



President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

## AGENDA ITEM 8

### General debate (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: At its second meeting, held yesterday, the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Twelfth Special Session decided to recommend that the Executive Director of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research be invited to address the General Assembly at a plenary meeting. May I take it that the Assembly approves that recommendation?

*It was so decided.*

2. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now hear a statement by the President of the Council of Ministers of the Italian Republic. On behalf of the General Assembly, I have great pleasure in welcoming Mr. Giovanni Spadolini and in inviting him to address the Assembly.

3. Mr. SPADOLINI (Italy):\* More than ever in recent months local wars have shattered the dream which mankind has pursued since the end of the Second World War of re-establishing a certain international order. These local wars are all linked to outbreaks of long-standing national resentments and the re-emergence of boundary disputes, which are no longer linked with the ideological assumption on which the destabilizing initiatives of some years ago were based.

4. We are confronted with an absolutely new situation which links to some extent the war between Iran and Iraq, the new war tensions in the Middle East and the armed conflict in the South Atlantic, in the Falkland Islands.

5. In the face of these obvious disturbances on the world scene, in the face of the disquieting reaffirmation of nationalistic tendencies which have their roots in disputes which date back hundreds and even thousands of years, man is asking questions about the basic instruments for maintaining peace within a pattern, perhaps unattainable, of a series of world balances. Not even the search for coexistence between the super-Powers appears to be adequate for the neutralization of this type of dispute.

6. During the 20 years between the two wars, and before the emergence of the Nazi barbarism, many attempts were made to build, upon the ashes of the first world conflict, a guaranteed international order. During those years, after enormous but unfortunately unfinished labours, mankind worked out plans for the

League of Nations. After the Second World War and the nuclear epilogues which marked its conclusion, we succeeded in advancing beyond the narrow and paralysing structures of the League of Nations and established this Organization, this community, to which I pay a sincere and profound tribute on behalf of the Italian Government. In particular, I salute Mr. Ismat Kittani, the President of the General Assembly, to whom I wish to express my personal satisfaction at his election to the presidency of this twelfth special session, and the Secretary-General, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, with whom I recently had a meeting at Rome, which I still remember vividly.

7. The United Nations is the direct outcome of the great movement of the eighteenth century which blossomed in the Enlightenment and reached its highest philosophical peak in the thought of Immanuel Kant. It was designed to impose the laws of reason on the laws of war and to rediscover in the common dignity of man a remedy capable of neutralizing the germs of violence, domination and hatred.

8. This enlightened and rationalist philosophy, which embodied the highest expression of the Christian conquest of the individual conscience and its perennial celebration, gave rise to a whole series of movements which were together defined, during the nineteenth century and a great part of the twentieth century, as pacifist and humanitarian ones.

9. Pacifism and humanitarianism are two sides of the same coin, two moments of the same reality. Constantly humiliated by the course of events, constantly contradicted by a tumultuous succession of wars, from the French Revolution to the second world conflict, those principles of peace and individual dignity, based on tolerance and mutual respect, have sustained the efforts of humanity for two centuries; they have constituted a defence against the unleashing of primordial hatreds, a bulwark against the most brutal violations of the international order and an anchorage for the human spirit in its efforts to withdraw into itself and those permanent values inherent in it.

10. It was not by chance that Benedetto Croce was able to speak of peace as the supreme perception of our spirit and as the highest conquest which mankind, guided and sustained by reason, could achieve in its perpetual struggle against the forces of evil and the forces of sin—to use theological language—which are multiplying around us and within us.

11. The Italian Government considers that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is of extraordinary importance, because it seeks to redirect world attention to an objective of absolute priority for the civilized and peaceful growth of mankind and, indeed, for its very survival.

\* Mr. Spadolini spoke in Italian. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

12. We intend to grasp the deeper significance of this meeting, of this initiation of a massive and carefully planned offensive against the arms race and against man's self-destruction. We exhort all States Members of the United Nations, and primarily the major nuclear Powers, to give proof of their firm determination to unite their efforts and their best abilities and mobilize all their intellectual and spiritual energies, which are essential for the success of this peace offensive.

13. We have all been called upon to live through one of the most tragic phases of the 35 years which separate us from the last world catastrophe. Recourse to the use of force for the settlement of international disputes is becoming more and more frequent, while intolerable violations of human rights and of international law continue to be perpetrated and while new conflicts are being perversely linked with ancient crises, giving rise to new and disquieting sources of tension. All these are signs of the gradual erosion of international trust, understanding and mutual respect.

14. Distrust, fear, the obsessive search for military security and attempts to divert the attention of public opinion from internal failures towards international objectives are increasing the use of armed force as a major means of meeting national needs and satisfying national aspirations.

15. It is our common responsibility to condemn resolutely and indiscriminately this tendency, whenever it appears. But at the same time it is our specific duty to bend every effort to affirm the basic principles of co-operation which are the basis of international law. And we must do this with the instruments of reason, dialogue and negotiation, refraining from any interference or pressure of whatever kind and renouncing any attempt to impose domination and hegemony of whatever nature.

16. The brutal language of weapons makes differences more acute, widens the gap between opposing positions, sows the seeds of hatred, increases instability and seriously threatens world balances. In this context armed violence can find no justification on moral grounds, and the traditional arguments in favour of preventive defence or necessary retaliation are no longer valid. Such violence is and remains an offence against humanity, our free conscience and the common good: the peaceful development of peoples and nations.

17. Consequently, our disarmament negotiations and the breaking of the arms spiral must be achieved with a maximum effort of solidarity among peoples and with a global strategy based not on military balances, which are of fundamental importance, but on the strengthening of mutual trust and on a vast network of co-operation.

18. We shall never be able to build up genuine world solidarity for maintaining and strengthening free co-existence among peoples if we cannot establish in time a new order based on equal dignity and respect for basic human rights.

19. This order must be credible in its objectives as well as in its instruments of action and capable of eliminating once and for all the destabilizing burden of the disparities and inequalities of wealth which still weigh upon the world. This is the necessary basis for halting the arms race and bringing about the gradual

dismantling of military arsenals, in accordance with the hope several times expressed, including on American soil, by the President of the Italian Republic, Mr. Sandro Pertini.

20. I consider it essential to give a unifying force to our discussions of disarmament by seeking the world order within a framework of broader and more genuine co-operation, with full respect for the characteristics of individual countries, their culture, their national values and the social and political conditions which characterize their respective and often different processes of development. A logical corollary of this action must be the elaboration of a series of regional plans to be co-ordinated within the United Nations and within its specialized agencies.

21. The search for solutions capable of combining military balance with economic security, the reduction of armaments with the creation of new development opportunities, and world stability with the free affirmation of national and regional realities within a framework of increasing well-being based on the principles of freedom and justice is not Utopian. In this century, which is coming to its end, it is a necessity to which there is only one alternative: the barbarism of war, the negation of reason.

22. Ever since man conceived the instruments of war which can bring about his own annihilation, there has been no subject more decisive for the very future of our planet than disarmament and peace. Disarmament involves the hopes of billions of men, the highest aspirations of a world free from ancestral fears and the primordial threats of war and destruction, in which the hard-won conquests of science and technology may be used with their full effects for the service of mankind.

23. No forum could be more suitable for tackling the great subject of disarmament than the General Assembly of the United Nations, which, in its universal approach, reflects the substantial unity of the aspirations and legitimate preoccupations of mankind.

24. Italy is participating in the twelfth special session with the profound conviction that we are all, with no exceptions, called upon to discharge a common responsibility.

25. Avoiding propaganda and rhetoric, the Italian Government intends to make its contribution to the collective effort to give a new impetus to the process of disarmament. In doing so we can never forget that the success of this unprecedented undertaking can only be the result of a joint effort in which each people must participate.

26. The point of departure for this tenacious and patient search is the Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*] adopted by the tenth special session four years ago, which sets forth principles and the Programme of Action [*ibid.*, *sect. III*] which are today, in our opinion, more than ever pertinent.

27. In reaffirming the complete validity of the deliberations and the decisions adopted in 1978, we must now advance further, ensuring their implementation, which so far has been lacking. Indeed, we cannot hide the fact that the complex balance of four years of proposals, initiatives and negotiations is clearly

inadequate and that the expectations which then arose have remained to a large extent unfulfilled.

28. It is not enough to deplore the failures or to assign the responsibilities which indeed exist. Instead of the sterile logic of recriminations, the time has come for a lucid analysis of the obstacles encountered along the path of peaceful co-operation among peoples and to follow up this analysis with courageous and coherent choices. These choices must be aimed at that "great moral idea" which is peace: an ideal profoundly rooted in Italy, in the Italian population, in its culture, in its ancient civilization and reflected in the Constitution of the Republic, born of the struggle against warlike totalitarianism, which repudiates war as an offence against the freedom of other peoples.

29. If we consider the events which have shaken international relations since the tenth special session, we are bound to observe with profound bitterness that the feeling of trust essential for the struggle against war has on many occasions been seriously undermined.

30. In the period 1978-1979 we witnessed, in spite of repeated appeals and condemnations by the General Assembly, the military occupation of Cambodia and the invasion of a small non-aligned country, Afghanistan, by a big Power, a permanent member of the Security Council. These countries are still being subjected to military occupation and police repression, which is often directed indiscriminately against unarmed civilian populations.

31. There is no need to mention the enormous tragedy of the refugees, which can be alleviated but not fully remedied by the efforts of the competent organs of the United Nations and through the contribution of so many States, primarily Pakistan and Thailand. We are thinking also of the tragedy of the Palestinian refugees.

32. Still within these last four years, the bloody conflict between Iran and Iraq has exploded in an area vital for world balance. Here there have arisen other, equally disquieting sources of tension, and I refer at this moment to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, which has reopened a deep wound. At the same time, we continue to be profoundly worried because of the situation in the South Atlantic.

33. Italy has followed with particular interest and constant admiration, and indeed with affectionate trepidation, the generous efforts made in recent weeks by the Secretary-General to find an honourable solution to the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) conflict—a conflict between two nations equally friendly to Italy—one bound to us by the links of a military and economic alliance, the other by old and historic ties of consanguinity and culture.

34. In the face of both these conflicts, the Italian Government has maintained, and still maintains, that the United Nations has an essential role to play in their settlement and has given the United Nations every support in that direction.

35. Besides these conflicts we are deeply concerned at the examples of interference and meddling in the internal affairs of States. Our thoughts go at this moment to Poland, where this has happened in flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the

Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, signed at Helsinki on 1 August 1975.

36. Nor can we ignore, again if we are aiming at mutual trust, the effects of the profound social and economic inequalities existing not only between nations but also within nations themselves. These inequalities must be alleviated and eliminated in the interest of all.

37. Besides trust, the balance of forces constitutes the second essential prerequisite for international stability and the essential basis for all disarmament negotiations.

38. In this respect, I wish to express Italy's concern at the nuclear imbalance brought about, particularly in the European theatre, by the massive reinforcements, both quantitative and qualitative, of the Soviet arsenal in the sector of intermediate-range missiles. This reinforcement, added to the pre-existing, traditional imbalance in the field of conventional weapons, has given rise to a situation of serious instability in the relationship of forces between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] and the Warsaw Pact which Italy and the other Atlantic partners have had to remedy with the double decision taken in December 1979 for the modernization of their own forces and the parallel proposal to expedite negotiations for the reduction of such armaments.

39. Together with its European and Western allies, Italy has helped to prepare the negotiating platform for the current Geneva discussions in the hope of reducing armaments to the lowest possible levels. It is no accident that the Italian Government has constantly stressed the political importance it assigns to the "zero option", a principle which was defined in the course of consultations between Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany last September and on which the hopes for peace in Europe and the whole world are today based. We expect from Geneva effective and genuine steps towards the ultimate objective of general disarmament under strict international control. We trust, as Chancellor Schmidt has said, that a meeting between President Reagan of the United States and President Brezhnev of the Soviet Union will soon take place.

40. Simple proposals for freezing existing ascertained imbalances can only aggravate the tension between East and West and make it more difficult to achieve specific disarmament agreements, agreements which must be based on the criterion of reciprocity.

41. The important thing is to be clearly aware that we cannot work in favour of disarmament only by taking an active part in the coming important negotiations for the control or reduction of armaments. Every time we remove a factor of international tension, every time we respect the fundamental norms of coexistence between peoples and observe punctiliously the principles and norms contained in the Charter, we are making the first and indispensable contribution which each of us must make to the cause of peace. And in a world in which force can count on destructive means of incalculable power, there is no doubt that the provisions of the Charter concerning the prohibition of the use or threat of force must be observed even more scrupulously.

42. Among the major themes of disarmament, the Government of the Italian Republic wishes to bring two in particular to the attention of the General Assembly. First and foremost is the subject of nuclear disarmament, whose importance is particularly recognized by Italy, which has fully respected the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*], renouncing the individual acquisition of nuclear armaments outside of a possible integrated system of European defence. Beyond the shadow of a doubt, nuclear disarmament is our most urgent problem when we consider the destructive potential already achieved by atomic arsenals, which continue to grow in an apparently endless spiral.

43. I have already mentioned Italy's firm commitment to the success of the Geneva negotiations on intermediate nuclear forces. Equally firm is our desire to contribute to the success of the negotiations initiated by the United States and the Soviet Union on strategic nuclear weapons. On this occasion, I must reaffirm the profound satisfaction of the Italian Government at the announcement of the beginning, on 29 June at Geneva, of negotiations on strategic weapons. According to the plans announced by the United States, with which the Soviet Union has signified its timely agreement, these negotiations are designed to secure significant reductions in the respective strategic arsenals, instead of simple, illusory limitations.

44. Together with the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy has the necessary moral qualification to raise its voice in favour of the success of these negotiations, mainly because, I repeat, together with the Federal Republic of Germany, it has scrupulously observed the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

45. Also within the field of nuclear disarmament, an extremely important objective remains: the conclusion of a convention on the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear testing. An agreement to this end, supported, obviously, by the necessary verification procedures, would increase mutual trust among States. But above all, it would signal an approach towards an effective and radical process of nuclear disarmament.

46. Besides the measures aimed at preventing the dangers of nuclear proliferation through the universal acceptance of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the related systems of safeguards, we should not neglect any possibility of establishing nuclear-free zones in certain regions.

47. The second important disarmament sector on which we must concentrate our efforts is that of conventional weapons. It is hardly necessary to recall that all the conflicts which have broken out since the Second World War have been fought—and some of them are being fought at this moment—with non-nuclear weapons which have caused millions of deaths. To the destruction directly caused by these conflicts we must add the intolerable economic and social burden of maintaining conventional arsenals, which diverts resources essential to development, especially in areas subject to the scourge of hunger and malnutrition.

48. Yet this is the sector in which we must note with regret the greatest delay in the control action which the international community must take.

49. Since the beginning of the multilateral negotiations at Geneva, which date back to the 1960s, in spite of the demands and efforts of many countries we have never achieved substantial progress, and we have not even built a solid basis of work that could lead to agreement. Only recently, and not without difficulty, have we been able to record the first limited signs of a reversal of this trend.

50. We welcomed with great satisfaction the new proposals put forward by President Reagan for the reduction of conventional forces in central Europe. These proposals will be further elucidated in the statement he will make the day after tomorrow before the Assembly. My Government, which has constantly played and will continue to play an active role in the whole subject of disarmament, applauds this new initiative and associates itself fully with it.

51. Also in the field of conventional weapons, the first step must be to apply the recommendations of the Final Document, which prescribes measures for the limitation and control of transfers of conventional weapons. The specific proposal on this question put forward by Italy in the Committee on Disarmament<sup>1</sup> was not sufficiently elaborated; we shall direct the attention of the special session to a new working document which will propose certain specific steps to ensure faster implementation. It is to this end that we shall devote ourselves during our work in New York.

52. We welcomed with satisfaction the adoption on 10 October 1980 of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.<sup>2</sup>

53. With regard to outer space, Italy sponsored at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly the resolution which invites the Committee on Disarmament to examine the question of the arms race in outer space and, as a matter of priority, the question of the prohibition by means of an effective and verifiable agreement of anti-satellite systems [*resolution 36/97 C*]. These systems constitute potentially destabilizing elements for international security because they are the sole examples of space weapons now in operation. An agreement such as the one proposed by us would undoubtedly represent an important step towards ensuring that outer space, which has been defined as the new frontier in the creative expansion of mankind, would be used for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of all peoples.

54. Everything I have said so far explains why Italy assigns particular importance in disarmament agreements to verification procedures. These procedures must constitute not an exception but an essential element to be included in all agreements for arms control, without any exception. Experience has shown us on too many occasions that the uncertainty arising from inadequate guarantees for the fulfilment of future obligations prevents negotiations on disarmament from achieving decisive progress.

55. It is time for the international community itself to take over the basic function of verifying disarmament agreements. For this reason, Italy has put forward a specific proposal for creating, in the framework of the United Nations, a body which will be entrusted in the future with the operation of all verifica-



tion mechanisms and procedures [see A/S-12/AC.1/19/Rev.1, annex]. This international body would be established in successive stages, with a corresponding increase in responsibilities and functions up to the final phase, in which it would take over direct control procedures through a corps of international inspectors.

56. The participation of all countries would be the best guarantee of the fulfilment of the obligations deriving from the agreements. It would strengthen the principle of undiminished security in all phases of the disarmament process. Finally, it would promote the achievement of the objective of universalizing the disarmament agreements, which Italy is pursuing with determination.

57. The proposal just mentioned and the other initiatives and contributions which Italy intends to make during this special session reaffirm the importance which Italy assigns to the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

58. We believe that our nations cannot renounce their security, but we are aiming at ensuring that such security be guaranteed at increasingly lower levels of expenditure, armaments and risks. This is our aim, for which we have been fighting for decades, well aware that it is our inescapable duty as human beings to create conditions in which a growing share of resources will be devoted to development instead of to the manufacture of instruments of war. We work towards improving the conditions of life throughout the world, which will benefit the entire international community and enable us to attain the supreme ideal of peace.

59. We must persist in the courageous and determined search for a global dialogue between the nations based on genuine understanding and practical co-operation as the only way to eliminate the terrible risk of a nuclear catastrophe. I say "global dialogue". I believe, indeed, that the best strategy for satisfying our peoples' desire for peace in a climate of security and, hence, with a balance between East and West is to pursue a policy designed to ensure economic progress, social justice, the safeguarding of human dignity and world stability.

60. When we affirm that we wish to advance the dialogue between North and South, when we stress the central and universal role of the United Nations in the launching of global negotiations, in essence we are concerned with maintaining the substance of the genuine interdependence of nations as regards not only our respective economic systems but the very destinies of our peoples. Consequently, we demand an equal division not only of the advantages but also of the responsibilities that derive from that interdependence.

61. In this spirit Italy, besides advocating a global dialogue, has become the sponsor of specific initiatives in such priority sectors as agriculture and food production. Next autumn we shall hold at Rome a meeting on the political level designed to launch programmes for more incisive action to increase the degree of agricultural self-sufficiency of the less favoured countries and to provide emergency aid machinery. We sincerely hope that we can achieve an effective joint campaign against hunger and malnutrition in the world.

62. Peace cannot be separated from justice, and social justice within individual States cannot be separated from international justice. As long as a part of mankind lives in danger of famine and in conditions which are not only degrading but a threat to survival, mankind will not be able to establish that world order which is the only authentic indestructible basis for peace.

63. Imbalances and disturbances between regions of the world and even between neighbouring regions are intolerable. In addition to the problem of relations between East and West there is the problem of relations between North and South. And peace, that peace which is the mark of human dignity shining in the heart of modern man, must be defended by the balance between East and West, but also, and increasingly in the decades to come, by the balance between North and South.

64. East-West, North-South: the extraordinary gravity of the events taking place in the world is such that the present Assembly is not and cannot consider itself a closed institution as regards its procedures, its points of reference or its discussions.

65. All that which is taking place outside seems to be in contrast with that which is being said here. However, there is in the world, in contrast to the reason for war, an overwhelming reason for peace, which here has its own structure and its own institutions.

66. We affirm here, while the slaughter is at its height, the ideal of the United Nations as an open institution providing an open procedure, an institution of intervention and unity, even where now there is the desperation of unresolved violence and revenge.

67. We believe in this institution, at this moment, when it is more difficult than ever to have hope.

68. We realize that now more than ever we need an institution like the United Nations for achieving agreements and that is even more necessary for those States which have sought unilateral solutions of force and are now prisoners of their acts of violence. Only here, only at the United Nations can we rebuild peace without vendettas, without rancour and without humiliation.

69. Precisely when the effectiveness of the institution seems to be most in doubt it may prove victorious. The Italian Government is here for this reason, to fulfil, together with the others, its own duty for peace. This is the greatest contribution it can make to the joint defence of freedom and justice.

70. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly I thank the President of the Council of Ministers of the Italian Republic for the important statement he has just made.

71. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, I should like to congratulate you on your election as President of the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. I should like to wish you success in your work.

72. I should like to wish Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar success in the important post of Secretary-General.

73. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, has sent a message to the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. In carrying out the solemn mission from the Soviet leadership I shall read out the text of this message.

“On behalf of the Soviet Union and of the 269 million Soviet people, I am addressing the United Nations General Assembly convened at its second special session devoted to disarmament.

“The session faces great and responsible tasks. Its agenda includes a number of items of the first importance. But if we are to single out the most important, the most urgent, the one now worrying people in every corner of the globe and pre-occupying the minds of statesmen and public figures in many countries of the world, it is concern for halting the endless buildup of ever more destructive types of weapons, ensuring a breakthrough in the improvement of international relations and averting a nuclear disaster.

“Concern for peace is the dominant feature of the Soviet Union’s policy. We are convinced that no contradictions between States or groups of States, no differences in social systems, ways of life or ideologies and no transitory interests can eclipse the fundamental need shared by all peoples—the need to safeguard peace and avert a nuclear war. Today, as never before, purposeful and considered action is required of all States in order to achieve this lofty goal.

“Guided by the desire to do all in its power to deliver the world’s peoples from the threat of nuclear devastation and ultimately to exclude its very possibility from the life of mankind, the Soviet State solemnly declares: the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics assumes an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. This obligation shall become effective immediately, from the moment when it is announced from the rostrum of the General Assembly.

“Why is the Soviet Union taking this step at a time when the nuclear Powers in NATO, including the United States, make no secret of the fact that their military doctrine not only does not rule out the possibility of the first use of nuclear weapons but is actually based on that dangerous premise?

“The Soviet Union bases this move on the indisputable fact, which is decisive in the present international situation, that should a nuclear war start, it could mean the destruction of human civilization and perhaps the end of life itself on earth. Consequently, the supreme duty of State leaders conscious of their responsibility for the fate of the world is to exert every effort to ensure that nuclear weapons will never be used.

“The peoples of the world have the right to expect that the Soviet Union’s decision will be followed by reciprocal steps on the part of the other nuclear States. If the other nuclear Powers were to assume an equally precise and clear obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, that would be

tantamount in practice to banning the use of nuclear weapons altogether, a goal advocated by the overwhelming majority of the world’s countries.

“In the formulation of its policy, the Soviet Union will naturally continue to take into account how the other nuclear Powers act, whether they heed the voice of reason and follow our good example or push the world downhill.

“Another objective of the Soviet Union’s initiative is to increase trust in relations between States. And that is particularly important in the present international situation, when the foundations of trust have been shaken by the efforts of those who are trying to upset the existing balance of forces, to gain military superiority over the Soviet Union and its allies and to destroy all the benefits brought by the policy of détente.

“The military and political stereotypes inherited from the time when one side had a monopoly on the atom bomb have become outdated. The realities of today require a fundamentally different approach to the questions of war and peace. The step now taken by the Soviet Union makes it easier to take a different view of the entire complex of problems invoked in the limitation and reduction of armaments, especially nuclear arms, and advances the cause of disarmament in general.

“The great achievements of human creative and technological genius enable the world’s peoples to open a new chapter in their history. At this moment there already exist boundless opportunities to tackle the solution of such human problems of global magnitude as the struggle against hunger, disease, poverty and many other evils. But that requires making sure that scientific and technological progress is used exclusively to serve the peaceful aspirations of humanity.

“The Soviet Union is assuming an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons because it has faith in the power of good sense and believes in mankind’s ability to avoid self-annihilation and to ensure peace and progress for the present and future generations.

“I should also like to draw the attention of the representatives of States attending the special session of the General Assembly to the following question. In the search for measures which would actually halt the arms race, many political and public figures of various countries have recently turned to the idea of a freeze—in other words, of stopping the further buildup of nuclear potentials. The ideas advanced in this connexion are not all alike; on the whole, we believe, they go in the right direction. We see in them a reflection of people’s profound concern about their destiny. To use a figure of speech, people are voting for the preservation of the highest value in the world, which is human life.

“The idea of a mutual freeze of nuclear arsenals, as a first step towards their reduction and, eventually, their complete elimination, is close to the Soviet point of view. Moreover, our country has been the initiator of concrete proposals aimed at stopping the nuclear arms race in its quantitative and qualitative aspects.

“Lastly, there is one more issue which, in our view, the General Assembly cannot disregard. Dangerous as nuclear weapons are, it must be borne in mind that in the arsenals of States there are other means of mass destruction, including chemical weapons. It is frightening to contemplate but nevertheless a fact that of the tens of thousands of tons of toxic agents among the armaments of certain countries, a few kilograms would suffice to kill millions of people. And in addition, new programmes for the production of even more sophisticated types of lethal chemical weapons are being launched.

“Every effort must be made to eliminate chemical weapons from the face of the earth. The Soviet Union is a devoted advocate of this approach. We are prepared to come to an agreement without delay on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of the stockpiles of such weapons.

“In general, the Soviet Union is in favour of moving ahead in all areas where opportunities exist for limiting and radically reducing armaments, be it in nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction or conventional armaments. There is no type of weapon which the Soviet Union would not be prepared to limit or ban on the basis of reciprocity.

“I should like to express my confidence that the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will provide an effective impetus for a cessation of the arms race and a transition to practical measures for real disarmament. In this way it will justify the hopes which the world's peoples are pinning on this thoroughly representative forum.

“I wish the participants in the session fruitful work for the benefit of all peoples and of universal peace.

“L. BREZHNEV”

74. The message of Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, that has just been read out contains a condensed exposition of the Soviet Union's attitude towards the most pressing problem facing mankind today, that is, how to preserve peace.

75. Peaceful coexistence between States with different social systems and the settlement of all controversial issues among them by peaceful means constitute the underlying foundation of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. This is the essence of the Programme of Peace in the 1980s adopted by the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

76. This has been convincingly borne out by all the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and its allies, the socialist countries members of the Warsaw Treaty. This is eloquently evidenced by the statements of L. I. Brezhnev, permeated with a profound concern that the nuclear war threat be removed.

77. Our country is taking yet another step of exceptional importance: the Soviet Union has pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. It is doing so unilaterally. If the other nuclear Powers follow our example, the likelihood of an outbreak of nuclear war will in fact be reduced to zero.

78. At the time the United Nations was being created, the winds of the world war could still be felt. In its Charter the founding Member States expressed the people's aspirations by formulating a universal international obligation similar to a vow, an obligation to prevent another war.

79. The idea of uniting the efforts of the peoples for maintaining international security is the very cornerstone of this world Organization. States with different social systems and ideologies fought shoulder to shoulder in the great battle against fascism that sought to impose upon the world the rule of vandals and butchers.

80. And today no one, particularly no politician at the helm of State policy, can remain indifferent to the clear-cut provisions of the Charter concerning the need to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

81. It is no wonder then that every year an overwhelming majority of States in the United Nations has been expressing concern lest mankind trip and fall into the abyss, concern for preserving the most precious thing on earth, namely, peace or, in other words, life.

82. This session specially devoted to disarmament problems should, in a more distinct way than any of the previous sessions, express the will to rein in the demon of war.

83. Any responsible political leader, scientist or reasonable person, if asked what a nuclear conflict could entail, would give but one reply: the consequences would be catastrophic for all peoples.

84. Is that perhaps an exaggeration? No. Today, hardly any serious person would venture to argue against that.

85. Is there indeed anyone who would wish to be consumed by the flames of a nuclear war? Just knock at random on any door in any town or village and ask that question. It would be correct to say that there is no nation, big or small, that does not long for a stable peace.

86. If all that is so, then how can that peace be achieved? One should not expect miracles. One has to struggle for peace.

87. It is people who have created not only rifles and grenades but also highly accurate missiles and highly lethal nuclear weapons. That means that people themselves must and can scrap the tools of war, should they so wish. We are convinced that States are equal to that task, provided they pursue a policy of peace.

88. It is being said that the disarmament problem cannot be solved at one stroke. It is hard not to agree with that. But if that problem is to be solved step by step, one should indeed try to do so, rather than take cover behind rhetoric in which one can so often find everything except a genuine desire to solve the problem.

89. The Soviet Union continues to advocate a practical approach to the solution of the problems of containing the arms race, of disarmament and of removing the risk of another war through agreements between States. That is the essence of L. I. Brezhnev's

message to the United Nations. The Soviet delegation has come to this session actively to promote that objective.

90. However, another course in world politics is also known to exist. That course is predicated on the continuation of the arms race and on its escalation. Concoctions of all sorts are produced on a grand scale to provide propagandistic cover for that course.

91. One can hear statements to the effect that arms limitation is not enough, that deep and impressive cuts are needed. The words themselves are not that bad. A closer look reveals, however, that it is the Soviet Union—and it alone—that is to make those deep and impressive cuts.

92. It is also being asserted that, in order to proceed to the reduction and limitation of arms at some future stage, mountains upon mountains of weapons, primarily weapons of mass destruction, should be accumulated in the arsenals of NATO—and the more the better. Indeed, such weapons are being accumulated with something of an obsession. Washington and the NATO bloc as a whole have announced such militaristic programmes.

93. The intent behind all this is to upset the existing military balance between the Soviet Union and the United States, the Warsaw Treaty and NATO, to move into a position of strength, to act from that position and to dictate one's will to others, notably at the negotiating table.

94. Nowadays, some NATO politicians are talking about the position of strength perhaps even more often than during the "cold war". Calls are made from the highest political pulpits of that bloc to the effect that the United States should be ahead of everyone else militarily, that it should and must be in the lead, and that is that. All those statements, interviews, resolutions and communiqués designed to stun people invariably smack of unbridled ambition. In fact, such things are becoming a glut on the market.

95. At times, such plans are discussed without any great subtlety, quite bluntly. More often, however, they are camouflaged. It is asserted, for example, that the Soviet Union has gained an edge in armaments, although that is a fraud, since facts and figures totally disprove that argument. The obvious intention is to mislead people.

96. Most recently, word has been widely spread that the Soviet Union has at its disposal "a most destabilizing factor". What it essentially boils down to is that only one type of weapon—land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles—is singled out in the entire range of strategic nuclear arms. These, they say, are the missiles that the Soviet Union should reduce in the first place.

97. What is behind all this? It is not all that cunning a trick. It is being proposed that reductions should apply to the type of strategic systems in which the numerical advantage—if this factor is regarded in isolation, and only in isolation—lies with the Soviet Union. At the same time, the issue of other strategic arms in which the United States has an advantage, and a big one—such as long-range cruise missiles, on which it is known that Washington now places particularly high reliance, and strategic aircraft, in

which the United States also has a considerable edge—is being deliberately glossed over. They keep quiet about the fact that the United States has several times more warheads on its submarine-launched ballistic missiles than the Soviet Union. The United States forward-based systems and the nuclear capabilities of America's NATO allies are totally ignored.

98. The same approach is taken to medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, and with the same purpose in mind—that is, to misrepresent the line-up of nuclear forces of the two sides there, too. Fabrications take the place of truth and are dressed up to look plausible.

99. What all this adds up to is a desire to wreck the existing parity in the field of nuclear arms, which is determined by the totality of the arms that the two sides possess, rather than by some of the individual types. Why is this truth concealed from people? Why is it kept under lock and key? They do not want people to know it. In this way it is easier to secure decisions in favour of the arms race and easier to defend bloated military budgets.

100. Whenever Washington has something against the weight of certain Soviet missiles, for instance, it immediately starts saying that they destabilize the strategic situation. To set the record straight, it should be recognized that such missiles form part of the overall equilibrium that has been carefully balanced and agreed by the Soviet Union and the United States over many years of negotiations. That is exactly what they now want to upset.

101. Once the veil is taken off Washington's strategic arms plan it is revealed that it is designed to undercut the security of the other side and to retain a completely free hand in implementing its own military programmes. This lopsided and twisted approach is unrealistic and unacceptable.

102. Actually, it is the unprecedented arms race launched in the United States that constitutes the destabilizing factor. See how fast the wheels of the American military-industrial machine are turning. In effect, the arsenals of that country are being stocked with every possible type of armaments, including such barbaric ones as chemical and neutron weapons. Scientific and technological progress is geared to march in step with the arms race policy. It has been squeezed into a military uniform.

103. Each day brings new evidence that the United States foreign policy is becoming pervaded more and more with a spirit of militarism. This militaristic intoxication breeds all sorts of frenzied military doctrines. A first nuclear strike is being talked about as if it were something casual or routine, whereas what is involved here is a criminal concept of unleashing nuclear war. The idea that a nuclear war is winnable provided the theatre of that war is moved to some place further away from home—for example, to Europe—is being presented as something of a masterpiece of military strategy.

104. When one comes to the country where the United Nations Headquarters is located one really finds oneself in a different world. In newspaper articles and on television screens officials of various ranks are driving home but one point: we must go on



and on and on arming ourselves so that the United States becomes the world's foremost military Power. In other words, the idea being impressed on people's minds is this: you want peace, go all out in preparing for war; dig in, hide yourselves wherever you can, but prepare.

105. The Soviet Union is in principle against a policy of military superiority. It does not seek military superiority for itself, nor does it grant anyone else the right to do so. Of course, our country is capable in any circumstances of taking care of its security and the security of its allies and friends. L. I. Brezhnev's statements to that effect are well known.

106. A genuine concern for peace requires the maintenance of the military-strategic balance. It has been ordained by history that such a balance between the two countries should evolve. This has been reflected in the relevant agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States. So would it not be better to use that balance as a springboard from which to work towards agreement to lower its levels in accordance with the principle of equality and equal security?

107. Why is that not acceptable? The arguments against that are moulded after a very simple pattern: supremacy over the Soviet Union is needed to keep it in a state of fear. It is as simple as that—to keep it in a state of fear.

108. But then the Soviet Union would also have every reason to keep the other side in a state of fear. If we are going to talk in such terms, both the strength and the fear should be equally shared by the two sides. It should not be argued: "We, the United States, have the strength, and you have the fear; that is the Soviet Union's share".

109. We are convinced, however, that all this fear-strength logic is faulty. The security of either side and of the world as a whole should be built neither on fear nor on a quest for military superiority. The search for agreements, dialogue and mutual confidence should guide and motivate States in their relations with each other. The basis for this is the recognition and maintenance of the existing parity through all possible efforts aimed at achieving a lower and lower level of armaments.

110. How can Washington's policy of gaining military superiority be explained? It is hard to rid oneself of the impression that someone has been carried away by the imperial dream of dominating the world. How else can we explain the fact that vast areas in one part of the world or another are declared without any grounds whatsoever to be zones of United States "vital interests"? This is viewed as enough for dispatching the navy or an expeditionary force to the other end of the world, to foreign shores and borders closer to other peoples' wealth.

111. Amid vociferous declarations about defending United States "vital interests" a naval armada was dispatched to the Persian Gulf. The plan to reimpose a vassal status on Iran by threat and force has fallen through, yet the armada is still in that area.

112. That area is only a stone's throw from the Soviet Union, as can be seen from a look at the map. What conclusion should we draw from this? What is it that the United States has lost in the Indian Ocean?

Why does it need a strategic military base on Diego Garcia? It is developing yet another springboard from which to threaten the Soviet Union and many other countries.

113. Nor does it seem to be an accident that the United States has been stubbornly resisting the demands of the littoral States that the Indian Ocean be turned into a zone of peace and disregarding their interests.

114. Outside interference, which goes as far as the dispatch of armed interventionist gangs, is continuing against Afghanistan. Even those who are doing all this have apparently come to realize that the Afghanistan of the past has ceased for ever to exist. There exists a new Afghanistan, with a new democratic régime in place of the former reactionary one; there exists an independent non-aligned Afghan State. The proposals put forward by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan provide a good basis for political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan, and the Soviet Union supports those proposals.

115. It was suggested that a world fiesta of sorts be staged to mark the withdrawal of the Israeli occupation force from the Sinai Peninsula. But what actually happened was that its place was promptly taken by American soldiers and by soldiers from other States, including some in which the old habit of cracking the colonial overseer's whip has not yet been totally abandoned.

116. Is the assertion of the United States military presence in the Middle East conducive to a just settlement in that area? No, it is not. It only encourages Israel to pursue its policy of flouting the legitimate interests of the Arab States and the national rights of the Palestinian people.

117. In full view of the entire world, while we are sitting here, Israel has committed another act of aggression against the sovereign State of Lebanon. Breaching the cordon of United Nations contingents in southern Lebanon, Israeli troops moved on, sowing death among the Lebanese and particularly among the Palestinians who had taken refuge in that country. Tel Aviv makes no secret of the fact that its aim is to annihilate the Palestinian people.

118. Can the United Nations look on impassively while this crime is being perpetrated and while its decisions are being trampled into the dirt? No. The United Nations and the Security Council must assert themselves and adopt measures under the Charter of the United Nations to stop the Israeli aggression.

119. Israeli troops should be withdrawn forthwith from Lebanon, and the ancestral lands of the Arabs previously seized by Israel should be returned to them. The Palestinian people should be given an opportunity to exercise their inalienable right to create a State of their own.

120. Special emphasis should be laid on the responsibility that the United States bears for the actions of the aggressor. Proof of this can be found in the position the United States took in the Security Council, as a result of which the Council was unable to take a decision on stopping Israeli aggression in Lebanon. It is clear to all that if Washington had lifted a finger

to put an end to those actions, Tel Aviv would not have dared to defy the United Nations.

121. The situation in South-East Asia still cannot be viewed as tranquil. The atmosphere is being poisoned by a hostile policy of interference in the affairs of the countries of Indochina. The aim of that policy is to prevent the peoples of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea from building a new life in conditions of independence and freedom. But they are moving along a path of their own and will continue to do so. As to the People's Republic of Kampuchea, it should, and no doubt will, take its legitimate seat in the United Nations.

122. For many years now socialist Cuba has had to resist blockade and pressure. Military exercises are staged off its very shores, troops are landed defiantly on its territory, and the Guantanamo base is still being unlawfully retained by the United States.

123. The people of Nicaragua is also being threatened now. Nicaragua is a small country, yet does not its people, like any other, have the right to be master of its destiny? It surely does.

124. The bloody massacres in El Salvador have aroused indignation all over the world. The punitive forces there are being armed and advised by those who formally associated with the anti-popular dictator régime.

125. Developments in the South Atlantic are but another manifestation of the policy of the use of crude force in international affairs. It would be proper for the United Nations to call emphatically for an immediate cessation of all hostilities in the area and for a just, anti-colonial political settlement of that acute issue.

126. In Latin America, Asia and southern Africa peoples are legitimately protesting against imperialist tyranny. They are waging a just struggle for independence and freedom against the remnants of hated colonialism. The Soviet people's sympathies are on their side.

127. And look at the efforts aimed at swaying those United States allies which realize the need to search for solutions conducive to easing tensions in the world and establishing international co-operation.

128. The developments of the last few days have once again confirmed that certain people have set themselves the goal of poisoning the atmosphere even more, of increasing confrontation, of creating additional incentives for escalating the arms race and pitting more and more States against each other.

129. All this is being done while we are gathered here under one roof trying to find common ground on the issues of preventing war, ending the arms race and strengthening peace.

130. Nobody has the right to treat the problems of war and peace lightly. Yet, the reasoning of some politicians apparently continues to go like this: since the United States and NATO have the Soviet Union and other socialist countries as partners in the talks on those problems, it remains to be seen whether or not to work for agreement with them, since they belong to a different social system and have a different ideology.

131. It is no wonder that sober-minded people all over the world shrug their shoulders, so to speak, when facing the question of how politicians responsible for the conduct of State policy can accept such reasoning.

132. It would be in order to say: should not certain people in Western capitals be serious in their pronouncements on issues of war and peace?

133. The same applies also to prophecies on the subject of socialism and its future which at times verge on political witchcraft.

134. The situation in the world causes legitimate concern among peoples. It has found its expression in parliamentary debates, in discussions at international forums and in the upsurge of a mass anti-war movement for which the Soviet people has profound esteem. The fundamental question is how to counter the policy of war preparations. There is an answer to that question, and it is a convincing one. The policy of war preparations must be countered with a policy of peace and peaceful co-operation.

135. The instigators of the arms race are out to erode people's will in the struggle for peace and to sow doubt in their minds as to the outcome of that struggle. We reject that. Faith in the strength and ability of peoples to safeguard peace is inherent in the Soviet Union's foreign policy. The Soviet people is firmly determined to uphold peace.

136. Since its birth the Soviet State has drawn inspiration from V. I. Lenin's words: "What we cherish most is the preservation of peace." "What we cherish most . . ."; those are truly undying words!

137. Today those words express the most cherished thoughts of the Soviet people, which is engaged in creative effort; they underlie the policy of the Soviet Union, including its foreign policy, the moral ideals and the spiritual creative endeavour in all its variety.

138. It has long been recognized that time is the most impartial judge of the policies of States on issues of war and peace. The Soviet people has drawn the sword only against aggressors, to defend the freedom and independence of its country. The feat of our people, who made a decisive contribution to the great victory over the fascist aggressor, will live through the centuries.

139. The instigators of the arms race have worked hard to find an argument in favour of that race and in justification of the astronomical figures of military budgets. They have obviously decided that the best thing to do is to scare people with the threat that purportedly emanates from the Soviet Union.

140. But the deception Washington so frequently resorts to in international affairs is an unreliable foundation for a long-term policy. Fewer and fewer people are being taken in by that deception, even though the propaganda machine continues to churn out one fabrication after another about the Soviet Union's armaments and armed forces and about its foreign policy. Confronted with reality, those fabrications fail the test. The Soviet Union is not threatening any State on any continent. The step announced in L. I. Brezhnev's message today is further convincing proof of that.

141. The Soviet Union has no claims to a monopoly on proposals conducive to lessening the threat of war. We are receptive to such proposals, even when they are made by politicians whose political views and world outlook greatly differ from our own.

142. As the message emphasizes, the idea of a mutual freeze on nuclear arsenals as a first step towards their reduction and eventual complete elimination is close to the Soviet point of view.

143. The Soviet appeal that agreement be reached without delay on a complete prohibition of chemical weapons has also been prompted by the grave realities of today.

144. We strongly reject the absurd tales implicating the Soviet Union in the use of those weapons. This fraud bears too obvious a trade mark to allow those who are peddling it to capitalize on it. Obviously they are attempting to conceal their own notorious sins in that respect.

145. The Soviet Union is submitting to the special session for its consideration a draft document entitled "Basic provisions of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction" [A/S-12/AC.1/12 and Corr.1, annex].

146. The draft takes into account other States' wishes, including those that deal with verification. It is our view that a breakthrough in reaching an international agreement could be made on the basis of the Soviet draft.

147. The Soviet Union is in favour of moving towards solving disarmament problems on a broad front, through negotiations. Negotiations currently under way should be revived and those that have been suspended should be resumed, and new negotiations should be started in those areas where the situation calls for it.

148. The current Soviet-United States talks at Geneva on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe are being closely watched everywhere. They deal with one of the key problems of European security and, indeed, of international security as a whole.

149. What is the goal of the Soviet Union? It is to deliver Europe totally from both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons. If that solution is not acceptable to our Western partners, we are prepared to agree on a total renunciation of all types of medium-range nuclear weapons targeted on Europe. We are also prepared to reduce gradually but substantially, by the hundreds, the medium-range nuclear weapons of both sides, the Soviet Union and NATO.

150. The Soviet Union is backing with practical deeds its desire for the Geneva talks to be successful. Our country has unilaterally ceased further deployment of medium-range missiles in the European part of the Soviet Union. Moreover, the Soviet Union is already considerably reducing the number of those missiles. We have stated in no uncertain terms that no medium-range missiles will be additionally deployed in areas where Western European countries would be within their range.

151. Now, what about the other side? As we have already said, its attitude is that it is only the Soviet

Union that should reduce its medium-range nuclear arms.

152. The interests of the European peoples require neither confrontation nor an undermining of détente. The right path towards consolidating security and developing co-operation in Europe has been charted in the Final Act of Helsinki.

153. To be true to the spirit of Helsinki means to abide scrupulously by the principles and understandings of the Final Act and to refrain from interfering in each other's internal affairs.

154. To be true to the spirit of Helsinki means to complete successfully the Madrid meeting of representatives of the participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, and to crown its work with a decision to convene a conference on measures for confidence and disarmament in Europe. As before, the Soviet Union will do its best to contribute to the positive outcome of the Madrid meeting.

155. There is not a single State unaware of the importance of talks between the Soviet Union and the United States on strategic arms limitation and reduction.

156. The Soviet Union has invariably advocated the resumption of these talks. Now, following the consent of the United States, the opening date for the talks has been agreed upon. This is undoubtedly a positive fact.

157. However, the SALT II Treaty, already finalized and signed, is known to have been shelved by the American side. Needless to say, that dealt a heavy blow to international confidence and international security.

158. Two other important treaties between the Soviet Union and the United States limiting activities in the nuclear field—the 1974 Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests<sup>3</sup> and the 1976 Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes<sup>4</sup>—are yet to be ratified.

159. It is worth recalling all this at a time when the United States delegation is returning to the table of strategic arms negotiations.

160. What is most important is that the talks should strike the right note from the very outset. From this standpoint, the position with which the United States side is coming to the talks, as described in Washington's official statements, cannot but give cause for wariness.

161. In connexion with those statements, it would be proper to point out that our partners in the talks both on the problem of strategic arms and on the problem of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe just cannot assimilate the obvious truth that the Soviet Union and the United States are equally interested in the solution of those problems and in talks on them. It would be a gross mistake to think that the Soviet Union was holding out its hand begging for talks. No, each side should extend its hand to the other if they both want to discuss their differences and to find mutually acceptable solutions to their problems.

162. In his recent speech L. I. Brezhnev clearly indicated what is needed for the Soviet-American talks to result in an agreement. First, the talks

should actually pursue the objective of limiting and reducing strategic arms rather than serve as a cover for the continuation of the arms race and to upset the existing parity. Secondly, the two sides should conduct them with regard for each other's legitimate security interests and strictly in accordance with the principle of equality and equal security. Lastly, everything positive achieved earlier should be preserved, including the SALT II Treaty.

163. It is also essential securely to block all channels for the continuation of the strategic arms race in any form. This means that the development of new types of strategic weapons should be either banned or limited to the extent possible in accordance with agreed parameters. We are already prepared to agree now that the strategic arms of the Soviet Union and the United States be quantitatively frozen the moment the talks begin and that their modernization be limited as much as possible.

164. Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union should take any actions that could upset the stability of the strategic situation. Aside from its intrinsic importance, the proposed freeze could also be conducive to progress towards a radical limitation and reduction of strategic arms. The Soviet Union has consistently advocated a substantial reduction of those arms.

165. It is hoped that the other side will give serious consideration to our proposals. There are, however, some alarming signals. The very moment that the Soviet Union proposes a freeze on strategic arms, Washington defiantly announces that the implementation of the programme for the production and deployment of new MX strategic missiles is to be stepped up.

166. It cannot be denied that today Washington is skilled in destroying bridges that could lead to agreement. Building those bridges is more difficult and important.

167. As is known, L. I. Brezhnev made a concrete proposal to meet United States President Ronald Reagan. The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that a summit meeting should take place and that, of course, it should be well prepared. It is obvious that such a meeting would inevitably centre on the problems of reducing armaments and of disarmament, that is, problems which are also in the focus of this special session of the General Assembly.

168. The Soviet Union believes that it would be useful to elaborate and adopt a nuclear disarmament programme to be implemented stage by stage. One of its initial stages could be the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for manufacturing various types of nuclear weapons. Many other States also are making statements along similar lines. The Soviet Union is prepared to consider this question in the overall context of limiting and ending the nuclear arms race.

169. The consolidation in every possible way of the régime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons has been and remains a priority task in terms of curbing the nuclear arms race. A situation cannot be allowed to arise in which on the one hand measures would be taken to lessen the threat of nuclear war, while on the other hand nuclear weapons would spread

all over the planet. Our approach to this problem takes into account the views of many other States and above all of non-nuclear ones. The Soviet Union is agreeable to placing under the control of IAEA some of its peaceful nuclear installations—atomic power plants and research reactors.

170. Non-nuclear countries parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII)*, *annex*] have been raising the question of guarantees of their security on the part of the nuclear Powers. Their interest is only natural. This question could be solved by concluding an international convention. The Soviet Union is prepared to conclude bilateral agreements on guarantees with States which do not possess nuclear weapons and do not have them on their territory.

171. The problem of the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests also calls for a solution. It can be tackled either radically or step by step. The Soviet Union believes that the trilateral talks with the United States and Britain, which were suspended by them at the final stage, should be resumed without delay.

172. An increasing number of States have been declaring that they do not want to have nuclear weapons on their territory. There have been suggestions of the creation of zones free of such weapons. For our part we shall contribute to the search for generally acceptable solutions concerning the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various regions of the world.

173. An agreement should be reached on a prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. The draft international treaty on that subject<sup>5</sup> submitted by the Soviet Union has been widely acclaimed by States Members of the United Nations. Why not begin concrete discussion of it in the Committee on Disarmament without delay?

174. The time is ripe for reaching agreement to limit the naval activities of States, especially those possessing powerful navies. A whole range of important issues could be considered in this respect.

175. The United Nations should speak out against extending the spiral of the arms race into the vast expanses of outer space and the depths of the oceans of the world. The significance of those environments for a peaceful future for mankind is growing steadily.

176. Modern armies are equipped with enormous quantities of weapons which have come to be called conventional. Yet in terms of their purpose and characteristics they are not much inferior to weapons of mass destruction. Therefore this area of the arms race and consequently of the policy of States also requires the most serious attention.

177. The Soviet Union stands for substantial reductions of the current levels of armed forces and conventional armaments. A situation in which many millions of people are withdrawn from the productive sphere and placed under arms cannot be considered normal. To start with, agreement could be reached, for instance, not to increase armed forces and conventional armaments, to be followed by negotiations on their reduction both on a global scale and in specific regions.



178. With regard to central Europe, such talks are under way at Vienna. The Soviet Union, together with other socialist countries, reiterates its appeal to its Western partners finally to get down to work on preparing an agreement on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe. It is high time to discard the policy of upsetting the balance between the sides in this area as well.

179. Foreign trade in, and transfers of, conventional weapons are currently running into tens of billions of dollars. Given a sensible approach, this channel for spurring the arms race could also be at least narrowed. The Soviet-American talks on this subject were in progress comparatively recently, but they were suspended by the American side, which has developed a sort of conditioned reflex with regard to negotiations on a number of cardinal issues. After two or three years of talks, the United States side breaks them off. The Soviet Union is ready to resume talks on this subject as well.

180. It is beyond the power of any economist to prove that such acute social and economic problems facing States as unemployment, inflation and growing taxation could be solved through militarization. The burden of military expenditures is becoming increasingly felt also in the developing countries, on some of which poverty and hunger are known to pay frequent and cruel calls.

181. Disarmament is a sure path not only to a safe but also to a more prosperous life for the peoples. Progress in the field of disarmament would make it possible to release huge resources by freezing, and even more by reducing, military budgets. Part of the saving of resources currently devoured by arms production could be used to assist developing States.

182. The Soviet Union is submitting to this session for its consideration a memorandum entitled "Averting the growing nuclear threat and curbing the arms race"

[A/S-12/AC.1/11 and Corr.1, annex]. It recapitulates our country's positions of principle as well as its major specific proposals. We express the hope that they will be studied most carefully and supported by the States Members of the United Nations.

183. This special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should not be an ordinary event in international relations. This will not happen, given the will of the States represented in this Hall. This session will leave a visible imprint on world politics if it gives a significant impetus to solving the most pressing problems of curbing the arms race and of disarmament.

184. The United Nations has adopted quite a few well-intentioned resolutions. Yet, no matter how good a resolution may be, it will remain on paper unless followed by deeds. This entirely depends on States, on whether they recognize the fact that any chance offered by history in the name of the triumph of life must be seized. That is what the Soviet Union is calling for.

*The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.*

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> CD/139/Appendix II/Vol. I, document CD/56.

<sup>2</sup> See A/CONF.95/15 and Corr.2, annex I. For the printed text of the Convention and its Protocols, see *United Nations Disarmament Yearbook*, vol. 5: 1980 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.81.IX.4), appendix VII.

<sup>3</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 27*, annex II, sect. 13, document CCD/431.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, *Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 27*, vol. II, annex III, document CCD/496.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, *Thirty-sixth Session, Annexes*, agenda items 39 to 56, 128 and 135, document A/36/192, annex.