

**United Nations**  
**GENERAL**  
**ASSEMBLY**

TENTH SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**9th**  
**PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 30 May 1978,  
at 3.35 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

**AGENDA ITEM 8**

**General debate (continued)**

1. Mr. Rovira (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like first of all, on behalf of my country, most especially to greet the President, Mr. Mojsov, and congratulate him on the honour conferred upon him when he was chosen to preside over this special session of the General Assembly dedicated to disarmament.

2. Uruguay, which has long maintained and cultivated good relations with his country, the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, sees in this distinction a tribute not only to his eminent qualities, but also to his country.

3. I should like also to express the satisfaction of my country at the election of Mr. Ortiz de Rozas to preside over the *Ad Hoc* Committee of this session. That constitutes a just recognition of his country, the Republic of Argentina, on whose old friendship Uruguay prides itself, of Latin America and, especially, of his brilliant intellectual and moral qualities as a talented diplomat, opportunely brought to the fore by the heads of the delegations of Sri Lanka, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Greece, when submitting his nomination [*1st meeting*].

4. The draft of the final document prepared by the Preparatory Committee for this special session of the General Assembly [*see A/S-10/1, vol. I*], presided over by Ambassador Carlos Ortiz de Rozas, to which he referred in his statement, presupposes an outstanding effort for conciseness about the very complex gamut of facts affecting the disarmament question, about the suggestions and clear and intelligent measures taken to reach—even if gradually and to the extent possible—the lofty and final goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

5. I therefore avail myself of this opportunity to transmit the congratulations of my delegation to the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee and to its members, representing 54 countries, for such fruitful work. That constitutes an eloquent indication that the work to be undertaken here and the conclusions to be reached under the expert guidance of the President of the General Assembly and the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, will undoubtedly be at least another step forward in the arduous task of the disarmament process and the gradual reorientation of the fabulous riches currently being absorbed by the arms race,

and it constitutes also a stimulus to development and a denunciation of poverty, backwardness, lack of culture, sub-human living conditions and the uncertainty of the future experienced by the great masses of the world population.

6. This Assembly must bear in mind particularly what the representatives of Argentina, Brazil and Yugoslavia have said, *inter alia*, that no limitation should be placed on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and that attempts to establish a complete monopoly by a small group of nuclear Powers must be rejected. That would be to the detriment of the interests of the developing countries.

7. My country shares the deeply felt desire of our world to reach a genuine state of peace through work and security, without fear of war, doomsday of apocalyptic dimension or any other type of conflict which would impede development; without strategic, political or any other type of discrimination, and with equal opportunity for all.

8. If we really want work such as that undertaken by this session to achieve its final and logical goals, the first thing which should be disarmed is men's minds.

9. In referring to this question during the last session of the General Assembly, I spoke the following words from this rostrum on behalf of Uruguay:

"It seems to us that the peoples of the world are under the impression that disarmament is exclusively a subject for rhetoric which they support as a matter of course as a worthy cause, whereas the reality is that, with the passage of time and contrary to what might be hoped, armaments of an increasingly sophisticated and deadly nature are escalating in all regions of the globe."

"For a variety of reasons, vast amounts of the incomes of States and the resources of mankind are poured into the stockpiling of means of destruction, while millions of human beings are dying in the streets for lack of food and while others exist in subhuman conditions for lack of proper integral development."

"It is urgently necessary in this field as in others to achieve solid results which will not only serve to maintain international peace and security but will permit us to continue to speak with moral authority and to rely upon the confidence of our peoples on an item so perverted by reality."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 13th meeting, paras. 202-204.

10. If one takes a look at the world situation today, those words are still relevant. The description given yesterday by the Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of China [7th meeting] of the increase in the nuclear power for military purposes of the super-Powers which are in the vanguard with this type of terror weapon requires no comment on our part. May God grant that the work of this session will be able to improve that dark prospect.

11. That is why I hasten to add that my delegation will give its firm support to every initiative designed to achieve the high goals set for this meeting.

12. Traditionally a country devoted to peace and freedom, within a framework of order and justice, a firm defender and promoter of the self-determination of all peoples, of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, and of the peaceful settlement of international conflicts and of broad arbitration, Uruguay will strongly support the observance of those fundamental rules of international law as well as the active application of all possible measures in the field of disarmament that the present circumstances will permit.

13. Specifically, my delegation will support any initiative that fulfils the following requirements: first, the promotion of nuclear disarmament and an emphasis on the prevention of nuclear war; secondly, support for the proposal to restructure the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and to improve the working methods of that body, which should be revised in the light of the principle of the juridical equality of States, so that every nuclear Power will participate; thirdly, efforts to prohibit the use of conventional weapons, especially such particularly inhuman weapons as napalm and other incendiary weapons and, in this respect, to put emphasis on the initiative in favour of convening next year a United Nations conference on this question; fourthly, an agreement on a convention for the non-use of nuclear weapons; fifthly, an agreement on the elimination of all chemical weapons; sixthly, emphasis on the importance of reaching agreement on a treaty banning nuclear testing in general, with the aim of submitting it for the consideration of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and eventual transmission to the General Assembly; seventhly, the commencement of multilateral negotiations aimed at preventing the arms race from being extended to the sea-bed and ocean floor and the subsoil thereof; eighthly, encouragement of the formulation of joint declarations by the major nuclear States whereby they would undertake to reduce their military expenditures and use the savings thus obtained for the promotion of the economic and social development of the developing countries; ninthly, the convening of a world assembly on disarmament; and lastly, equal participation by all States, including those possessing nuclear weapons, in the international negotiations on disarmament.

14. Let me express a few thoughts that clarify and explain the position of my country as I have just presented it.

15. The world is now suffering and has suffered for many decades—almost since the end of the Second World War—from a very special type of limited war, that is,

guerrilla war, from which my country has suffered and which, as an ideological base, is found today all over the world, especially in the non-Marxist States, both developed and underdeveloped; it is aimed at the disruption and fall of those States.

16. On this subject, may I be allowed to observe that for this type of war, of which my country can provide a unique and little known experience, disarmament offers no solution. It is not the weapons employed in this type of war that concern the Assembly now; what is at stake in this case is the question of cultural values imposed in an almost scientific, calculated, deliberate and devious manner by small extremist minorities through the use of violence and terror.

17. This is a subject that deserves the greatest attention and it should not escape the consideration of an Assembly such as this, or factual and scientific study by its specialized bodies, because disarmament is indissolubly linked to a whole series of conflicts that could threaten peace in any country or groups of countries and consequently could have repercussions on world peace. Here I should like to remind those present what the Foreign Minister of the Argentine Republic said along the same lines, that an indirect and more subtle means of aggression exists which promotes terrorist violence for the purpose of dominating various countries [5th meeting].

18. It does not seem necessary to insist on the fact that mere technology is the most important factor which identifies the times in which we live.

19. Thus Raymond Aron may speak of the “technological era”; Michel Poniatowski of the “society of scientific development”; Zbigniew Brzezinski of the “technotronic society”, because of the relevance of technology and electronics; Pierre Bertaux has spoken of the “mutational society”, referring to the mutation imposed on society by technology and A.M. Hilton has spoken of the “‘cyber-cultural’ society”, alluding to the influence of the technology of cybernetics in today's culture.

20. The creation of other neologisms, such as the “neotechnic” industrial society, the atomic era or the space age obviously also has a technological connotation.

21. In a book that is well known, Francesco Alberoni employs the following equation:  $P=f(ST)$ , which shows that the power of nations,  $P$ , is a function of the territory,  $T$ , and of technical capacity,  $S$ . Since  $T$  is invariable, any increase in power will depend on the increase in technological capacity, hence the competitive race among nations for bigger and better technology to strengthen, above all, economic development on the one hand and war power on the other.

22. If we are in a technological age, war is also necessarily technological.

23. R. Buckminster Fuller was the man to foresee one of the outstanding consequences of technology, putting it in one phrase: “to do more with less”. With fewer resources, technology produces more; with fewer causal components,

it obtains greater effect. Fuller calls this principle that of "comprehensive ephemeralization", and its meaning can be understood from a simple example: with one quarter of a ton of communication satellites, more information is disseminated than by using 15,000 tons of submarine cables; with 100 kilograms of computers a greater calculation capacity is obtained than by using 2,000 million kilograms of traditional calculating machines.

24. This principle of ephemeralization, translated into war technology, shows that half a kilogram of botulism toxin has a greater lethal power than the whole range of weapons used in the last 100 wars in history; and what could be said of the H bomb, a few kilograms of which have the destructive power of millions of tons of TNT, or other refined devices of the present-day war "gadgets" arsenal?

25. Neo-technology, therefore, from the point of view of warfare promotes a change of scale, a quantitative jump, that in present-day circumstances allows anyone in the world to grasp the ready availability of those instruments capable of condemning humanity and the biosphere to total destruction.

26. Professor Gaston Bouthoul adds to the three classic population sectors—namely, the primary, secondary and tertiary—yet another, the quaternary, which is that covering destructive activity, that of the population dedicated to do research on, produce and use the weapons necessary for war.

27. J. Robert Oppenheimer said, and with reason, that 90 per cent of all scientific researchers in history are alive in our time, thus giving a notion of science and technology in our age. Alastair Buchan mentions that 25 per cent of the world's scientists, who constitute 90 per cent of all scientists in the history of mankind, are dedicated to research on weapons. In turn, as Arnold Toynbee has said, "the single art of war evolves at the expense of all the arts of peace", so anyone can realize the enormous impact of technology in mutation, not only quantitatively but also in the sense of the qualitative jump represented by available and potential weapons. Those weapons are the non-conventional ones, and the type of war brought about as a consequence of their possible use has been known since Nagasaki as non-conventional warfare.

28. Non-conventional weapons are atomic weapons in the following varieties: A bombs and H bombs, whose effects are heat, ionizing radiation and expansion waves; reduced residual radiation bombs, whose effects are heat and expansion waves but not radiation; neutron bombs, whose effects are the result of radiation and not of heat and expansion, being therefore lethal to living beings but permitting the conservation of buildings and materials.

29. Chemical and biological weapons are also non-conventional weapons and together with atomic weapons they constitute the trilogy of modern warfare.

30. The ABC, or complex of atomic, biological and chemical weapons, A, B and C, is considered by strategists as the absolute in weapons.

31. Those weapons that permit climate modification or psychotropic weapons are also non-conventional weapons.

32. Rockets, aircraft, satellites and guided missiles are some of the possible delivery systems of atomic weapons.

33. If warfare technology and the sophistication thus provided daily increases the destructive power of those weapons, it is legitimate to think that this same technology has the power to invent means and create instruments to defend human life against those weapons. In this sense, some possibilities are: the technology of defensive weapons, such as, for example, ABMs or anti-ballistic missiles, detection systems and so on; the technology of biological defences, deriving from the resistance to radiation of certain biological organisms and the support means, based on the advances made by biology, bioengineering, chemistry and genetics; the technology that makes possible the control of absolute weapons, such as the discovery of photo-verification techniques, seismographic detection, measurement of radioactivity, use of satellites, and so on, as highly reliable elements for the evaluation and monitoring of warfare potential; the technology geared to find solutions to potentially conflicting problems, attacking their causes, as well as that having to do with research in the field of ribosomic biosynthesis of proteins; or attacking the consequences, such as decontamination and environmental purification technology, or the technology of recycling, that can be precisely considered technologies at the service of research for peace.

34. Simone de Beauvoir has stressed the contribution of technology in the depersonalization of modern man and his becoming "a thing". Ludwig von Bertalanffy has referred to a process of progressive de-anthropomorphization, conditioned by science and technology. Gerald Leach in his book *The Biocrats*<sup>2</sup> shows the danger of manipulating man himself, his will, his psyche, his organism and his genes as the greatest danger of technology.

35. These also are weapons, instruments of destruction, to which technology itself must and can find the antidote.

36. If, as remarked by Lyman Bryson, in his work *Science and Freedom*, blind technological materialism is not contained by scientific humanism, then not war but the very future of man as such, his destiny, will be at the mercy of a final and surely fatal test.

37. It is worth while to make some observations concerning the meaning of psychology about war and peace and consequently about disarmament. There are two inexorable areas to be considered in the problem of arms control. One is the arms race, the other pacifism. Pierre Haser says that the problem of peace has become too important to leave to the pacifists. In turn, Herbert Butterfield thinks that the *leit-motiv* of the arms race advocacy is the "tendency of power as such to expand indefinitely until faced with a greater power".

38. There we have the *primum movens* of the psychological implications of the arms race. Arms control becomes a

<sup>2</sup> Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1972.

sort of symbiosis, a sort of marriage between the pro-armament and pacifist attitudes of man. It does not imply disarmament and, in turn, it is a path to peace.

39. Klaus Knorr in his work, *On the Uses of Military Power in the Nuclear Age*, referring to the usefulness of weapons, says: "Utility is a matter of perception and values. It is essentially subjective, and this fact precludes computation and prevents comparison between countries and over time."<sup>3</sup> Knorr uses a simple formula that shows that  $U = V - C$  where  $U$  is the usefulness of arms power, depending on certain values,  $V$ , and on certain costs,  $C$ . The usefulness depends on the difference of total values and total costs. Among the values, what is taken into account includes territorial integrity, survival, security and assets such as respect and prestige, which, as a minimum, have a high psychological content. Among the costs, what is taken into account includes economic expenses, financial expenses, moral damages, guilt complex, injured dignity and so on.

40. The fact that scientists, rulers, strategists and military men can line up either for or against optimistic or pessimistic theories is also a psychological attitude, since there are enough arguments to feed both conceptions.

41. The well-known concept of nuclear deterrence is based on psychological suppositions, as shown by James E. Dougherty: "The concept of deterrence is something more than a strategical-military concept. It also belongs to the realm of psychology, since it entails an effort to influence other people's behaviour through dissuasion, namely, through the threat of inflicting an unacceptable amount of punishment in retaliation for a certain undesirable form of behaviour, such as military aggression."

42. Y.A. Maslow, who in a way is the craftsman of humanist psychology, attributes to dissuasion the outstanding role in the search for security when he affirms that "everything seems less important than security and protection".

43. Albert Einstein, on the other hand, believed that fear was the priority psychological factor and said: "Atomic energy can intimidate humanity and induce it to put order in its international affairs, something it would not do without the pressure of fear."

44. Anyway, dissuasion is an intellectual game and its condition is a high degree of rationality on the part of the parties to a conflict.

45. Nuclear strategy is based on the mutually assured destruction (MAD) principle or assurance of mutual destruction. In order for such deterrence to exist, it is necessary to possess enough nuclear power to inflict irreparable damage on the other party. This balance of terror was the one leading to the first strategic arms limitation agreement in May 1972, which is aimed at freezing nuclear capacity without undercutting the retaliation force of each of the parties.

46. General Pierre Gallois, in his book *The Balance of Terror: Strategy in the Nuclear Age*,<sup>4</sup> holds the theory of

"proportional deterrence", based on the possibility available to lesser Powers of acquiring a deterrent force capable of inflicting on a potential aggressor losses equal to the value of what it puts at stake. Thus, a small Power can acquire a deterrent force and hence contribute—according to Gallois—to the maintenance of peace. Here, returning to Knorr's equation  $U = V - C$ , what we are dealing with is trying to create the conviction of the lack of usefulness,  $U$ , of a potential act of aggression because of the danger hovering over the values,  $V$ , brought into play.

47. The psychological approach is related also to arms control, as stated by Donald Brennan, when he says: "A great deal of the considerable complexity of arms control has its origin in the fact that this is a very subjective question: you could not find two specialists that could see the implications in the same manner."

48. But it is on the aggressive behaviour of communities where psychologists lay the greater emphasis concerning the dangers of war confrontation.

49. We should quickly recall here certain points of view.

50. Dr. Alex Comfort relates aggressive behaviour to population density. G. M. Carstairs related aggression to the delimitations of the territory over which man or a community exercises control.

51. Frank Fraser Darling maintains that man is the one species that can lie, either to others or to himself. No other animal species lies. Man, by falsifying truth, loses authenticity and that attitude breeds aggression.

52. Joseph S. Weiner relates aggression to overcrowding, due to the repeated emotional stress to which individuals are subjected, which comes to create in man an emotional hyperreactivity, which constitutes the base of all aggressive behaviour.

53. C. H. Waddington differentiates animal aggression, which is interspecific, from human aggression, which is intraspecific, because of the speech capacity that man has and the complicated semantic mechanisms that always carry the probability of provoking confrontation.

54. John Dollard, in his study *Frustration and aggression*,<sup>5</sup> relates human aggression to frustrating experiences, either individual or social ones. Frustration breeds aggression and aggression exacerbates frustration, as in a vicious circle which ends finally in a consummated act.

55. Philip Noel-Baker, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, believes that man has acquired, through evolution and history, a spirit of contradiction, a sinalgmatic attitude which places him as forming part of a dualism, like fighting against something, or even doubling his personality and fighting against doubt, as Hamlet does. Class struggle itself, which Marxism claims as one of its conceptual columns, is in part the fruit of the psychology of Karl Marx, whose motto was precisely *De Omnibus Dubitandum*—everything is subject to doubt. Noel-Baker believes

<sup>3</sup> Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1966, p. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1961.

<sup>5</sup> Yale University Press, New Haven, 1939.

that it is necessary to create an ethos in international affairs that will allow communities to pass from a sinalagmatic attitude to an analagmatic one.

56. B. F. Skinner, the most distinguished behaviourist psychologist, in his polemical book *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*,<sup>6</sup> considers that aggression related to our culture is linked to two factors: “the futile desire of uncontrolled freedom and blind faith in human dignity”.

57. Man cannot be free, for this thinker, because his acts are partly programmed in his genes and partly conditioned by the physical and social environment. His dignity is an illusion, because man cannot attribute to himself credit for his own conduct. In this manner, he ends up in aggression, which at this stage puts survival into question. The solution lies in the search for self-control through behavioural engineering and the aid of culture.

58. Without prejudice to the solutions proposed in the draft final document of the Preparatory Committee—and the difficulties involved in its preparation, of which the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, made us aware with great wisdom and tact at the inaugural meeting, can be seen by merely reading it—my delegation considers that the Assembly should take into account the possibility of promoting the creation of an advisory polemological body that would work under the supervision and trusteeship of the United Nations, with the tasks that I shall now mention.

59. That advice is indispensable and the contribution thus provided by an institute of that character would surely offer the best and most complete information on a question already complex in itself that is in a process of very rapid change. It would also be the appropriate channel for such information to reach the peoples of the world, making available in a direct and untarnished form the whole magnitude of the problems that beset us.

60. Polemology—from the Greek *polemos*, war—is a scientific study of war and peace with the aim of drawing conclusions for the preservation of peace.

61. The aim is to shift the treatment of the cycles of war and peace from the political forum, where that problem is traditionally dealt with, to the scientific arena. In polemology, war and peace are approached with the usual scientific methodology: the establishment of comparable facts, the creation of theories of interpretation, the demonstration of those theories and the processing of their application.

62. Karl von Clausewitz, in his well-known treatise *On War*,<sup>7</sup> establishes that war is the continuation of politics through other means. Therefore, war could be an instrument at the disposal of men.

63. Polemology puts that assertion in doubt, and maintains that men are those who, in given psychological circumstances, become passive pawns in the game of war. Polemology tries in that way to extract from human sci-

ences, and specifically from those dealing with behaviour, the necessary elements to disentangle the bellicose attitude of man. Polemology also differs from “traditional pacifism” that supposes that a minimum of good will can put an end to conflicts, and tries axiologically to judge those conflicts without an objective basis.

64. The aim is to become better acquainted with the causes, rhythms and functioning of war, so as to obtain a “functional pacifism”, very different in nature from “traditional pacifism”.

65. Here I should like to repeat what was mentioned by the Vice-President of the United States [2nd meeting], who referred to the forces driving the arms race—such as technology, international tension and legitimate concerns over security—without failing to mention irrational factors. All Governments, he said later on, must strengthen institutions and have the necessary knowledge to control arms.

66. As is well known, war was considered as God’s plague, as the Lord’s punishment sent to man. In that way, to the rider of the Apocalypse was attributed the power to banish peace from earth so that men could slit each other’s throats:

“... the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them.” [Revelation 11:7.]

“A noise shall come even to the ends of the earth; for the Lord hath a controversy with the nations, he will plead with all flesh; he will give them that are wicked to the sword . . .

“Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Behold, evil shall go forth from nation to nation, and a great whirlwind shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth.

“And the slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth . . .

“Howl, ye shepherds, and cry; and wallow yourselves in the ashes, ye principal of the flock, for the days of your slaughter and of your dispersions are accomplished; and ye shall fall like a pleasant vessel.” [Jeremiah 25:31-34.]

67. The Council of London attributed, in 1665, the ravages of the epidemic to the Lord’s curse, aimed at chastising the citizens of London for the unholy writings of Thomas Hobbes.

68. The theological perspective of war and peace ended up declericalizing itself, deconsecrating itself, and was thus replaced by a certain form of knowledge embodied in three disciplines—morality, sociology and law.

69. But these three disciplines showed a clear tendency to set normative criteria concerning the approach to war and peace. And hence, there were held to be just wars and unjust wars—a precedent for which can be found in Em-

<sup>6</sup> Knopf, New York, 1971.

<sup>7</sup> Modern Library, New York, 1943.



peror Constantine—of the defenders of good, confronted with the artifices of evil.

70. Scientific research on war and peace, based on objective criteria and not on axiological and normative premises, started late in history, and it was in our century, and above all after the Second World War, that the first steps were taken. In the 1940s, with the publication of the monumental work *A Study of War*, which was the result of the multidisciplinary study of 70 authors working under the direction of Quincy Wright for 15 years,<sup>8</sup> the bases of polemology were set down. From then on, and with the advent of atomic weapons, research on war and peace not only became objective, but the reason for its existence was the preservation of the human species threatened with extinction by ionizing radiation.

71. Albert Camus said that each generation brought with itself dreams and desires for the making of a new world, but, he added, his generation brought with it the desire that the world not be destroyed.

72. Polemology studies war and peace.

73. As to war, it analyses its etiology, its causes. They may be: structural, trying to search for relationships among economic, ethnic, political, demographic and aggression structures; conjunctural, analysing the effect of the historical context; occasional, namely, the consequence of immediate motivations.

74. Wars can be, furthermore, limited, for they concern only the military apparatus of nations; total, for they concern the whole military and civil context of nations; intentional and unintentional. The type corresponding to the intentional type of war is the Clausewitz model, that is, "the continuation of politics through military means". It is the so-called model of "cataclysmic war", described by Leo Tolstoy in *War and Peace* where war appears as an undesirable and not as a premeditated element, the product of blind or aleatory forces that confront man with the consummated act.

75. The sword of Damocles of nuclear war, according to polemologists, is not included in the canons of strategic war. An intentional war between two reasonable States is hard to envisage, but an error or accident, a lack of calculation, an escalation, can indeed become the cause of atomic disaster. Thus, Thomas Schelling, in his book *Arms and Influence*,<sup>9</sup> says:

"There is not a foreseeable process through which the United States and the Soviet Union can be dragged into nuclear war. If war breaks out, it will be as a result of a totally unforeseen process, of reactions that it is not possible to predict exactly, of quite unpremeditated decisions, of developments that will not be under complete control. War has never evaded uncertainty, but, with the data provided today by technology, geography and politics, it is not easy to see how a world war could come to pass unless it is due to uncertainty."

76. Here I would like to remind the Assembly of what the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union said in his statement a few days ago [5th meeting]—that one error would be enough to unleash a nuclear conflict. The Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany justly remarked [*ibid*] that what went into a policy of security should bear in mind the effective capacity to manipulate crises and the predictability of military conduct. He said later that any unpredictable behaviour was risky.

77. Therefore, strategic war gives way to unintentional, accidental war, the result of escalations in conflict situations. The threat of war is contained in the "accidents" that can happen in conflict situations, which would in turn provoke uncontrollable chain reactions.

78. Hence polemology takes as the core of its goals the study of the "conflict theory" so that the multidisciplinary scientific knowledge thus obtained allows it to forecast the whole possible range of accidents.

79. The general theory of conflict is based on the fact that social systems suffer disturbances and that these disturbances develop with coincidences and analogies that can be rationalized. Family, labour, economic, political, religious, ethnic, ideological, cultural, and international conflicts present a set of similar patterns, a certain evolutionary isomorphism, in spite of multiple and obvious differences. Scientific analysis allows for the deduction of basic and common concepts that will constitute a conflict theory, which will in turn make forecasting possible, as is done in economic theory, or prospective analysis. In the economic cycles of prosperity and depression, what is involved is the acquisition of knowledge to take measures to increase prosperity and inhibit depression. Medical science does the same with the cycles of health and disease, and polemology, in the war-peace cycles, aims, through scientific knowledge, to strengthen peace and diminish the risks of war. Polemology covers many other aspects, from the cultural anthropology approach, where the end is to look for ethnic bellicosity in the processes of culture shock and cultural interpenetration, even to the search of quantifiable parameters in demography, economics or econometrics, which can clarify conflict situations, and again to the mathematical approach to the problem, using set theory, the game theory of John von Neumann and Oscar Morgenstern, the war theory of Lewis Richardson, of the conflict simulation models using computers and "gaming".

80. As for peace, polemology studies its different forms and the factors that tend to alter the equilibrium on which it is based. It is argued that the state of peace is not the natural state of man, because strategy or biological science of behaviour indicates an innately aggressive behaviour. But this is seen in man and not in animals, where it is rare for struggles to the death to exist within the same species. Raymond Aron already stressed this in his book *Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations*,<sup>10</sup> when he said that "the difficulty of peace is to be found more in the humanity than in the animality of man. Man is the being who prefers revolution to humiliation and his own truth to life."

<sup>8</sup> University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1965.

<sup>9</sup> Yale University Press, New Haven, 1966.

<sup>10</sup> Doubleday and Co., Garden City, N. Y., 1966.

81. There is positive peace and negative peace. Negative peace is the absence of war. Positive peace implies that communities agree to live together within the frame of reference set out by a minimum of common values. Negative peace is the one that preoccupies us because of its immediate dangers. On the basis of that concept, negative peace—or the absence of war—involves simply trying to abolish war, prohibiting it as is done in the Charter of the United Nations in paragraph 4 of Article 2, contenting itself with the prohibition of war as a means of resolving conflicts, but without proposing other solutions to replace war and without suppressing conflict situations themselves. The measures of negative peace only permit the accumulation of tensions that will end in the inevitability of war. The road to follow is that of positive peace, which goes to the origin of conflicts in order to avoid them and peacefully resolve a given situation. For this it requires the assistance of knowledge and reason, of science and of rationalism.

82. There is, also, a static and a dynamic peace. Static peace, the result of the *status quo*, such as the peace of Versailles, which Carl Schmidt called “the legitimization of booty”, condemns a society to immobility. In a society such as ours, subject to rapid change, the only possible option is dynamic peace.

83. In the encyclical *Populorum Progressio*, the parallelism between peace and development, change and peace, was drawn. Alfred North Whitehead attributed to development the feature of imposing “change within order and order in change”, sensing in this way the necessary symbiosis of those two elements so dear to dynamic peace, to peace in development.

84. Johan Galtung, who carried out a study of 35 different theories of peace at the request of UNESCO, paid for by the International Peace Research Association, applies to the analysis of these theories the thermodynamic concept of entropy, which includes elements such as the perspective of statistical physics and the concepts of order and uncertainty.

85. A priority task of polemology is the study of “peace conditions”, namely, the requirements for the establishment, maintenance and strengthening of peace. United States Senator Fulbright called those “peace conditions” “our need” when he said: “If the common danger can serve to measure the intensity of our need, the existence or absence of the community’s positive feelings must measure our capacity”.

86. Emeric de Vattel defines “peace conditions” as the *jus necessarium*, the law of need, that could very well be the natural law of the atomic age. The “peace conditions”, the *jus necessarium*, “our need”, or whatever you wish to call it, are related to a number of interdependent factors, but the first and most fundamental of them is the study of arms control.

87. The methodology of peace research is varied and pleomorphic. However, it can be put together in two great currents. On the one hand there is the historico-analytical current, represented above all by Raymond Aron, E. H. Carr, Morgenthau and Schwarzenberger, and based in his-

torical analysis, the detection of analogies and their generalization.

88. Thus, for example, Gaston Bouthoul, Director of the Polemological Institute of France, initiates the analysis of the great phases such as the Sinic Peace, starting in the year 211 B.C. with the unification of China by Huang-Te; the *Pax Romana*, which goes from the year 30 B.C. to the year 350 A.D.; the *Pax Britannica*, which goes from the year 1814 to 1914; and the *Pax Atomica*, in which, since 1945, the world has been living.

89. There is another current—it could be called the modern or mathematical method—that uses statistics, mathematical analysis, building of models and the detection of quantifiable parameters and information processes as such, and even relations with semantics, as in the case of “semantic implications”, and analyses, using data processing, documents, speeches and newspaper reports of a given community, searching for those terms and models with strong impact, affective or emotional, in order to measure the hostility and aggression derived therefrom. Karl Deutsch, Johan Galtung, Anatol Rapoport, K. E. Boulding, Lewis Richardson and Thomas Schelling are the most outstanding authors.

90. Concerning the organizations that carry out polemological research, these can be classified into three types, namely, institutes of international relations, research institutes on national security that present and carry out studies on strategic subjects, and institutes on peace research itself. Among the latter, for example, we could mention the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), created in 1966 in commemoration of the 150 uninterrupted years of peace in Sweden; a private institute that carries out similar research, with headquarters at Oslo; the Department of Peace Research of the Academy of Sciences of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), founded in London in 1964; the Polemological Institute of France, already mentioned, created in 1945; the Centre for the Sociology of War, at Brussels; the Polemological Institute of Groningen, in the Netherlands; and the peace research institutes of the United States of America, united in a central organization, the International Peace Research Association (IPRA).

91. In other words, many other institutes have appeared all over the world since the 1960s with the aim of putting scientific knowledge at the service of peace and the containment of war proliferation.

92. My delegation considers that the United Nations should supervise the functioning of a polemological organ whose aim could be the study of peace in the light of science; the promotion of multidisciplinary research on peace, its realization and perfection; the study of aggression and its causes; the collaboration in the said studies of all the Member States through their scientific staff; the research and analysis of all the conflicts occurring in the world; the establishment of a data collection network on conflict situations, similar to world or regional meteorological networks; the elaboration of theoretical pro-

grammes, models and *sui generis* scientific solutions for each conflict situation in the critical stage; the elaboration of forecasting methods put at the disposal of Member States; the creation of a world polemological information bank that includes the majority of related disciplines; and the preparation of periodic, dynamic and readaptable plans of polemological character for the strengthening of world peace and international security.

93. Here I should like to mention the proposal put forward by the President of the Republic of France. He said that there should be an instrument of disarmament studies at the level of the world Organization [3rd meeting] and he suggested that it be created.

94. As the President of the General Assembly said in his outstanding opening statement before this Assembly on 23 May, never in the history of the world have such great sums been used as they are today for weapons and armies, thus becoming such a very burden, even for the most powerful and richest countries in the world—which proves the madness of continuing on this road. Only the destruction of civilization and human life itself can be found at the end of that road.

95. Of the more than 3,000 resolutions adopted by the United Nations since its creation, about 200 deal with disarmament, as was said in the same statement by the President, but—as he immediately went on to add—no serious breakthrough has been attained in this area.

96. Even if we want to, we cannot be over-optimistic about concrete, tangible results in this meeting.

97. While this enormous effort is being made and enormous sums squandered, whole peoples suffer from hunger, lack of aid, lack of education and lack of a future. Such a situation is a challenge to the human conscience. By itself, it is a cause of frustration, of tension, resentment and aggression. The arms race keeps up its deadly pace.

98. This Assembly is the object of attention of the whole world. Many are those who have put their trust in what can be done here. Let us not disappoint that hope, because the United Nations will then be mortgaging its credibility and, indeed, its own future.

99. These are the fervent wishes of Uruguay.

100. Mr. SONODA (Japan)<sup>11</sup>: Mr. President, on behalf of the Government of Japan, I should like to congratulate Your Excellency on your assumption of the high office of President of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I am confident that, under your impartial leadership, and benefiting from your excellent judgement and wealth of diplomatic experience, the special session will prove to be most fruitful.

101. The Charter of the United Nations was adopted in San Francisco 33 years ago. It clearly states at the very beginning that the peoples of the United Nations have re-

solved to combine their efforts “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind”. All the nations which gathered to found the United Nations committed themselves to this solemn pledge, and all the nations which have since joined this august body have given the same solemn undertaking.

102. During these 33 years, however, the world has seen a great number of armed conflicts and a continuous increase in armaments, including nuclear weapons. I cannot help feeling a sense of deep disappointment at this state of affairs.

103. At the same time, I am greatly encouraged that unremitting efforts have been made to bring lasting peace to the world, and that the present special session on disarmament being held is one concrete accomplishment of such efforts.

104. Having recovered from the devastation of the Second World War, with the understanding and co-operation of the other countries of the world, Japan now has one of the strongest economies in the world. In the past, an economically powerful country has invariably been a military Power as well. However, Japan has rejected such a course, and has consistently endeavoured to use its economic capabilities for contributing to the stability and prosperity of the international community.

105. The Constitution of Japan proclaims that:

“We, the Japanese people . . . desire peace for all time . . . and we have determined to preserve our security and existence, trusting in the justice and faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world.”

It then states that:

“ . . . the Japanese people . . . never renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as a means of settling international disputes.”

106. In the proud spirit of such a Constitution, which it is hoped will open new vistas for humanity, Japan has maintained the fundamental policy of refusing to become a military Power which may threaten other States. It has instead made international co-operation the foundation of its foreign policy.

107. At the basis of my country's decision to choose such a path, which is a challenging experiment without parallel in history, lies our firm determination that “such a war must never break out again”—a determination deeply rooted in the heart of each and every Japanese through bitter experiences in the Second World War. Today, more than 30 years since the end of the war, the Japanese people still hold firmly to this determination. Japan will never act counter to it.

108. The fervent longing of the Japanese people for lasting peace, and their firm resolve to devote themselves to its attainment, coincide in every way with what the Charter

<sup>11</sup> Mr. Sonoda spoke in Japanese. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.



of the United Nations demands of the countries of the world. Japan, aspiring to be a pioneer in the establishment of new standards of behaviour for sovereign States within the world community, is determined to strengthen still further its diplomatic efforts dedicated to peace and based on international co-operation.

109. As is well known, Japan is the only country which has experienced the indescribable horrors caused by nuclear weapons. In a flash, the atomic bombs which were dropped on the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki 33 years ago reduced those two cities to ashes and took the lives of nearly 300,000 people. Of those who luckily escaped death, the agony and suffering of some 370,000 men, women and children continue even to this day. This agony is not confined to nationals of Japan alone. For the sake of future generations of mankind, we must never forget the stark realities of the suffering and devastation caused by nuclear weapons.

110. Today, Mayor Araki of Hiroshima, and Mayor Morotani of Nagasaki, are present in this hall, representing the citizens of those two cities.

111. Today's nuclear weapons have a destructive capacity which defies comparison with that of the atomic bombs used against the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. If nuclear weapons were ever to be used again, the ensuing devastation and suffering would be enormous, quite beyond our imagination. The Japanese people are firmly united in the conviction that such a tragedy must never be repeated. I believe that this determination is shared today not only by the Japanese people, but also by the peoples of the entire world. In the light of such a world-wide conviction, I think it would be highly significant to proclaim 6 August as Disarmament Day.

112. Today, the representatives of a variety of non-governmental organizations, which have for many years worked in Japan for the abolition of nuclear weapons, have come in great numbers to this session. They are more than 500. Their presence reflects the burning conviction of the Japanese people that our ultimate goal, the abolition of nuclear weapons, must be achieved at the earliest possible date.

113. Based on the strong desire of the Japanese people for the abolition of nuclear weapons, my country has, as a matter of national policy, consistently upheld the three non-nuclear principles, of not possessing, not manufacturing, and not permitting the entry into Japan of nuclear weapons, even though it possesses the capacity to develop such weapons. The reason for which my country became a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373(XXII)*, *annex*] was also our desire for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

114. On behalf of the Government and the people of Japan, I wish to state yet again that my country is firmly committed to these three non-nuclear principles. At the same time, I strongly urge the nuclear-weapon States to make every possible effort to ensure that nuclear weapons will never be used, and to banish all nuclear weapons from the earth.

115. The nuclear-weapon States ought to be in a position to understand better than any other country the horrors of nuclear weapons and the threat they pose to our survival. The non-nuclear-weapon States, whatever their ideology or political system, earnestly desire the removal of the ever-present threat posed by nuclear weapons. It must be concluded, therefore, that there should be no difference whatsoever among the nations in their desire totally to eliminate nuclear weapons. I am firmly convinced that if each and every nation resolves to strive yet harder on such a premise, the total abolition of nuclear weapons will come within our reach. This is our duty towards the generations to come.

116. While the attainment of general and complete disarmament should undoubtedly be the common goal of all the countries of the world, it should not be forgotten that for each country disarmament is a problem which is closely linked to the requirements of ensuring national security. In the present international community the balance of power among countries, whether on a regional or a world-wide scale, is a significant factor in the maintenance of international peace and security. If we wish to move towards the attainment of general and complete disarmament there is no way open to us other than to keep this ideal always in mind and proceed step by step with concrete and feasible measures.

117. So far I have outlined my country's basic thinking on disarmament. I should like now, against this background, to give my Government's views on some of the main issues.

118. First, I should like to re-emphasize the fact that to make progress in negotiations on nuclear disarmament, with the goal of eliminating all nuclear weapons, is the task facing us today to which the highest priority should be given. To attain that goal it is most essential to adopt feasible measures, step by step, in the direction of first halting the nuclear arms race and thereafter reducing existing nuclear arsenals. In order to arrest the nuclear arms race it is necessary to prevent any further increase in the number of nuclear-weapon States. To this end, international efforts should be intensified to make the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons truly universal and on that basis to strengthen further the non-proliferation régime. In this connexion, I am firmly convinced that the imperatives of preventing further nuclear proliferation and promoting the peaceful use of nuclear energy, an essential energy source, can and must be pursued in harmony.

119. The Government of Japan believes also that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones where suitable conditions exist can be useful in preventing proliferation. My country hopes that international endeavours to establish such zones will be continued and that the nuclear-weapon States will give their positive support, including assurances that they will not attack such zones with nuclear weapons.

120. International efforts to prevent an increase in the number of nuclear-weapon States can achieve little without the efforts of the countries which now possess nuclear

weapons to achieve nuclear disarmament. Positive contributions by all the nuclear-weapon States are indispensable if the ultimate goal of the abolition of nuclear weapons is to be attained. However, there has been little progress in the efforts made so far by the nuclear-weapon States for the reduction of their nuclear armaments. I cannot help feeling a sense of deep disappointment and strong frustration. The two major nuclear-weapon States have particularly heavy responsibilities in this regard. I strongly request that the United States and the Soviet Union, mindful of those responsibilities, work for the earliest possible conclusion of an agreement in the second round of strategic arms limitation talks, and should promptly follow it with further talks on the substantial reduction of their strategic arms.

121. Furthermore, my country urges China and France to become parties to such existing treaties as the partial test-ban treaty<sup>12</sup> and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and to participate in disarmament negotiations, beginning with the negotiations on the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

122. The first specific step towards halting the nuclear arms race should be the comprehensive prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests. It is indeed regrettable that more than 1,000 nuclear-weapon tests have been conducted in the past 33 years and that at least 8 tests have already been conducted this year. I should like to appeal strongly to the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union to reach agreement at the earliest possible date in their current trilateral consultations on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, and to make it possible for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to start multilateral treaty negotiations this summer. At the same time, I should like to request all countries to refrain from setting off any nuclear explosions, whether for military or for peaceful purposes, before the conclusion of such a treaty.

123. Another realistic step towards arresting the nuclear arms race would be the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for nuclear explosions. Japan has promoted this idea ever since 1969. I should like to take this opportunity to urge the nuclear-weapon States to halt the production of fissionable nuclear materials for explosive purposes, except in such quantities as are necessary for non-explosive and non-weapons purposes. In order to ensure compliance with such measures, the nuclear-weapon States should accept International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards similar to those which are applied to the non-nuclear-weapon States under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and other international agreements.

124. The establishment of effective systems of verification is no doubt indispensable in ensuring concrete progress in disarmament. In the field of a comprehensive test ban, Japan, with its highly advanced seismological research, has been contributing to the establishment of a system of verification of nuclear tests using seismological

methods. It is our intention further to strengthen our efforts in this field. Japan appeals strongly to the countries concerned to intensify international efforts, including their efforts through the United Nations, for the purpose of developing effective systems of verification for a variety of disarmament measures.

125. Mankind will be able to reach the stage of making significant progress towards the substantial reduction of existing nuclear weapons only when all nuclear-weapon States have proceeded with the concrete measures that I have suggested for halting the nuclear arms race. I am convinced that this is the road along which mankind must advance towards the abolition of nuclear weapons.

126. Together with that of nuclear disarmament, the task of banning chemical weapons, which are also weapons of mass destruction, is urgent. My country, throughout the 10 years of deliberations in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, has made strenuous efforts for the early attainment of this goal, which have included the submission of a draft treaty banning chemical weapons.<sup>13</sup> I should like to request that, with the convention banning biological weapons<sup>14</sup> already concluded, negotiations on a treaty banning chemical weapons be promptly undertaken.

127. The international community is today witnessing an enormous build-up of conventional weapons as a result of their production and international transfer. Such an accumulation is fraught with the danger of inducing the outbreak of armed conflicts and the escalation of armed conflicts in areas of tension.

128. On the basis of its fundamental position of devotion to peace, Japan refrains from exporting weapons to any part of the world, thus maintaining a highly exceptional, indeed a unique, position among the advanced industrialized countries. Furthermore, my country has taken the initiative in advocating the commencement of international studies with the aim of restraining the unlimited international transfer of conventional arms, while appealing to the major arms suppliers to start consultations with a view to voluntary restraint in the export of arms to areas of conflict. We appreciate the fact that in positive response to this appeal, the United States and the Soviet Union have begun consultations aimed at curbing arms exports.

129. This question of the international transfer of conventional arms is undoubtedly a delicate and difficult one as it has a direct bearing on the security of a great number of countries. Nevertheless, we cannot bypass this question simply because it is difficult. While fully recognizing the complex nature of this problem, I earnestly hope that the first step towards achieving restraint in the unlimited international transfer of conventional weapons will be taken at this special session.

130. It goes without saying that the prime aim of disarmament is the preservation of international peace and secu-

<sup>13</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 27, annex 1, sect. 2.*

<sup>14</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).*

<sup>12</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).*

rity. I should like at the same time to emphasize that as we move forward with disarmament the resources so far allocated to armaments should be released for the prosperity and development of the international community, in particular for the developing countries.

131. World military expenditure, which is increasing year by year, has now reached the staggering figure of almost \$400 billion annually. On this one day alone more than \$1 billion is being spent for military purposes. This amount, 20 times as much as the total amount of the official development assistance from the developed to the developing countries, constitutes a serious obstacle to the economic and social development of the world community.

132. It is essential that all the countries of the world, including the nuclear-weapon States, should bear this in mind and make ever greater efforts in the field of disarmament in order that we may devote our resources and energies to the prosperity of the whole international community, and particularly to the development of the developing nations.

133. Disarmament is a complex and difficult problem. Progress in it can be achieved only through the unremitting concerted efforts of all the countries of the world for the common goal of attaining general and complete disarmament. I very much hope that concrete results will be attained at this special session for the improvement of the disarmament machinery to encourage such concerted efforts.

134. Finally, it must be emphasized that the aim of disarmament will not be achieved in the final analysis unless distrust among countries, which underlies the arms race, is removed. We must break the vicious circle in which mutual distrust causes increases in armaments and increases in armaments breed distrust. Instead, we must build relationships in which mutual trust promotes disarmament and disarmament builds mutual trust.

135. Inspired by the wisdom born of its own bitter experiences in the past war, my country has decided to dedicate itself to peace and has based its diplomacy on a policy of avoidance of hostility with any country. It has striven to deepen exchanges and communications, thereby building a relationship of mutual trust with all the countries of the world regardless of their political system, power or geographical distance. I believe it is precisely such endeavours that will build a firm basis for efforts at disarmament.

136. As I stated at the outset, the basic policy of Japan is to devote itself to peace. Japan has adhered firmly to the stringent policy of not possessing, not manufacturing and not permitting the entry into Japan of nuclear weapons. It has refrained from exporting weapons to the rest of the world. I therefore feel personally proud in stating that Japan occupies a highly advanced position in the field of disarmament.

137. It is our strong hope that specific progress will be made in nuclear disarmament and other disarmament fields through concerted international efforts. Various construc-

tive proposals have been made and will continue to be made at the present session of the General Assembly. The crux of the matter, however, is the achievement of actual and concrete progress in our disarmament efforts.

138. I most earnestly hope that the present special session may prove to be a constructive forum that will lead to concrete achievements in the field of disarmament and may thus give a strong impetus to the international effort for general and complete disarmament.

139. Before concluding my statement, let me share with this audience my deep convictions on the question of nuclear weapons.

140. Distinguished delegates who represent nuclear-weapon States, I trust that you know better than anyone else the horrors of nuclear weapons, which could annihilate mankind. Nuclear weapons remind me of the tusks of the mammoth, which ultimately caused the mammoth's self-extinction. It is my earnest hope that nuclear-weapon States will give careful thought to the future of mankind and pursue responsible policies.

141. Distinguished delegates who represent non-nuclear-weapon States which are under the dark shadow of existing nuclear weapons, we can never forget the horrifying holocaust that could be caused by nuclear weapons. Let us unite in our total commitment and proceed together for the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

142. I should like to conclude my statement with this sincere appeal to all representatives gathered here today.

143. Mr. AYALA-LASSO (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, first of all I should like to extend to you my Government's congratulations and my own on your election as President of this special session of the General Assembly, which I am sure you will guide with the same expertise as the session which immediately preceded it.

144. I am also pleased to congratulate Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas on his effective guidance of the work of the Preparatory Committee, which has laid down such useful foundations for the special session, and on his well deserved election as Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

145. The problems this Assembly must face are serious and far-reaching. Disarmament and related problems were the first to be taken up by the General Assembly at its initial session, thus fulfilling the praiseworthy profession of faith in the Preamble of the Charter, which commits the peoples of the United Nations to doing away with the scourge of war.

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

146. As a dramatic paradox between the hopeful time when the United Nations Charter was signed at San Francisco and its coming into force, there was the ill-fated August when the first atomic bombs of plutonium and uranium exploded over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, ushering in the era of massive death and total destruction.

147. It was therefore natural that the first resolutions of the General Assembly of 1946 were directed towards, on the one hand, limiting arms and, on the other, establishing the Atomic Energy Commission to take up the problem of the use of this enormous destructive force.

148. Various formulas, from a limited disarmament commission to a plenary commission, were tested. Meanwhile the kilotons produced by fission atomic bombs gave way to the era of megatons with the fusion bomb which made its debut in the Bikini atoll.

149. From the simple intention to reduce arms, thinking moved forward in the 1960s to the idea of general and complete disarmament. But a 33-year struggle was necessary before there was success in convening a special session of the General Assembly devoted to the specific problems of disarmament. That is the enormous significance of this session of the Assembly and of the unavoidable problems it will have to consider.

150. The stockpiled nuclear power, which has been called the world megatonnage and is equivalent to 60 tons of dynamite for every inhabitant of the earth, meant that until a short time ago we believed that a new war was not possible because of the so-called balance of terror, because it would affect all mankind and there would be no victory for any Power.

151. Yet its spectre emerges from the shadows when major world leaders maintain that total war is inevitable, although it may be postponed; when high officers of other Powers in public statements do not reject the possibility; and when the main actors of this great military drama increase their nuclear arsenals and are set on manufacturing new and terrible weapons of mass destruction.

152. Among the disarmament measures to which Ecuador considers priority should be given are the following: first, total prohibition of any kind of nuclear testing; secondly, prohibition of the testing or production of new weapons of mass destruction, whether radiological, chemical, biological or meteorological; thirdly, effective destruction or limitation of rocket delivery systems; and fourthly, a commitment by each State not to be the first to use nuclear weapons in case of conflict.

153. Existing treaties prohibit nuclear tests in the atmosphere, on the sea-bed and in outer space, but they omit the subsoil where the most complex nuclear warheads have been tested. It is indispensable to fill this vacuum by reaching an appropriate agreement.

154. On the other hand, the Treaty of Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies [*resolution 2222(XXI), annex*] has to be reviewed to provide effective assurance that in those environments only peaceful activities will be carried out. The use of satellites for military purposes or the manufacture of anti-satellite weapons and killer satellites are a threat to all. The recent incident of the fall of the Cosmos 974 satellite in Canada makes it essential to draw up adequate safeguard rules for the use of nuclear energy in outer space.

155. Although environmental destruction is apparently independent from disarmament it has to be linked to it. Besides the effects of environmental pollution by radioactive isotopes as a result of nuclear testing, the use of defoliants has transformed some parts of the world with their deadly effect in climatic changes and, regrettably, meteorological weapons that can dramatically alter life are not inconceivable.

156. The delicate biochemical balance of the atmosphere cannot be altered without lethal consequences for the human being whose only sources of oxygen are the land biomass and the marine phytoplankton. It is essential, therefore, to prohibit any testing of weapons on either land or sea, which may alter that balance.

157. While certain weapons of mass destruction, it is true, are the most dangerous for the existence of humanity and the continuation of its history, nevertheless the so-called conventional weapons also have negative importance.

158. While on the one hand the developed countries that sell weapons urge the developing countries to devote their efforts to promoting human rights and to furthering their plans and programmes for social and economic development which would benefit the vast masses of the population, on the other hand they encourage the investment of considerable financial resources in war devices which are not always in accord with the real interest of the peoples. Thus, an atmosphere of instability and distrust is created which leads to a breach in regional balance and ensures a continued source of income for the arms suppliers.

159. In the Yearbook of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute for this year it is pointed out that in this field: "There is also a qualitative change—in the 1950s large numbers of second-hand weapons were sent to third-world countries, often without any supplementary equipment, such as spares and support equipment, or training agreements. Today, the arms market is a buyer's rather than a seller's market, and any importer able to pay is likely to find a seller of even the most sophisticated armaments."

160. According to another authorized source, purchases of weapons by developing countries are at present larger than purchases by the industrialized countries, the estimate being that two thirds of purchases of all kinds of weapons are made by developing countries.

161. Without doubt, in this as in other aspects, the two super-Powers bear a primary responsibility. During recent years both are estimated to have exported weapons to all regions of the world to a value of \$55 billion (the United States \$35 billion and the Soviet Union \$20 billion).

162. Here it is fitting to recall what the President of the United States said on the subject:

"Let us seek to reduce the annual dollar value of arms sales, limit the transfer of sophisticated arms and lessen the scope of our agreements of co-production

with other States. And, what is equally important, let us strive to have other nations, whether free or not, join us in this effort."

163. In this connexion my delegation would consider the possibility that, on the initiative of the States of each region, regional conferences be held to prevent and limit conventional weapons as long as appropriate conditions exist. This we consider to be interesting.

164. In this respect, Ecuador agrees with those who have raised the question of regional disarmament as an important phase for world-wide disarmament. It should be considered to be the duty and responsibility of States large and small to adopt, together with world-wide disarmament measures, those regional disarmament measures which could well be accelerated by an effective reduction of tensions and, above all, by means of the peaceful settlement of disputes, which would have a most encouraging effect on the restriction of military expenditure. We shall therefore support the proposal to study the regional aspects of disarmament, without any exception or discrimination, as well as any negotiation to that end.

165. On 9 December 1974 Ecuador and seven other Latin American countries signed the Declaration of Ayacucho, in which each one committed itself to: "... promote and support the building of a lasting order of international peace and co-operation and to create the conditions which will make possible the effective limitation of armaments and an end to their acquisition for offensive purposes, so that all possible resources may be devoted to the economic and social development of every country in Latin America."

166. Furthermore, we should bring back to life the spirit of the joint United States-Soviet declaration of 1961<sup>15</sup> on general and complete disarmament under international control which established the principles that were to lead to the inescapable goal of disarmament.

167. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace represent valuable contributions because they are positive steps towards general and complete disarmament.

168. In this respect I should like to express the satisfaction felt by Ecuador that the Government of the United States of America has announced its intention of obtaining authorization to ratify Additional Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco<sup>16</sup> and that the Soviet Union has subscribed to Additional Protocol II of that instrument. That Treaty is an example of the peaceful desires of Latin America and of its repudiation of nuclear weapons. It is to be hoped that France, with its glorious humanitarian tradition, will adhere to Additional Protocol I and that the Latin American States which have not yet done so will take the necessary steps to become parties to the Treaty.

<sup>15</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 19, document A/4879.

<sup>16</sup> Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326).

169. The arms race affects the very survival of mankind and is therefore of concern to all States. There can be no indifference in that respect, and although the responsibility of the super-Powers is paramount on the subject, every country should participate actively to contribute towards the solution of the problems implicit in this drama which affects all of us.

170. We cannot overrate the correlation which exists between disarmament and economic development. According to the statistical information of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, \$360 billion are invested annually in arms; that means that the terrifying figure of almost \$1 billion a day is spent on weapons, while there are geographical areas in which the inhabitants suffer from hunger and subhuman conditions. The Secretary-General of the United Nations has pointed out that the world investment in arms exceeds the amount spent both on education and on health.

171. The Committee established under General Assembly resolution 32/174 to undertake negotiations leading to the establishment of a new international economic order has indicated that disarmament might be one of the most effective means of ensuring the real transfer of resources which would benefit the developing countries. Article 15 of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States [*resolution 3281(XXIX)*] further establishes the commitment to promote disarmament and use the resources thus released for economic and social development.

172. It is essential that one and all contribute decisively to make possible a new order which will ensure peace and progress. Technological advance must be at the service of mankind and must facilitate collective advancement. For this reason, Ecuador considers that greater opportunity should be given for the developing countries to enjoy the peaceful uses of nuclear energy within the framework of the relevant safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

173. Furthermore, we must not forget that social and economic development necessitates the use of resources and funds which must be provided by the developed countries, in compliance with their obligation to work towards the establishment of a new international economic order, quite apart from the funds released by an adequate disarmament policy, which could also contribute to that end.

174. The United Nations is the appropriate forum in which to consider and discuss the problems pertaining to disarmament. Ecuador is in agreement with the idea of setting up a new disarmament body, to function within the framework of the United Nations under the direction of the General Assembly, the work of which would be carried out in accordance with the normal rules of the Organization, with any State having the right to submit initiatives on the subject to that body and to participate in its work without prejudice to the existence of specialized negotiating bodies.

175. I believe that in the disarmament debates sufficient attention has not been paid to the real causes which could



bring about armed conflicts and therefore lead peoples, for reasons of national security, to the need of arming themselves. The fact is that it is the existence of conflicts or tensions which could give rise to a breach of peace and of international security. Therefore it is essential that within the context of disarmament we study how to lessen tensions and settle disputes by peaceful means, including the setting up of United Nations bodies for conciliation and good offices and the strengthening of existing machinery. The arms race is largely a consequence of the problems which still remain in the international field. That is why every country should work for, facilitate and co-operate in the solution of existing problems and the elimination of what leads to international tension.

176. The United Nations came into being as a competent body to ensure peace and to save future generations from the scourge of war. Its constituent Charter therefore establishes the unavoidable obligation to contribute to the maintenance and preservation of peace and condemns force as a means of creating, altering or taking away rights. Therefore every country must give its undertaking to co-operate in ensuring compliance with the objectives pursued by the World Organization, and within that context each country is also bound to make a positive contribution to the peaceful solution of existing problems, which will make possible the adoption of effective measures to limit expenditures on armaments.

177. The only thing that can restore to a world convulsed by conflicts a feeling of security, without which there can be no peace, is the determination of all countries, large and small, to place their full trust in the United Nations, in the machinery for the peaceful solution of disputes and in its firm responsibility in contributing to peace, understanding and international co-operation.

178. Ecuador, being convinced of these principles, wishes to reaffirm its support for the international bodies charged with preserving and maintaining peace, and reiterates its will to make a dynamic contribution to ensure compliance with the objectives for which this special session of the General Assembly is met. Further, it will give resolute support to any initiative directed to that end and it will unwaveringly pursue its traditional policy of peace, remaining open to co-operation and good understanding.

179. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): May I begin my statement by extending the congratulations of my country to the President of this special session devoted to disarmament. We believe that no other choice could have been wiser. His personal qualities make him particularly well qualified to conduct the delicate and complex negotiations which are to take place in the coming weeks.

180. Furthermore, the very idea of a special session devoted to disarmament was born in Yugoslavia, at the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Belgrade in 1961. It is only natural that Yugoslavia, one of the principal advocates of non-alignment, should, through him, preside over this important special session to which the non-aligned movement accords special interest.

181. Indeed, this session is taking place at a time when it is becoming more than ever necessary to seek ways and means of preserving mankind from total destruction and of alleviating the ills of all kinds affecting two thirds of the population of the world.

182. That is why my country has advocated the idea of this special session from the very outset and why we have constantly given it our steadfast support. This support derives from our belief that only a democratic and representative framework such as this will guarantee the objectivity of our debates and the universality of our decisions, conditions without which we cannot realistically expect to resolve the many complex problems arising in this area of concern to the entire international community.

183. Over the past nine years, ever since in December 1969 the General Assembly declared a Disarmament Decade [*resolution 2602E(XXIV)*] efforts have been made, often within the United Nations system, at times outside it, to achieve the objectives which we have all set for ourselves for the end of this Decade.

184. In this constant search, inspired partly by a moral obligation to bring about general and complete disarmament and partly by the need to use some of the resources thus made available to promote development, unfortunately no important result has been recorded thus far. But if no solution, even a partial one that would be theoretically or practically feasible, has yet been found in the second aspect of our global objective, certain measures at least have been taken within the framework of the first aspect.

185. In addition to the negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms, several treaties and conventions have been concluded stressing the peril of the arms race and governing the activity of States in two vital but, it is true, limited areas.

186. Those negotiations, even if conducted successfully, and those international instruments, even if ratified by the majority of States—which is not the case—are only examples of sporadic action and of palliatives which are not part of a global and integrated approach to the problem of disarmament in all its ramifications.

187. It goes without saying that we do not question the desirability of those partial measures, which have at least been useful to some extent and have contributed to a growing awareness of the problems which exist in this area. But we must admit that these measures fall far short of the hopes raised by the Disarmament Decade and which are very half-hearted in relation to the task to be accomplished. In fact, the only step towards general and complete disarmament was the proclamation of zones of peace and denuclearized zones in certain parts of the world.

188. But despite the initiatives I have just mentioned the general tendency that the Disarmament Decade aimed to correct is continuing and gaining ground. Instead of promising progress in the field of general and complete disarmament, there has been an unbridled arms race and military

arsenals have been increased and improved even since the declaration of the Decade.

189. Never has the capacity of man to eliminate all traces of life and civilization from the surface of the earth been so great. Never have resources devoted to that task reached such proportions. This frightening paradox, so often denounced from this rostrum, the keen awareness of it that States are constantly declaring and the absence in their conduct of any convincing sign that they are doing anything to remedy it, are a constant source of surprise.

190. The reasons which have led to this situation are much more complicated than might seem at first sight. They are of different kinds. There are certain areas in which States simply do not want to take action because the present state of affairs suits them. That lack of action is covered by something which fits very neatly into current diplomatic language and is known as 'lack of political will'. Clearly, that element is of essential importance, because such a will is a *sine qua non* of any negotiations. It is only when that will is manifested, only when it has been demonstrated, that serious discussions leading to lasting agreements can begin.

191. There is another problem which is handicapping any kind of progress towards general and complete disarmament. There is a climate of distrust that prevails between the nuclear Powers and the militarily important countries. That distrust, justified by the idea that the limitation of nuclear weapons and the prevention of their proliferation is aimed in reality only at the perpetuation of the present military situation in which the two super-Powers will maintain a quantitative and qualitative monopoly, has seriously contributed to military escalation and political and economic disequilibrium throughout the world. The desire for hegemony on the part of some countries and their aggressive policies of intimidation are hardly likely to promote a process which is complicated enough without that. This outdated policy, sometimes conducted by mini-Powers that have only just freed themselves from the colonial yoke, creates a desire for security in other States. This desire, while legitimate, engenders a spiral of violence in the final analysis and leads all sides to resort to the possibly illusory formula of peace through over-arming. Finally, for certain countries the arms race and the maintenance of their military superiority guarantee the possibility of their pursuing their colonialist designs and subjugating their colonial peoples. One need look only at the situation in the Middle East and in southern Africa to assess the danger that such situations represent for the future of mankind.

192. Both politically and militarily speaking, those are a few of the reasons why, two years before the end of the Disarmament Decade, the objectives of the Decade are far from being attained and the hopes originally aroused are far from being fulfilled. Although it has been established that those are the direct causes of the failure of our initiatives, be they unilateral, bilateral or multilateral, we cannot validly dissociate those questions from the institutional aspects of the process in which we find ourselves engaged. For negotiations as complex and controversial as disarmament negotiations to achieve concrete results, it is impor-

tant for all countries, on a democratic basis, to be able to put forward their views on all the problems pertaining to the arms race. But the unsuitability of present institutional arrangements and their narrow, unbalanced nature impede progress of any kind to a very considerable degree.

193. The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament provides us with a rather telling example here. That Conference, open to just a few countries, could not provide us with an appropriate framework giving suitable guarantees to justify a complete halt to the arms race.

194. The many problems relating to the question which has brought us here cannot even begin to be solved over the long term until they are dealt with in a representative framework, one representing the various views and opinions existing throughout the world. This special session of the General Assembly reflects the view of the majority of States that only this kind of approach will give us a reasonable chance of success in our common undertaking.

195. We believe that our task must be to change methods that we have used in the past, explore new approaches and establish a plan of action that will make it possible to overcome past inadequacies and obstacles.

196. Proposals along those lines have already been made by the Secretary-General. He has suggested that \$1 million be devoted to national and international efforts for disarmament for each \$1 billion at present being devoted to armaments [1st meeting].

197. The head of State of France, Mr. Giscard d'Estaing, presented to the General Assembly [3rd meeting] a practical plan of action at the world-wide level based on three essential principles. All those proposals, which will certainly be discussed in detail, have the initial merit of introducing the element of democracy into a debate that is of concern to the entire international community. They are also a new approach, rather than the old familiar path that has so far led nowhere. On those grounds alone they deserve to be among the possibilities considered in this continuing quest for general and complete disarmament.

198. The General Assembly should be guided by a sense of urgency in taking the following measures, without which no genuine disarmament can be achieved.

199. First and foremost, all action should be continued to eliminate the sources of tension that exist throughout the world which might at some time drag the world to the brink of a widespread disaster. This task is especially urgent and essential, inasmuch as those sources of tension are generally in areas well known for their racist character and their aggressive and expansionist policies. Serious studies have been carried out in that area and suggest that the régimes of Pretoria and Tel Aviv are trying to equip themselves with atomic weapons. Consequently there is an urgent need to find just and lasting solutions to the problems that underlie international tension.

200. We must next continue to strengthen regional dis-

armament and, within that framework, further complete and clarify the concepts of zones of peace and nuclear-free zones. In order to protect those zones from nuclear proliferation, it is important that all States—and particularly those which possess nuclear weapons—recognize their status as denuclearized zones and solemnly pledge to respect them as such.

201. In the circumstances, the responsibilities of the States in those areas and the other States must be identified, both individually and to each other. Verification and control machinery must be established to ensure respect for the existing rules. Finally, in order to prevent wrong interpretations with unpredictable consequences, it is necessary to define the legal relationship between the status of those zones and existing international law, and the conditions that should govern the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

202. Initiatives to create such zones should be taken by States belonging to them and which are obviously those most concerned by the implementation of agreements in that area. Those agreements, to be applicable, must take into account the specific conditions existing in each area and the political and military balance there which in most cases represents an important factor in international stability. Disarmament in those circumstances, the political and military importance of which goes well beyond the region in question, must be guided by the need to preserve that stabilizing equilibrium.

203. I shall speak now of institutions. This session should consider, on the one hand, the creation—preferably within the United Nations—of effective international machinery to control the application of decisions that have been taken and follow-up action, and on the other hand, the reorganization of existing negotiating structures. In this respect, the most urgent task is to abolish the idea which seems to have gained ground over the past few years that certain countries, because of their possession of astronomical quantities of the most modern and therefore the most destructive weapons in the world or because they are more directly threatened than others with the possible use of those weapons, are empowered to decide on behalf of the international community on subjects as important as disarmament. That is a problem which concerns mankind as a whole, however, and all mankind must take part in discussion of it. Any approach not taking that truth into account seems to us to be quite unrealistic.

204. The arms race has caused political instability and is a direct source of an omnipresent nuclear threat. Today—more than yesterday and certainly less than tomorrow—it is a no less disturbing threat to the economic and social development of the world. In spite of the growing dangers to the international community of the accumulation and sophistication of military arsenals and in spite of the total impoverishment of two thirds of mankind, there is a growing imbalance between resources devoted to armaments and resources devoted to development.

205. There is, however, no doubt about the relationship between disarmament and development, two objectives which States have set for themselves and have pledged to pursue with the same vigour.

206. The quantitative objectives set for the Second United Nations Development Decade are far from having been reached, yet astronomical sums have been devoted to an undertaking the most certain result of which is the complete destruction of mankind. The distortion of priorities in this area is best illustrated by the fact that with every passing year the world spends \$400 billion on arms, whereas the net flow of public assistance for development barely exceeds \$15 billion annually.

207. A number of proposals have been made to remedy that situation, aimed primarily at establishing a proper balance between expenditures in the two areas and especially designed to bring about a system which could guarantee a steady increase in funds freed by a decrease in military expenditure. All those proposals are valid, but they are based on one unknown fact which, so far, has been difficult to determine: the real amount of military budgets, particularly the military budgets of certain nuclear super-Powers.

208. It should be stressed, on the other hand, that hunger, ignorance and sickness which continue to rage throughout most of the world are all very serious problems and that their solution should not be linked to uncertain progress in negotiations on disarmament.

209. Those are the tasks that should be performed by this special session. In this connexion, a number of suggestions and proposals—some of long standing and others more recent—have been put forward.

210. Once we have established the framework and principles to guide our future action in the light of their debate, we should then begin the final process leading to general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The most appropriate framework for that task seems to us to be an international conference like this one, or at least held under the auspices of the United Nations; it should be most carefully prepared, as required by the dangers threatening the world. In our common attempt to build a world of peace and concord, free from fear, lasting solutions must urgently be found to the problems posed by the arms race. The very survival of mankind is at stake. We believe that in the search for these solutions we cannot afford to fail.

211. Mr. Carlos ALZAMORA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, my delegation is pleased by your election, which we consider to be particularly auspicious because it was in Belgrade nearly two decades ago that the non-aligned countries for the first time pointed out the need for this event. We fully trust that under your skilful guidance this Assembly will arrive at the results that are the aim of its convening and to which mankind so urgently aspires.

212. Forty years after the discovery of the fission process and more than three decades after the application of that unprecedented war technology, the international community has called this meeting, of special relevance for the evaluation of the sombre course that has been pursued and to review the scope of the steps taken in the past decades of negotiations on disarmament.

213. Many of the speakers who preceded me agree on the correct description of the situation to which an unbridled arms race has brought us and which has become a constant factor causing growing alarm, one of gargantuan proportions, in contemporary international relations. There is no doubt some scepticism about a precise description of nuclear arms. Our opinions range from those of the most pessimistic scientific sources which state that nuclear war would not only destroy mankind but would also lead to such ecological changes as would make the planet uninhabitable, to points of view which might be described as being of a macabre optimism, which maintain that such a conflagration would not necessarily destroy all mankind, although obviously the survivors would be living in an indescribable world.

214. I believe that the very presence of representatives of all States Members of the United Nations in this special session is sufficient proof that there is a collective awareness of the urgent need to try to make new efforts of political will to counteract this threat to all forms of life. There should be a profound effort to do away with the very dynamics of the most harmful forms of destruction ever placed in the hands of man by a scientific imagination which gives the lie to the creative and rational idealism of our essential selves.

215. This is, therefore, an opportunity which we cannot allow to escape us since it is required of us by future generations to prove that on attaining a universality in international relations, the twentieth century was able to take a qualitative jump into maturity, that is was able to control and redirect the instinct of aggression which has today become systemic in all official and underground forms of violence which convulse the planet.

216. Therefore, this General Assembly is unique in its content among the noblest endeavours of our times, because it must arouse the political imagination of an enervated world grown indolent in the face of the reality of violence and dangerously accustomed to the obsolete doctrine of an international stability sustained by the balance of terror. At the same time, a realistic and pragmatic basis for international agreement must be introduced, so that an alternative form of international security may be established—that is, new means of control and balance, first, to contain and—secondly, to reverse the modernization of weapons in terms of mutually desirable and politically balanced programmes for defence and security.

217. Thus presented, the twofold aim of this Assembly would seem to be unattainable. Nevertheless, the purpose of this forum, to activate the most recondite creative resources of nations, must be reflected precisely in a combination of idealism and realism. This must be done not only because of a shared apprehension about the nuclear *status quo*, but in the light of numerous but ephemeral past attempts at arms control and disarmament. The manner in which the present Assembly was conceived leads precisely to a bringing together of sources which converge in the concentration of efforts at the multilateral, regional and bilateral levels on the basis of agreed principles and an effective programme of action for disarmament.

218. As a non-nuclear country, we believe that it is no longer legitimate or desirable to depend on a doctrine of a nuclear strategic balance which combines a relaxation of tensions and deterrence with chance, in unknown proportions, because the perpetuation of that balance of terror quickly leads to a suffocating atmosphere of international insecurity, with ruinous results for the world economy. In that atmosphere, the non-nuclear countries become theoretical, and frequently actual, targets of strategic rivalry, and thus the processes of peaceful agreement which are often the result of sincere and prolonged efforts of diplomatic closeness and friendly conciliation are hindered. That is why so many nations view with growing alarm the fact that what was considered to be the final instrument of deterrence, the final guarantee of stability—the nuclear weapon—is now being improved, as they say, leading the strategists of the nuclear Powers, and particularly of the super-Powers, to plan conflicts which they themselves had previously termed impossible, as a justification for the stockpiling of their nuclear arsenals.

219. We have accordingly affirmed that in the idealistic and realistic work that is to be undertaken in this forum, the non-nuclear countries, particularly the non-aligned countries, whose endeavours since Colombo<sup>17</sup> have led to the convening of this special session, must be able to contribute their ideas, speak and exercise their rights. In an interdependent world of global interconnexion, such as the present world, there can be no fruitful results without the participation of all countries, regardless of their strength, position or experience.

220. For the careful building of an alternative system of international security there are natural prerequisites which this Assembly has been considering. I refer to the search for the most effective formula to combine partial attempts at arms control, from the strategic sphere of the great Powers to those concerning the so-called conventional weapons, so as to arrive at a pragmatic order on the way towards the supreme goal of general disarmament under international supervision, in terms of the following shared priorities: to halt the nuclear arms race and not add to it new and incalculable dimensions; to adopt agreements to reduce nuclear weapons; to halt the production of new weapons of mass destruction; to improve the policy of both vertical and horizontal nuclear non-proliferation; to improve and increase nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace; and to halt the further sophistication of conventional weapons and look into the bases controlling their transfer. In other words, to start a race in the opposite direction that will mean the effective beginning of disarmament with a parallel effort at every level for peaceful agreement and the maintenance of international peace and security.

221. Each of these priorities is in itself a complex objective, involving in turn subordinate objectives. And for the present Assembly to be as successful as we all hope it will be it must achieve an operative combination of a supreme goal with the present practice of a step-by-step method.

<sup>17</sup> Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Colombo from 16 to 19 August 1976.

222. But to bring a halt to the nuclear-arms race is, above all, the paramount responsibility of the nuclear Powers. Given this situation, we look with expectation to the possibilities of future agreements on the limitation of strategic arms of greater significance. We also await the successful conclusion of an agreement, so often announced, on the total cessation of all nuclear tests, which would give a more efficient psychological impetus to the beginning of the process of nuclear disarmament.

223. As for the production of new weapons of mass destruction, we believe that the time has come to prohibit chemical weapons and to freeze research into new weaponry of unimaginable effects which would be a destabilizing factor in international relations. As a supplement to these goals, it is important that agreements already arrived at to control weapons in the oceans and outer space be strengthened without affecting the satellite monitoring system that guarantees their observance.

224. Implementing a nuclear non-proliferation policy in turn requires realistic and consistent measures, because it is obvious that the privilege of nuclear monopoly that our voluntary and collective renunciation—something that is without parallel in history—bestowed on the nuclear Powers has not been met with the reciprocal contribution which is its indispensable counterpart. They have neither halted the nuclear-arms race nor have they put an end to nuclear-weapon tests in their arsenals, nor have non-nuclear countries been given guarantees of security that—with the universal commitment to non-proliferation—were the essential objectives of the 1968 treaty.

225. To the unpostponable compliance with this commitment, which is the moral and political basis of our renunciation of nuclear weapons and the condition for respecting the Treaty, must be added the guarantee for free access to the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes on the basis of universal, standardized and non-discriminatory safeguards that will ensure its correct purpose and use.

226. We believe that the qualitative and quantitative improvement of nuclear-weapon-free zones must be based on agreements similar to the Treaty of Tlatelcoico, naturally taking into account the geographical and geopolitical characteristics of each region. And my delegation welcomes the recent advances made towards the improvement of that instrument, which so faithfully expresses the peace-loving nature of Latin America.

227. The international transfer and modernization of conventional weapons has increased beyond measure in our time and is of great cost, particularly for the developing countries, the drainage of whose scanty financial resources paradoxically serves to fill the coffers of the developed countries, which have found in the war industry one of their most lucrative sources of activity. It is therefore logical to seek understandings between suppliers and buyers of weapons as a parallel step to mutual reduction agreements where there must be complete guarantees for national defence and security that are essential for the developing countries. In this respect, we deem it desirable and advisable that the most effective measures be introduced gradually at the regional level, where *de facto* there is a better

combination of the understanding of the individual security of each State with the necessary bases of growing credibility and trust which inspire any effective diplomatic effort.

228. Linking disarmament to development is an aspect that has aroused a growing interest among nations, since they are all bound to find resources of every kind to meet their multiple and growing economic and social needs, especially the developing countries for which defence needs represent a particularly heavy burden, especially at a time when the negative international panorama increasingly aggravates the economic prostration of the third world nations.

229. In connexion with this, various initiatives are being submitted that deserve the support of my delegation. We particularly appreciate the declaration made on this aspect of the disarmament problem—among others treated with singular relevance—in the lucid, realistic and visionary statement of the President of France. We also welcome the initiative of the Secretary-General on beginning to devote a percentage of military expenditures to efforts at disarmament, linked as it of necessity is to disarmament's relation with development.

230. But this also means that we shall have to begin to think of the crucial problem of reconverting the war industry in realistic but imaginative terms which will protect its present and future potential in the field of development and co-operation. This is a political and economic task of a complexity and importance that has not yet been sufficiently dealt with, but which is as decisive as are diplomatic negotiations for disarmament. Because the horrifying figure of \$400 billion is not only a measure of the arms madness of our time but also a definite indicator of the dangerous magnitude and influence that the war industry has acquired as a factor of international economic life, generating its own dynamics and its own political and military pressure. Therefore, the dismantling of the political and psychological strategy now based on the balance of terror and destruction must include a parallel redirection of the war industry and the vast interests created in its shadow in 30 years of ideological and military confrontation towards developmental and peaceful purposes of full and mutual benefit.

231. In terms of these priorities, this Assembly must agree on a declaration of principles that, instead of being a rhetorical enunciation, would mean a real political commitment, capable of mobilizing Governments towards implementing a programme of action for disarmament. This programme of action must be conceived of in such a way as to advocate realistic policies that are sufficient to overcome the tardiness of the present process, the present shortcomings and the imbalance in the approach to disarmament questions, by setting specific goals and, if possible, a flexible time-table. The work of the Preparatory Committee, which was presided over with outstanding distinction and brilliance by Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, constitutes a valuable and positive contribution to this task. Finally, this Assembly must agree on a means adequate for a follow-up to these negotiations, within the historic commitment that guides its efforts, and to this end seek a substantial revi-



sion of the deliberative and negotiating organs on disarmament.

232. For the attainment of these three goals there must be a combination of the efforts of the non-nuclear Powers and the nuclear Powers in a balanced manner, both as regards responsibilities and as regards obligations, because it is unacceptable that there should be any suggestion of a division of responsibilities so that the nuclear States would be responsible for nuclear disarmament, and conventional disarmament would be the responsibility of non-nuclear-weapon States. For it is an irrefutable fact that once again it is the nuclear-weapon States that also stockpile the most impressive and sophisticated arsenals, which it is increasingly questionable to call conventional armaments. The disarmament process must be gradual. There must be an adequate balance of responsibilities among all States, which at various stages would maintain an adequate level of security for each. From this conviction flows the need to bring to the reformed deliberative and negotiating bodies the points of view and interests of non-nuclear States which are now inadequately represented. From this, in turn, flows the unavoidable need to reach agreements so as to strengthen to the fullest extent the role of the United Nations itself in the complex and urgent field of disarmament.

233. I do not believe it inaccurate to suggest in this context that only when significant advance is made in the key sectors of nuclear strategic disarmament will there be progress at the regional and bi-national levels regarding the problem of conventional arms with a sufficient complementary impact to assist in replacing the balance of terror with an untried system of international security and a new era in international relations.

234. This is the conclusion we are led to on the basis of the fragmentary but well known experience of small countries which so far have served only as a kind of defence quarantine before the nuclear epidemic, or even helped to consolidate the present nuclear monopoly. I am referring specifically to the notable commitments entered into and fully complied with by the non-nuclear countries in regard to non-proliferation, denuclearized zones and zones of peace, as well as various approaches to arms control at the regional and subregional level. Latin America has made consistent and constant efforts of real historical importance in this experiment. Among these, the Treaty of Tlatelolco and the Declaration of Ayacucho are outstanding. The latter is an exemplary contribution to limited agreement on reduction of arms expenditures on our continent which, in addition to other regional and subregional initiatives, Peru had the honour to promote.

235. As an active and simultaneous participant in the work of the General Assembly, of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the World Disarmament Conference, of the Preparatory Committee for this special session and of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, Peru has also lent the United Nations permanent support in its peace-keeping mission with military contingents and diplomatic envoys.

236. In a categorical and striking reaffirmation of this as-

piration to peace and concord, President Morales Bermúdez has declared that:

"The same purpose of peace which led Peru to become a party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to participate actively in disarmament forums, to raise the Declaration of Ayacucho as an initiative, and to promote talks with neighbouring and friendly countries, leads me to declare today that the Government of Peru is permanently willing to consider, with the greatest interest, any new formula for agreement in the region which will strengthen present trends to restore mutual confidence in the region and the credibility necessary to control conventional weapons."

237. In this spirit, Peru now firmly supports the proposal set forth in this forum by the Foreign Minister of Venezuela [2nd meeting] to seek the most appropriate means to ensure the prompt implementation of the Declaration of Ayacucho, being as it is intended to achieve an effective agreement on arms limitation which will make it possible to devote larger resources to the economic and social development of Latin America.

238. Strategic approaches which sought to find in weapons of mass destruction the guarantee for security are bankrupt. Nuclear States are not safer, nor are the non-nuclear States. But the arms race, activated by the fruitless rivalry which maintains that strategy, continues to grow and become more dangerous. We now have weapons for every conceivable situation. But that is not enough, and more have to be invented, and more deadly ones. Thus the process is self-sustaining and expands in an uncontrolled and malignant manner.

239. It is therefore up to us, the non-nuclear countries, the countries of the third world and the non-aligned countries, to fulfil our responsibility to our peoples and to the entire world community. The time has come for the vehement and just protest of countries such as ours to prevail. We had no participation in or responsibility for its creation, but we are involved in an atmosphere of intolerable violence, so counter to the dearest principles and interests of mankind, its security and its survival.

240. The peoples we represent demand that the lengthy process of building an elementary order of security and progress should not be interrupted by terror or threat. Many nations, like mine, have made a powerful contribution to the making of the human adventure something worthy of being lived. Today they firmly demand that this Assembly for ever discard the ominous possibility that there will be no future generations or that they will be forced to rebuild from its beginning all our civilization and our culture.

241. Mr. OWONO ASANGONO (Equatorial Guinea) (*interpretation from Spanish*): May I be permitted, first of all, to congratulate the President on behalf of my delegation, and to pay a well-deserved tribute to him once more now that he is presiding over this important special session of the General Assembly. It is not by chance that now that the General Assembly is meeting to deal with the contro-

versial and complex question of disarmament, it is his country, Yugoslavia, which is entrusted to preside over our deliberations. The efforts of the Government of Yugoslavia and its people, whose conduct is based on the lofty principles of the policy of non-alignment, the promotion of peace and peaceful coexistence among nations, to contribute to the cause of disarmament, together with the excellent diplomatic qualities that characterize Mr. Mojsov, are in themselves the best demonstration that the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is being held on an objective basis and that it will find the means to establish an adequate process of control, reduction and elimination of strategic weapons, and set up the conditions for lasting international peace and security for the benefit of the peaceful and genuine development of the international community in all aspects.

242. International peace and security, which are more than fundamental objectives enshrined in the San Francisco Charter, would have no significance and could not be achieved if they did not go hand in hand with the integrated development of the entire international community. In other words, there can be no peace and security without development, just as there can be no development without peace among all the peoples in the world.

243. This close relationship between development and world peace leads us to the question of disarmament. It is for this obvious reason and in this context that major changes take place in our society, which seeks with ever more determination the above-mentioned objectives of economic and social progress, international peace and security, and finally disarmament. It is also for this obvious reason that on many occasions the international community has attempted to look to itself to establish world organizations such as this one and to conclude world agreements and treaties. It is for this same reason, therefore, that once more we are meeting in a special session of the Assembly, because the international community is clamouring for social and economic well-being and for peace and security.

244. The Disarmament Decade solemnly proclaimed by this General Assembly in 1969 is now almost at an end and nothing specific has been done to make a reality of the great purposes and objectives that inspired the international community at that time. Many resolutions and declarations have been adopted since the creation of the United Nations, but they have had no positive results. Efforts at the bilateral level have also clearly failed. Thus, we continue to live under the constant threat of a third world confrontation and the use of weapons of mass destruction. We are witnessing an excessive and dangerous increase in the proliferation and refinement of all types of weapons, including nuclear weapons; the strengthening of the great military alliances; an increase in the numbers of offensive weapons and in their marketing; and the constant augmentation of military budgets, involving a vast consumption of human and natural resources. In short, this heightened state of military competition among States, far from reconciling their interests for peace, security and social and economic well-being, increases the danger and the threat of war among them. International peace and security have been placed on the market at a paltry and inhuman price.

245. Moreover, the maintenance of this state of affairs has extremely harmful economic and social consequences which are incompatible with the implementation of the new international economic order and contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

246. My delegation believes that this special session of the General Assembly is a historic one, unique in the annals of the United Nations, both because of the very nature of the issues it is called upon to resolve and because it is the first of its kind devoted to this question of vital importance.

247. The problem of disarmament, which has been stressed by the United Nations since its inception, is one of the difficulties confronting this world Organization in attaining its lofty aims. My delegation hopes that this special session will assist the nations of the world in assuming their responsibilities, subordinating their political and hegemonistic convictions and seeking a new pacific approach in international relations, so that confrontation and ambition for power may be replaced by tolerance, understanding and mutual respect.

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

248. I should like to repeat at this time the words spoken in the General Assembly in 1975 by Mr. Nguema Esono Nchama, the Vice-President of the Republic and Minister for External Relations of Equatorial Guinea. He said:

“The Government of Equatorial Guinea understands international peace and security to mean not only the absence of hostilities among nations, but also the full exercise by all peoples of their fundamental rights and freedoms. Thus, situations threatening international peace and security are those created by colonialist, imperialist and racist régimes, the economic exploitation practised by economic Powers over developing countries, the increasing presence of military bases of the major Powers scattered all over the world, as well as the proliferation of nuclear weapons for war purposes and the constant zeal shown by the Powers in perfecting their military technology.

“My Government, which has no ambition to dominate and is neither a producer nor consumer of these nuclear devices, . . . considers that the solution to this problem of disarmament is as simple as it appears complex, if, with goodwill, the major Powers concerned will only co-ordinate their efforts and rationalize their policies in order to eliminate the causes which have given rise to this nuclear weapons race.”<sup>18</sup>

249. Direct responsibility for ensuring a world of peace, prosperity and social well-being for the entire international community rests effectively with this Organization and, in particular, with each one of its Members. However, the same cannot be said as regards responsibility for the specific problem of disarmament, which my delegation be-

<sup>18</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Plenary Meetings, 2356th meeting.*

lieves is solely and exclusively within the competence of the super-Powers and the major producers of destructive weapons.

250. The arms race among the great Powers, aside from the danger it represents to international peace and security, provides the main impetus for the arms race among the other countries of the world. The danger of disturbance of the peace and the international social order becomes ever greater as this competition intensifies and States endeavour to stockpile all the weapons available to them and to improve their quality. The question of the arms race is exactly comparable to that of opium addiction: it begins with the producer and then spreads until it reaches all the strata of society.

251. As the representatives of a third-world country, my delegation is participating in this special session in the full conviction that our legitimate demands that the arms race be curbed and for international control of all conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction will be heard. It is well known that we do not have much to offer in order to make general and complete disarmament effective; on the other hand, we have a great deal to lose if the present situation of confrontation continues. The third-world countries have understood that they cannot participate in this opium addiction because that would automatically mean the total destruction of their legitimate aspirations to progress, social well-being and a peaceful life. None the less, our countries are increasingly the victims of Machiavellian temptations and conspiracies, even though they have no part in the interests and intentions that have led to the present state of tension and confrontation.

252. Our primary objective is the economic and social development of our States and the effective achievement of our independence and national sovereignty within a peaceful community of nations. As I have just pointed out, these aspirations have been constantly undermined by foreign forces and influences that use all methods and formulas within their reach—colonialism, neo-colonialism, economic discrimination, the use of force, threats, and so on.

253. As far as my country is concerned, the Republic of Equatorial Guinea has increasingly been the victim of barbarous attacks by the information media of the West in order to defame the Constitutional President for Life of our Republic, His Excellency Masie Nguema Biyogo Ngué Ndong, and his Government. We are well aware of the influential circles and the motives that guide those media and their interests in Equatorial Guinea. That is why they can never say anything good about Equatorial Guinea. Our head of State has quite rightly always stated that we shall know we have departed from the true path of the revolution when those information media cease to criticize the Republic of Equatorial Guinea. My country enjoys peace, tranquillity and harmony. We do not attempt or claim to match others. The rights of all are guaranteed in so far as unity, sovereignty and national independence are guaranteed. We prefer to preserve these national principles rather than to submit to the whims of any imperialist Power. We have repeatedly stated our principle of mutual co-operation with all the countries of the world as long as they respect

our principles of independence and national sovereignty. It is shameful that the Western press feels incapable of criticizing the violations of human rights that continue in South Africa, Namibia, Zimbabwe and Palestine, while at the same time it sees fit to report events the human mind cannot accept which are to the detriment of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea. Equatorial Guinea has been independent since 5 March 1969, when it assumed its international responsibilities.

254. The establishment of the movement of non-aligned countries is justified by this state of constant conspiracy to which our States have been subjected—States members of this great independent movement, which includes almost all third-world countries. To defend our legitimate aspirations, our countries have done all in their power to see that the international community undertakes to provide a solution to the thorny problem of the arms race, dealt with by the Belgrade and Colombo Conferences in 1961 and 1976, thus making possible agreement among the international community.

255. The third-world countries neither produce nor consume nuclear weapons, nor are they members of large alliances and military pacts. None the less it is inevitable that a third-world confrontation would have as a target the defenceless regions of Africa, Asia and Latin America. That is inevitable because, despite their inoffensive positions and their peace-loving nature, it can be stated that, starting from the Second World War, the only confrontations that have involved the interests of either of the major over-armed Powers, with a consequent danger to international peace and security, have always had as their settings Africa, Asia and Latin America. We have only to think back and remember the imperialist wars imposed on the peaceful peoples of Korea, Viet Nam and Democratic Kampuchea, on the Asian continent, the liberation struggle of the valiant Cuban people and the struggle for the achievement of national sovereignty over its canal by the people of Panama, in Latin America; the valiant peoples of Algeria, Guinea, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Angola, Zimbabwe, Namibia, and so on, on the African continent; and the imperialist war to which the people of Palestine and the Arab countries, in the Middle East, have been subjected, to mention just a few.

256. All of these struggles waged in defence of legitimate rights have been and are being used by foreign Powers for hegemonistic purposes and to disturb the peace in disregard of the fact that the interests of our peoples are at stake. Our territories have been chosen as fields of confrontation for hegemonic disputes among the super-Powers.

257. As a member of the non-aligned movement, my Government resolutely supports the idea of general and complete disarmament and will defend it everywhere. But we know that to be impossible if the major Powers that are holding the cards try to distract the attention of the world community. Nothing and no one can stand in the way of the super-Powers in putting an end to this situation of conflict. None the less, for decades we have conducted fruitless negotiations while the super-Powers have been increasingly strengthening what they call their defence

systems, while occupations and the maintenance of military bases continue to be the means for certain privileged States to achieve security, while espionage, bribery and military questions continue to be the order of the day. My delegation cannot accept the security of one State being based on the insecurity of others. We should like to draw attention to and stress the fact that the major Powers should on this occasion respond to the imperatives of world peace, which rest in their own hands.

258. World peace and international security are highly complex concepts which involve different elements of the social life of the international community, and they will never be effectively achieved unless all these elements are taken into account. Therefore international peace and security are inconceivable while some peoples suffer racial discrimination and colonialism. World peace is inconceivable in a world in which the sovereign rights of peoples are disregarded every day. International peace can never be possible in a world of economic injustice and hegemonic rivalry.

259. I must stress what my delegation means by international peace and security, because the objective of disarmament rests on precisely that foundation. But before going into the real concept of disarmament we should analyse the causes of the present proliferation of weapons. In my delegation's view, the defence of its sovereignty and independence by each State is a general and sacred right of all peoples without distinction. But this right in no way can or should extend beyond the territory of the State to that of second and third States, against their will and to the detriment of their most fundamental rights.

260. In this context we cannot accept the present trend towards the proliferation of military bases under the orders and control of a few nuclear Powers. My delegation forcefully condemns that policy which is a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations. Hence we condemn the foreign occupation of the territory of independent peoples in the Korean peninsula, the Arab territory of Palestine and the naval base of Guantánamo in Cuba, and the presence of colonialist occupation forces in Namibia and Zimbabwe and of expansionist and secessionist forces in Cyprus. These occupations, which are sources of friction, violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and are incompatible with the over-all principles of disarmament.

261. The Government of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea feels that, with the expulsion of Spanish colonialist occupation forces from Guinean national territory in 1969, the Republic of Equatorial Guinea fulfilled one of the highest national duties that any State can be called upon to fulfill. My Government does not accept and will not accept the stationing of foreign forces on its territory. As a third-world country we can make no other contribution to the cause of disarmament. We cherish peace with independence, national sovereignty and mutual respect.

262. My delegation hopes that at the present session the Assembly will thoroughly study all aspects of these harmful elements that not only violate the fundamental rights of States but are also an obstacle to the cause of disarmament.

263. It is almost impossible to progress in the field of disarmament if we do not first root out the causes of the present friction among States. Rivalry between East and West cannot guide our future evolution. We are in duty bound to review our conduct in international relations if we truly wish to give realistic meaning to the question of disarmament. I would even venture to state that the stockpiling of any types of weapons by any party would be unimportant and danger-free if States based their relations on respect and mutual trust, on understanding, co-operation and tolerance. The policy of genuine détente between East and West could in itself determine world disarmament to a great extent.

264. But the world is obsessed with the need to behave otherwise and therefore all human and material resources are being used to promote violence and to bring about the destruction of the human race. The \$360 billion of military expenditure during the past year confirms this madness of mankind.

265. My delegation feels that this is a very appropriate forum for serious reflection by the international community on this very grave problem which may determine the future of our peoples. There are two possibilities before us—a second Hiroshima or the achievement of a world of peace, progress and social well-being.

266. We are all aware of the negative effects of the arms race which results in a squandering of human and material resources, the hindering of national development efforts and above all the constant danger of the outbreak of war with the threat of the use of nuclear weapons. While the developed countries can well afford the luxury of devoting themselves to those types of activities because the future of their populations is secure, the objectives of the developing countries are quite different. Even so, the developed countries should not forget that international moral law requires that they give up the arms race since they not only harm the interests of the third-world countries but also create harmful consequences for their own populations.

267. We have listened with great relief to the statements made by the super-Powers and all the atomic-weapons producers. We welcome with many of them the idea that part of the resources now allocated to military budgets could be used to improve the standard of living of all the countries of the third world in the short term. All the problems today faced by the developing countries are rooted in the inadequacy of their economic development and a solution might be found by eliminating these superfluous expenditures.

268. Military agreements and treaties concluded by States for purposes of defence, while they are a partial formula for a balance of power in the world, cannot be considered a solution to the present state of tension and the dangers of world war. This means that measures must be taken to prohibit the use of given weapons of mass destruction. It would be extremely useful if agreements were reached among States determining zones of peace, nuclear-weapon-free zones. Therefore, my Government supports efforts to declare the Indian Ocean a zone of peace and supports the Treaty of Tlatelolco which prohibits the use of

nuclear weapons in Latin America. The African continent, which is constantly exposed to the threat of war and to the intervention of the super-Powers, should also be safeguarded by a similar treaty and my Government supports efforts made by other African States to this end.

269. My delegation feels that at the present session the Assembly will take necessary measures to mobilize all available resources from Governments, non-governmental organizations and individual citizens in order to heighten awareness throughout the world of the need for effective and immediate disarmament. The programme of action should include the preparation of a global plan based on an in-depth analysis of past experience, of the problems involved in disarmament, its causes and all immediate, short-term and long-term measures which may put an end to the production, use and spread of weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons.

270. In the nuclear sphere my Government feels that nuclear technology used for peaceful purposes is a valuable contribution to the progress of peoples and that all the nations of our world have a right to obtain such technological knowledge and to improve it and are entitled to an exchange of experience. The International Atomic Energy Agency should therefore control this technology and prepare related programmes.

271. My delegation will support all the measures agreed on by this General Assembly for the reduction and control of armaments in the world. We are especially in favour of the recommendations made by the countries of the non-aligned movement, which include a declaration and programme of action, because we feel that they are realistic objectives capable of committing the international community to effective disarmament. Similarly, we support the recommendations made by the 13-member group of expert consultants.<sup>19</sup> Their implementation by all States would not only achieve the much desired objective of effective disarmament, but would also guarantee a basis for the development of the international community.

272. In conclusion, my delegation is convinced that the international community, which has twice suffered the horrors and consequences of war, is without doubt aware of the seriousness of the present threat of the arms race and of the very important role which it must play, together with major Powers in particular, which have a special responsibility.

273. My delegation is confident not only that this special session of the General Assembly will be useful in bringing out and assessing the facts but also that it will be recalled in history by future generations as a meeting of minds for the creation of a world that will flourish in peace, harmony, understanding, progress and social well-being.

274. The PRESIDENT: Two representatives have asked to speak in exercise of their right of reply. Members are aware that, in accordance with the practice of the General Assembly at previous sessions, such statements shall be

limited to 10 minutes. I now call on those representatives who have asked to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

275. Mr. ROLÓN ANAYA (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to thank the President and at the same time express my gratitude to the Chilean delegation for having highlighted the importance of the statement made by the Minister of my own country at the 5th meeting by speaking in exercise of its right of reply.

276. Now that the problem of the Panama Canal has been resolved, with the new treaty which restores the principles of justice between two States, the problem of the landlocked situation of Bolivia is that of greatest concern among all the questions that affect disarmament, peace, integration and development in Latin America.

277. The Minister of my country has summarized the objective facts concerning the failure of negotiations which have been conducted at great length without practical result. When matters become interminably confused, something must be done. Are we not here involved in trying to remove from the sphere of mere good intentions the need of the world for disarmament? The problem for the solution of which in 1975 Bolivia offered a formula of peace, integration and development, with a specific proposal concerning the establishment of a nucleus of development on the Pacific, is not simply a matter between neighbours; it is of trilateral, even multinational, interest, if peace and integration are of concern to the entire continent.

278. Moreover, to be effective dialogue must not only be begun; it must also be useful and it must come to an end. It cannot take place as a mere diplomatic diversion, out of touch with reality and time. We cannot have an inconclusive dialogue without objectives merely for the sake of distraction. Also, I repeat that the problem is not merely binational; it is not a simple dialogue; it is in fact a "trialogue", if I may use a neologism; it affects another country, not only by virtue of a treaty but also because of the historical and natural influence of that other country in the area.

279. Bolivia is not taking a negative position; even less a position of partiality that would exclude others.

280. We do not and will not close our minds to the possibility of a reconsideration of this painful situation which affects us so much. Bolivia whole-heartedly desires a solution which will result in peace, integration and development that would not only meet Bolivia's interests, namely by giving us an outlet to the sea—something which could be as specific and practical as, for example, the case of Walvis Bay which, together with the rest of the world, we are claiming for Namibia in Africa—but which could also be of direct benefit to Chile and Peru in conditions of integrated co-participation in development.

281. Our joint aspirations must find a point of practical convergence. Bolivia at this time is experiencing a democratic transition to the election of government officials. However, all Bolivians want positive, not elusive negotia-

<sup>19</sup> See *Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.78.IX.1).



tion—truly constructive and appropriate negotiation not only for Bolivia, but also for Chile and Peru. In the meantime, the establishment of a zone of peace such as that provided for in the draft resolution and the plan of action for disarmament submitted by the Preparatory Committee [see A/S-10/1] commands the firm support of my delegation. We want that zone in the Pacific and throughout Latin America, for the integration and development of all the peoples of the region, and we want to contribute to the implementation of the doctrine of Tlatelolco and the Declaration of Ayacucho, through the most recent proposal of Venezuela, which we support and to which we shall contribute in this General Assembly.

282. Mr. DÍEZ (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of Bolivia has brought to a multilateral forum a situation which is of interest to the three countries of our region. Chile has been prepared to hear the Bolivian request to resolve the problem of access to the sea. It was upon the initiative of the President of Chile that the Presidents of Bolivia and of my country met in Charaña. It was the Government of Chile which in December 1975 proposed that a basis be established for negotiations, a basis that was accepted in general terms by Bolivia.

283. Subsequently, meetings were held to resolve a complex problem which not only affects the interests of Chile and Bolivia but is also governed by two treaties: a treaty with Peru and the treaty of peace and friendship signed with Bolivia in 1904.

284. At a meeting held by the Foreign Ministers of Peru, Bolivia and Chile during the General Assembly last year here in New York, it was agreed that each of the Ministers

would appoint a representative to facilitate finding a solution. The Bolivian Government has not yet appointed its representative, while the other participants in the meeting have.

285. At the same meeting we were informed of a statement made by President Banzer to the newspaper *Presencia*, transmitted by the ANSA agency. In that statement the President of Bolivia said that he preferred that a decision on an exchange of territories, which is what Bolivia initially agreed to with Chile, be reached by a freely elected congress in Bolivia and therefore he preferred a delay in the negotiations.

286. Subsequently, Bolivia suspended diplomatic relations with Chile.

287. The means which Bolivia has—and here I repeat what I stated a few days ago in this very General Assembly—of attaining its aspirations is direct dialogue with Chile on the basis of territorial compensations and with respect for all treaties in force which affect the situation in the area. My country has been and continues to be prepared to hold talks and to take whatever steps may be necessary so that Bolivia can make a reality of what today is not a right, namely, access through Chilean territory. Access to the sea through Chilean territory will be the culmination of friendly relations between the two countries on the basis of a territorial exchange and with respect for all treaties in force, the inviolability of which is reaffirmed today by the Government of Chile.

*The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.*