



President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mrs. FLESCH (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): I should like first to associate myself with the delegations that have preceded me in extending to Mr. Kittani my most sincere congratulations on his unanimous election to the presidency of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly. That honour shown to him is a just tribute to his personal qualities and to the skill with which he has conducted the work of the Assembly.

2. I should also like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for the important part he has taken in preparing for this session as well as for the exemplary efforts he has made for the maintenance of peace throughout the world under a mandate that he has been exercising for only a few months. The Secretary-General may rest assured of the unreserved support of the people and Government of Luxembourg in carrying out his heavy responsibilities.

3. A few days ago [*2nd meeting*] the Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Leo Tindemans, stated at this rostrum the position of the 10 member States of the European Community. It goes without saying that Luxembourg subscribes fully to that. My statement will therefore be confined to references to some problems that are of particular concern to my country.

4. Four years ago we met in this same forum to discuss the subject being considered by us again today. We succeeded on that occasion in adopting by consensus a Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*], which constitutes a framework setting out the principles which must guide us in the great task of disarmament. While that document fully retains its validity and relevancy, and while we continue to subscribe to it in its entirety, we must note, unfortunately, that the actions that we have been able to undertake since 1978 on the basis of that text and which have had some concrete effects have been very limited.

5. I realize that as complex a task as disarmament cannot be completed in a few days or in a few months, but that it is a long-term endeavour. However, I believe that we should not allow too much time to elapse if we do not want to risk one day being overtaken by events. Indeed, while world military expenditures amounted to some \$400 billion in 1978, today they surpass \$600 billion. Each year 5 to 8 per cent of available resources throughout the world are absorbed by military budgets alone. In other words,

the arms race continues despite all the attempts that have been made in recent years to curb and halt it. It has been calculated that if we allow for an annual growth rate of 2 per cent, which is not much compared to past rates, the total amount of military expenditures would at present prices be \$743 billion by the year 2000. Given a growth rate of 3 per cent, the corresponding figure would be \$903 billion. This must simply not be allowed to happen and we must strive to prevent it happening.

6. We have reached a critical crossroads in the history of mankind, and we must readjust a process that has developed its own momentum and which threatens to escape all control. World public opinion is more and more aware of the dangers inherent in the arms race, and it is calling for specific actions with increased vehemence. How many hopes have been inspired by this special session, how many men and women of goodwill have committed themselves actively to disarmament campaigns! I believe that we have no right to disappoint them. If indeed something has changed since the tenth special session, in 1978, it is the growing awareness and sensitivity of public opinion regarding the arms race. In many countries we have seen the spontaneous birth of popular movements which, gripped by a feeling of anxiety in view of the madness of armaments and collective destruction, protest against the continuation of present policies. This type of pacifism, whether it be freely expressed or whether attempts are made to prevent it, is a new phenomenon, at least on its present scale, and was unknown but a few years ago. This new sensitivity of public opinion must provide a background to and a source of inspiration for our work.

7. Popular wisdom rebels in particular against nuclear weapons which, because of their "overkill" capacity, have exceeded any human scale and threaten the very existence of mankind. It is difficult, indeed, to believe in the possibility of a limited nuclear war. In the Final Document of 1978 we were unanimous in recognizing that effective nuclear disarmament measures as well as the prevention of a nuclear war must be given top priority. This remains true today. It is clear to me, and we noted this at the time, that the nuclear-weapon States, and in particular those States which possess the largest nuclear arsenals, have a particular responsibility here. Accordingly, we welcome the agreement between the two super-Powers to meet at the end of this month to start negotiations not only to limit but also to reduce their strategic weapons. The acronym START, under which these negotiations will be known, seems to be of particular significance here. All our hopes and all our encouragement go to that initiative. We hope that this "start" will soon yield specific results which will benefit us all. We ardently hope, likewise, that

the negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear weapons which are proceeding at Geneva will soon yield tangible results. European countries, including Luxembourg, are the first to be concerned by this type of weapon. The reduction and the elimination of these weapons would be an important step towards nuclear disarmament.

8. Without wishing to deal here with other aspects of the non-peaceful uses of nuclear energy, such as the ban on nuclear testing, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2873 (XXII), annex*] and others, I will merely note that a small State as committed to peace as the Grand Duchy cannot fail to support all measures which would limit and reduce nuclear weapons in a balanced manner. Our position is identical with regard to the perversion of the so-called "inhuman" weapons—chemical weapons and radiological weapons. The prevention of an arms race in outer space deserves our particular attention. Indeed, we are at a stage where norms can still precede the establishment of a *fait accompli*. We must try to take advantage of the time that remains to us before, as with so many other arms systems, the actual existence of the weapons in outer space makes future regulation and control difficult, if not impossible.

9. Conventional weapons, that scourge which has been an integral part of the history of humanity since its very beginning, continue to absorb by far the greater part of the total amount spent on arms. This fact concerns us all, developed countries and developing countries alike. While I have no illusions about the possibility of all the hawks one day turning into doves and that in one day the phenomenon that has determined our evolution since our very beginnings might thereby disappear, I do believe that conventional weapons changed when weapons of mass destruction appeared. Any use of conventional weapons, however limited, may indeed through escalation lead to the use of nuclear weapons and bring about the destruction of our planet. Conventional weapons are thus intimately linked with nuclear weapons, and while the latter exist there is no substantial difference between these two categories of weapons. This unbreakable link between conventional and nuclear weapons constitutes an additional reason for us to devote our entire attention to it. This question has not yet been dealt with from a universal standpoint with the priority that it deserves. Even on the regional level the idea of reducing conventional weapons has not yet made headway. In this respect, we regret that it should have been necessary to adjourn until next autumn the Madrid meeting of representatives of participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. We hope that at that time negotiations will be able to lead to the convening of a conference on disarmament in Europe in conditions which would offer the 35 participating States some chance of attaining tangible results.

10. Likewise, the Vienna negotiations on the mutual and balanced reduction of conventional forces which aim progressively to reduce existing military forces have not yet yielded real progress. It is desirable that they be given a fresh momentum so that European security could be enhanced and so that the enormous

cost entailed in maintaining forces at their present level could be substantially reduced.

11. The question of the cost is, indeed, a second aspect of conventional weapons which deserves our attention. In view of the enormous appropriations that it absorbs—more than 80 per cent of total arms expenditures—it is an exorbitant waste of the limited resources of our planet, which could be used for other purposes such as the struggle against poverty and development in general.

12. As was quite rightly pointed out by the study entitled *The Relationship between Disarmament and Development*,¹ the world can either continue to indulge in an unrestrained arms race or it can strive to establish a more viable international economic order. It cannot pursue the two objectives at the same time. That, together with eliminating the danger of collective destruction, is really what this session is all about. That truth applies not only to the developed countries but also, I feel, to the developing countries, for whom military expenditures are especially burdensome. It seems clear that disarmament can make progress only to the extent that States are able to ensure their security by means other than constantly increasing their military arsenals.

13. The principle of undiminished security must guarantee the security of every State in a balanced, equitable manner, without any State or group of States having advantages over other States at any stage in the disarmament process. That aim can be achieved only if there is parallel development of agreements between States for the regulation, limitation and reduction of weapons and armed forces, on the one hand, and the establishment of a collective security system, on the other.

14. It is in this latter field—of collective security—that the United Nations has a primary role to play. We hope, therefore, that the United Nations role in the disarmament process will be strengthened. The present special session provides the best opportunity for taking adequate measures to that end.

15. I fully realize the difficulty of this endeavour, given the diversity of interests involved. However, if we wish to apply ourselves to these great endeavours with some chance of success, we must demonstrate courage commensurate with the goal to be attained. This session, in view of the hopes that it has inspired throughout the world, cannot afford to err by timidity. We should show ourselves ready to envisage the adaptation of existing structures or, possibly, the establishment of new structures if the effectiveness of the system can be thus improved.

16. This is particularly true of international verification machinery, which is essential if we wish to enhance the climate of confidence among States. One of the main causes of mistrust, which is the basic reason for the arms race, is the lack of reliable data about the military activities of others and about certain questions concerning mutual security. The establishment of international verification machinery, particularly the establishment of an international satellite monitoring agency, would make an important contribution here.

17. Furthermore, we hope that the comprehensive programme of disarmament can be adopted at this session and thus provide us with a framework for future negotiations aimed at limiting and reducing weapons. By adopting a more specific approach to the disarmament problem, by envisaging, if necessary, a phased procedure as well as the possibility of a periodic examination of progress achieved, this programme would, we feel, be a useful supplement to the Final Document of 1978. Clearly, this document will not be able to satisfy the hopes placed in it unless it sufficiently reflects reality so that it can give rise to specific action. If that is not the case, we may well produce another paper devoid of value which would suffer the sad fate of so many other documents that have preceded it.

18. This special session, which is being held at a time when public opinion is showing unprecedented vigilance and sensitivity, must give new impetus to the disarmament process. We have no right to suffer another failure on the long and difficult path of arms limitation and reduction. The essential point is for us to be able to take specific action now.

19. A first encouraging step was taken with the solemn opening of the World Disarmament Campaign. We support that initiative and voice the hope that it will be conducted impartially and objectively and that it will thus help improve the process of mobilizing world public opinion.

20. In conclusion, need I stress the overriding importance that my country attaches to this special session and to the adoption of a viable disarmament programme? Nothing less can in fact satisfy the immense hopes that it has aroused; nothing less can satisfy the peoples of the world, which have a legitimate right to expect the monstrous danger and the heavy burden of weapons which weigh on them finally to be alleviated.

21. Mr. STRAY (Norway): "To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" was the goal which the founding Members formulated for the United Nations in 1945. They declared themselves ready to do this with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources. It seems appropriate to remind ourselves of this goal on the occasion of the second special session on disarmament. In view of the present international situation, there are still no other goals which are more valid or more worthy of our dedicated support in the efforts to improve relations among States.

22. The nuclear threat is the most serious challenge facing mankind today. The international community must not only achieve the termination of the nuclear-arms race and prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons, but also obtain substantial reductions in these weapons. At the same time, we should not forget the horrors caused by the use of modern conventional weapons. As pointed out by the Secretary-General in his statement at the opening of this session, "Since 1945 . . . the world has experienced well over 100 wars fought with conventional weapons. These have caused vast suffering and destruction and the loss of an untold number of human lives."

23. Military confrontations in recent years in many parts of the world are tragic reminders of the in-

creasingly destructive potential of conventional weapons. Our overriding objective must therefore be to prevent any war. Any use of arms must be effectively deterred.

24. We have to admit that the disarmament strategy adopted at the tenth special session has not yet led to substantive action. The lack of progress over the last four years tells us that the task we have undertaken is a difficult one, but it would indeed be tragic and short-sighted if we permitted this to undermine our commitment to disarmament. On the contrary, our efforts to achieve global and regional disarmament and stability must be pursued relentlessly, both by the United Nations and by every single Member State.

25. To the best of its abilities Norway is contributing actively towards these goals. We consider the work for disarmament as part of our security policy. Norway is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO]. This alliance has two objectives: to provide military security for its members, and to strive for détente, arms control and disarmament.

26. Our defence efforts are aimed at military stability and reassurance. Our disarmament efforts aim to substantiate the negotiating commitment of the alliance.

27. We can point with satisfaction to the fact that important and positive developments have taken place very recently. The commitment of the member States of NATO to a programme for peace was spelled out clearly and forcefully in their summit meeting at Bonn on 10 June. Some weeks earlier the President of the United States took an important initiative for negotiations on strategic nuclear armaments. We are pleased that the parties have now agreed on a date for the opening of these negotiations. My Government gives full support to the stated objective that the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks [START] should lead to substantial reductions in these weapons on both sides. In the meantime we attach great importance to the fact that both parties have declared their willingness to observe the provisions of existing agreements, including those of SALT II, as long as the other party does the same.

28. The proposed START negotiations must be seen in relation to the ongoing talks at Geneva between the United States and the Soviet Union on intermediate nuclear forces. The United States initiative should, in our view, also improve the prospects for a positive outcome of the Geneva talks. Norway supports, as a first step, the total elimination of United States and Soviet land-based intermediate-range missiles.

29. The START negotiations and the negotiations on intermediate nuclear forces are supplemented by other important negotiations aimed at achieving security and stability at lower levels of military armaments in Europe and in a broader East-West perspective.

30. Norway attaches great importance to the talks at Vienna on mutual and balanced conventional force reductions. At the NATO summit at Bonn it was announced that a new, important Western proposal would soon be presented in those talks. It is the hope of the Norwegian Government that this initiative will create a new momentum in the talks and thus

facilitate a breakthrough after nine years of negotiations.

31. We also take full part in the endeavours, within the framework of the Conference on European Security and Co-operation, to arrive at a clear and precise mandate for a conference on disarmament in Europe. As a first step, we should establish an effective system of measures to build confidence and security in order to achieve greater openness and transparency in military matters all over Europe. We shall work actively towards this goal when the follow-up meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe reconvenes at Madrid in November this year.

32. It is thus with great satisfaction that we note that negotiations have been initiated and are being followed up in both the nuclear and the conventional fields. We sincerely hope that this second special session on disarmament will give an impetus to this very broad range of important negotiations.

33. We know, however, that certain dilemmas confront us. On the one hand it is universally realized that progress in the field of arms control and disarmament will improve the security of all nations. In the long run, enduring peace and security cannot be built upon the accumulation of weapons. On the other hand it is also realized that adequate strength in relation to the strength of others is a prerequisite for the maintenance of regional and global stability.

34. A further paradox is that world peace in the past decades has rested mainly upon the concept of nuclear deterrence. More than ever we feel the need to find a more acceptable basis for securing lasting peace. At least it should be obvious that existing nuclear arsenals are unnecessarily large. Both military security and deterrence could be maintained at considerably lower levels of armament than we have today. Therefore there should be room for substantial reductions of nuclear arms.

35. In order to be effective, all proposals for disarmament and arms control have to comply with the important principles of balance, reciprocity and verifiability. Proposals of a purely declaratory character will lead neither to disarmament nor to security but to frustration.

36. International disarmament and arms control measures cannot remove all disagreements and all conflicts in the world. But progress in disarmament will reduce the fear of aggression and increase confidence among nations. This in itself will improve and stabilize international relations. Progress towards these goals does not necessarily require international agreements. Much can also be achieved through national efforts and measures aimed at restraint and reassurance. For example, considerable progress could be made if individual nations simply exercised more restraint in their own military dispositions.

37. My country has for its part imposed such unilateral restrictions. Allied manoeuvres are never held in the vicinity of our border with the Soviet Union, but several hundred kilometres away. No foreign troops are stationed in Norway in peacetime. Furthermore, there are no nuclear or chemical weapons in Norway. These steps have been taken in order to avoid tension and to secure stability in the Nordic area.

38. The second special session on disarmament provides us with a timely opportunity to discuss the relationship between disarmament and international peace and security and to identify areas where progress can be made.

39. The agenda of this session is comprehensive and contains important issues. I shall briefly outline Norway's views on some of them.

40. Our work at this session should take as its point of departure the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session. On the basis of that Document and a realistic evaluation of the international situation we should be able to work out a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Norway attaches great importance to such a programme and hopes that it will serve as a useful guide for future negotiations. In order to fulfil these expectations it is important that it should be adopted by consensus.

41. During the years ahead nuclear disarmament and arms control must take priority on our agenda. Further increases in nuclear-weapon arsenals must be prevented and substantial reductions should be achieved. At the same time, the proliferation of such arms to new countries and regions must also be halted. These two sets of problems are interlinked. A lack of progress in the field of nuclear disarmament will make it more difficult to uphold the present non-proliferation régime. Thus progress in these two fields should be seen as complementary and be pursued in a parallel way. In this connexion I draw the attention of the Assembly to a document which Norway, together with the other Nordic countries, has submitted to this session and which elaborates further on these matters [*A/S-12/AC.1/49, annex*].

42. Norway considers a comprehensive test ban to be essential in terms of both halting the nuclear-arms race and supporting non-proliferation efforts, and we welcome the establishment at Geneva of a separate working group on a nuclear-test ban [*A/S-12/2, para. 38*]. I take this opportunity to repeat the Norwegian Government's offer to make the Norwegian Seismic Array [*NORSAR*] available as a station in a global seismic verification system. In a document submitted by Norway to this session, we have outlined a number of ideas on how further to improve existing possibilities for verification of a comprehensive test ban [*A/S-12/23, annex*].

43. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned also constitutes an important measure in terms of preventing the further spread of nuclear weapons.

44. The establishment of such a zone has been discussed with regard to northern Europe. If the ongoing negotiations reach positive conclusions, a nuclear-weapon-free zone could later become an element in negotiated agreements between NATO and the Warsaw Pact involving further reductions of nuclear weapons on both sides. In that part of the world, nuclear-weapon-free zones will, however, be meaningful only if they contribute to mutual and balanced nuclear disarmament and thus serve to enhance security, not to diminish it. To alleviate the risk of nuclear weapons still being used against the zone,

it is mandatory that the nuclear arms be dismantled and destroyed and not merely moved to other areas.

45. The question of a chemical-weapons convention remains, in our view, one of the most important issues on the international agenda for disarmament. We hope that the twelfth special session will give the necessary impetus to the efforts to prohibit the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons, as well as the destruction of existing stocks.

46. Genuine disarmament should release resources for civilian development purposes. The recommendation of the Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, in which Norway participated, provides a basis for the United Nations work in this field. In a separate document before the Assembly, Norway, together with the other Nordic countries, has stated its views on the implementation of this study [A/S-12/18, annex]. The collection and dissemination of information on the military use of resources and arms transfers will strengthen the United Nations data base for international reporting of military expenditures. We hope that more countries will make use of this reporting system.

47. It would also serve to increase confidence among States if all Governments undertook as a general rule to assess the long-term and short-term impact on arms control and disarmament efforts when making national decisions on the procurement of major weapons systems and other important defence measures. Conversely, the potential effects of arms control and disarmament proposals should be assessed through a similar process.

48. In the view of the Norwegian Government, it is desirable to strengthen further the efficiency and the role of the multilateral disarmament machinery. In this regard the Committee on Disarmament is of particular significance. Norway supports an increase in the Committee's membership in order to allow for interested nations to join. Norway is already taking part in the Committee and its working groups as an active observer. Should the second special session on disarmament recommend an expansion of the Committee's membership, Norway will actively seek full membership. If appointed a member, Norway would be prepared to establish a separate disarmament delegation at Geneva.

49. Contributions to our efforts from non-governmental organizations should be welcomed and their proposals given due consideration.

50. Since the first special session on disarmament, in 1978, the fear of nuclear war has increased. We share these concerns. A truly world-wide public opinion expressing itself freely and openly for peace and disarmament is a challenge as well as an inspiration for responsible leaders.

51. In the view of the Norwegian Government, the World Disarmament Campaign deserves the support of the United Nations. It is important, however, that the Campaign become truly universal, so that there may be an adequate balance as to its accessibility in various political environments and in all countries.

52. It is the sincere hope of the Norwegian Government that the second special session on disarmament will provide a good basis for real progress in the field

of disarmament. We are convinced that this hope is shared by all delegations taking part in this session. But that being so, why is it so difficult to achieve concrete results? Maybe the explanation is that every one of us is pursuing too strongly his own individual approaches and perhaps not willing enough to take sufficient account of the views of others. Both realism and a will to compromise is required from all of us in order to transform hopes and expectations into meaningful achievements. May we all be able to bear this in mind during our continued work.

53. Mr. TÓMASSON (Iceland): My delegation extends warm congratulations to Mr. Kittani on his election as President of the General Assembly at this second special session devoted to disarmament. His record of performance in guiding the sessions of the General Assembly for the past nine months gives us great confidence that under his leadership the work of this session will be crowned with success.

54. Four years have passed since the first special session of the General Assembly entirely devoted to disarmament concluded its work. The results of that special session, embodied in the Final Document, which was adopted by consensus, were of great historical significance, and concrete important measures have followed, especially with regard to the machinery making the United Nations primarily responsible for disarmament deliberations and negotiations.

55. However, the 157 Member States of the United Nations now assembled for the second special session on disarmament have to deal with the very same basic facts as were deliberated upon four years ago. Hardly any concrete measures of disarmament have been agreed upon recently. The arms race has continued unabated, at an accelerated pace, even. And while tremendous financial resources are increasingly being squandered on all kinds of armaments all over the world, a great number of people, a large proportion of the world's population, suffer from hunger and sickness, and their fundamental needs in housing and educational advancement are unfulfilled. We all know that a nuclear war would mean the end of civilization on this earth, even the end of the human race. At the first special session on disarmament we were all agreed that mankind has to remove the threat of a nuclear holocaust. Disarmament and arms control are essential for the prevention of war, the strengthening of international peace and security and the economic and social advancement of all peoples.

56. At its thirty-fifth session, the General Assembly solemnly declared the 1980s to be, as well as the Third United Nations Development Decade, the Second Disarmament Decade [resolution 35/46] and strongly urged all Governments to work steadfastly during this period towards the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

57. At this second special session on disarmament we have to review the progress—or rather the lack of progress in most cases—in the implementation of the decisions and recommendations contained in the Final Document. We hope that an opportunity will present itself at this session for halting the deplorable trends and developments of the most recent past. With the

political will on the part of all, a fresh impetus can be given here to the process of genuine disarmament, leading to militarily significant, equitable and verifiable agreements on the control and reduction of armaments. It is obvious that all nations of the world have to contribute to the disarmament process if the arms race is to be halted and reductions of armaments are to be achieved. The basis for genuine disarmament, or at least agreement on the limitation of armaments, is, in the final analysis, mutual trust between States and confidence that other nations will not resort to the use of military force.

58. At the tenth special session, in 1978, the nuclear-weapon States, among others, called for the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting all nuclear-weapon tests, and yet during these four years since the first special session on an average one nuclear weapon test has been conducted each and every week. A comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty has still not been concluded.

59. The two super-Powers play the major role in disarmament questions, and their responsibility in that sphere is by far the greatest. Unfortunately, a very great improvement is needed before mutual trust can be established between the two. And their enormous arsenals are such a large part of the total armaments in the world that there is no possibility of achieving major success in disarmament negotiations if they are in reality not willing to co-operate. This applies to all disarmament forums, whether at this very session of the General Assembly, in the Committee on Disarmament or in the negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions.

60. The responsibility of the two super-Powers is obviously greatest with respect to nuclear armaments. The nuclear arms race must be curbed and effective measures of nuclear disarmament must be adopted, because the very future of mankind is at stake. The whole world puts great hope in the ongoing negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on intermediate-range nuclear forces. Furthermore, we all welcome the forthcoming START talks between the United States and the Soviet Union. It is obvious that both parties to these negotiations will have to show the political will to improve relations between East and West and make efforts to relax tensions and increase mutual trust if they are to achieve positive results. The Icelandic Government fully supports these efforts at negotiations on substantial reductions in the nuclear weapons of the two countries. It is to be hoped that both sets of negotiations between the super-Powers will be conducted with all deliberate speed and that they will have an equitable outcome which promises enhanced security for all.

61. At the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly the Foreign Minister of Iceland, Mr. Ólafur Johannesson, said during the general debate:

“The arms race is different from other races in that the faster the pace the greater the probability that all participants will lose. Therefore, the question of security must not revolve around the attainment of military superiority. Increased security must be attained through military balance at the lowest possible level of armaments and forces.” [8th meeting, para. 13.]

62. Iceland has no military establishment of its own. Because of the country's geographic position and because of international developments during the past few decades, the great majority of the Icelandic people is convinced that its security is best safeguarded by participating in the defensive efforts of the Atlantic alliance, at least as long as the unsettled state of world affairs remains as it has been in recent years.

63. Iceland has supported and will always support all effective measures to eliminate the causes of international tension and conflict, and we will continue to support all constructive efforts at real disarmament.

64. Iceland has become a party to the international agreements on partial disarmament negotiated within the United Nations framework over the past two decades, beginning with the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water.² Those agreements need to be expanded and the test ban made comprehensive, and further limitations on nuclear armaments have to be agreed upon. We urge all nations to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In this connexion I refer to the working paper submitted by the Nordic countries on the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons [A/S-12/21, annex].

65. The Icelandic nation is increasingly concerned at the continuing naval arms race. Submarines with nuclear weapons aboard are constantly sailing the seven seas, and some of them do not seem to have any hesitation in entering stealthily the territorial waters of coastal States, as has become quite evident recently.

66. Because of Iceland's geographic position in a strategically important area, it is only natural that these developments remain a preoccupation of the Icelandic nation. Proposals have been made in the Althing, the Icelandic parliament, on studying ways and means of arresting these alarming developments, and in this context the possibility is being investigated of calling an international conference on nuclear weapons in the North Atlantic.

67. Finally, I should like to come back to what I referred to at the outset, namely, the economic anomaly that while tremendous amounts of money are squandered on all kinds of armaments all over the world, far too great a part of mankind suffers from hunger and sickness.

68. Recently, UNICEF presented an overwhelming picture of one aspect of this situation. In 1981 the life of a child in this world was estimated to be worth approximately \$100 a year. If this amount had been wisely spent for each and every one of the 500 million poorest mothers and children in the world they could have been provided with better food, basic education and health, more sanitation and cleaner water. Quite simply, such action designed to provide at once for the basic needs of all the children in the world would have been the greatest humanitarian deed imaginable and one of the best possible investments for mankind. In 1981, \$100 a year for a child was a higher price than the world was prepared to pay. The result was that one child died every other second, or 17 million over the whole year. Fewer than 10 per cent of these children had been vaccinated. That

would have cost \$5 per child. This was, however, too expensive, and consequently 5 million children died.

69. The year 1982 will be no better. This very day 40,000 children will die, 100 million children will go hungry to bed tonight, and before the end of the year 10 million children will have suffered permanent physical and mental damage due to malnutrition.

70. These are gloomy facts, but they are reality all the same. We should bear these facts in mind when we think about the colossal amounts of money spent on armaments in the third world and the industrialized States. Therefore, it is with good reason that the five Nordic countries have submitted to this special session of the General Assembly a working paper on the relationship between disarmament and economic development [A/S-12/18]. It is the hope of my Government that as many delegations as possible will be able to support the views set forth in this document.

71. It is not enough to make lofty promises and agree that the whole world is menaced by the arms race and nuclear catastrophe. Let us turn words into deeds. It is of the greatest importance that every effort be made to bring about mutual confidence between States, so that armaments may be reduced and the resources diverted instead to the promotion of economic and social progress and development throughout the world.

72. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now hear a statement by the Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. I have great pleasure in welcoming Mr. Andreas A. M. van Agt and inviting him to address the General Assembly.

73. Mr. VAN AGT (Netherlands): At the outset of my statement I wish to express, on behalf of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, my great satisfaction at seeing this important session under the able guidance of Mr. Kittani of Iraq.

74. What I have to say here is, of course, in continuation and confirmation of what has already been stated in the impressive address delivered by Mr. Tindemans on behalf of the 10 members of the European Community.

75. The world finds itself today in a strange and even contradictory situation. While the need for disarmament is more than ever present in the hearts and minds of all peoples, disarmament itself has not been allowed to advance significantly in real terms along the lines of the recommendations of the first special session on disarmament, in 1978. Contrary to hopes and expectations, the impressive list of proposals recommended in the Final Document of 1978 has hardly been implemented. At the same time international relations have taken a turn for the worse, and the development and procurement of weapons systems have kept pace with this tendency. At this very moment several wars are being fought. A reversal of this trend will not come about without our very best efforts, and even then it will be difficult enough to achieve.

76. The search by Governments for a safer world finds its roots in the deepest aspirations of our peoples. Here at the United Nations we are on stage: everything we say and do or fail to achieve at this session will be watched by millions of our citizens, whose

alarm at the dangers threatening them is not only understandable but often justified and legitimate. In a number of Western countries, my own included, this grave concern has inspired the growth of massive peace movements. If the peoples in other countries, where freedom of expression is severely circumscribed, were free to organize disarmament rallies I have no doubt that the turn-out would be as great as it was in New York or Amsterdam.

77. Does this public interest mean that the World Disarmament Campaign, primarily aimed at the mobilization of public opinion, has already become redundant? In my opinion it means nothing of the kind. Now that the President of this special session has solemnly launched the World Disarmament Campaign, which he did on the opening day of the session, I wish to state that in the view of my Government, world-wide dissemination of impartial and factual information by the United Nations is vital, to provide a solid and objective basis for public discussion and the search for sound solutions, going well beyond the mere expression of an ideal.

78. A renewed effort in the field of arms control and disarmament is imperative not only for reasons of international security, but also on economic grounds. The present world economic situation depends on a reversal of the arms race in order to increase the possibilities of finding solutions to world-wide social and economic problems, in particular to those facing the developing countries. We therefore welcome the recent United Nations study entitled *The Relationship between Disarmament and Development*¹ and consider it to be a unique and highly relevant document. Together with our partners in the European Community, we have responded to it in a manner that leaves no doubt about the joint conviction of the European Community countries of the necessity for a positive follow-up. In the Netherlands, there is a considerable public interest in conversion studies, which, in our view, merit further attention.

79. Where should a new impetus to the largely stagnating process of arms control and disarmament be given? Let us first take a look at general criteria that should direct this impetus.

80. The measures sought should be concrete in nature. In addition, any arrangement agreed upon should be based on reciprocity. If disarmament provisions are to be viable, they should be adequately verifiable. Measures envisaged should be militarily significant and at the same time realistic in scope, with emphasis on the most destabilizing phenomena. Purely declaratory efforts, without the underlying intention to live up to them, will only serve to raise false hopes, which will in turn create widespread disenchantment before long. While it would be rash to assume that disarmament could make spectacular progress in an adverse international political climate, States cannot afford to defer disarmament efforts because that climate is unfavourable. It can be argued that the existence of a political and ideological confrontation makes arms control and disarmament even more urgent and essential.

81. Following those general remarks, I should like to discuss four main themes, namely, nuclear disarmament.

mament, a chemical-weapons ban, conventional disarmament and the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

82. We should do our utmost to reduce to a minimum the risks inherent in the existence of nuclear weapons. We therefore welcome with deep satisfaction the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union will resume their talks on strategic nuclear armaments at the end of this month. The process first known as SALT and now known as START is no doubt the single most important instrument to stabilize the strategic balance and bring it down to lower levels. The mutual recognition of its importance is again demonstrated by the fact that both the United States and the Soviet Union are willing to live up to earlier agreements, SALT II included. Those agreements have contributed to stability and have slowed down the arms race in some areas. The need for further far-reaching reductions is widely recognized. Progress in this field is of vital interest not only to the two nations directly involved, but to the world at large. I firmly hope that START will make it possible to reach agreement on substantial reductions of strategic weapons, leading to much lower, but equal, levels.

83. Of crucial importance, too, are the negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces currently taking place between the United States and the Soviet Union at Geneva. Those negotiations cannot be conceived other than in close relation to the START process. In close consultation with its allies, the United States has made a proposal for the complete and world-wide elimination of United States and Soviet land-based longer-range intermediate-range nuclear force missiles. Achieving a mutually acceptable zero-level outcome would represent a major step on the road to disarmament.

84. When talking about strategic and intermediate-range nuclear weapons, we should not forget short-range nuclear weapons such as the neutron weapon. Because of the danger of reducing the nuclear threshold, the Netherlands Government, supported by Parliament, has expressed itself against the deployment of this weapon in Europe.

85. Limitations or quantitative reductions of nuclear weapons—however important on their own merits—are in themselves not sufficient, as Prime Minister Trudeau of Canada put it four years ago, “to suffocate the nuclear-arms race”. To that end, more comprehensive measures are required. Allow me, therefore, to dwell in some more detail upon the need for a comprehensive test ban and a cut-off, the latter implying an end to the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

86. In 1978, a comprehensive test ban appeared to be within reach. Today, we seem to be further away from this major objective. This regrettable situation developed in spite of the useful work done by the *Ad Hoc* Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events,³ in the framework of the Committee on Disarmament, who exerted their best efforts for the removal of technical obstacles with respect to the verification of such a ban. It is fortunate that a working group of the Committee on Disarmament has now been established. At the same time,

resumption of the trilateral negotiations between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, parallel with the multilateral negotiations, is, in our view, indispensable. Given sufficient political will, the remaining obstacles can be overcome.

87. A cut-off would constitute an even more fundamental measure than a comprehensive test ban. It would set absolute limits for the total volume of nuclear weapons. Although I recognize that vital security interests are at stake, I consider such a cut-off to be technically feasible. For its implementation, lessons can be drawn from the IAEA inspection system and the experience gained in safeguarding nuclear facilities. All aspects of a cut-off of production of fissionable material for weapons purposes should be urgently examined with a view to drafting a specific proposal. The participation of nuclear-weapon States in such a study is, of course, essential.

88. Being realists, we cannot expect nuclear weapons to disappear overnight. In the foreseeable future they will be an essential element in the inventory of the armed forces of a number of major Powers and remain linked to the strategies of military alliances.

89. Against this background the nuclear-weapon States would take an important step forward by elaborating a common formula for their negative security guarantees, thus increasing the confidence of non-nuclear-weapon States that they will not be the victim of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against them.

90. At the tenth special session each of the nuclear-weapon States submitted its own formula for such an assurance. It is the feeling of many that it should be possible to incorporate the common elements in these national statements into a single formula. The Netherlands has suggested wording for such a common formula to the Committee on Disarmament [*A/S-12/2, chap. III, sect. C, annex III, last paragraph*].

91. Now we can but urge the nuclear-weapon States once again to take up this matter. We therefore warmly welcome the statement made on this subject by the Foreign Minister of France on 11 June [*9th meeting*]. This statement gave further support to our conviction that the process has advanced sufficiently for the General Assembly to make a breakthrough towards the attainment of a common formulation during this second special session on disarmament.

92. All the measures and steps that I have so far referred to would, by the same token, strengthen and increase the credibility of the régime established by the Non-Proliferation Treaty. This régime continues to be the cornerstone of the Netherlands policy on preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is my firmly held view that there is great danger in the horizontal as well as in the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. Proliferation would serve no one's interest and would further endanger global security.

93. I call on all the States that have not yet done so to become parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to accept safeguards on all their nuclear installations. The Netherlands Government also strongly advocates the establishment of new arrangements to improve the safety of the nuclear fuel cycle, such as an international plutonium storage régime.

94. The European situation illustrates how difficult it is to reduce dependence on nuclear weapons once they are part of an existing regional balance. In this connexion I should like to say a few words in pursuance of the recently resumed discussions on the question of the non-first-use of nuclear weapons. I shall do so by explaining the Netherlands position on this sensitive issue. First, let me postulate that even the slightest possibility of any use of any nuclear weapon horrifies us. The option of the use of nuclear weapons by the alliance to which the Netherlands belongs is relevant only in the event of aggression against us—that is, in the case of a serious violation of the Charter of the United Nations and in particular of the principle of the non-use of force embodied therein. The Charter explicitly recognizes the inherent right of individual and collective self-defence, and this obviously includes the right to determine what level of force is needed to dissuade the aggressor from pursuing his military activities. Leaving uncertain the circumstances in which nuclear weapons would be used against an aggressor is an integral part of our strategy to deter aggression in Europe. To take away that uncertainty in a situation in which a large conventional imbalance exists in Europe would increase rather than diminish the chance of a military conflict.

95. A serious non-first-use declaration can be an important confidence-building measure at a certain stage of the disarmament process, but in view of the present situation, in particular in Europe, it cannot be the first step. First we have to make progress in controlling and limiting the nuclear weapons themselves and create a stable balance between East and West in the conventional field also. This would in itself reduce the role of nuclear weapons in the overall military posture.

96. The European example demonstrates that it is of the greatest importance to prevent the introduction of nuclear weapons into regions where such weapons are not yet present. The Netherlands therefore continues to support the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones following the example of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).⁴ We sincerely hope that this Treaty will soon become fully effective.

97. So far I have spoken mainly about nuclear disarmament, but we should not allow our grave concern about those devastating weapons to make us lose sight of our mission to achieve general and complete disarmament in other fields of lethal weaponry as well.

98. Fortunately, the Netherlands has never been victim of the use of chemical weapons, but my Government is acutely aware of the horror that can be spread by those weapons, which continue to be perfected. Unprotected civilians are particularly vulnerable to this type of warfare. Chemical weapons fall within the categories of poisonous weapons and of weapons of mass destruction. They constitute a non-conventional category of their own. Their use had been rejected by the international community long before they were actually first used. Subsequently introduced international legal instruments have remained imperfect to this day.

99. The disconcerting reports on the possible use of chemical weapons in Afghanistan and South-East Asia and the threat of an imminent new round of arms competition in this field highlight the overriding necessity of the earliest conclusion of a treaty totally banning chemical weapons. In the Committee on Disarmament the Netherlands has actively contributed to the elaboration of such a treaty and will continue to do so.

100. Supported by the unanimous opinion of the Netherlands Parliament, I should like to reiterate from this rostrum that the Netherlands armed forces do not possess chemical weapons, that my Government does not consider introducing those weapons for its armed forces and that my Government also rejects the stationing of stockpiles of chemical weapons on Netherlands territory.

101. Preoccupation with nuclear armaments and chemical weapons should not make us forget that conventional weapons too are effective tools for inflicting death and destruction. By far the major share of military expenditures is absorbed by conventional armaments. They can also trigger the use of the even more devastating categories of weaponry that I discussed earlier. The Netherlands therefore underlines the importance of the study on conventional disarmament that is being undertaken [*see A/S-12/3, annex III*].

102. In Europe we are faced with the single largest concentration of conventional weapons in the world. This, among other considerations, makes us attach the greatest importance to efforts which are being undertaken to reduce confrontation and enhance stability within a regional framework. The Netherlands participates directly in the negotiations on mutual reductions of armed forces and associated measures in central Europe, and we will reduce our armed forces if an agreement is reached. A great deal of work has already been done by the negotiators at Vienna. In an attempt to give the negotiations a fresh impulse, Western participants will soon submit new comprehensive proposals. I hope that those proposals will provide the foundation for an early agreement on substantial reductions, resulting in a common collective ceiling in the short term.

103. In the broader framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe efforts have been undertaken for nearly a decade now to enhance peace, security and justice in the region. When the follow-up meeting reconvenes at Madrid this fall, we will continue our endeavours to reach a balanced and substantial concluding document, including a mandate for a conference on disarmament in Europe. As a first step, such a conference would seek agreement on a series of confidence-building and security-building measures that are militarily significant, binding, verifiable and applicable throughout the whole of Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals.

104. Confidence-building measures aim at openness and transparency and can reduce the misconceptions and uncertainties that are often a source of tension and a stimulus to the arms race. Far from being a substitute for disarmament, confidence-building measures can help bring about a climate conducive to actual disarmament measures. They remain relevant

even in later stages of the disarmament process. A good example is the availability of data on military budgets.

105. Many Western, neutral and non-aligned States have co-operated with the Secretary-General in submitting data on their military expenditures. The Netherlands has done so for the third consecutive year. My Government deplores the fact that certain other States continue to refuse to follow this example. If this situation is allowed to continue, the concept of agreements on a reduction of military budgets will unfortunately remain stranded at the declaratory stage.

106. Since the tenth special session the danger of an arms race in outer space has become acute. Not only are more and more satellites being used as the eyes and ears of modern military forces, but we are also witnessing the development and in some cases even the testing of anti-satellite weapon systems. The possibility of disabling satellites by attacks with anti-satellite weapons should be considered the most destabilizing aspect of an emerging arms race in outer space. At this very moment the feasibility of using new weapon concepts based on advanced scientific and technological principles for anti-satellite weaponry is beginning to be considered. Such developments would have serious implications for the international situation. We therefore welcomed the first exchange of views on this very complicated subject during the last spring session of the Committee on Disarmament, which I hope will be followed up during the coming summer session.

107. It is our firm belief that the prerequisites for arms control in outer space still exist, since no State seems as yet to possess a commanding lead in the relevant technology. Discussions and subsequent negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament would greatly benefit from speedy resumption by the United States and the Soviet Union of their bilateral negotiations on anti-satellite weapons.

108. Even a disarmament agenda containing only the most urgent matters to be dealt with in the immediate future is formidable. In recent years considerable changes and improvements have been effected in the structure of multilateral disarmament consultations. Yet, further improvements are still required. To that end the Netherlands recently made several proposals to the Secretary-General. One is that the Committee on Disarmament should meet all year round, a suggestion which we shall pursue further.

109. Another of these proposals is one which I now wish formally to submit to this special session. The need for improved procedures for monitoring the observance of existing agreements, such as those on biological and chemical weapons, has made itself acutely felt in recent years. This obvious lacuna has prompted the Netherlands Government to reformulate the proposal it put forward during the tenth special session as a first step towards the establishment of an international disarmament organization [*14th meeting, para. 154*].

110. An international disarmament organization, as we envisage it, could be defined as the operational framework for the implementation of international arms control and disarmament treaties with important functions in the field of verification and for the hand-

ling of complaints. In addition, such an organization could be instrumental in the preparation and organization of review conferences already provided for in several existing disarmament treaties and could serve as a clearing house for information on disarmament.

111. In presenting these preliminary views on an international disarmament organization, the Netherlands realizes that careful study and consideration are necessary before the international community can decide on the establishment of a new international organ. The results of ongoing disarmament negotiations, particularly those relating to chemical weapons and a comprehensive test ban, will also have a bearing on that subject. The Netherlands therefore proposes that a number of steps be taken which could ultimately lead to the establishment of an international disarmament organization and that, as a first step, the Secretary-General could seek the views of Governments on this question, in particular on the tasks to be allotted to such an organization, its structure and its links with the United Nations.

112. The Netherlands Government hopes that a decision to seek the views of Governments will be taken at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and will present proposals to that end.

113. To sum it all up, we in the Netherlands believe that, though the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament is not yet within reach, we should—even in these difficult times—be capable of taking a few practical steps towards it: disarmament in security, increased security through disarmament.

114. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the important statement he has just made.

115. Mr. AUDU (Nigeria): We are passing through very difficult times in the history of the United Nations. Some of the founding Members of the Organization are currently engaged in bloody conflicts. What is more, the cold war has never been colder. But we must not be discouraged. Now is the time for wise counsel, statesmanship and courage. It is therefore a matter of satisfaction for my delegation that this crucial second special session is taking place under the able presidency of Mr. Kittani. We remain confident that, as a worthy representative of his country, a fellow non-aligned State, he will bring to bear on our deliberations his rich experience and the expertise which he so effectively and generously placed at our disposal during the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

116. Only a few days ago we learned with shock and sadness of the passing away of His Majesty King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud, head of State and Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. I should like to convey to the Government and people of Saudi Arabia the condolences of the Government and people of my country.

117. Right from the time of independence, my country has been in the vanguard of the pursuit of disarmament negotiations. Looking back after two decades, we see that the gulf existing between aspirations and

achievements remains as formidable as ever. Our sustained and undiminished interest in the subject derives from three considerations. First, it is our fervent belief that the increasing reliance by nation States on the use of force rather than on negotiations and the good offices offered by the United Nations for the peaceful settlement of disputes is a sad commentary on our time and age. Secondly, the disproportionately large share of the world's resources being devoted to the arms race, against the background of increasing mass unemployment, in a world where over two thirds of the inhabitants live under conditions of abject poverty and want, is both scandalous and immoral. Thirdly, in the context of third world development needs, the arms race constitutes the most formidable single obstacle to progress.

118. The Preamble to the Charter of the United Nations affirms the determination of us all to exert the best of our endeavours to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. In line with this commitment and consistent with its primary purpose of maintaining international peace and security, the General Assembly, in its first-ever resolution, of 24 January 1946, gave substance to a first priority of laying down the principles of disarmament through the establishment of an Atomic Energy Commission with a mandate to submit proposals to the Security Council on the management of nuclear energy based on the following four provisions: first, that scientific information should be exchanged in the interest of the use of atomic energy for peace; secondly, that use of atomic energy should be controlled so as to ensure that it is only for peaceful purposes; thirdly, that atomic weapons should be eliminated from national arsenals; and fourthly, that there should be effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to make sure that there is no evasion of the required controls.

119. Today the arms race continues inexorably in its upward spiral while efforts at disarmament have been made subject to the vagaries of inter-State relations, as well as the political and ideological sensitivities subsisting among countries at any given time. In the circumstances of today's world of interdependence among States and mutuality of interests, the rationality of pursuing a military option is hardly tenable, particularly when the great majority of the world's population lives below the poverty line.

120. Four years ago the General Assembly convened its first special session devoted to disarmament against the background of an uncertain international climate. It was the largest and most representative gathering of nations ever assembled up to that date to consider disarmament problems.

121. The momentum generated by the holding of that special session succeeded, among other things, in sensitizing Governments, non-governmental organizations, peace and research institutions and the public at large to the deleterious consequences of the arms race and underscored the necessity for a concerted effort to halt and reverse it in the interest of human survival. Most importantly, it adopted by consensus a Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*] which, *inter alia*, established principles of a disarmament strategy, a Programme of Action replete with priorities and a restructured disarmament machinery. Sadly, the modest expectations subsumed in the provisions of that

Final Document have regrettably remained a mirage and almost a dead letter.

122. Today the situation is hardly different from what it was four years ago. The international climate not only has remained uncertain but has in fact deteriorated. The arms race has continued to undergo not only an increased quantitative development but also a qualitative improvement. While the quantitative aspect has been concerned with the quantum of sophisticated weaponry in the arsenals of States, the qualitative improvement has concentrated on modernization, accuracy and perfection of weapons, their systems and their vectors. In turn, the two distinct aspects of the arms race—the nuclear and the conventional—have embraced new concepts and doctrines to keep pace with advances in military science and technology. But the irony of it all is that the greater the advance in military technology, the more questionable the purposes of war become.

123. It is hardly necessary to try to justify the need for holding this second special session on disarmament. The justification is implicit in the existing state of play in international relations, in the use or threat of use of force by States against other States, in interference in the internal affairs of other States, in the existence of conflicts and hotbeds of tension in various regions of the world, in military intervention and the occupation of sovereign territories, in the overt attempts to create spheres of influence, in the denial of the inalienable rights of peoples to self-determination, in the effort by the big Powers to discharge their self-imposed world responsibilities, particularly in the third world, in furtherance of their geopolitical, geostrategic or economic self-interests, and, indeed, in the failure to implement the decisions and recommendations of the first special session on disarmament.

124. It is the firm belief of my Government that an acceptance by all States of the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations on the non-use of force in the conduct of inter-State relations constitutes the most solid basis for eliminating the danger of war and the current arms race. If States were to adhere to this principle we would not today be faced with the vexing questions of Afghanistan, Kampuchea, the Middle East crisis, Western Sahara and the Falkland Islands. It is our hope, however, that we shall ultimately find peaceful solutions to these problems.

125. It is a sad commentary on their value judgement that nations have tended to perceive their security only in terms of a military option and military capability. This, in the main, has provided the motive force for weapons acquisition by States, including even those less able to sustain such an unproductive arms race, at the risk of distortion of their national priorities and realities, given their weak economic base. Security for third world countries is not only limited to the requirements of defence, but extends to the necessity of providing adequate economic and social structures and the wherewithal for the realization of their full potential and national aspirations.

126. We have no doubt but that the two super-Powers, the nuclear-weapon States and the militarily significant States retain vicarious responsibility for

propelling the arms race. The responsibility also devolves on them to take the necessary first steps towards its limitation and reversal. In this connexion we dare to suggest that a unilateral decision by one super-Power, for example, to reduce by even 1 per cent its existing stockpile of nuclear weapons, weapons of mass destruction and conventional armaments might induce a mutual response by the other super-Power. And dare we hope that in turn this might induce other countries to follow suit? Is it too much to expect that the present leaders of humanity could have the wisdom, the courage and the far-sightedness to be thus magnanimous?

127. Nuclear disarmament remains the priority concern of mankind. Efforts must therefore be made to achieve it in the shortest possible time. The right time is now. In this regard we greet with enthusiasm the peace movements in Europe, North America and elsewhere, the proponents of "ground zero" and the public at large, who have continued to dramatize the unacceptability of the nuclear weapons option. We share with them the expectation that a nuclear freeze, which would entail a halt to nuclear testing, a halt to the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes and a halt to the further manufacture of nuclear weapons, could become immediately possible as a result of the deliberations of this special session.

128. My delegation is sometimes intrigued by the claims and counter-claims of the two super-Powers and, by extension, the two military alliances, as to which of them retains the edge of superiority in weaponry. Because of this, new weapons systems and their means of delivery have been developed and deployed by each side to close the conceived gap of vulnerability or to blunt the edge of superiority. The special session of the General Assembly should decide on the modalities of establishing the facts of the situation. This would certainly be a contribution to the disarmament process. The two super-Powers and their respective allies should not be allowed to play a match without a referee.

129. It is in the interests of all mankind that the disarmament dialogue between the two super-Powers should be maintained on a continuing basis, since strain or stress in their bilateral relations has profound implications for the arms race. In this regard my delegation notes that, although the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, which produced the SALT I and SALT II agreements, had not been conceived as disarmament measures, yet they helped to underscore the necessity of East-West détente. However, it is regrettable that SALT II, which we all greeted with enthusiasm when it was signed in June 1979, has still not been ratified. It is our hope that pending ratification both countries will endeavour to conduct themselves in line with the provisions of that agreement, at least until a more satisfactory one is achieved.

130. We note with interest the initiation of United States – Soviet negotiations on nuclear arms at Geneva last November, as well as the stated intention of both countries to commence negotiations on the reduction of strategic arms on 29 June 1982. We hope that these talks will live up to the expectations of the international community and produce constructive results in the interest of peace and disarmament.

131. The Non-Proliferation Treaty, concluded in 1968, remains the bedrock of the non-proliferation régime. My Government continues to believe that the implementation of the provisions of the Treaty entailed a balance of obligations and responsibilities on the part of both the nuclear-weapon States and the non-nuclear-weapon States that are parties to the Treaty.

132. Nigeria and indeed all of Africa have been particularly receptive to the objectives of the nuclear non-proliferation régime, out of concern for peace and in the conviction that the nuclear-weapon option, in our present circumstances, is inconsistent with our development aspirations. However, we retain the belief in our right to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. It is for these reasons that the majority of African countries have in fact become signatories of the Treaty. They can remain so only if the nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty show tangible proof of their readiness to fulfil their moral and legal obligations under the Treaty, to negotiate in good faith toward general and complete disarmament and to refrain from denying non-nuclear parties access to nuclear energy for peaceful purposes through recourse to discriminatory practices by means of clubs and cartels. The failure of the parties to agree on a document at the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in August 1980 was a manifestation of the wide crack that now exists in the Non-Proliferation Treaty wall.

133. As they have denied themselves the nuclear-weapon option through accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, it is only legitimate that the non-nuclear-weapon States should be provided with credible guarantees by the nuclear-weapon States that they will not be victims of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. My Government retains the expectation that such negative security guarantees should ultimately be made legally binding. We urge the Committee on Disarmament, which is currently considering this question, to endeavour to complete its work expeditiously.

134. Nigeria believes that collateral measures of disarmament provide an important contribution to the disarmament efforts. They should be seen as complementary to, and not substitutes for, actual disarmament measures. In this connexion we think that such concepts as those of nuclear-weapon-free zones, zones of peace and so on should be actively pursued.

135. But of major importance is the question of military expenditures, which promote the growth of the arms race. There is a clear necessity for their immediate reduction, first by the nuclear-weapon States, followed by the militarily significant States and then by other States. In other words, the freezing and reduction of military expenditures must be conceived and implemented within the framework of a global approach to disarmament, taking into account established objectives, principles and priorities.

136. The question of conventional disarmament is one in which all nations have a vital interest. Efforts in the field must take account of the legitimate defence requirements of States, the defence of sovereignty and the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination and independence. In this regard, my delega-

tion welcomes the decision of the General Assembly to appoint a Group of Experts on All Aspects of the Conventional Arms Race and on Disarmament relating to Conventional Weapons and Armed Forces [*resolution 36/97 A*]. My Government is pleased to provide an expert to participate in the work of the study group.

137. I should now like to make a few comments on a subject to which my country attaches the greatest importance. It is the question of the link between disarmament and development. On these two issues the future prospects of mankind depend.

138. The Final Document adopted by consensus four years ago recognizes that the economic and social consequences of the arms race are so detrimental that its continuation is obviously incompatible with the implementation of the new international economic order. Also, the recently concluded United Nations study entitled *The Relationship between Disarmament and Development*¹ leaves no doubt in our minds as to the close relationship between disarmament and development. We must not accept hunger, disease and war as inevitable. Indeed, the United Nations was founded to eliminate those three evils.

139. The astronomical increase in global annual expenditure on armaments from \$300 billion in 1978 to \$600 billion in 1981 represents a colossal waste of precious but limited resources in a world in which two thirds of the population live in squalor and abject poverty, while the gap between the industrialized North and the raw-materials-producing South becomes wider. The striking differences in population, per capita income and life expectancy make changes not only desirable but indeed imperative if the world economic and political systems are not to be subjected to perpetual stresses and disequilibrium.

140. It should by now be clear to all of us that the increasing global expenditures on arms have not only aggravated the problems of the developing countries trying to achieve adequate levels of economic and social development, but have also aggravated the current structural and economic crises facing the industrialized North. It seems either that only a few economic or political analysts fully appreciate the link between increasing expenditure on armaments and the consequential decreases in resources available for investment to stimulate the economy internally within the developed countries themselves, or that hardly any of the world's political leaders are courageous enough to implement the right policies to correct the situation.

141. There seems to be an attempt to play down the structural crisis which the developed countries themselves are facing. While recognizing the needs of developing countries, my delegation believes that such emphasis is often exaggerated, especially in the context of a moral issue like disarmament. We believe that the release of real resources through drastic reduction in military expenditures will provide for the well-being of all mankind when such resources are ploughed into socio-economic programmes in both developed and developing States. In this context, my delegation believes that at this special session the Assembly should examine the report on the United Nations study on disarmament and development and

adopt specific decisions that take into account the desire of the industrialized North to recover from its current recession and the development needs of the under-developed South. The world cannot pursue both development and an arms buildup at one and the same time. The two are incompatible, and one certainly has to give way to the other. The question is which one is to give way in our time and age.

142. I should like now to turn to the comprehensive programme of disarmament, which is seen by many as a blueprint for disarmament and as a document of hope. My delegation is very much aware of the enormous efforts that have been made in the Committee on Disarmament to elaborate the programme. We are also aware that a few problems of concept and substance exist, but we remain confident that, given the political will to negotiate, the problems are not insurmountable. My delegation expects that at this session the Assembly will address itself positively and constructively to resolving the remaining problems of the measures, time-frame and nature of the programme. It is in the interest of us all to be able to adopt the comprehensive programme of disarmament, which represents a unified perspective in disarmament negotiations leading to general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

143. As a means of encouraging expertise in the field in a growing number of States, particularly in the third world, my country was motivated to suggest at the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, in 1978, the establishment of a United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament [*6th meeting, paras. 96 and 97*]. My delegation believes, and its implementation thus far confirms, that the programme of fellowships on disarmament has been one of the most concrete results of the first special session on disarmament. Encouraged by this development, and on the basis of the growing interest shown in the programme by an ever-increasing number of States, my delegation would like to suggest that the General Assembly give consideration to the desirability of increasing the number of fellowships from the current 20 to at least 25 as from 1983. It is our conviction that such a modest increase would respond meaningfully to the growing demand and the acceptance of the programme as a useful instrument in promoting expertise in and awareness of disarmament. In this connexion I should like to stress that, if the fellowships programme is to continue to meet its objectives, adequate funds must be made available to meet the cost of its increased activities.

144. I cannot end my statement without drawing the attention of the General Assembly at this second special session on disarmament to the collective decision taken in 1964 at Cairo by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity on the denuclearization of Africa. Achievement of the objective of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa⁵ has continued to be frustrated by the minority white racist régime of South Africa through its development of a nuclear-weapon capability. Available data, including the Secretary-General's report, to which is annexed the Group of Experts' report entitled *South Africa's Plan and Capability in the Nuclear Field*,⁶ have confirmed incontrovertibly the ability of South Africa to produce

nuclear weapons. We draw attention particularly to the collaboration and collusion of some Western countries with the racist régime in this development. It is unacceptable that the glitter of gold and strategic minerals or other geopolitical or geostrategic interests of such countries should become a higher-priority consideration than the lives, liberty and well-being of other human beings. Where indeed are the convictions concerning decency, humanity, civilization, respect for democratic principles and rationality of which we hear so much and which are so often claimed by those same countries?

145. The General Assembly must seek to take measures to enforce sanctions against South Africa and discourage those Western countries from enabling it to destabilize the rest of Africa and pose a threat to international peace and security.

146. My delegation sees any act of restraint in nuclear collaboration with South Africa as a significant contribution to the non-proliferation régime.

147. This body should once again call upon all countries to desist forthwith from collaboration in the nuclear field with racist South Africa.

148. We all have a stake in survival. We must seek disarmament through the construction of peace, because, in the words of the Council of Churches of a Member State,

“We believe it our duty to pursue disarmament not just as a means to enhance security or to effect economies but as a clear Christian obligation, by which we mean that to use the human and material resources of God’s creation to prepare for destruction is contrary to God’s will for the human family.”

149. I am convinced that all the great religious faiths represented in the Assembly will concur with that statement.

150. Mr. DIALLO (Niger) (*interpretation from French*): Two days ago we heard the sad news of the death of His Majesty King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud of Saudi Arabia. I wish first of all to state our grief at the cruel bereavement which has stricken the fraternal and friendly people of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. I wish to express our most sincere condolences to the delegation of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

151. In electing Mr. Kittani to preside over the current session, the General Assembly gave fresh proof of its recognition of the competence, skill and wisdom with which he presided over the work of its thirty-sixth session and the special sessions on Namibia and the Middle East. I should like to take this opportunity to recall, on behalf of my delegation, the solemn tribute paid to Mr. Kittani by President Seyni Kountché during the thirty-sixth session [*25th meeting, paras. 9 to 12*] when he came to bring to the other peoples of the United Nations a message of peace, friendship and goodwill from the people of Niger.

152. I should like also to express publicly to our new Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, our confidence in and appreciation of him.

153. His election to head the Organization is a great honour for his country, Peru, and for the Latin American continent. We know the positive contribu-

tion of Latin America to the struggle of the peoples of the third world for their dignity, their freedom and their independence and its valuable contribution to the ongoing efforts of mankind to ensure peace, security and economic and social progress for all peoples.

154. But in his election we see above all the crowning of a long and active career, a career in the service of his country and, at the United Nations itself—of which he is now the highest official—and in other international bodies, in the service of international peace and security and of the economic and social progress of humanity. We congratulate him.

155. In paragraph 8 of its study entitled *Relationship between Disarmament and International Security*⁷ the Group of Experts appointed pursuant to paragraph 97 of resolution S-10/2 notes that

“The arms race involves, willingly or unwillingly, the militarily and economically most powerful States and the main political-military alliances, and, indirectly, the whole world, and has profound political, economic, social and psychological impacts on humanity”.

That emphasizes the massive dimensions and complexity of the problem which the Assembly is considering and which in many respects is one of the gravest challenges facing the world.

156. The arms race is indeed a prodigious problem owing to the immense material, financial and human resources it involves and the resulting danger for the very existence of mankind.

157. The reports issued by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute [*SIPRI*] give us an idea of the gigantic sums involved in the acquisition of armaments. For 1980 alone world-wide military expenditures were in the range of \$500 billion. Likewise it has now been established that some 500,000 researchers and engineers are at work on military projects which absorb close to 40 per cent of all the expenditures devoted to research and development in both the public and private sectors.

158. Those sums make possible the manufacture and massive stockpiling of sophisticated devices of death and destruction, thus creating a grave danger for all of mankind.

159. Shouldering its responsibility under the Charter, especially with regard to the maintenance of international peace and security, the Organization has, since its establishment, undertaken persistent efforts to halt this race towards the apocalypse and to promote détente. Thus, the United Nations has furthered the creation of negotiating bodies which have made an appreciable contribution to the consideration and adoption of measures to curb the arms race and to promote the achievement of general and complete disarmament.

Mr. Hazoumé (Benin), Vice-President, took the Chair.

160. Between 1946 and 1966 the General Assembly adopted nearly 100 resolutions on disarmament and related questions. Those efforts were continued in the framework of the First Disarmament Decade, which was solemnly proclaimed by the United Nations in 1969 [*resolution 2602 E (XXIV)*].

161. In recent years, the General Assembly has considered and adopted a large number of resolutions on disarmament questions, including that in December 1980 containing the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade [resolution 35/46, annex]. The thirty-fifth session alone saw the adoption of nearly 40 resolutions in this field.

162. That continuous activity of the Organization bears witness to the growing concern of the international community because of the arms race. But can we say that progress towards general and complete disarmament has been commensurate with those efforts by the Organization? A negative reply is given us in the thirteenth SIPRI Yearbook published on 27 May last. According to the Institute, world-wide military expenditures have increased by 3 per cent a year since 1978 and reached the astronomical figure of \$650 billion in 1981. I repeat: an increase of 3 per cent a year since 1978. This is something of a fateful sign. 1978 was the year of our first special session devoted to disarmament. It will thus have been the starting point of the steady movement of mankind towards death and destruction which is the problem with which we are now concerned.

163. SIPRI further informs us in its Yearbook that two of the Members of the Assembly have between them fire-power equivalent to 8 billion tons of TNT.

164. The projections carried out by the Washington Bureau of Population Studies at the same time inform us that this month, June 1982, the population of the world will reach 4.6 billion.

165. A comparison of the figures for the world population and those for the fire-power of those two countries alone demonstrates the insane magnitude of the danger which looms over the whole of our human race: those two countries possess the means to destroy our planet with a charge amounting to 1.8 tons of TNT for each of its inhabitants. Yes, as was noted by SIPRI researchers, 1981 was a bad year for those who hope for a less heavily armed and more peaceful world.

166. There is no doubt that the progress made towards disarmament has not measured up to our hopes and to the praiseworthy efforts of the Organization.

167. A large segment of international public opinion is showing more and more scepticism towards the disarmament enterprise.

168. The disillusion is so great that the present special session of the Assembly has aroused hope only in those among us blessed with unshakeable optimism. Possibly those of us who are responsible derive the courage to mount this rostrum only from the powerful desire for survival of the peoples we represent. But it is far from our intention to say or even to think that those who initiated this session performed a useless task.

169. We wish only to state the facts so as to draw lessons from them and to say what, from our viewpoint, ought to be done gradually to set the members of the international community on the path to general and complete disarmament.

170. The facts are as I have just described them; they are characterized by growing efforts—quantitative and qualitative efforts—to build up impressive arsenals and

to increase weapons stockpiles and military forces, and by a frantic race for mastery of the best technical and technological data for dealing death and sowing destruction, as though the principal participants in that race had discovered some secret which would ensure their immortality.

171. The lessons to be learned are that our efforts to halt the arms race and direct the world towards general and complete disarmament have so far been in vain. Therefore it is for the international community in the Second Disarmament Decade to give priority attention to a certain number of problems the solution of which would substantially promote the attainment of the objectives which our Governments have set themselves in regard to disarmament.

172. The present international situation is characterized by a state of tension unprecedented since the end of what was called "the cold war". Almost throughout the world we are witnessing muscle-flexing which foretells a joyless future.

173. In the Middle East, Israel continues with unbearable arrogance to disturb the peace and stability of the countries and peoples of that region of the world by an obdurate policy of Judaisation and the settlement of the territories illegally occupied since the 1967 war, by the persistent denial of the right of the Palestinian people to a State on the soil of their homeland, by repeated acts of aggression against its neighbours.

174. Yesterday it was the criminal bombing of the nuclear plant at Tamuz, which was unanimously deprecated and condemned by the international community. Then it was the illegal annexation of the Golan Heights. Today it is Lebanon which is being subjected with redoubled intensity to fire and bloodshed under the bombs and shells of the aircraft and tanks of the Israeli army.

175. In southern Africa a situation similar to that prevailing in the Middle East is being perpetuated and developed. In this connexion we note that colonialism, racism and *apartheid* obstinately hold fast in that part of the African continent. South Africa still occupies the territory of Namibia, subjects millions of men and women to the odious policy of *apartheid* and, without respite, organizes raids and armed incursions against the front-line States. This, too, is a situation which is incompatible with the objectives being sought by the present special session of the General Assembly.

176. Likewise, here and there in Africa we see hotbeds of tension created and developed by the greed, the will to dominate and manifold acts of intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign and independent States, which are thus by force of circumstances compelled to allocate an important part of their meagre resources to ensuring their security.

177. In other parts of the world the quest for spheres of influence has led certain Powers to commit and deploy their military forces beyond their borders and even in certain cases to occupy militarily the territories of other sovereign and independent States, in violation of all the rules of international law. These are situations which generate tensions in international relations and are themselves the cause of the acceleration of the arms race.

178. The international community, then, must resolutely devote itself to seeking and finding final solutions to the conflicts prevailing in the Middle East, Africa and other parts of the world.

179. The increasingly frequent recourse to the use or threat of use of force to settle inter-State disputes must be a subject of grave concern for the Organization in its efforts to achieve disarmament. Because of the military option for the settlement of disputes between them, many countries in many parts of the world are today involved or engaged in open armed conflicts.

180. The sabre-rattling and fury of war resounding from the various battlefields, the echoes of which reach us here, reveal not only the courage of the fighters but also the bitterness of the fighting, its deadly and destructive character—to the great joy of the warmongers.

181. It therefore becomes imperative for the international community to ensure strict compliance with the principle of the prohibition of the use or threat of use of force in international relations and to encourage and promote, concurrently, the peaceful settlement of disputes which may exist or arise among its members. The complete and rational use of the appropriate existing structures, both regionally and world-wide, would be a major contribution to the efforts of the United Nations to curb the arms race.

182. The final renunciation of the use of force and the systematic recourse to the peaceful means for the settlement of disputes between States would thus make it possible to convene and hold, with certain chances of success, regional disarmament conferences and at a later stage to envisage the holding of a world disarmament conference.

183. The pursuance of the policy of détente, with each State complying with the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations in its relations with other members of the international community is essential, in our view, to achieving the objectives of disarmament.

184. Thus, with détente, positive measures could be taken with regard to the spread of nuclear weapons, which is today for mankind the most threatening form of the arms race. The Government of Niger therefore welcome the will expressed by the main nuclear Powers of the world to resume negotiations on the limitation of nuclear weapons. Niger firmly believes in the need, for the very survival of mankind, to end without delay the spread, both horizontal and vertical, of nuclear weapons.

185. It also seems to us that the cause of disarmament would stand to gain much by being heard and understood by world public opinion. Too many extravagant claims and overheated passions too frequently accompany the disputes which arise among States here and there and quickly degenerate into armed conflicts. We are in an over-armed world and we face grave problems of all kinds. It is essential that not only Governments but also peoples recognize and understand the dangers inherent in this situation.

186. The Assembly must therefore draw up an inventory of information and data regarding the arms race and determine the most effective means for ensuring that they are disseminated as widely as possible, thus sensitizing world public opinion in favour of an increased effort to achieve general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

187. Those are some of the actions which, in our view, deserve to be given priority by the United Nations in the context of efforts which it has made for decades to achieve general and complete disarmament under international control.

188. The task which has brought us together here is not, we must realize, an easy one. It is a long-term task, which implies much patience, courage and perseverance in the effort. An important step will be taken in the attainment of the noble objective we are now pursuing when the innumerable armed conflicts which are bringing death and destruction to many parts of the world are resolved in accordance with the interests of all; when all sides definitively renounce the use or threat of use of force and accept recourse to peaceful means to settle disputes arising among them; when each country, in the East as well as in the West, in the North as well as in the South, decides that its conduct in its relations with the other members of the international community must conform to the spirit and letter of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

189. Our entire programme should ultimately consist in promoting respect for and effective implementation of the principles contained in that Declaration, in courageously and resolutely cultivating the spirit of détente and in making international co-operation a reality. For, in fact, nothing can replace international co-operation in the preservation and guaranteeing of the interests of each people and each country. It is assuredly a great mistake to think in terms of power, domination and spheres of influence in the pursuit of the special interests of each of our countries. There is, furthermore, something repugnant and revolting about such an attitude.

190. As President Seyni Kountché said from this rostrum during the thirty-sixth session,

“Mankind, which aspires to its well-being, happiness and survival, really has no need of all the weapons and death-dealing machines which it is being so feverishly pushed to acquire, only to find itself in the final analysis the only possible target of its own aberrations.” [25th meeting, para. 39.]

Such is the paradox of our world, in which on the one hand there is a tremendous squandering of resources and on the other vast areas of intolerable poverty.

191. The Group of Experts appointed by the Secretary-General to study the relationship between disarmament and development indicates, in this connexion, that some 570 million people are suffering from malnutrition in various parts of the world, that 800 million are illiterate, that 1.5 billion have only limited medical services, if indeed they have any at all, and that the number of children not attending school is as high as 250 million.

192. The astronomical expenditure of financial, material and human resources caused by the arms race could usefully be employed to combat that totality of sufferings and to ensure for mankind the well-being to which it aspires. Niger is ready to do everything it can to ensure the attainment of those goals.

193. Mr. VO DONG GIANG (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): Four years ago, in this very Hall, the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly was formally adopted, thus constituting a victory of peace-loving States and peoples in the persistent and complex struggle to eliminate the danger of a new world war, which would necessarily be a nuclear war. Since that time, contrary to our hopes, that important document has not been implemented, and the international situation has further deteriorated. In spite of the commendable efforts of the majority of its members, the Committee on Disarmament has not achieved any tangible results. Soviet-American negotiations on disarmament have been broken off. The arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race, far from having been curbed, has been speeded up more than ever. The situation in Europe, the theatre of two world wars in the first half of our century, has become more tense, seriously compromising East-West détente and placing all mankind under the threat of a nuclear war of extermination. At the same time, new crises are emerging on every continent, while existing crises have become more explosive and serious.

194. Where are the causes of the impasse and even the reversal with regard to disarmament and of the tense and explosive situation in the world? Who is to assume responsibility? What can be done to halt and reverse the arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race, in order to achieve general and complete disarmament and to guarantee a lasting and stable peace, thereby responding to the legitimate and fervent aspirations of billions of people on our planet?

195. Although the Second World War caused mankind vast loss of human life and material goods, mowing down tens of millions of people, destroying countless villages and towns, economic installations and the cultural artifacts of many of the world's countries, it constituted at the same time an excellent business opportunity for the arms merchants, the magnates of the foremost imperialist entity, to grow rich quickly, enabling that country to become the dominant Power both economically and financially within the world capitalist system. Absolute economic supremacy and a monopoly on the atomic weapon were the two factors that that country intended to employ in order to maintain its position as the "sole leader" and its domination over its allies and other nations.

196. That illusion, however, quickly faded. After having lost the monopoly of the atomic weapon, that warmongering Power sought by every means to guarantee military supremacy for itself, and nuclear supremacy in particular. It was and it remains a pioneer in the production of new nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, each more sophisticated and dangerous than the last. Thus, the arms race launched by that Power has been continuously pursued and accelerated on an ever larger scale, wasting each year hundreds of millions of dollars

that should have been used for the social and economic development of nations and for the urgent material and intellectual needs of mankind.

197. In order to enjoy total freedom of action in enhancing their war potential, the leaders of that country have always taken a negative attitude to disarmament initiatives put forward by the socialist countries, the non-aligned countries and other peace-loving countries. They have created obstacles and have systematically sabotaged bilateral or multilateral negotiations on this vital problem. It is common knowledge that the draft international convention on the permanent prohibition of the production and use of nuclear weapons put forward by the Soviet Union as long ago as 1946, when it did not yet have the atomic weapon, was rejected because those leaders harboured the illusion that they could perpetuate their nuclear monopoly in order to achieve their aim of world hegemony. Since then the arms race has gone on at an increasing pace, bringing mankind every day closer to nuclear catastrophe.

198. In response to the well-founded concern of the international community, the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session adopted, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, an historic document, the Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe [*resolution 36/100*]. Once again, the party that earlier opposed the conclusion of a convention on the complete prohibition of the production and use of nuclear weapons opposed that Declaration, because the Declaration strongly condemned anyone who would have the audacity to be the first to use nuclear weapons, proclaiming that such an act would be "the gravest crime against humanity" [*ibid.*, para. 1].

199. It is not by chance that a major nuclear Power takes such an attitude to a question that concerns the very survival of mankind—the prohibition of nuclear weapons. Having obtained the nuclear weapon, that country immediately began to prepare strategies and plans for the use of that odious weapon. All those military strategies—from "massive nuclear reprisals" to the present concept of "limited nuclear war", including that of "phased responses"—are clearly aggressive, with the nuclear weapon as a trump card. The doctrine or strategy of limited nuclear war, which has been talked about cynically recently, is basically a variation of one and the same concept—the use of the strategic arm as a strike force in a "preventive attack". That doctrine is extremely dangerous, for it seeks to delude people by trying to convince them that nuclear war could be acceptable because it is only limited and will not lead to disaster for mankind.

200. To achieve their ends, those concerned have openly demanded to negotiate from a position of strength, have sought by all possible means to delay the negotiations under way and not to ratify the treaty already signed and have even called into question the treaty already ratified on the limitation of strategic weapons, using as their pretext the need to guarantee their security and national interests. In fact, this is nothing but an attempt to subordinate the negotiations on disarmament to their armaments programmes.

201. However, at the United Nations, as in all other forums, the representatives of the most warmongering Power in the world have ceaselessly proclaimed their

so-called desire for peace, posing as the champions of the freedom of peoples. The peoples of the world clearly understand that that rhetoric about peace and freedom is designed precisely to conceal acts of war, aggression and domination of peoples. In the past four decades those circles have gathered together the most reactionary and militaristic forces and recently have intensified their collusion with the expansionists and hegemonists of a large Asian nation—those who promote great chaos in the world—to threaten the peace, independence and sovereignty of peoples and to promote hundreds of armed conflicts, causing the death of tens of millions of people in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

202. With more than 1,500 military bases and more than half a million troops in foreign countries and with 200,000 men in their rapid deployment force, the militaristic forces want to intervene anywhere in the world which they consider relevant to the vital interests of their country from the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf to Central America and the Caribbean region and so on. They arrogate to themselves the right to impose economic blockades, to conduct subversive activities and to use force and the threat of force against independent countries that refuse to submit to their diktat. Without the protection of their overseas friends, how could the Pretoria racists have maintained to this day the vile *apartheid* régime and their colonial domination in South Africa and Namibia? How could they have carried out acts of aggression against the other countries of the region, and in particular against Angola, Mozambique and Seychelles? How could the Israeli Zionists have continued their illegal occupation of the territories of Palestine and other Arab countries, continued to massacre their peoples and, in particular, carried out the recent savage, large-scale aggression against Lebanon and Syria, in spite of all the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and in spite of the unanimous condemnation throughout the world? Without the assistance given by the leader of imperialism to fascist, dictatorial régimes, the struggle of the peoples of Chile, El Salvador and Western Sahara to exercise the right to self-determination and independence might have been victorious. That same warmongering Power continues to maintain colonial domination over the peoples of Puerto Rico and Micronesia and stands openly at the side of the colonialist aggressors on the question of the Malvinas Islands.

203. The myth of the increased threat of the Soviet Union is completely groundless. It has been invented to justify the new phase of the arms race started in 1978 by the country to which I have been referring; to justify the undeclared criminal war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan; to conceal the war of destruction by proxy waged to restore the genocidal régime to Kampuchea against the young People's Republic of Kampuchea and against the other countries of Indochina; to conceal the manoeuvres and actions aimed at reversing the situation in the Polish People's Republic; to interfere in the internal affairs of the socialist countries of Eastern Europe and to sabotage East-West détente in Europe.

204. In the campaign of hostile propaganda aimed at the Soviet Union and the socialist community, pride of place is given to the myth about the alleged use by

the Soviet Union, Viet Nam and Laos of toxic chemicals in Afghanistan, Kampuchea and Laos. In spite of the conclusions of the Group of Experts to Investigate Reports on the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons, contained in the annex to the Secretary-General's report,⁸ that the accusations levelled against those three countries are groundless and in spite of the fact that those who participated in inventing imaginary evidence publicly denounced the deceit of their Government, the United States endeavoured to involve the United Nations deeper in that infamous propaganda operation. A number of officials of that country, including the highest leader, declared shamelessly that they have evidence or that they will find it. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam as well as the Democratic People's Republic of Laos have categorically rejected that new farce. It is highly regrettable that in this forum there are still countries that echo those fallacious allegations.

205. Neither the use of magic nor prevarications can whitewash the imperialists' heinous crimes, which have been condemned by world public opinion, of having waged a chemical war of annihilation against the Vietnamese people and the other Indo-Chinese peoples, leaving in its train immeasurable consequences for millions of Indo-Chinese and for tens of thousands of American veterans and their families, as well as for the environment.

206. How can the United States use the so-called crisis of Afghanistan, which they themselves invented, to justify an increase in their military budget to an unprecedented level and their decision to deploy medium-range missiles in Western Europe as well as their decision to introduce rapid deployment forces in the Persian Gulf region? All of that is an integral part of their plan to provoke tension and to recover their military superiority, and it was decided upon well before the dispatch by the Soviet Union of limited military contingents to Afghanistan to help that people to preserve its revolutionary accomplishments from the subversive activities on the part of reactionary Afghan elements maintained from abroad. It is a fabrication which does not take into account public opinion when attempts are made to have others believe that the situation in the Indian Ocean has become tense as a result of "the Afghanistan incident" because it has been well known for a long time that, as was officially recognized by the United States representative in the First Committee of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, the United States has never supported the idea of convening a conference in order to implement the 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace [*resolution 2832 (XXVI)*].

207. Public opinion is daily becoming more aware that the so-called crisis in Kampuchea is nothing more than a crafty and perfidious device of psychological warfare fabricated by China in collusion with the United States in order to react frantically and desperately to the crumbling of the genocidal régime in Kampuchea and to stem the renaissance and development of the Kampuchean people under the leadership of the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea. Distorting the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and using the banner of anti-Sovietism, they attempt to mobilize public opinion in order to discredit an act of justice and of good

conscience undertaken by Viet Nam towards Kampuchea. In fact, they are defending no principle but the cadaver of the genocidal régime which they still cherish the illusion of resuscitating to prevent any change in accordance with the right of self-determination and other basic national rights of the Kampuchean people, because any such change runs counter to their hegemonistic interests in South-East Asia and in the world at large. We wonder why the ringleader of imperialism and the international reactionaries can arrogate to themselves the right to enter into collusion in the struggle against the peoples of Viet Nam and of other countries of Indo-China, while they do not accept the fact that the three Indo-Chinese peoples have a right to solidarity with each other and to exercise their legitimate right to collective self-defence. If it is not because of hegemonistic designs in South-East Asia, why were they furious when Viet Nam signed the Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation with the Soviet Union? Everyone knows that the Soviet Union, for some 60 years of its existence, has always supported peoples struggling for self-determination and independence, has always been on the side of peoples struggling for peace and peaceful coexistence throughout the world and has never joined in wars of aggression in South-East Asia or in any other part of the world. It is to be deplored that at this rostrum, in describing the world situation since the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the representative of a country in South-East Asia distorted the truth, indicating that the overthrow of the genocidal régime in Kampuchea as well as the prevention of the restoration of that régime constitute a source of tension in the region, while it did not dare mention a highly criminal event, the death-dealing war of aggression conducted by China against Viet Nam in February 1979 with the approval and support of the United States.

208. It is perfectly clear that the party guilty of creating tension in the world, of sabotaging East-West détente, of opposing disarmament and of intensifying the arms race, of using a position of strength and of opposing the independence and sovereignty of peoples, international peace and security, that trouble-maker and warmonger, is precisely American imperialism. The position of strength that it seeks to achieve is nothing but an attempt to recover lost positions, its nostalgia for the privileges of old, a dream of reviving the golden age which will never return.

209. Peoples throughout the world must denounce and condemn these attempts and oblige the warmongers genuinely to respect the desire of billions of people for peace. It is in this way that genuine disarmament can be achieved. The international community will certainly not be duped by manoeuvres and activities aimed at concealing the crimes of imperialism. The realities of history since the appearance of nuclear weapons have eloquently demonstrated that the root cause of the frantic arms race, the root cause of the danger of a nuclear war of annihilation resides neither in the existence of two military and political blocs, nor in confrontation between those two blocs, nor in the policies of both major nuclear Powers, because only one of those two started the arms race and attempted by every means possible to embark on the

course of nuclear war, while the other Power is sparing no effort to prevent this.

210. Having emerged in the aftermath of imperialist wars and the crumbling of the colonialist system, the socialist countries and the young independent countries have grown in peace. Their peoples therefore need peace to reconstruct their countries and to develop their economies that have been ravaged by war and imperialist and colonialist exploitation. Being constantly threatened by wars of aggression launched by the imperialists who are attempting to reimpose their domination, those young States are not able to devote all their human and material resources to the reconstruction and the development of their countries; they are obliged to reserve a significant share for national defence. This is the only alternative available to them to preserve their independence and national sovereignty and to thwart the bellicose aims of the imperialists and preserve world peace.

211. Having been compelled to strengthen their defence capacity, the socialist countries, non-aligned countries and other peace-loving countries have always demonstrated goodwill in negotiating on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security in order to stop and reverse the arms race, to achieve partial disarmament and to progress towards general and complete disarmament.

212. By its very nature, socialism means peace. Under the socialist system there is no place for social strata that profit from and grow wealthy from preparations for war. The foreign policy of the socialist countries is one of peace and friendship among nations. In the field of disarmament the socialist countries have always taken a positive attitude. They have not only advanced many constructive initiatives, but have also taken unilateral actions in order to reduce the danger of military confrontation in Europe.

213. The well-known Peace Programme, adopted by the twenty-sixth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and its recent proposals on disarmament, in particular the solemn commitment with immediate effect made by the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, put forward by President Leonid Brezhnev in his message to this session of the General Assembly [*12th meeting*], are new and eloquent proof that the Soviet State has no greater interest than to spare mankind a nuclear catastrophe. That Peace Programme and those recent proposals involve a series of important measures aimed at limiting the arms race, eliminating all hotbeds of tension, strengthening mutual trust among States and improving the international climate. That Programme and those proposals enjoy broad support and esteem throughout the world and are a valuable contribution to the development of the struggle for disarmament, the relaxation of tension and the maintenance of world peace.

214. The non-aligned movement, which took the initiative for convening the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, considers the struggle against the arms race and for peace and détente and for the prevention of a nuclear war to be one of its most important objectives. The Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana in 1979, declared

that all the peoples should participate in the endeavour "to consolidate détente; to extend it to all parts of the world; and to avert the nuclear threat, the arms build-up and war".⁹ In that spirit, the Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Havana on the eve of this special session asked that negotiations on arms limitation and disarmament no longer be linked to the strengthening of weaponry and that they be resumed without delay.

215. During the past days, thousands of non-governmental organizations and hundreds of millions of people on all continents have raised their voices as one in order to stay the hand of the warmongers, to ask for an end to be put to the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race and for the immediate resumption of negotiations on strategic arms limitations to eliminate the danger of nuclear disaster in order to preserve the most sacred human right—the right to life.

216. The United States cannot continue to ignore this vital and pressing demand of all mankind. It cannot continue to cherish the hysterical illusion that victory can be won in a nuclear confrontation whose consequences for the very existence of mankind would be unforeseeable. They ought to sit down at the negotiating table and really begin negotiations on questions of substance with a constructive political will, in response to the most important aspirations of peoples throughout the world, including the American people.

217. The Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament gave priority to negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Events over the past four years demonstrate that that decision was fully justified. In the joint efforts of the international community to eliminate the danger of nuclear war, it is above all for the nuclear Powers to demonstrate goodwill and seriously begin negotiations.

218. Bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States should be conducted on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security. Any attempt to win military superiority runs counter to that principle and cannot fail to cause a deadlock in the negotiations. We see no reason for the delay in ratifying SALT II, which was solemnly signed by the two major Powers three years ago.

219. Multilateral negotiations should also be speeded up, and in these all the nuclear-weapon countries have a particular responsibility. The peoples can no longer tolerate the fact that a permanent member of the Security Council—a nuclear-weapon country which produced the doctrine of the inevitability of a third world war, which proclaims itself a member of the "NATO in the East", which has conducted a large-scale war of aggression against Viet Nam and which still occupies parts of the territory of Viet Nam and of several other neighbouring countries—is not taking part in the negotiations and is calling upon other countries to put an end to the nuclear arms race while it is free feverishly to build up its own nuclear arsenal, both quantitatively and qualitatively.

220. The world public is closely watching and will pass severe judgement on the attitude of the nuclear-weapon countries as regards the cessation of test explosions and of the production of new weapons systems, the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the

territories of States where there are no such weapons at present, non-first use and the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear-weapon stockpiles. Those who truly want disarmament cannot fail to feel indignant at the position of the United States at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly in voting against all resolutions concerning the cessation of the nuclear-arms race, as well as at the attitude of China, which has broken the record for non-participation in votes on such resolutions. That abdication of responsibility is particularly reprehensible since those two Powers are both permanent members of the Security Council.

221. As a non-nuclear country and the victim of a serious threat from a nuclear-weapon country, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam firmly supports the proposal to conclude an international convention on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear weapon States, which was put forward in 1978.

222. Because of the warlike and extremely obstinate attitude of imperialism and international reaction, the danger of nuclear war is growing day by day. On the other hand, never has mankind's desire for peace been manifested more vehemently, and never have the forces of peace in the world been as powerful as they are today. In these conditions if we persevere in the struggle for peace and détente and for nuclear disarmament, we have a real chance of preventing another world war, of thwarting any attempt by the most aggressive forces of war to plunge mankind into a nuclear disaster.

223. From the rostrum the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam wishes to make the following statement.

224. On the basis of its constant policy of peace and in accordance with the relevant declarations and resolutions of the United Nations on the prevention of the nuclear-arms race, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has decided to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This decision bears witness to our solid faith in the invincible strength of the three revolutionary trends and the forces of peace in the world. It is the expression of our will to contribute to the struggle for disarmament, to curb the nuclear-arms race and to eliminate the threat of nuclear war.

225. At this very moment there is danger of the abuse of scientific and technological progress for the production of new generations of weapons of mass destruction. We hope that the Committee on Disarmament will soon begin negotiations on the signing of a convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear neutron weapons and expedite negotiations with a view to signature of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction, as called for in the relevant resolutions of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

226. In the face of the existing tension in many regions of several continents, the elimination of hotbeds of war in those regions becomes ever more urgent. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam supports initiatives concerning the establishment of zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones in Africa, Latin America, the Middle East, the Mediterranean, Europe,

the Scandinavian countries, the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia. The establishment of zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones should be based on the principle of respect for the interests and aspirations of the countries of the region, without foreign interference and without threats from Powers outside the region.

227. We reaffirm our steadfast support for the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean at Colombo, on the date envisaged [*resolution 36/90*], with a view to making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. We share the legitimate concern of the countries of the region and of adjacent countries at the fact that certain States have deliberately impeded the convening of that Conference, while the imperialists continue to maintain and expand their military bases in the region—in particular, the gigantic military base on Diego Garcia.

228. As an Asian country, Viet Nam unreservedly commends and supports the initiative taken by the People's Republic of Mongolia concerning the signing of a convention on non-aggression and the non-use of force in relations among the States of Asia and the Pacific.¹⁰

229. As regards South-East Asia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, on behalf of the three countries of Indo-China, submitted to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly the seven principles that govern relations of peaceful coexistence among the countries of the region [*16th meeting, paras. 95 to III*]. Those proposals, as well as the ones presented by the conferences of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the three countries of Indo-China, remain valid. Together with the other countries of Indo-China, Viet Nam has spared no effort to enter into dialogue with the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations [*ASEAN*] in order to settle existing differences and disputes in the relations between the two groups of countries—those of Indo-China and those of ASEAN—by peaceful means, through negotiations. These should be conducted on the principle that all South-East Asian problems should be settled by the South-East Asian countries themselves on the basis of the principles of equality, friendship, mutual respect and understanding, taking into account the legitimate interests of all, in mutual agreement, without imposing the views of any one party on another, without foreign interference and without the use or threat of force in relations among themselves. Such dialogue will contribute to creating conditions conducive to the establishment of a zone of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia.

230. The Reagan Administration's new military strategy in Asia, recently revealed, stresses the strengthening of military relations with China and its allies and the strengthening of close ties with the ASEAN countries in their anti-Viet Nam policy and at the same time the strengthening of the military capacity of those countries in order to facilitate the deployment of American forces from the West Pacific to the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf. The real aim of that strategy is to strengthen collusion between the United States and China with a view to "South-East-Asianizing" American military activities, that is, to wage wars by proxy through the use of South-

East Asian countries in the area, in order to have free reign in other parts of Asia and the world.

231. It is very clear that the main obstacle to the creation of a zone of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia resides in the intervention and the threat of war that come from Peking and Washington. That is why the South-East Asian problem is first and foremost not just a problem between the countries of Indo-China and ASEAN. The question that must be resolved is one of putting an end to interference and threats of war from the two above-mentioned Powers so that the countries of the region can establish a zone of peace in conformity with their wishes, as is stated in the Final Document.

232. Thus far many highly valuable initiatives have been put forward. There are many suitable forums and mechanisms available for disarmament negotiations. The only factor which is lacking, which lack is obstructing all progress towards disarmament, is goodwill on the part of the most aggressive war-oriented Powers that launch the arms race in order to obtain a position of strength. Until those forces of war are pilloried by all mankind they will not be able to take reality into account and adopt a more serious attitude in negotiations and it will be impossible for progress to be achieved towards disarmament.

233. It is the most fervent hope of the Vietnamese delegation that this special session may reflect the united and dominant voice of millions and millions of people all over our world demanding the cessation and reversal of the arms race, the elimination of the threat of nuclear disaster. May this session make the desired contribution to improving the international situation on the basis of guaranteeing the independence, sovereignty and security of all peoples, in order to create the conditions needed for the economic and social development of all States, above all the developing countries, on a just and democratic basis.

234. The delegation of Viet Nam believes it is for the leaders of all States to listen to the full range of voices from the different sectors of the populations of all continents and from all political and social persuasions, who represent the expression of one desire and aspiration: peace on earth. They are making history. In this respect, the Vietnamese delegation believes that after this special session it will be necessary to speed up the preparation and convening, as soon as possible, of the world conference on disarmament with massive and universal participation [*see A/S-12/4*].

235. Lastly, the Vietnamese delegation would like to congratulate Mr. Kittani most warmly on his unanimous election to the important post of President of this special session devoted to disarmament. It is our fervent hope that under his very competent leadership the General Assembly will be able effectively to discharge the difficult responsibilities conferred upon it, that it will be able to give new momentum to disarmament, in particular to nuclear disarmament, thus responding to the legitimate and urgent demands of all peace-loving peoples on all continents.

236. Mr. ABDALLA (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, I should like first of all to express to Mr. Kittani once again, on behalf of the

Sudanese delegation, our delight at seeing him conduct the work of this very important session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. His work during the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, his obvious competence throughout his presidency of the emergency special session on the question of Palestine and his experience in foreign affairs and the affairs of the Organization are qualities which will enable him to conduct the deliberations of this important session so that we shall achieve the goals for which it was convened.

237. The General Assembly is holding this important special session in an international atmosphere charged with tension which reflects the growing willingness to use force contrary to the rules of international behaviour accepted by the international community and set forth in the Charter of the United Nations. The most tragic event reflecting this dangerous trend in international relations is the barbarous attack against Lebanon by Israel, the occupation of a large part of the country and the war of extermination carried out against the Palestinians in Lebanon, all of which violate the Charter of the United Nations, the rules of international law, resolutions of the Security Council and even the simplest rules of enlightened international conduct.

238. Israel acts openly before the world and arrogantly proclaims its actions, which are reported by the media throughout the world. It indiscriminately bombs Lebanese cities and villages, rendering homeless approximately 800,000 people. The barbarous and merciless extermination of the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples is continuing, and the number of dead and wounded has reached tens of thousands.

239. From this rostrum the Sudan expresses its strongest condemnation and indignation with regard to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon and its occupation of that territory. The Sudan appeals for unconditional immediate withdrawal from Lebanese territory. We appeal to the Security Council to shoulder its responsibilities with regard to implementing a withdrawal and adopt the measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter should Israel refuse to carry out an immediate withdrawal.

240. The Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the Palestinians is a link in the chain of wars, acts of aggression and violence, violation of international peace and security and armed interference in the internal affairs of another State which we have witnessed since the end of the Second World War. This long series of armed conflicts demonstrates that there can be no peace based on nuclear balance and deterrence between the two super-Powers. The peace between the countries of NATO and the Warsaw Pact is truly fragile and may be short-lived, for it rests on a frantic race for strategic supremacy and unbalanced nuclear deterrence; it is also not genuine peace, for it represents peace for only a minority of the world in Europe and continuous war for the past three decades throughout the world affecting numerous regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In the final analysis, it is peace based on fear and mistrust amidst the growing threat of nuclear war, which would spare no one and annihilate victors, vanquished and neutrals alike.

241. Genuine and permanent global peace cannot be based on continuous preparations for war and the stockpiling of the means of destruction. The convening of the first special session on disarmament was a clear expression of the conviction of the international community, represented by the General Assembly, that the only way to establish true peace is disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament. That is why my country's delegation attaches particular importance to the convening of the second special session on disarmament, because its convening only four years after the first such session constitutes the affirmation of the will of peoples and States to eliminate the dangers of war, especially nuclear war, through global disarmament. They also represent an affirmation of the United Nations role in achieving this objective. Disarmament, the elimination of the real dangers of war and the restoration of international peace and security have been among the basic goals of the United Nations since its creation at the end of the Second World War. Thus, the first special session on disarmament provided an excellent opportunity to draw the attention of the international community to disarmament and was a serious attempt to eliminate the dangers of war by concluding an international agreement on global disarmament within the framework of the United Nations.

242. The Final Document adopted by the tenth special session, in 1978, was a milestone and a good start for halting the arms race, and for arms limitation leading to global disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament. Unfortunately, four years later, the goals set by the tenth special session for this session are far from having been achieved. The arms race far exceeds the efforts to halt it. No international agreement has yet been concluded on global disarmament with effective international controls. Regrettably, the gradual reduction of military budgets recommended by the tenth special session has not yet been implemented. Consequently, it has not been possible to release even a very small amount of the huge material and human resources being wasted on armaments. The world has not moved away from the abyss of nuclear war towards which the arms race is pushing it. On the contrary, it has moved closer to that abyss, thanks to the unrestrained development of the production and modernization of weapons, the increase in the nuclear arsenals of the great Powers and the squandering of enormous resources which mankind needs at a time of grave economic crisis.

243. As we are gathered here once again to discuss a matter not solely related to peace, security and prosperity in the world but also having to do with survival, we are more and more convinced that tangible progress will be made towards disarmament only if the international community, within the framework of the Organization, reaches agreement on a comprehensive programme of disarmament, in keeping with the Programme of Action contained in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session. We believe that such an outcome will be very difficult to achieve, given the divergent viewpoints and deep disagreements. However, we feel that the survival of the world—from East to West and from North to South—is something that surpasses limited viewpoints and

narrow national interests and is a goal transcending power rivalries and ideological conflicts.

244. The comprehensive programme of disarmament must define the measures for disarmament, a precise time-table and other measures preparing the way for future negotiations, so that priority in these negotiations will be given to nuclear weapons and then other weapons of mass destruction, including chemical and conventional weapons, in particular weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects, in order to reach the goal of comprehensive disarmament.

245. Although we emphasize these priorities, it is also necessary to undertake negotiations on all weapons systems at the same time. To ensure the success of this session, we must adopt measures likely to accelerate nuclear and conventional disarmament. That is the responsibility of all States, in particular the nuclear States, but first of all it is the responsibility of the Soviet Union and the United States, since it is in their agreement or disagreement that the success or failure of the international community to reach agreement resides. It would be a welcome initiative if the super-Powers decided to continue their talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in the near future. The convening of this special session on disarmament reflects the desires and aspirations of all the world's peoples, and it should prompt the super-Powers urgently to reach an agreement guaranteeing the survival of their own peoples and all the peoples of the world.

246. In his statement during the session of a special character of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme, held at Nairobi last month to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, held at Stockholm, the President of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan, Mr. Gaafar Mohammed Nimeiri, said:

“Although we have travelled a long way in our search for a clear concept of peace and peaceful coexistence and a definition of the principal causes of confrontation among peoples, we are, unfortunately, still an extremely long way from applying this concept to the real world. The world is spending huge sums to perfect and accumulate means for the destruction of man and his environment. The arms race remains the criterion of development. But the developing countries gain nothing from the armaments race; they have no need of it. All mankind is suffering from the evil that seems to be anchored in certain souls. From this rostrum we launch a resounding appeal to the world to put an end—today, not tomorrow—to this frantic arms race and to devote the material and technical, as well as natural, resources thus released to the improvement of the environment and of the conditions of the deprived peoples of the world. We appeal for efforts to give a new impetus to international co-operation, coexistence and interdependence in the search for the fulfilment of the goals of dignity, peace and well-being for all mankind.”

247. The interest of Sudan and other developing countries in disarmament is not based solely on the dangers inherent in the armaments race and its risks for

the survival of the human race; it is based also on the very close link between disarmament and the economic and social development of all peoples of the world, particularly the peoples in the developing countries. That is a logical and moral link, because to waste immense material and human resources in the armaments race at a time when the world is facing a crushing economic crisis and when millions of persons in the developing world are suffering from hunger, disease and poverty is contrary to the humanitarian sentiments of mankind and detracts from the very aim that the armaments race is supposed to pursue. For there can be no peace and stability when millions of persons go to bed hungry every night. The logical link between disarmament and economic and social development is to be found in what could be achieved if the material and human, as well as technical, resources now devoted to the arms race were to be directed towards the revitalization of the world economy, the raising of the standard of living of the enclaves of poverty—and they are so numerous—in the developed countries, and the acceleration of the development of the developing countries, which have the greatest need of these resources. Devoting the resources wasted on armaments to development could constitute the most effective assistance to the international community in its endeavours to promote economic co-operation and the establishment of the new international economic order.

248. The delegation of Sudan is deeply convinced that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements arrived at through the free choice of the States of the region concerned is one of the basic measures of disarmament. Hence, Sudan has constantly expressed its support for all the United Nations resolutions designed to declare the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

249. In the same context, Sudan has worked tirelessly, and will continue to do so, with the other States of the region to put into effect the concept of the security of the Red Sea as a peaceful waterway exempt from the conflicts of the great Powers and the rivalries of military strategies. Similarly, Sudan, in accordance with its commitments under resolutions of the Organization of African Unity, has constantly stated the need for declaring the African continent a nuclear-weapon-free zone and removing from it all the remnants of foreign influence and intervention and, consequently, the causes of tension and the threats of the use of force.

250. Sudan believes that economic and social development requires international peace and security and the elimination of all hot-beds of tension. It believes that conflicts must be solved by peaceful means. It is therefore only natural that our people and their governmental and non-governmental bodies regard the cessation of the arms race and the achievement of disarmament as two very important, indeed urgent, tasks. We believe that taking up this historic challenge by rejecting any recourse to the use of force in international relations and by achieving security through disarmament is in the interests of all peoples, and it is in the interests of the United Nations and of economic and social development. It is the means of ensuring true security for the peoples; it is a guarantee that they will have a future

of international peace and security. All that can come about only if the desired disarmament measures provide for peaceful settlement of disputes, without any interference in the domestic affairs of States. They must provide for the right of peoples to choose their political, economic and social systems in complete freedom.

251. In regard to regional disarmament measures, particularly nuclear disarmament, my country's delegation cannot but express its regret at the fact that the two racist régimes, those of Pretoria and Tel Aviv, have found the means to acquire and manufacture nuclear weapons. That is a direct danger to peace and security in Africa and the Middle East and, consequently, to international peace and security. Hence, disarmament measures must prohibit access by these racist régimes to an excess of weapons and material technology. That should be achieved by a firm commitment by all States to abide by the relevant United Nations resolutions. But these measures must not hinder the just and legitimate struggle of peoples for self-determination and for the elimination of colonialist régimes and racist or foreign domination.

252. The implementation of such measures must also be closely linked to the speedy application of resolutions concerning existing conflicts, and above all those concerning the questions of Namibia and Palestine.

253. Although the international atmosphere could make one despair, there are certain indications in regard to disarmament and the removal of the spectre of nuclear war that give cause for some optimism and for hope. In the first place, there has been the powerful awakening of public opinion in all the countries of the world. There is a clear and forceful demand for an acceleration of disarmament efforts, particularly efforts towards nuclear disarmament, to spare the world from the risks of nuclear war.

254. The General Assembly, which is a reflection of the international community, took a very wise decision in launching, on the very first day of this special session, the World Disarmament Campaign. This responds to the demand of international public opinion, which has now become very much aware of the need for peace, disarmament and the rejection of *we*. We hope that the Campaign will increase the opposition of the peoples to the race in armaments, both nuclear and conventional, and that it will bring pressure on the Governments of the world to accelerate the conclusion of an agreement limiting and eliminating armaments, for the greater good of mankind.

255. In conclusion, I should like to repeat words used by the President of the Democratic Republic of Sudan when he addressed the peoples and leaders of the world at the session of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme. He said:

“The responsibility of the present generation is to safeguard mankind from disasters and from wars. That responsibility carries with it other obligations that must be met. That is the only way to guarantee a worthy life for man wherever he lives. This aspiration can be achieved by mankind only through the confirmation of a renunciation of the arms race, the quest for peace, and it involves the use of all the

scientific potential of human beings for the benefit of mankind and of the environment.”

256. So we repeat our sincere call to all the political leaders of the world that we should halt the arms race and give that objective the priority which is commensurate with its link to the survival of the world and the protection of mankind from self-destruction. Man can have a worthy, dignified life only if we stop the arms race, which is so destructive of all life.

257. Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): Having distinguished himself so admirably as President of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, what cause have we to doubt the quality of Mr. Kittani's stewardship of this very important session? We continue unreservedly to repose all our confidence in him, in the full knowledge that his proven skills and sense of commitment will guide the deliberations of this session to a successful conclusion.

258. The painful reality we face as we meet here to try once more to devise practical ways and means for the achievement of effective and meaningful disarmament is that the arms race has in fact accelerated since the first special session on disarmament. Armed conflicts have mushroomed as nations, big and small, emboldened by easy access to sophisticated weaponry, seek to settle old scores against one another. Indeed, even as we meet here such conflicts are raging around the world.

259. There is also the fallacious belief that the security of a nation can be found only in the possession of huge arsenals of lethal weapons. Consequently, even nations—particularly in the third world—which cannot even feed their own people or give them any reasonable standard of living seem always to find money to buy weapons. And yet experience has shown that a nation that loves peace can always find real security and strength in its weakness, for the possession of huge arsenals of sophisticated weapons can only whet appetites for military adventures and arouse extra-territorial ambitions which invariably lead to catastrophes.

260. Even the super-Powers cannot in all honesty claim to have found peace and security in the dangerous balance of terror they have created between themselves. All they have done is to instil in their own people and in people all over the world an increasingly terrifying sense of insecurity, fuelled by the equally terrifying fear that one of these days a nuclear conflagration will be triggered by mistake. Such a mistake is distinctly possible, given the fierce competition for world hegemony in which the two super-Powers are engaged.

261. Moreover, the two super-Powers have not restricted their deadly race to themselves. Nuclear reactors purportedly meant for the peaceful development of energy resources are now a part of foreign aid. But, as we know, nuclear reactors for the development of energy resources have often turned out to be capable of producing nuclear bombs, despite the so-called safeguards imposed by the donors. Nuclear devices born of these reactors have been tested at hidden sites. As a result, even the most brutal régimes that have ever roamed the face of the earth have access to the stuff of which nuclear bombs are made, and our world is becoming more and more dangerous.

Now is the time to say "enough is enough", before it is too late.

262. If so far the balance of terror between the two super-Powers in particular has prevented the eruption of a nuclear war, the race in other armaments has already caused a great deal of havoc in every continent. Because it is so easy today to buy weapons, bloody armed conflicts of all kinds are becoming more and more prevalent. With increasing frequency, border disputes are not being referred to peaceful arbitration; they are settled on the battlefield. Territorial ambitions are pursued with tanks, missiles and bombs.

263. The consequences of these regional conflicts are known to all. In addition to producing millions of refugees they have transformed the regions affected into areas of endemic instability and have fuelled the arms race, thereby endangering rather than strengthening the security of the countries involved.

264. Paragraph 13 of the Final Document aptly states that "Enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence or doctrines of strategic superiority."

265. The fact is that the \$600 billion spent on the accumulation of weapons of mass destruction in 1981 alone has not given us peace and security; it has, on the contrary, aggravated our sense of insecurity. Our lives in the shadow of a nuclear holocaust have become an endless nightmare. With so much money squandered on armaments in the pursuit of a dangerous arms race, more urgent human needs have been neglected, particularly in the third world. There is mass starvation, ignorance and disease in a world which can afford to spend billions of dollars on the purchase of weapons of destruction. Yet, as paragraph 1 of the Final Document states, "the accumulation of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, today constitutes much more a threat than a protection for the future of mankind".

266. There can be no security in a world of starving masses and escalating military expenditures. Surely there must be a correlation between retarded development in many countries in the third world and escalating military expenditures. The Secretary-General is very right indeed in observing in his foreword to a United Nations document called *Disarmament: A Periodic Review by the United Nations* that:

"A shocking proportion of the wealth in human and material resources that might otherwise be directed towards reducing the burden of poverty on the majority of the world's population is drained away into this wasteful and ultimately illusory quest for security through arms."¹¹

267. Yes, security through arms is an illusory objective, because there can be no winners in an arms race. Even the super-Powers, with their deadly arsenals of nuclear warheads, know only too well that they are simply holding each other to ransom. There will be no victory for either of them in the nuclear arms race in which they are engaged. On the contrary, the only eventuality in such a race is what is often described as the final epidemic. The tragedy, of course, is that the two super-Powers cannot an-

nihilate each other without annihilating the rest of mankind.

268. No one is suggesting that the two super-Powers should throw away all their arms and begin to trust each other in our competitive world. That would be an extremely unreasonable suggestion, for the two super-Powers are so polarized ideologically that the prospect for the development of mutual trust between them is almost non-existent. Each super-Power has allocated to itself a part of the globe where the other is not allowed to tread, and neither of the two is or will be prepared to cease to be fanatically jealous of its domain. Hence, the two are facing each other across an ever-widening crevasse of suspicion and hostility.

269. But they have a choice to make, namely, either to reduce drastically their armaments, so that we can begin now to build a world in which the use of force in international relations could be declared obsolete, or to lead the world along a suicidal path to the final epidemic. This special session will have served no purpose if we cannot avail ourselves of the opportunity it offers to make the choice.

270. Millions of people around the world are yearning for peace. They are yearning for the diversion of the resources now spent on amassing armaments to civilian endeavours to enhance the lives and welfare of millions of the poor all over the world.

271. It will no doubt take more than political will for countries to reduce their armaments and to devote to civilian purposes the ever-growing resources now available for the purchase of arms. I have spoken of the absence of mutual trust between the super-Powers. I have contended that in most parts of the world border disputes are today settled on the battlefield and that territorial ambitions are pursued with tanks, missiles and bombs. Nations have thus become used to backing their claims or settling their scores with the force that derives from the possession of weapons of war. Therefore, to many of those nations disarmament is obviously almost tantamount to an invitation to surrender, to surrender their rights, to surrender their claims. What is lacking in them is the will to realize that, if countries were not so heavily armed, nations would have been free of the fear of being threatened with destruction or domination.

272. I am sure it is not the aim of this special session to strive for total disarmament tomorrow, for that would be unreasonable. But it is very important that we should begin now to match words with action. It is very important that we should begin now to relegate ideology and political expediency to the background and together face the fact that we are all poised precariously on the edge of a dangerous precipice. This session is very crucial, and we should try our best to depoliticize it so that we can face the issues before us unencumbered by ideological prejudices.

273. Of immediate urgency, in our view, is halting the nuclear-arms race, for which, without fear or prejudice, we hold the two super-Powers responsible in equal measure. They are responsible for the race, and it is their responsibility to halt it. It is they also who are largely responsible for the conventional arms race, and it is largely their responsibility to halt it.

274. The international community also demands that the arsenals of nuclear weapons should be drastically reduced. It is not only a question of arresting the arms race. It is also a question of drastically reducing nuclear weapons. The same applies to conventional weapons. Nations must learn to live in peace with one another in a world free of fear. As stated in paragraph 1 of the Final Document:

“The ending of the arms race and the achievement of real disarmament are tasks of primary importance and urgency. To meet this historic challenge is in the political and economic interests of all the nations and peoples of the world as well as in the interests of ensuring their genuine security and peaceful future.”

275. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In keeping with the decision taken at the 12th meeting of the Assembly this morning, I now call upon Mr. Davidson Nicol, Executive Director of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research.

276. Mr. NICOL (United Nations Institute for Training and Research): The problems we are dealing with and the trends which we are trying to reverse in the armaments race are increasingly world-wide phenomena. Although their intensity varies in different regions, few countries and, for sure, no major parts of the globe are free from them. The comprehensive character of the armaments race is reflected also in the fact that it has already extended into the oceans and into outer space.

277. The forces behind the armaments race in the contemporary world cannot be accounted for simply in terms of the action-reaction processes created by the apprehension generated in each country by the military programmes of others. The armaments race encompasses new sectors of society, and it develops a momentum of its own. We are bound to admit that today we still have a poor understanding of the many processes that sustain the arms race and determine its orientation.

278. The success of the disarmament efforts will partly depend on a thorough understanding of the dynamics of the armaments race, and the disarmament process itself will be credible only if based on a thorough study of both the technical aspects of the disarmament measures envisaged and their implications for the security of States.

279. This means that research is an essential component of the overall disarmament effort. In fact, the General Assembly itself has recognized that negotiations on disarmament and the continuing effort to ensure greater security must be based on objective and in-depth technical studies. The Assembly has also expressed the view that research and study activities by the United Nations in the field of disarmament should promote informed participation by all States in disarmament efforts. It has considered also that it is advisable to undertake more forward-looking research within the framework of the United Nations. The Assembly has also repeatedly stressed the need of the international community to be provided with more diversified and complete information on problems relating to disarmament, as well as the importance of ensuring that disarmament studies should be

conducted in accordance with the criteria of scientific independence.

280. UNITAR has included from its very beginning peace and security issues in its training and research programmes. This is neither the place nor the time to review the whole wide spectrum of UNITAR activities in this field. I shall limit myself to the period following the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

281. Within our divisions of research and training we have published and carried out projects on disarmament matters. In all our activities relating to disarmament we have maintained close contact with the United Nations Centre for Disarmament and other organizations of the United Nations system involved in disarmament affairs.

282. Disarmament became a major research preoccupation of UNITAR, particularly after the establishment of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research [UNIDIR]. As may be recalled, UNIDIR was established on 1 October 1980, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 34/83 M, adopted on 11 December 1979. It was set up within the administrative framework of UNITAR as an interim arrangement until this second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The Institute was established as the result of extensive consultations at the request of the General Assembly, involving the Secretary-General, the Board of Trustees of UNITAR and the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies. It is based on voluntary financing. The Government of France has been outstanding in its support.

283. UNIDIR is meant to conduct objective scientific research aimed at facilitating progress towards disarmament. It also facilitates the access of a large number of States, particularly the developing ones, to existing information, studies and research on disarmament. Specifically, the mandate of the Institute is to carry out research for the purpose of assisting ongoing negotiations in the field of disarmament and arms limitation. This stimulates initiatives for new negotiations and provides a general insight into the problems involved. In carrying out its mandate, UNIDIR is guided by the provisions of the Final Document.

284. During the short period of its existence, UNIDIR has already succeeded in establishing itself as a serious and meaningful research institution. A progress report on UNIDIR's activities has already been distributed to delegations. I shall therefore now refer only briefly to the four UNIDIR projects that have been completed.

285. I refer first to the *Repertory of Disarmament Research*.¹² This is a reference work of scientific merit and a practical working tool intended for all those who have responsibilities in the disarmament field or are interested in it—diplomats, officials, academics, journalists, members of non-governmental organizations, students and others. Two main concerns lay behind the compilation of this *Repertory*. The first was that disarmament problems should be dealt with in their totality and should include questions relating to demilitarization and the limitation, reduction, regulation and control of arms, as well as security. The second concern was that the sources of information should be as varied as possible, and

efforts were therefore made to collect a representative body of references from all corners of the globe.

286. Secondly, I turn to the establishment of a disarmament data base. As a continuation of the work started with the *Repertory*, UNIDIR has undertaken a study on the establishment of an automated disarmament data base.¹³ The study has been made available to delegations to the special session. The expansion of disarmament efforts calls for a system based on modern technology which is capable of collecting, processing and disseminating the vast information in this field. The first stage in the establishment of the disarmament data base has already been started by UNIDIR in co-operation with the University of Grenoble, France.

287. Thirdly, I refer to the study on the risks of unintentional nuclear war.¹⁴ This is a major study which tries to answer the question of how to assess the risks involved in an unintentional nuclear war by providing a broad view of the widely dispersed and heterogeneous literature relevant to this subject. It is hoped that this study will be found extremely useful in view of the conditions now prevailing in the world. Copies of the book will be made available to delegations during this special session.

288. A dozen other research projects have also been completed, and they will be published after the special session.

289. One particularly successful activity of UNIDIR to which I should like to draw attention was the convening of the First Conference of Directors of Research Institutes on Disarmament. This Conference, initiated by UNIDIR, took place at the Palais des Nations at Geneva on 16-18 November 1981. Its objective was to strengthen international co-operation in the field of disarmament research, to find ways and means to make better use of the available material and intellectual resources and to avoid unnecessary parallelism and duplication. It was meant also to strengthen the impact of research on governmental policies as well as on deliberations and negotiations in the field of disarmament.

290. I should like to stress that in a little over a year this Institute has taken its place within the United Nations and within the academic community.

291. Besides its programme of theoretical and applied research on questions relating to disarmament and international security, UNIDIR has established a worldwide network of contacts and effective collaboration with international and national research institutes. Close co-operation with other agencies and organizations within the United Nations system carrying out activities in the field of disarmament has also been established.

292. The special session is to take a decision on the future institutional framework of UNIDIR's activity.

293. In discussing the future institutional arrangements for disarmament research within the context of this session, I believe that the following considerations are important.

294. First, research and scientific information on problems relating to disarmament are linked. General

Assembly resolution 33/71, for instance, emphasizes these links in four of its preambular paragraphs.

295. Secondly, to give more meaning to its work, UNIDIR should be linked to the political organs of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, and therefore reports on its activities should be brought to the attention of the First Committee of the General Assembly—as we hope they will be.

296. UNIDIR should always remain an autonomous scientific research institution.

297. In this connexion, I should like to stress that, within the framework of UNITAR, we have given UNIDIR such a character. It is an autonomous institution within UNITAR. The General Assembly will now, we hope, decide on the structure that it wishes this important Institute, UNIDIR, to have.

298. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Two representatives have asked to speak in exercise of their right of reply. I would remind them that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, such statements are limited to ten minutes and should be made from their seats.

299. Mr. NGO PIN (Democratic Kampuchea): Today once again we heard an arrogant Hanoi-authority representative trying, like his master the Soviet Foreign Minister, to turn black into white. The situation of tension in South-East Asia was created, in fact, by the Vietnamese invasion and occupation of Kampuchea. The objective of that aggressor is well known to all. Here they try only to divert the General Assembly from its valuable work devoted to disarmament and aim at nothing but covering up their crime committed against innocent peoples, particularly the people of Kampuchea. Therefore, at this stage my delegation does not wish to make any detailed comments, but we categorically reject the Vietnamese and Soviet deceit, lies and slander in the Assembly.

300. My delegation will, however, have the opportunity later to describe in detail in its statement in the general debate the actual situation prevailing in my country and in South-East Asia, as well as in the world as a whole—which, in fact, relates to our actual concerns with respect to disarmament.

301. Mr. SHI Ji Cheng (China) (*translation from Chinese*): In his statement the Vietnamese representative levelled utterly groundless attacks and slanders against China. It is well known that it is Viet Nam which is carrying out provocations and aggression against its neighbours. It is Vietnamese troops which, with the support of a super-Power, are occupying Democratic Kampuchea; it is Viet Nam which has repeatedly refused to implement the resolution adopted by the General Assembly concerning the withdrawal of foreign troops from Kampuchea. Moreover, the Vietnamese representative even sought to justify the aggression and expansion of a super-Power. I wish to express our indignation and categorical rejection of the statement made by the Vietnamese representative.

NOTES

- ¹ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.1.
- ² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964, p. 43.
- ³ See CD/335, Appendix II/vol. II, document CD/260, annex.
- ⁴ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326.
- ⁵ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 105, document A/5975.
- ⁶ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.81.I.10.
- ⁷ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.4.
- ⁸ A/36/513.
- ⁹ A/34/542, annex, chap. I, para. 25.
- ¹⁰ A/36/388.
- ¹¹ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.5, p. 1.
- ¹² United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.82.0.2.
- ¹³ United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.82.0.6.
- ¹⁴ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.0.1.