the problems that the world faces and the direction in which solutions must be sought. Perhaps in this emerging era, where global interdependence is becoming a living reality in all facets of human experience, reliance on the "balance of terror" may fade away, to be replaced by the concept of one world, one humanity, and we must continue to pursue tenaciously the aim of beating our swords into ploughshares if succeeding generations are to be delivered from the scourge of war.

76. Mr. MLADENOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, first of all, I should like to express my satisfaction at seeing you preside over this exceptionally important session of the General Assembly.

77. The tenth special session of the General Assembly is a major event in international life. Its significance is defined by the topical and urgent nature of the items on the agenda and by their importance for all countries and peoples: namely, the items on halting the arms race and achieving disarmament.

78. The problems of war and the material preparation for war are as old as human society itself. Ancient Rome has given us the saying: "If you want peace, prepare for war". Yet, while at the time of the Roman Empire, according to the scale used in some estimates, the death rate from the then basic weapons such as swords, spears and arrows ranged between 20 and 34, and more recently, using the most powerful means of warfare available, such as field guns, it did not surpass 34,000. In our day a thermonuclear bomb of one megaton capacity has a death-rate index of 660 million.

79. Obviously, those who have been entrusted with the destinies of the peoples have no right to think in terms of categories of the past. In present-day conditions war is not a sensible or an admissible alternative for mankind. War could lead to an unprecedented catastrophe. Accordingly, the policy of constant production and stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction and of increasing the danger of a thermonuclear catastrophe, which is looming over the nations, is a senseless and inadmissible policy.

80. The arms race has long since entered the sphere of the irrational. Is it not a challenge to common sense that military expenditures in the world have reached the colossal figure of \$400,000 million per year and are continuing to rise, whereas at the same time mankind is faced with such problems as how to solve the energy crisis, how to secure basic raw materials, how to control environmental pollution and how to eradicate hunger and disease?

81. Judging by the quantities in which material and human resources are being wasted and the negative effects of this, the arms race now is having the disastrous consequences that we usually associate only with actual wars. If

we do not put an end to this, then the process of constant qualitative improvement of existing weapons and the invention of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction will confront mankind with even greater dangers.

82. The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Bulgarian people attach paramount importance to the struggle for affirming détente in international relations and establishing a lasting peace and co-operation among nations, and to the struggle for disarmament. As was stated by Mr. Todor Zhivkov, President of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, in his report to the National Party Conference on 20 April 1978: "the most important and urgent task now is to halt the arms race and to set off on a broad front towards détente in the military field".

83. Considerable achievements have already been made. These have been reflected in multilateral and bilateral treaties already concluded with the aim of limiting the arms race and banning certain types of weapons.

84. The contribution made by the socialist countries to attaining these results is well known. Also well known are their many initiatives aimed at resolving the most pressing problems of disarmament. A particular place among these measures belongs to the proposals made recently by the Soviet Union designed to avert a nuclear war, to end the arms race, and to begin actual disarmament. These measures include the new constructive proposals made from this forum by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Mr. Gromyko. The countries of the socialist community have come out with a number of initiatives to implement measures for military détente in Europe, including the proposal which would have the participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe assume the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against one another. They also include the proposal not to increase the number of States members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization or of NATO. The socialist countries have set forth their positions on these principles and also on the programme of action in the field of disarmament in the documents which they have submitted to the Preparatory Committee [A/S-10/1, vol. V documents A/AC.187/81 and 82].

85. Curbing the arms race and implementing disarmament measures are now perfectly feasible tasks. The process of relaxation of tension has now become the dominant factor in international relations. The political détente in Europe—the fruit of initiatives and long-standing efforts made by the socialist countries and the result of joint constructive activities of States that participated in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe—has started the process of improving the political climate throughout the world, and has provided the kind of favourable atmosphere which facilitates the gradual solution of existing problems in the interest of all peoples.

86. However, as the Assembly knows, in the international arena there are circles at work which are interested in continuing and even intensifying the arms race. These are above all the military-industrial complex and some

other notorious forces in the West. They are trying to bring back the world to the times of the cold war and they are intensifying their efforts to influence the policies of certain Governments. I cannot but mention regretfully that this is the impression conveyed to us by the issues to be taken up at the forthcoming NATO session. It is also the impression conveyed to us by some statements delivered at this special session of the General Assembly—statements that have struck a dissonant note amidst the common concern for the termination of the arms race and for the creation of propitious conditions for reaching agreement in this field. What is characteristic of these forces is that they are maintaining the fallacious argument that political détente is quite compatible with the arms race and that these two processes can coexist and develop in parallel. Obviously, this argument is a convenient cover-up for those who are amassing profits by pursuing a policy of constant increases in military budgets and stockpiling more and newer weapons. These forces are trying to undermine the confidence among nations and to cloud relations among States.

87. These same circles are making efforts to influence world public opinion in such a way that the peoples would be able to accept a nuclear war as something inevitable or even normal. They advocate the theory of the so-called first-strike nuclear capability; they discuss, cold-heartedly, various scenarios in which, in the event of an initial exchange of nuclear strikes, only a few hundred million people would perish.

88. The advocates of the policy of a further increase in armaments justify that policy by the revived myth of a so-called "Soviet threat" and with assertions that the Soviet Union and the other States members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization allegedly have been trying to gain military superiority over the West. Those allegations are completely unfounded and contradict the substance of the policy of the socialist countries. The Soviet Union, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the other countries of the socialist community have frequently and formally refuted those dangerous and harmful trumped-up charges. In our country, as in the other socialist countries, there are no socio-economic forces interested in producing weapons and encouraging enmity against other peoples. In his speech on the occasion of the celebrations commemorating the sixtieth anniversary of the Great October Revolution, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev said:

"The Soviet Union takes effective care of its defence, but it does not and will not strive to achieve military superiority over the other side. We do not want to upset the relative balance of the armed forces which now exists between, let us say, the East and the West in central Europe or the USSR and the United States. In return, however, we insist that nobody else tries to upset that balance in their own favour."

89. It is gratifying to note that recently the opponents of détente and of disarmament have found themselves in growing isolation, that their actions are meeting with increasingly strong protest from millions of people all over the world and that there is increasing support for the policy of strengthening and deepening détente and disarmament.

90. Important and responsible tasks now face us. The tenth special session of the General Assembly should become a forum for a broad exchange of views and comments on the general questions relating to the approach to disarmament problems, the basic trends on which the coordinated efforts of the States Members of the United Nations should be focused in order to achieve real results in halting the arms race and achieving disarmament. The General Assembly must take decisions at this session that will help to increase the effectiveness of the negotiations now under way in this field in order that agreement may be reached as soon as possible on specific measures to end material preparations for war. In the document we shall be adopting we must re-emphasize the responsibility of all States, and above all the nuclear States and those which possess considerable military and economic potential, for adopting real and effective measures in the field of disarmament. It must be pointed out that no measures in this field can be effective or realistic if they are discriminatory or require that certain States begin to disarm unilaterally. The only measures that can be successful are those which do not lead to the attainment of benefits by some States at the expense of the security of others. Among the important tasks facing us at the present session, in our view, is that of ensuring the necessary conditions for increasing the effectiveness of existing international instruments in the field of disarmament. The General Assembly could make a real contribution in this respect by appealing to those Governments which have not yet done so to accede to those agreements.

91. Equally important is the task of taking the necessary steps to ensure the entry into force and the universality of the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques [*resolution 31/72, annex*]. In this connexion, I have pleasure in informing the Assembly that on 25 May 1978 the People's Republic of Bulgaria ratified that important instrument designed to avert an arms race in a new and particularly dangerous field.

92. As for the basic directions in which the concerted efforts of Member States should be channelled, the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria fully supports the broad programme of measures put forward by the USSR and aimed at halting completely any further quantitative or qualitative increases in the armaments and armed forces of States with great military power, and in particular at the cessation of the manufacture of any type of nuclear weapon, cessation of the production and prohibition of all other types of weapons of mass destruction, cessation of the development of new types of conventional weapons of great destructive force and renunciation by the States which are permanent members of the Security Council and the countries linked to them by military treaties of the expansion of armies and the increase of conventional weapons.

93. We share the views expressed here on the need to begin by discontinuing the production of nuclear weapons, and then gradually reducing the stocks of those weapons until they are completely eliminated.

94. The events relating to the neutron weapon have re-

vealed the sinister prospect of a new and more intensive phase of the arms race and creating conditions in which any international conflict could easily develop into a nuclear-missile war.

95. President Carter's statement that he has postponed taking a definite decision to start production of the neutron bomb, and the subsequent statement by Mr. Brezhnev that The Soviet Union will not begin production of such a weapon if neither the United States nor any other country does so, are undoubtedly positive and encouraging developments. However, the issue is still on the agenda, as can be seen from some attempts to connect it with other problems. The decision not to produce the neutron bomb is not one in the interest of one side only, thus justifying the demand for compensatory action by the other side. The prohibition of the neutron weapon is in the interest of all peoples. The draft convention submitted by the socialist countries on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of neutron weapons<sup>7</sup> provides the basis for an agreement to remove the threat which that weapon represents.

96. The drafting and conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations will help to avert the danger of a world war, deepen and expand international détente and strengthen confidence among nations.

97. The realities of our time make it necessary to give priority to the task of containing the threat of the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is of particular importance to secure universal accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to strengthen the control system provided for in that Treaty. At the same time, it is necessary to ensure the fullest access by non-nuclear States to nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

98. The General Assembly is also faced at this special session with the important task of providing an impetus to the various negotiations now under way on separate measures of disarmament so that these may reach a successful conclusion. We note with particular satisfaction the progress achieved in the Soviet-American negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms, the prohibition of chemical weapons, the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, the banning of radiological weapons, and so on, as well as in the tripartite talks between the USSR, the United States and Great Britain on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. The solution of those problems is long overdue and what is needed now is that the States concerned display the political will to bring those discussions to a successful conclusion.

99. The People's Republic of Bulgaria attaches great importance to the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe. However, as in the case of strategic arms, so at Vienna a necessary condition for the success of the talks is strict respect for the principle of equality and of safeguarding the security interests of any State. It is also essential that attempts to

attain unilateral advantage at the expense of the security of other countries be abandoned. Western countries should cease their attempts to tip the existing military balance in this region in their favour. We are convinced that common sense shall prevail and that obstacles still barring the road to a speedy and successful completion of these extremely important negotiations shall be removed.

100. The importance of the tasks facing this special session is determined not only by their direct relationship with international peace and security, but also by their economic and social dimensions. Disarmament can play an enormously beneficial role for the economic development of all countries and for the establishment of equitable international economic relations. Accordingly, we believe that this session should reaffirm the interest of Member States in the implementation of the well-known Soviet proposal of 1973.<sup>8</sup> That proposal, which enjoys the support of the overwhelming majority of Member States, concerns the reduction of the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council and of States which possess considerable military and economic potential, and the allocation of part of the means thus saved to assistance for developing countries.

101. The People's Republic of Bulgaria shares the developing countries' concern over the intensified arms race. We greatly appreciate their contribution to the efforts to achieve disarmament and lasting peace. We believe that this session, as well as other disarmament forums, will help to strengthen and expand co-operation among all peace-loving forces.

102. The question of the machinery for the negotiation of matters of disarmament also commands our attention.

103. The existing system of forums, organs and channels for negotiations was set up gradually, in response to needs as they arose, and, in our opinion, it fulfils its functions satisfactorily. Of course, it is neither sacred nor immune, and from time to time must be adapted to changing conditions. However, we feel that radical changes, such as those proposed by some countries, could only lead us into unknown territory, without guaranteeing achievement of the objectives being pursued. For that reason we feel that we should approach such proposals with extreme caution.

104. The General Assembly is undoubtedly an important forum for equitable consideration of the fundamental questions of disarmament. However, mankind needs also a universal forum authorized to take effective and binding decisions on specific disarmament problems. The world disarmament conference, which should be attended by all States, including all those possessing nuclear weapons, could fill such a role.

105. We are deeply convinced that the cause of disarmament requires the adoption, at the tenth special session, of the necessary measures for the preparation and convening of the world disarmament conference.

<sup>7</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Supplement No. 27, vol. II, document CCD/559.*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid., Twenty-eighth Session, Annexes, agenda item 102, document A/9191.*

106. This year can mark a decisive turning-point in the struggle to put an end to the arms race and to proceed towards effective measures for real disarmament. This special session can make an important contribution towards this end.

107. The eyes of the whole world are turned towards this hall. The discussions held here and the document now being prepared will help to clarify the nature of the dangers confronting mankind and will intensify further the efforts to adopt decisive measures to overcome these dangers. The results of our work can become an incentive for progress in all current negotiations on various aspects of disarmament, so as to pave the way for serious work in new spheres.

108. Let us, by our common efforts, help the achievement of these ends and justify people's expectations. May the current session mark the beginning of a new and decisive stage in the struggle for disarmament and for lasting peace throughout the world.

*Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) resumed the Chair.*

109. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The present special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has been called on the proposal of the non-aligned and other small and medium-sized countries. This convocation is a reflection of the strong dissatisfaction of the third world and the many small and medium-sized countries with the intensified arms race between the super-Powers, and with their fierce rivalry for hegemony, as well as a reflection of the eager desire of these countries to eliminate the danger of war. The Chinese delegation is ready to join the representatives of other countries in discussing disarmament, which is a question of common concern to all countries of the world, and hopes that this session will make a positive contribution to the people's cause of unity against hegemonism in defence of world peace.

110. In recent years, there has been an upsurge in the struggle against hegemonism, in which the third world plays the role of the main force. The people of all countries, and the countries and peoples of the third world in particular, have waged an unremitting struggle against the policies of aggression and war of the super-Powers and have dealt heavy blows at them. Egypt, the Sudan and Somalia expelled Soviet experts or resolutely abrogated their treaties with the Soviet Union in defence of their sovereignty and national dignity. The people of Zaire, after successfully repelling, last year, an invasion engineered by the Soviet Union and executed by a force of mercenaries, are now valiantly repulsing a new invasion of mercenaries engineered by the Soviet Union and Cuba. The African countries are strong in their demand for an end to super-Power interference in the Horn of Africa. The Panamanian people have won a new victory in regaining sovereignty over the Panama Canal. There is a mounting struggle by the people in and around the Indian Ocean against the military presence of the super-Powers in that region. The struggle of the third-world countries in defence of their maritime rights and their struggle for the establishment of a new international economic order have continued to

make headway. The Japanese people are putting up a strong opposition to Soviet hegemonist behaviour and insisting on the recovery of their northern territories. There is a growing tendency among the second-world countries in Western Europe and other regions towards unity against hegemonism. All these developments amply show that the main trend in the international arena is the joining of all forces for an intensified fight against super-Power hegemonism.

111. Meanwhile, the two super-Powers, each with its immense military capabilities, are locked in an intense struggle on a global scale in which social-imperialism, that latecomer in the race, is pertinaciously taking the offensive. It is rapidly expanding its armaments of all kinds with a view to achieving military supremacy over its rival; at the same time, it is seizing spheres of influence and expanding on a world-wide scale. One super-Power is bent on expansion; the other has its vested interests to protect. As the struggle intensifies, they are bound to fight it out some day. The tense confrontation in Europe, the turmoil in the Middle East, and the gathering storm in Africa are all visible indications of the growth of factors for war. It is in face of the ever-growing menace of war and with a view to safeguarding their independence and security that the third world and the many small and medium-sized countries are opposing the super-Power's contention for hegemony and at the same time strongly demanding that the super-Powers stop their arms race and disarm. This is a fully just demand which deserves wide support.

112. There is an old Chinese saying: "Review the past and you'll know the present better." So it may not be unprofitable to review the history of disarmament as we discuss the question today.

113. Hundreds of meetings relating to disarmament have been held since the end of the Second World War. And from the start of the Disarmament Decade of the 1970s, disarmament negotiations under a host of names have run on almost without let-up, and have given rise to quite a number of disarmament statements, declarations, agreements, resolutions and treaties of one sort or another. However, the arms race gets more and more heated, and the danger of war keeps growing. Why?

114. As everyone knows, the third world and other small and medium-sized countries have put forward many reasonable proposals and suggestions for disarmament. These include the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and their destruction, the establishment of nuclear-free zones and zones of peace, the prohibition of all chemical and biological weapons, the prohibition of the establishment of military bases and stationing of troops on foreign soil. If these proposals and suggestions were put into effect, they would undoubtedly help consolidate international peace and security. But on the issue of disarmament the super-Powers have always shown duplicity, saying one thing but doing quite another. They preach disarmament but are actually carrying on arms expansion on a massive scale. It will be recalled that the Soviet Union and the United States issued in 1961 a joint statement of agreed principles for

disarmament negotiations,<sup>9</sup> in which they spoke of "general and complete disarmament", peddling it in the most fascinating terms. Now, 17 years have passed. Have they put into practice the principles advertised in their joint statement? No, not even a single one. The fact is that the super-Powers are not at all working for general and complete disarmament, but for general and complete arms expansion. Suffice it to point out that the military expenditures of both the Soviet Union and the United States have shot up. These were respectively \$20,000 million and \$40,000 million in 1961, but reached more than \$120,000 million and \$100,000 million in 1977. Their spendings roughly equal the sum total of the military expenditures of the 150-odd other countries. Social-imperialism, that most ardent preacher of disarmament, has made the biggest strides in the arms race. Over this period, the Soviet Union increased its strategic missiles more than 14-fold, nearly doubled its naval tonnage, and augmented its military force by nearly 10,000 tanks, several thousand military aircraft and more than a million men. A Soviet leader even said boastfully that with its powerful armed forces, "the Soviet Union is ready to wage an all-out war employing each and every kind of weapon". In terms of the momentum of arms expansion, even the other super-Power pales in comparison.

115. Last year the Soviet Minister for Foreign Affairs thought it very smart to claim that the Soviet Union had advanced more than 70 disarmament proposals in recent years, attempting thereby to show its sincere desire for disarmament. But what sort of proposals were these? They were either hollow talk about the "non-use of force" and the "deepening and consolidation of international détente", or illusory bubbles about "banning environmental warfare" and "prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction", or schemes with glaring loopholes calculated to evade the real issue, such as the proposal "to prohibit the emplacement of nuclear weapons on the sea-bed", which excludes nuclear submarines, or stratagems to restrict others and serve its own ends such as those stressing "nuclear non-proliferation" and a "nuclear test ban". They are all worthless proposals designed out of sinister motives and totally alien to the purpose of genuine disarmament. The more proposals of this kind the Soviet Union puts forward, the more its hypocrisy and treachery show up.

116. What are the lessons of history to be drawn from the long struggle around disarmament?

117. First, lack of sincere desire on the part of the super-Powers is the key reason why there has been no progress in disarmament over such a long period. The super-Powers invariably camouflage their arms expansion with rhetoric about disarmament. We should not give credence to their fine-sounding words but should call on them to take practical measures of disarmament.

118. Secondly, the people of the world want genuine not sham disarmament. The super-Powers, however, cook up

all sorts of disarmament hoaxes to lull the people of the world and tie the hands of other countries, and in this way restrain the other party. It is constantly necessary to expose these hoaxes so that they do not confuse the issue.

119. Thirdly, the super-Powers will not accept in good faith any proposal for genuine disarmament. Even if some agreements are reached, the super-Powers will refuse to be bound by their terms. Hence, one should by no means entertain illusions about disarmament.

120. The super-Powers obviously anticipated that the representatives of small and medium-sized countries would voice a strong demand for genuine disarmament at this forum. So they have continued to play tricks to evade the pressure of world opinion, divert public attention and stall progress at this session. On the question of nuclear disarmament in particular, they deliberately dwell on side issues to obstruct the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. They vigorously advocate the "complete prohibition of nuclear tests" and "consolidation of the system of nuclear non-proliferation" as "major steps" to reduce the danger of a nuclear war. But who will be taken in by them? The Soviet Union and the United States have conducted hundreds of nuclear tests, both in the atmosphere and underground, which constitute about 90 per cent of all the nuclear explosions carried out in the world. A complete test ban now would not in the least touch their nuclear arsenals or restrict their continuing the production, development, stockpiling of nuclear weapons or their use of them. How can it reduce the danger of a nuclear war? Even more fraudulent is their claim that non-proliferation will reduce the threat of a nuclear war. Can it be asserted that this threat comes from the non-nuclear small and medium-sized countries and not from the two super-Powers whose nuclear weapons are deployed for instant attack? As we all know, the Soviet Union and the United States contrived the "partial nuclear test-ban treaty" and the "treaty on nuclear non-proliferation" in the 1960s. As a result, the many non-nuclear countries have been hampered, and even their right to the peaceful use of atomic energy has been restricted, while the Soviet Union and the United States have continued the expansion of their nuclear armaments at full steam. The Soviet Union in particular has made a dash and caught up. The ruse of the two super-Powers in contriving these treaties has become obvious to more and more people. Can it become more credible by extending the test ban and consolidating the nuclear non-proliferation system? Recently the Soviet Union came up in seeming earnest with a proposal for so-called "cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction". This is but a new trick which likewise cannot eliminate the threat of a nuclear war. Let us leave aside the problem of verification. Even if the two super-Powers do stop producing nuclear weapons, they can fight a nuclear war all the same with the numerous atom bombs and hydrogen bombs already in their possession. In a word, their proposals in various guises serve the single purpose of consolidating their positions as nuclear overlords, so that they may freely subject other countries to nuclear threat and nuclear blackmail.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, Sixteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 19, document A/4879.

121. The super-Powers are playing up the prospect that a new agreement will be reached at their "strategic arms limitation talks", and describing it as a "major contribution" to the strengthening of international peace. This is a deliberate falsehood. For anyone willing to face up to realities, the history of the negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms since they began in 1969 has been a history of the strategic arms race between the Soviet Union and the United States, no more and no less. The previous strategic arms limitation agreement reached after hot bargaining provides neither for reduction in quantity nor restriction on quality, but was designed to ensure expansion and improvement of their strategic arms to a higher level. In recent years, they have vied with each other in improving their strategic arms and rapidly developing multiple independently-targeted re-entry vehicles (MIRVs) and, what is more, they have worked hard to develop new types of strategic weapons such as the Backfire bomber, the cruise missile and mobile multiple-warhead missiles. In the eight years of negotiations, the Soviet Union has brought its once backward nuclear arsenal up to a par with that of the other super-Power. How can this be described as an effort to limit the nuclear-arms race? Any forthcoming agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States will at best be one with quantitative but no qualitative limits and envisaging continued "upward equilibrium" in respect to MIRVs. A United States leader is more frank in admitting that the Soviet Union and the United States have just been "working out new game rules" for the nuclear-arms race. What is there to boast about in such agreements?

122. It is only natural that an increasing number of small and medium-sized countries should demand that disarmament begin with the reduction of the arms of the two super-Powers, whose nuclear as well as conventional arsenals far exceed those of any other country in the world. Each of them possesses thousands of strategic nuclear weapons, tens of thousands of tanks and military aircraft, hundreds of principal warships and huge stocks of other conventional weapons. What is more, in order to gain military supremacy, they are both stepping up the development and commissioning of more sophisticated nuclear and conventional weapons, constantly augmenting and strengthening their ground, sea and air forces, energetically expanding and grabbing military bases abroad and reinforcing their troops stationed overseas. While engaging in the arms race themselves, the super-Powers are seeking to put the blame on other countries. The Soviet propaganda machine has even slandered the third world as being the "source of the arms race" and called for "vigilance" against the "extent the arms drive has reached in the third world". This is the trick of a thief crying "stop thief". Have not the super-Powers advocated the principle of "equal security" in disarmament? Since the hegemonist Powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, claim that their security can be assured only through a military equilibrium between themselves, the small and medium-sized countries are all the more justified in demanding that these Powers be the first to reduce their super-arsenals, for they are threatened by the super-Powers' superior military strength.

123. The two super-Powers, the Soviet Union and the

United States, are deliberately confusing the issue by advocating disarmament by all. Their armaments already far exceed their defence needs and are being used as tools of aggression and expansion and in the struggle for hegemony. Everywhere they are threatening to use force, subjecting countries to military control, even resorting to armed aggression, and are busily preparing to unleash a new world war.

124. Their armaments should certainly be drastically cut. As for the many small and medium-sized countries, armaments are their means of defence to safeguard their independence and security against aggression. Many third-world countries still lack adequate defence capabilities, they need to strengthen their national defence. So what arms do they have to reduce? Even the second-world countries in Western Europe and elsewhere, which are faced with the grave threat of annexation and invasion by Soviet social-imperialism, need to strengthen their defence capabilities. Disarmament must start with the two super-Powers. This is a fundamental principle on the question of disarmament today. It is also the chief yardstick of real progress in disarmament. The super-Powers are trying to use "general disarmament" as an excuse for their refusal to cut their own armaments. This will never do.

125. The Chinese people and the people of all other countries firmly demand peace. It has been the consistent stand of the Chinese Government that China will live in peace with all countries on the basis of the five principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference to each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. We do not threaten anyone, much less commit aggression against anyone. China is a developing country as well as a socialist country and belongs to the third world. Like other third-world countries, we eagerly desire to lift our country from economic backwardness and are resolutely opposed to a world war. The Chinese people badly need an enduring peaceful international environment for the great task of developing China into a modern and powerful socialist country by the end of the century. China will never commit aggression against other countries even when it becomes a powerful socialist country. This is dictated by China's socialist system and by Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. However, since we are confronted with imperialist, and especially social-imperialist aggression and threats, we cannot but strengthen our preparedness against war while carrying on construction. How can we afford to relax and go to sleep when a super-Power has deployed a million troops along our border? Our war preparedness is not intended for aggression but for defence against aggression. Some people make the slanderous charge that we are warlike and want to provoke a world war. This is truly preposterous. Is China stationing hundreds of thousands of troops on other countries' territories? Has China sent out fleets to all oceans to make a show of force? Has China staged one offensive military manoeuvre after another in different parts of the world? The absurd slanders against China do not merit refutation.

126. The Chinese Government and people have always stood for genuine disarmament and have made positive efforts for it. We have not only supported all rational pro-

posals of disarmament and put forward a number of suggestions of our own, but also taken a series of concrete measures which accord with the wishes of the people of all countries.

127. We have always stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, and have on many occasions stated that we will at no time and in no circumstances be the first to use nuclear weapons.

128. We have always firmly supported the demands of small and medium-sized countries for the establishment of nuclear-free zones and peace zones, and have undertaken a due commitment towards the Latin American nuclear-weapon-free zone.

129. We have always stood for the dismantling of all military bases on foreign soil and the withdrawal of all armed forces stationed abroad. We have no military bases and no troops abroad, and we will never ask any country for military bases or station our troops on the territory of any other country.

130. We have always stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of biological and chemical weapons, and we firmly uphold the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare.<sup>10</sup>

131. We have always held that all countries have the right to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, and we are firmly opposed to the attempt of the super-Powers to hamper, on the pretext of nuclear non-proliferation, the development by other countries of their own nuclear industry.

132. We have always been opposed to the practice of using military aid to extort privileges, pose armed threats or make exorbitant profits, and we ourselves have never resorted to it.

133. We have solemnly declared that we will not seek hegemony in any part of the world. Our Constitution includes the explicit provision that China "will never seek or strive to be a super-Power". And we have publicly declared to the people of the whole world that if one day China should play the tyrant in the world, they should work together with the Chinese people to overthrow it.

134. The principled position of the Chinese Government and people on the question of disarmament is open and above-board. Our deeds and words are in accord, and we always live up to our words. We firmly support all the rational proposals put forward by the small and medium-sized countries, but we must thoroughly expose the disarmament hoaxes of the super-Powers. That is what we did in the past and what we will continue to do in the future.

135. People call for disarmament in the hope that it will

reduce the danger of war. Hence the worth of a disarmament measure lies not in its face value but in its real effect. Any measure that helps to safeguard international peace and security and postpone the outbreak of a war should be supported; conversely, any measure that serves the interests of either super-Power in seeking hegemony and preparing for war must be opposed. Here is the difference between genuine disarmament and sham disarmament.

136. The people of the whole world eagerly demand nuclear disarmament and the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war. We do not believe in the horror story spread by the super-Powers that a nuclear war will destroy all mankind but, like the people of other countries, we Chinese are firmly opposed to a nuclear war. Everyone knows that the only way truly to free mankind from the threat of nuclear war is through the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. Over the years we have repeatedly called on all countries to declare that they will prohibit and destroy nuclear weapons completely, thoroughly, totally and resolutely, that is, no use, no export, no import, no manufacture, no testing, no stockpiling of nuclear weapons, and the destruction of all existing nuclear weapons. And we have proposed the holding of a conference of the heads of all countries to discuss the question of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, and first of all to conclude an agreement on the non-use of nuclear weapons. But the super-Powers have not responded to our proposals, and the talks on nuclear disarmament have been going on for more than a dozen years without any substantive progress. We believe that, in order to reduce the threat of nuclear war to the small and medium-sized countries in the absence of an agreement on the non-use of nuclear weapons, a measure of urgency is for all nuclear countries to undertake not to resort to the threat or use of nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones. This is a reasonable and practical measure. Non-nuclear countries pose no threat to nuclear Powers; why should not the nuclear Powers undertake not to use nuclear weapons against them? If the super-Powers even refuse to take this minimum action, it will only prove that their statements about desiring to see nuclear weapons prohibited and the danger of a nuclear war removed are sheer lies.

137. Important though nuclear disarmament is, it cannot by itself eliminate the danger of war. Thus the reduction of conventional armaments has become a matter of increasing urgency. Both world wars broke out before the invention of nuclear weapons. The reality today is that the super-Powers, especially the Soviet Union, are making an all out effort to expand their conventional arsenals. The amount of conventional weapons produced by the Soviet Union alone already equals the sum total of those produced by the United States and the Western European countries. In face of the rapid growth in Soviet conventional military strength, the United States has also noted the need to shift the emphasis in arms expansion to conventional weapons. When the two super-Powers, which are the only countries capable of launching a world war, come into conflict, they may fight a nuclear war, but it is more likely that they will fight a conventional war. When the two sides use large quantities of new types of sophisticated conventional

<sup>10</sup> League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV, No. 2138, p. 65.

weapons which are highly lethal and destructive to fight a war over vast areas, it will spell disaster for the people of many countries.

138. In Europe, which is the focus of contention between the two hegemonist Powers, it is plain that the Soviet Union, using as a smoke-screen the talks on mutual reduction of forces in Central Europe, has in recent years greatly strengthened its conventional military deployments, expanded its military manpower and renovated its weapons and equipment. The number of its ground forces stationed in Eastern Europe has exceeded 600,000 men. It has moved up more and more tanks, armoured transport cars and artillery pieces, and upgraded the attack capability of its air force. It has also deployed huge fleets in the Barents Sea, the North Sea, the Baltic and the Mediterranean to form a naval encirclement of Western Europe. In short, it has positioned and readied its conventional military forces for a surprise attack on Western Europe. Having done all the above, this super-Power, which had all along refused to renounce the first use of nuclear weapons, suddenly turned benevolent by proposing at the recent Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe that all participants sign an agreement on mutual renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons. As some discerning observers in the West have pointed out, this Soviet proposal was aimed at facilitating its blackmail and eventual invasion of Western Europe by means of its predominant conventional forces.

139. It is thus unrealistic to assume that nuclear disarmament alone will lessen the danger of a world war, and it is even more so to believe that it will prevent local wars. Conventional forces are being used by the two super-Powers in the struggle for world hegemony to carry out aggression and expansion everywhere, posing an ever greater threat to the independence and security of all peoples. Social-imperialism, in particular, has been using tanks, aeroplanes, guns and warships, and not strategic nuclear weapons, in its many armed threats or military adventures in the Middle East, in Africa and in Asia. It can thus be seen that for the purpose of reducing the danger of war it is no less urgent to reduce the conventional armaments of the super-Powers than to reduce their nuclear armaments. The non-aligned countries have stressed that "conventional weapons which give cause for grave concern should also be the object of disarmament agreements". This view is perfectly correct. Equal importance should be attached to the reduction of conventional armaments and that of nuclear armaments, and the two should proceed in conjunction. The super-Powers must not be allowed to exploit the peoples' urgent desire for nuclear disarmament in their attempt to delay the reduction of their conventional arms, even less to intensify their race in conventional arms.

140. The war machines of the two super-Powers have reached unprecedented proportions in peace-time history and have become swords of Damocles hanging over the heads of the people of the world. It is imperative that the super-Powers take effective disarmament measures, cut down their huge arsenals and reduce their military threats to other countries. The Soviet Union and the United States must first of all take the following action: first, declare that

at no time and in no circumstances will they resort to the threat or use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones; secondly, withdraw all their armed forces stationed abroad and undertake not to dispatch armed forces of any description to other countries and dismantle all their military bases and paramilitary bases on foreign soil and undertake not to seek any new ones; thirdly, stop their nuclear and conventional arms race and set out to destroy by stages their nuclear weapons and drastically reduce their conventional weapons; fourthly, undertake not to station massive forces or stage military exercises near the borders of other countries, and undertake not to launch military attacks, including surprise attacks, against other countries on any pretext; and, fifthly, undertake not to export weapons to other countries for the purpose of bringing them under control or fomenting war or abetting threats of war.

141. When major progress has been made in the destruction of Soviet and United States nuclear weapons and in the reduction of their conventional weapons, the other nuclear countries should join the Soviet Union and the United States in destroying all nuclear weapons. It is high time that the super-Powers demonstrated their sincerity for disarmament with actual deeds instead of hollow words.

142. It is understandable that many small and medium-sized countries should have proposed that funds released through the reduction of military expenditures under disarmament measures be channelled towards the economic development of the developing countries. Some third-world countries have explicitly demanded that the two leading nuclear countries undertake to be the first to do so. This demand is well-founded. The two super-Powers, which are sharply increasing their military expenditures for arms expansion and war preparations, have obtained funds through plundering the developing countries as well as through exploiting the people in their own countries. For the development of their national economy, the developing countries rely mainly on their own efforts. They have also to strive for the establishment of a new international economic order. It is fully justifiable that they demand the channelling towards their economic development of the resources released through reduction of the military expenditures of the super-Powers, for they are only asking for the return of a part of the super-Powers' ill-gotten wealth. Nevertheless, it would not be so easy to make the super-Powers do so. Take the case of the Soviet Union: it has been talking for many years about "aiding the developing countries with funds released by disarmament", but this has been mere lip service designed for demagogic effect. It has proposed a 10 per cent cut in military expenditures, yet each year it increases its military expenditures by 4 or 5 per cent. If it really wants to be generous, why does it not begin by cancelling the debts incurred by some developing countries through their arms purchases from it? Some second-world countries have already reduced or cancelled the debts of developing countries. Why cannot the Soviet Union do the same?

143. The strong demand of the small and medium-sized countries for a reform in the machinery for disarmament is fully legitimate. Machinery such as the Geneva Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has long been un-

der the control of the two super-Powers and has become a forum where they talk sham disarmament and obstruct genuine disarmament. This state of affairs must be thoroughly changed. Questions of disarmament and international security, which concern the interests of all countries, should be deliberated by an international organ with the participation of all countries under the auspices of the United Nations. The items and procedures of disarmament negotiations should be decided on by this organ, while machinery responsible for disarmament negotiations should be truly free of super-Power control and should be set up through consultations by the above-mentioned deliberative organ. Only in this way can the views of every country be fully expressed. The one or two super-Powers must not be allowed to manipulate the negotiating machinery and to impose their will on other countries. It is also necessary to point out that, unless the super-Powers change their stubborn attitude of obstructing disarmament, it would be very difficult to achieve success no matter what kind of negotiating machinery there may be.

144. The danger of war stemming from Soviet-American rivalry is a growing menace to the people of the world. To put off a new world war is the common task of the people of all countries. True, the struggle for disarmament is aimed at making it more difficult for the super-Powers to carry out their plans of arms expansion and war preparations. But historical experience as well as present-day realities tell us that the imperialists always divide the world in proportion to strength, and that the arms race is an indispensable means of their rivalry for hegemony. They are contending for world hegemony; they will not readily agree to reduce their armaments and weaken their war machines. As long as imperialism and social-imperialism exist, general and complete disarmament is an even more impossible goal. Hence, we must not pin our hopes for the maintenance of world peace on disarmament. There are many other things we can do to delay the outbreak of a war.

145. First, tell the people of the world about the danger of war and its root cause and urge them to get prepared materially and organizationally to resist a war of aggression. The better their preparations, the less the chance that the warmongers will dare to unleash a war. Conversely, if the super-Powers are allowed to spread illusions of peace with the result that the people lower their guard, fail to perceive the real threat of war, put blind faith in peaceful negotiations and the so-called "balance of terror" or pin their hopes on general and complete disarmament, opportunities will open up before the warmongers and the danger of a new world war will grow. Therefore, the struggle for disarmament can help to put off a war only if it is accompanied by full exposure of the super-Powers' plot of sham disarmament and real arms expansion, and if the people of the world are alerted to the danger of war. The lesson must never be forgotten that both world wars broke out amidst a chorus of "peace" and "disarmament".

146. Secondly, strengthen the anti-hegemonist struggle in all spheres. The struggle of the people of the world against the hegemonism of the two super-Powers and their struggle against the latter's policy of war are the two sides

of a coin. The super-Powers want to grab world hegemony by launching a world war and, in preparing for this war, they are committing acts of hegemonism in all parts of the world. Everywhere they are engaged in aggression and expansion, seizing resources and areas and routes of strategic importance and stepping up their deployments for a global war. The people of the world can upset the war plans and deployments of the two hegemonist Powers and put off a new world war by waging a sustained struggle to frustrate their acts of aggression and expansion, that is, to stop their infringement on the sovereignty and encroachment on the territories and territorial seas of other countries, prevent their interference in the internal affairs of other countries by the threat or use of force or any other means, and thwart their attempts to set or redivide spheres of influence in any part of the world. Therefore, the people's struggle for disarmament must be linked up with the struggle in defence of national independence, state sovereignty and territorial integrity and against super-Power aggression, interference, subversion and control. The struggle against the super-Powers must be waged not only in the realm of disarmament but in all other fields as well. Recently, some countries have got rid of the Soviet military installations on their territories and territorial seas; others have sternly rejected Soviet bids to lease bases; and still others have denied overflight to Soviet airplanes transporting arms. These are effective steps against social-imperialism's war plans, and they are admirable steps.

147. In order to postpone the outbreak of war, it is also necessary to oppose a policy of appeasement. The Soviet Union is increasing its military threat to Western Europe, striving to expand its influence in the Middle East and carrying out a series of military adventures in Africa. From this it is clear that the aims of Soviet global strategy are to control and monopolize Europe, to weaken and squeeze out the influence of the other super-Power in all parts of the world, and ultimately to supplant the other super-Power and establish its own hegemony over the whole world. Facts show that this super-Power flaunting the label of socialism is more aggressive and adventurous than the other super-Power; it is the most dangerous source of a new world war and is sure to be its chief instigator.

148. Yet, there are some people in the West today who are cowed by Soviet military threats and are afraid of war, or who indulge in a false sense of security and deny the existence of a serious danger of war. Politically, they seek peaceful co-operation to accommodate the Soviet hoax of "détente". Economically, they offer big loans and technical equipment to pacify the Soviet Union.

149. Militarily, they seek respite through compromises and concessions. They even dream of averting the danger threatening themselves by sacrificing the security of others. Whether they do it knowingly or not, to pursue such policies of appeasement will only serve to camouflage and abet social imperialism's war preparations and bring the war closer. It is precisely to encourage the trend of appeasement that the Soviet Union has been so diligently selling its fraud of "disarmament" and "détente". Hence, it is necessary to guard against appeasement in the struggle for disarmament.

150. While there is the danger of a new world war, the possibility does exist of putting off its outbreak. This depends to a great extent on whether or not the people of all countries can make progress and score victories in their struggle against hegemonism. If the people of the world, including the people of the United States and the Soviet Union, unite, if all countries subjected to the aggression, interference, control, subversion or bullying of the two hegemonist Powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, join together to form and broaden to the maximum an international united front against hegemonism, and if they fight with redoubled energy, they will surely be able to frustrate the super-Powers' policies of aggression and war and uphold world peace. The world will certainly move in the direction of progress and not retrogression. The future of mankind is infinitely bright.

151. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker in the general debate is the Prime Minister of Denmark. I have great pleasure in welcoming His Excellency Mr. Anker Jorgensen, and in inviting him to address the General Assembly.

152. Mr. JORGENSEN (Denmark): This is the first time that I have the honour to address the General Assembly. I would therefore like to say to you, Mr. Secretary-General, how deeply I respect and believe in the work done by the United Nations, by you, and by your competent staff. For me, this Organization remains the greatest hope for the future of man and for world peace.

153. I would also like to give you, Mr. President, the congratulations of myself and my Government on the occasion of your unanimous election to preside over this special session of the General Assembly.

154. The arms race goes to the heart of the problems of the troubled times in which we live. Disarmament problems are inseparable from problems of international security and détente. The balance of power, the problems of nuclear energy, relations between alliances and non-aligned countries, are all tied up with disarmament. The arms race has far-reaching effects in economic and social terms. Great economic interests are involved.

155. Nearly 30 years ago, in 1950, the Danish nuclear physicist Niels Bohr wrote an open letter to the United Nations and the world. Niels Bohr took a leading part in the early research on the nature of the atom. His work laid the basis for the splitting of the atom and the creation of atomic energy. He said:

“Proper appreciation of the duties and responsibilities implied in world citizenship is more necessary now than ever before. The progress of science and technology has tied the fates of all nations inseparably together. Any widening of the borders of our knowledge imposes an increased responsibility on individuals and nations through the possibilities it gives for shaping the condition of human life.”

156. Since then the wave of armaments has risen to heights never seen before. Niels Bohr's words have taken on a far greater importance than they had 30 years ago.

The possibilities of misusing nuclear energy for destruction are increasing all the time. This puts a heavy responsibility upon us all. We must find a way to arms control and reduction of armament.

157. Our time is unique. Never in the whole of history has man been faced with such formidable and urgent problems. The speed of technological development makes it more and more difficult to find and to agree upon effective means of control. Policy is losing the race with technology. Policy can only win this race and safeguard the survival of man if it gains control of science and technical research.

158. The Danish Government is deeply concerned about both the nuclear and the conventional arms race. We have to face the fact that the balance of terror is both fragile and vulnerable. It is therefore vital to stop this race and to reach specific disarmament agreements. These agreements must ensure a balance of power as stable as possible at a level of armaments as low as possible.

159. The most urgent risk obviously lies in the field of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. This places a special responsibility on the two super-Powers. They hold by far the larger part of this destructive potential. Their responsibility for reaching agreements on strategic arms limitation is decisive and inescapable. But the rest of the world lives in the shadow of the nuclear arsenal. We wait with impatience for a final agreement within the framework of the second round of negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms agreement. And there must also be a third treaty leading to a marked reduction and a qualitative restriction of strategic arms.

160. On the other hand, all nations in the world are responsible for checking the further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

161. Non-proliferation creates a problem of security. A large number of countries renounce nuclear weapons without enjoying the security of being members of an alliance. It stands to reason that such countries may feel faced with a security problem in relation to those countries that keep these weapons. It is fully understandable that they are looking around for assurances.

162. Furthermore the questions of non-proliferation and the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes cannot be separated. A sharp and clear distinction must be made between the peaceful and the military use of nuclear energy, but this must not affect the right of all nations to follow the energy policy they find appropriate. This point of view has led the Danish Government to take part in the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation project.

163. Other specific disarmament measures are also urgently needed. Some of these, we are glad to see, are actually under way. It is now generally accepted that a complete and comprehensive nuclear-test ban is not only a necessity, but also feasible. Biological warfare has already been banned. Now we should have a speedy decision to ban chemical and radiological arms. We should also ban

those especially inhumane types of arms which were not covered by the two recently-signed Additional Protocols to the Geneva Convention of 1949.<sup>11</sup> I am thinking of things like fragmentation bombs, napalm, and so on, which cause civilians particularly evil and vicious suffering.

164. Disarmament and security are two sides of the same thing: the search for a stable peace. No disarmament measure should let anyone gain military advantages. The same level of security must be preserved for all countries throughout the process of disarmament.

165. All the measures I have mentioned are specific, small stitches in the large pattern of disarmament. In a way, nuclear disarmament is also such a stitch, although one of overwhelming importance. We must look at this pattern as a whole. And the case for general and complete disarmament becomes clear when we look at the close relationship between nuclear and conventional weapons—actual in some parts of the world, potential in others.

166. The other day this aspect of disarmament was vividly described by the President of France [3rd meeting]. He rightly pointed out that a trustworthy balance in the conventional field must be established in the European theatre before nuclear arms can be done away with. We have noted with great interest the French proposal for dealing with this problem—the calling of a European conference—and we shall study it carefully.

167. The problem of conventional armaments, production as well as transfer, presents itself in different ways in different geographical areas. None of the leading States should gain political influence in the third world through transfers of arms. A great deal of conventional arms are being traded these days because of fear of one's neighbours. Wherever there is a danger of local conflict, there is a demand for heavier and more sophisticated means of defence. And more arms in one country lead to less security in another. In the long run, the only way to break this vicious circle is by regional co-operation. We therefore feel that regional organizations should play a major role in the limitation of conventional armaments. We hope that all these problems will be made the subject of a study under United Nations auspices and we have, indeed, together with others, made proposals to this end.

168. I have dealt so far with subjects of substance which will, as we hope, form part of the action programme resulting from this special session. Carrying out that programme will involve altering some existing organs and perhaps setting up some new ones. In this field we hope that new ground will be broken at this session.

169. A major factor for us is the importance of bringing France and the People's Republic of China into the international negotiating process.

170. It is also essential that the programme of action be followed up effectively. We cannot make a direct comparison between the special session on disarmament and the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Some parallels, however, may perhaps be drawn. The special session might start a process whereby agreed goals in the disarmament sphere are reassessed and updated from time to time. This would also keep up the pressure for tangible results. In any case, the special session will attract a lot of international attention, and it is in itself of value to stimulate public interest in the problems of disarmament. Those problems cannot be solved without the greatest possible public backing.

171. The Danish Government will be glad to co-operate in carrying out all constructive and realistic disarmament proposals where our participation can be useful. Danish experts and Danish installations in Greenland, for example, might be useful for an international seismic system, thereby helping to solve the problem of verification of a comprehensive test ban.

172. The Nordic proposal for an in-depth study of the relationship between disarmament and development [A/S-10/1, vol. V, document A/AC.187/80] is another example. Here we are faced with an aspect of the problem of disarmament which should be looked at in a longer-term perspective. The international arms race represents massive over-consumption for destructive purposes. It consumes enormous resources which we badly need, if we are to meet the economic and social challenges of our time. I am thinking here, in particular, of the urgent need to narrow the gap between the developed and the less developed countries—a gap which not only is morally unacceptable, but also carries the germs of future conflict. In this perspective we see a clear connexion between international efforts to reduce world-wide consumption for military purposes and our commitment to a new international economic order.

173. The main purpose of the study proposed by the Nordic Governments is to arrive at conclusions and recommendations to national Governments on how real resources, now used for military purposes, can be transferred to constructive civilian purposes. This should make it easier to make political decisions in a given situation of disarmament. It is our hope that this initiative will lead to fresh thinking and action in this field and help to promote a more productive North-South relationship.

174. I began this statement by welcoming the holding of this special session of the General Assembly. I should like to end on the same note. There has always been a close relationship between the Danish attitude to the question of disarmament and our policy in the United Nations. This session of the General Assembly is, in itself, a confirmation of this view. The responsibilities of the United Nations in the field of disarmament are, of course, only a part of the much more far-reaching task of safeguarding peace and justice, of being the last resort of the weak against the strong.

175. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assem-

<sup>11</sup> Protocols additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts and Non-International Armed Conflicts adopted on 8 June 1977 by the Diplomatic Conference on Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts.

bly I wish to thank the Prime Minister of Denmark for the important statement he has just made.

176. The last speaker for this morning is the Prime Minister of Iceland. I have great pleasure in welcoming His Excellency Mr. Geir Hallgrímsson and in inviting him to address the General Assembly.

177. Mr. HALLGRÍMSSON (Iceland): Mr. President, allow me, at the outset, to say how pleased I am to address this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament under your leadership. I take this opportunity to compliment and congratulate you on the efficient manner in which you led the enormous work of the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly, as well as the eighth and ninth special sessions.

178. As we gather for the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted entirely to disarmament, we are faced with a challenge and, at the same time, presented with an opportunity.

179. The formidable challenge has been with us for the whole life of the United Nations, and a tremendous effort has been made in the disarmament field. Yet only nominal progress has been made. All attempts to curb the arms race have unfortunately proved ineffective. Not only are total world expenditures for military purposes ever-increasing, but nuclear proliferation has been added, with its vastly greater destructive power.

180. Now, as all the 149 Members of the United Nations are assembled to discuss exclusively arms limitations and reductions, we are presented with a remarkable opportunity to stop this trend and reverse it. It has long been evident that real progress towards effective disarmament measures will be made only with the global participation of all States. It is mainly for the purpose of stressing that point that I wish to address this Assembly.

181. Iceland is one of the smaller Members of the United Nations, an unarmed nation in a relatively large island in the North Atlantic, which, on becoming a sovereign State in 1918, declared its perpetual neutrality. We hoped that by being neutral and unarmed we would be allowed to live in peace in our remote island. The course of events in the Second World War and subsequent developments convinced us, however, that it was in our vital interest to solve our security problems by participating in a multilateral defence effort with our closest neighbours in Europe and North America, within the framework of the North Atlantic alliance, established in conformity with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. At the time of signing the North Atlantic Treaty, Iceland declared that it would remain an unarmed nation, as it had been for centuries. We realize, however, that in the unsettled state of world affairs it is of vital importance to guarantee the safety of nations and individuals.

182. International peace and security have been preserved in our part of the world. Improved East-West relations and greater contacts at the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe in 1975 have to some

extent opened up new possibilities for lasting détente and durable peace.

183. Iceland has supported, and will always support, all constructive endeavours to eliminate sources of tension and conflict. To achieve this, we must aim at creating more open societies; we must enhance human rights; we must strengthen democracy; and, by opening up all frontiers, we must make relations between peoples still closer. Only thus will we eliminate distrust and suspicion and establish the proper atmosphere for disarmament.

184. Iceland has become a party to the international agreements for partial disarmament negotiated within the United Nations framework during the last 15 years, beginning with the partial test-ban treaty of 1963. These agreements need to be expanded, and the test ban must be made all-embracing. Nuclear armaments limitations have to be agreed upon. All nations should accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The prerequisite for all disarmament in the nuclear field is, of course, that agreement be achieved within the framework of the negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms.

185. However, satisfactory results in the disarmament field will not be attained unless all the nuclear Powers, not only the two engaged in the negotiations can agree on common measures of arms control and reductions. The aim must be the complete elimination of nuclear weapons from national arsenals.

186. But there are also other major tasks to which the international community should turn immediately. The conventional arms race needs also urgently to be curtailed and reversed. Ways must be found to guarantee security without a constantly increased rivalry in military expenditures between nations.

187. This would make it possible drastically to reduce military expenditures globally, not only in the industrialized countries, but even more so in the developing countries, whose arms buying has increased steeply in the 1970s.

188. In democratic societies, allocations to defence are weighed against demands for increased economic progress and individual well-being, and therefore only cover basic security requirements. Experience shows that in régimes where the leaders are not bound by the will of the people in free elections the situation is different. There, military spending has priority over the general welfare of the population, which is limited accordingly.

189. Rather than waste scarce resources on military goods and services, development aid should be vastly increased in order to improve economic conditions and raise the standard of living of people in developing countries and, in fact, in the whole world.

190. This special session has been thoroughly prepared and considerable progress has been made towards a common agreement, although a great number of outstanding problems still remain in the search for generally acceptable

solutions with regard to the final document, including the declaration, the programme of action and the improvement of the machinery for disarmament negotiations. With goodwill and positive contributions from all, it is my hope that these outstanding issues will be successfully resolved during the session.

191. The tenth special session of the General Assembly must mark the opening of a new chapter in the intensified efforts at substantial disarmament. Meaningful measures must be agreed upon by all States.

192. Let us not repeat the almost fruitless efforts of the last three decades. We have been travelling in circles and making lofty declarations while the arms race runs on unchecked and armaments become more and more destructive and more widely distributed.

193. Let us turn to these immediate and urgent tasks: decrease armaments and globally expand economic and social development.

194. Security and stability have to be maintained, and distrust and suspicion eliminated, otherwise no results will be achieved and the final goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control will remain as distant as ever.

195. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly I wish to thank the Prime Minister of Iceland for the important statement he has just made.

*The meeting rose at 2.15 p.m.*