



Monday, 21 June 1982,
at 3.35 p.m.

Official Records

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. PRADHAN (Bhutan): Mr. President, allow me to begin by congratulating you on your unanimous election to the presidency of this second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.
2. I should also like to take this opportunity to express the heartfelt condolences of the delegation of Bhutan on the untimely and sad passing away of His Majesty King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud of Saudi Arabia. King Khalid was indeed a great and dynamic monarch and a leading figure of the Arab world.
3. This session is taking place at a highly critical phase in international relations. Today the super-Powers and some other nations have at their command the weapons to destroy civilization and annihilate the human race. The irony of this "madness and immorality", as the Secretary-General rightly termed the arms race on the opening day of this session [*1st meeting, para. 58*], is that the objective was to achieve the security of nations. It has instead turned out to be a frightful nightmare for the inhabitants of this planet.
4. The fear of a nuclear holocaust that many speakers here have spoken about is not illusory. It is based on the fact that there are over 50,000 nuclear warheads now being deployed. Their combined explosive yield has been calculated to be about a million times greater than the bomb dropped on the city of Hiroshima. The massive demonstrations in various parts of the world and those that have taken place here on our very doorstep underline this dread and concern. The participants in these demonstrations, which cut across national boundaries, language, race and religion, want their voices to be heard. They want their concerns to be taken into account by the Governments of all nuclear-weapon countries and particularly by the two super-Powers.
5. The launching of the World Disarmament Campaign at the start of this session was a welcome development. This campaign will undoubtedly serve to enhance the awareness of millions and educate them about the dangers and horrors of a nuclear war. World public opinion forms an important and crucial ingredient in our struggle to attain disarmament. It must therefore be vigorously nurtured and strengthened so that it becomes a powerful lobby in promoting disarmament. At this point, my delegation would also like to acknowledge the determined and invaluable role played by the numerous non-governmental orga-

nizations all over the world in mobilizing public opinion against nuclear weapons.

6. The first special session on disarmament was a major and important step in the development of an international strategy towards our goal of general and complete disarmament. What this session should now strive to achieve are concrete and realistic results in pursuance of the first session.

7. One of our central tasks is to draw up a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Such a programme should work towards time-bound commitments for general and complete disarmament.

8. The partial test-ban Treaty¹ was a positive step in the right direction. However, as developments have shown, it was not adequate to prohibit nuclear-weapons testing. Therefore, the international community must be able to agree on a comprehensive test-ban treaty for halting all nuclear tests. No justification can really be accepted by the international community for continuing to delay such a treaty in the face of an imminent holocaust.

9. My delegation has always supported the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] in principle. Again, this international instrument also needs to be strengthened and made equitable so as to ensure accession and to gain wider acceptance. If this is done, this instrument could take us a long way in our arduous search for effecting nuclear disarmament.

10. My delegation welcomes the agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union to resume talks on the reduction of strategic arms. This has undoubtedly been a positive development. We hope that these talks will succeed and lead to significant reductions in the nuclear arsenals of the super-Powers.

11. The nuclear-weapon States must in this manner take all possible steps and give the international community unambiguous commitments. Though our ultimate endeavour is to rid the world of all nuclear armaments, any step which leads towards this goal, however small, must be encouraged. In this context my delegation has also welcomed the declarations by some major Powers that they would avoid the first use of nuclear weapons. We hope that all other nuclear-weapon States will follow this trend.

12. The international community must vigorously oppose the development and use of chemical, radiological and bacteriological weapons. The use of such inhuman weapons should be condemned, and the States concerned should be called upon to halt all such practices. My delegation fully subscribes to, and is a party to, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on

Their Destruction [*resolution 2826 (XXVI), annex*]. We will also go along with any multilateral instrument which seeks totally to ban the production and use of chemical and radiological weapons.

13. The great achievements of mankind in this century in the exploration of outer space are beginning to take an ominous turn. The deployment of weapons systems in outer space must be banned before it becomes irreversible. Outer space must be used solely for peaceful purposes.

14. The enormous diversion of the world's resources for destruction stands in stark contrast to the pitiable efforts made by the developed and the more favoured countries to provide the very basic necessities of food, clothing and shelter for the teeming millions of the world's poverty-stricken. As we have repeatedly heard in the course of this general debate, the annual world military expenditure has crossed the \$600-billion mark. This state of affairs must be set right. This can be achieved more easily the sooner the brakes are applied to the arms race.

15. My delegation has also watched with increasing concern the establishment and development of industries for the production of armaments. It seems to us that several countries seek to solve their employment and other economic problems by producing and supplying weapons to areas riven with conflict and tension. The estimates available to us reveal that the arms transactions of both developed and developing countries amount to more than \$26 billion annually. If the laws of supply and demand are permitted to prevail without restraint, we can well imagine the state of affairs in which we shall find the world.

16. The Governments of such countries must take a more responsible and long-term view of this issue. They should ensure that appropriate restrictions are applied; otherwise they may soon discover that without warfare and weapons production their countries' economies will be in serious difficulty. This aspect therefore deserves a closer look by the Governments concerned.

17. The role of the United Nations has to be made more effective as regards both disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security. We must be able to devise within the United Nations system the means of solving disputes peaceably and containing the use of force wherever and whenever they occur.

18. Military flare-ups can be avoided to a considerable degree if countries strictly abide by a few guiding principles. This involves, among other things, avoidance of intervention and interference in the affairs of sovereign States; respect for the sovereignty and independence of all States large or small; declining to use or to threaten to use force in the settlement of disputes, whatever their nature; and a genuine concern for international peace and security. In other words, the measures that we devise should ensure national security and thereby diminish the fear and suspicions that cause nations to arm.

19. Every head of State or Government and every minister or leader of a delegation who has addressed the Assembly from this rostrum has in no uncertain terms expressed fear of an imminent nuclear holocaust.

The times dictate that we cannot truly use this forum simply for purposes of propaganda or to assuage public opinion. Our common concern should enable us to make genuine progress on disarmament.

20. The hopeful eyes of the world are fixed upon us, and specifically on the countries with nuclear weapons. Let us set aside all that divides us, and let us instead generate the necessary political will to make this planet of ours a safer and more peaceful place.

21. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Sir, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate you once again on your assumption of the presidency of the General Assembly. I am confident that under your leadership the General Assembly will at this important special session be able to function competently and bring about effective results.

22. Before I delve into my subject matter I should like to express the deeply felt sorrow of the Government and people of the Arab Republic of Egypt on the tragic loss that befell the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

23. The entire Arab and Islamic nation has lost one of its greatest leaders, a symbol of its solidarity, a wise head of State and an advocate of peace, a far-sighted leader, a man of clear insight. The late King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud passed away after a life dedicated to the service of his country and people. On this occasion I should like to express my deepest condolences to the delegation of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. May God welcome him among the faithful and the martyrs and may he grant his family and people courage and solace.

24. I stand here delivering Egypt's statement to the Assembly session on disarmament as a man who belongs to a nation that has known war and its heavy burdens. From that position we are participating in this session with a full consciousness and awareness of the dimensions of the problem that we may encounter. Similarly we contributed to the work of the Committee on Disarmament because we consider disarmament a matter of paramount importance to our country, our region and the world at large, for disarmament is organically related to the most important problems that confront today's world—in particular, the questions of international peace and security and economic and social development.

25. At the present time, during this very session, international peace and security are passing through an increasingly threatening stage brought about by resort to arms rather than the rules of international law set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and the collective security system embodied therein. Our region is now witnessing deplorable events resulting from the Israeli armed invasion of brotherly Lebanon. Allow me to quote a passage from the statement issued by the Presidency of Egypt on 7 June 1982 on this subject.

“While the Arab Republic of Egypt, assisted by peace-loving peoples, is exerting strenuous efforts to achieve lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East which will ensure security, stability and prosperity for all peoples in the region, a flow of reports started on an Israeli invasion of the brotherly people and territory of Lebanon wherein civilians, women and children are being victimized

and properties demolished by heavy artillery shelling. This invasion constitutes an outrageous violation of the spirit of peace and a threatening escalation of tensions, regional instability, a flagrant violation of the principles of international law and legality accepted by all peoples as reflected in the Charter of the United Nations.

“The people and Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt denounce this flagrant aggression on the sovereignty, security and safety of Lebanon, and the victimization of our Palestinian brothers. We call upon Israel to cease all military operations and withdraw from the Lebanese territories in order to avoid further deterioration in the situation and to safeguard peace from this recurrent menace, which poses a new obstacle before endeavours made to help achieve better prospects for all peoples in the region.”²

26. The recurrent setbacks to international peace and security have indeed thwarted the incessant efforts exerted in the field of disarmament. The continued failure to find a just solution to international problems, which are so numerous in the world today, has rendered the achievement of any progress in our endeavours to ensure disarmament a matter of great difficulty and complexity. It has, rather, aggravated the arms race and consequently heightened tension and worsened the international situation. Thus the causes and effects rotate successively in a vicious circle for which humanity pays dearly in blood and funds. There are, for instance, the problems of the Middle East, Afghanistan and Kampuchea, in addition to a number of other chronic problems. Progress in the field of disarmament will never be possible in the absence of an international climate conducive to the acceptance and application of the principle of the concept of disarmament.

27. Despite the threat that looms over international peace, we should not lose hope. We should, rather, endeavour to meet the aspirations of the peoples which we have seen demonstrated in a world-wide movement in favour of the cause of disarmament.

28. The nuclear deterrent cannot be taken as the foundation for the establishment of peace, since such a foundation should be firmly grounded on a system of collective security, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

29. In dealing with the problems of disarmament, the General Assembly faces at the same time a host of problems on the international scene—first and foremost, the problem of international security, which has much to do with the preservation of peace. However, while there are theories which base national security on armament and the feeling of security on further armament, these theories have proved erroneous, since the arms race has led to the undermining of international peace and security, particularly since the introduction of nuclear weapons into military arsenals.

30. We had hoped that détente would result in a reduction of the level of armaments and in disarmament. That has not been the case, notwithstanding the intensified efforts undertaken on the one hand by the United Nations, in both the negotiating and the deliberative bodies, and on the other hand in parallel

bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union and agreements concluded within that framework.

31. Egypt, as a non-aligned State, believes in the principles of non-alignment, including the principle that general and complete disarmament under effective international control is the only path towards halting the deterioration in the international situation which would ultimately lead to the annihilation of the human species. While Egypt, along with the other non-aligned countries, calls for disarmament, we do not call for it in a vacuum, but within a collective security system which guarantees security for all nations in accordance with the principles of the Charter, in particular the principles of the non-use of force in international relations, self-determination, the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means and respect for the right of all States and peoples to live in peace. In this context, we should like to pay a tribute to Chancellor Helmut Schmidt for his reference to the constructive role of the non-aligned countries in the international field, especially when he said, “Indeed . . . the non-alignment of the third-world countries is a critical factor for stability and peace in the world as a whole”. [10th meeting, para 105.]

32. The present special session is in fact a continuation of the tenth special session, convened in 1978. Thus the previous session constituted a mainspring and a basis for the present one. Despite the fact that the previous session drew a clear path and outlined a specific Programme of Action, little, if anything, has been achieved. Furthermore, the international situation has continued to deteriorate and disarmament endeavours are meeting numerous difficulties. This means that we must intensify our efforts and perhaps do our work again from the beginning. This special session should find the reasons for the failure to achieve the practical results, which have been hopefully anticipated for the past four years. It should objectively determine those reasons, free of polemics and recriminations, since the responsibility lies with us all. This special session is also requested to introduce proposals for accelerating negotiations on issues of first priority. Such proposals could be set forth as recommendations within the framework of a comprehensive programme of disarmament to be implemented according to a fixed schedule binding on all parties. A review of the achievements should be conducted at the end of each stage. We hope that a suitable format for this plan which is acceptable to all parties can be arrived at during this special session, since we consider this to be important and necessary. If we did not abide by a fixed schedule for each stage of the comprehensive programme of disarmament there would be no incentive to achieve progress, and the political obstacles and technical problems would appear more complex than they are. This would eventually lead the negotiations into a vicious circle.

33. The world today is in need of a strategy for peace, of which disarmament constitutes one of the main pillars as well as one of the vital effects, for disarmament is a cause and an effect just as it is a means and a goal.

34. Such a strategy for peace can never be established unless we all abide by the principles of non-use of force and respect for the collective security system, which we consider the foundation of the international political order of today, as well as respect for international law and for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

35. I should like to emphasize the responsibility of the great Powers, particularly the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States, for the cessation of the arms race.

36. We are well aware that disarmament has numerous political, economic, psychological and security aspects that should be taken into consideration. We are also aware of the fundamental problems related to the implementation of disarmament agreements, particularly the question of verification, as a result of which each party may feel confident that the other parties are complying completely with their obligations. We are well aware of these facts, for the vast experience that we have acquired in the matter of disarmament negotiations has enabled us to perceive its complexity. However, we are aware that it is not feasible to establish a perfect system of verification and that it is necessary to accept a degree of risk for the cause of peace. That would entail, first, a political decision. Nevertheless, such a risk is far less than the risks entailed by allowing the arms race to carry us along with it to its inevitable end—war. We associate ourselves with those who call for the establishment of confidence-building measures with a view to furthering disarmament efforts and curtailing the psychological risks to those efforts, particularly in areas of tension, such as Europe and the Middle East. There is no doubt that the study on confidence-building measures conducted by the Secretary-General with the assistance of a group of governmental experts³ encompasses useful concepts that could be taken as a basis.

37. I do not believe that we differ on our priorities, nor on the fact that the avoidance of a nuclear calamity should top the list of those priorities. On this basis, Egypt adopted in 1974 a proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, for three fundamental reasons: first, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone is compatible with the ultimate goal—nuclear disarmament—and constitutes a step forward on the road to that goal; secondly, it is in harmony with the objectives of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and fosters it; thirdly, the Middle East region in particular is considered one of the hotbeds of the world, and keeping it free of nuclear weapons is a necessary contribution of considerable weight to easing tension in the region as well as in the world. Egypt has persevered in its efforts in the United Nations to establish such a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region. For the first time since 1974, Egypt succeeded in having a resolution adopted by consensus in the General Assembly, during its thirty-fifth session [*resolution 35/147*]. This resolution is considered a turning-point, and further practical steps on the road to its implementation were anticipated hopefully. However, the raid on the Iraqi nuclear reactor on 7 June 1981 caused a setback. We hope that that incident will not have aborted the resolution. Egypt will not succumb to desperation and will try again,

despite the unfavourable circumstances created by that incident.

38. Egypt, in adhering to the principles it believes in and in contributing to consolidating the foundation of international peace and security, unilaterally decided to renounce the nuclear option and therefore ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons on 26 February 1981. We sincerely hope to see Israel follow the example of Egypt, so that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East may transpire.

39. The implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa,⁴ adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its first ordinary session, held at Cairo in 1964, endorsed by the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo the same year, and adopted by the General Assembly the following year [*resolution 2033 (XX)*], would indeed further the cause of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in the world.

40. In this connexion, I urge all countries to halt any sort of co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

41. The establishment of zones of peace and co-operation runs parallel with the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We hope that the Indian Ocean will be the first such zone in the near future.

42. The ban on testing nuclear weapons is closely linked with the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, both horizontal and vertical, in order to extend the scope of the partial nuclear test-ban Treaty of 5 August 1963,¹ whereby nuclear-weapon tests were prohibited in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. A matter that gives reason for optimism in that regard is the agreement reached in the Committee on Disarmament just before the close of its first session this year, establishing an *ad hoc* working group that will concentrate initially on studying matters related to the verification of compliance with a future treaty banning tests of nuclear weapons under ground. We welcome the establishment of the working group and hope that it can discharge its responsibilities.

43. There is also the question of guarantees that should be given by nuclear-weapon States to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. This subject should be finalized in a manner satisfactory to States that have renounced the nuclear option, with a view to reassuring them that they will not be blackmailed by the threat of use or actual use of nuclear weapons.

44. It is high time for nuclear-weapon States to comply with the obligations incurred under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, signed on 1 July 1968, article VI of which stipulates that "Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control". The compliance of nuclear-weapon States with their obligation under that article is the practical way of convincing non-nuclear-

weapon States that have not yet done so to become parties to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

45. As to other weapons of mass destruction, we cherish the hope that the Committee on Disarmament will soon conclude a draft treaty on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. We hope too that the Committee will conclude the drafting of a draft treaty on the prohibition of radiological weapons.

46. Among measures which ought to be tackled with urgency is the conclusion of an agreement on the prohibition of the use of outer space for other than peaceful purposes and of stationing any kind of weapons in orbit around the earth. This would complement the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies [*resolution 2222 (XXI), annex*], signed on 27 January 1967. Also, among other urgent measures is the conclusion of an agreement on non-interference with artificial earth satellites of other States. We hope that the Committee on Disarmament will soon be able to reach an agreement on these subjects.

47. There is also the question of harnessing modern technology for the development of new weapons of mass destruction or the improvement of existing weapons. This is a course fraught with danger, since the continued use of science and technology for weapons purposes might lead to the discovery or development of weapons thus far unknown or to the sudden improvement of existing weapons. Were that to happen it might be felt that a war could be won by the employment of the new or improved weapons and by exploiting the surprise factor. Therefore agreement must urgently be sought on effective measures for halting the use of new technology for other than peaceful purposes. It is not easy to achieve this; nevertheless there must be an exchange of views on how best to achieve a verifiable agreement to that end.

48. International security and economic development are but two sides of the same coin, if I may use that analogy. It has now become obvious that more armament does not offer more security, because more spending on arms will be matched by other States as a matter of course.

49. On the other hand, increasing expenditure on arms exhausts quantities of human and material resources that could otherwise be directed to raising the living standards of peoples, developing the infrastructure, eradicating disease and illiteracy, and so on. If this is the case even with rich States, how much more is it true of developing countries? The scarce resources which are being directed unwillingly to armaments do not produce food, clothing, schools or hospitals. Therefore the requirements of international security and economic and social development demand that the arms race be halted and reversed. Accordingly, agreement must be reached on reducing military expenditure by a certain percentage yearly and allocating a portion of the resources thus saved for the purpose of the economic and social development of developing countries. The benefit will be shared by the donor countries as well, since raising the living standards of underdeveloped peoples augments the potential for export to their countries, which is beneficial to donors and recipients alike.

50. With reference to the disarmament machinery approved by the first special session devoted to disarmament, we consider that its potential has not been used to the full and that there is room for increasing its efficacy. This will be debated during the course of the session. However, I cannot fail to commend the United Nations Centre for Disarmament for its excellent performance and the efficiency with which it carries out its tasks. We feel that because of the expected future increase of its responsibilities, an expansion of the Centre should be considered to enable it to cope with foreseen increased activities.

51. Mention must be made of an achievement which should not be underestimated, namely, the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects,⁵ adopted on 10 October 1980 and opened for signature on 10 April 1981. This Convention, while not going as far as we might have wished, is nevertheless a significant achievement. There is no doubt about that. We hope that additional protocols to the Convention will be concluded in the not too distant future. This Convention is to be viewed as an example of what can be achieved in the field of disarmament. In this connexion, conventional disarmament should indeed be pursued in parallel with nuclear disarmament, since some so-called conventional weapons, such as incendiary weapons, have devastating effects, comparable to those of weapons of mass destruction. We shall do our utmost in that regard through our participation in the work of the Group of Experts on All Aspects of the Conventional Arms Race and on Disarmament relating to Conventional Weapons and Armed Forces established for the purpose.

52. Our world has become a single indivisible whole. We can no longer see war and peace or wealth and poverty each from his own angle; rather, we must have a comprehensive and far-reaching perception. Shortsightedness led to the outbreak of two world wars in one century. Therefore we should take stock of past experience in order not to repeat our mistakes. The two world wars inflicted heavy suffering on many peoples. Nevertheless that suffering is not to be compared with the scourge which a third world war might prove to be.

53. Let us rely less on the strength of arms and more on compliance with international law and justice, as represented by the Charter of the United Nations. As we all know, selfishness breeds nothing good, and we have only to look at the distant and recent past to be confirmed in that belief.

54. Peace is a responsibility which we all share. This session assumes this historic mission. Will history record that we have risen to the level of this responsibility? We hope that the answer will be in the affirmative.

55. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania): The convening of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament at this time, when the international climate and the arms race have reached the lowest ebb and the maximum frenzy respectively, is most timely. This gathering brings together world statesmen and leaders at a propitious

moment to consider ways and means of defusing the complex and dangerous situation which mankind faces today. I hope and trust that this session will not disappoint the high expectations of hundreds of millions of people.

56. It is no exaggeration to say that today, more than at any time in history, mankind is confronted with a most explosive scene. The current state of international relations evokes the cold-war days. Indeed, it even threatens to turn the clock back one generation to those days if we do not act to stop the situation from deteriorating. The situation is compounded by existing conflicts and by the creation of new ones. This, in turn, encourages the arms race because of mutual fear and suspicion. It also generates insecurity because of the false belief that the more a nation arms itself the safer it is. It is a vicious circle from which we have to work hard and fast to disentangle ourselves. Otherwise, we shall be overtaken by events.

57. It has been said that the nuclear arsenals in the hands of nuclear-weapon States, especially the two super-Powers, are enough to destroy the world many times over. And yet in spite of this reality, improvements in the technological precision of nuclear weapons through military research and development continue unabated. I do not need to quote statistics concerning the vast sums spent on this exercise since they are well documented by experts and have been quoted by previous speakers. What bothers and scares us is the peddling of dangerous and cynical concepts such as the plausibility and winnability of nuclear war and consequent survivability. We seem to be blind to the extent that we are even countenancing limited nuclear war. We are even under the delusion of thinking of enhanced security through nuclear superiority, and yet we all know that nuclear war would mean the end of life and civilization.

58. The Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, which was chaired by Mr. Olof Palme, has rightly observed, in its report entitled "Common Security: a programme for disarmament",⁶ that the only way to survive nuclear war is to prevent it from occurring. Here I wish to quote the following extract from section 1 of the Commission's recommendations:

"There will be no winner in a nuclear war. The use of nuclear war would result in devastation and suffering of a magnitude which would render meaningless any notion of victory. The size of existing nuclear stockpiles and the near certainty of devastating retaliation make it futile and dangerous to consider nuclear war an instrument of national policy. Nuclear war would amount to an unprecedented catastrophe for humanity and to suicide for those who resort to it."

The report goes on to give an alternative, in section 1.1 of the same chapter 6:

"But nations are not condemned to live by the ugly dictates of nuclear weapons. They have the choice and indeed the responsibility to curb and eliminate the horrendous forces of destruction which nuclear weapons represent."

59. I can only hope that those who bear primary responsibility for international peace and security will

heed these sobering recommendations, for it is a fallacy to remain under the delusion that peace and security can be achieved through armaments. Peace and lasting security can be ensured only through justice. Security cannot be ensured through the strength of arms, but through respect for international law and the Charter of the United Nations, which prohibit the use or the threat of force, interference and intervention in the internal affairs of other States. Scrupulous respect for the independence, the territorial integrity, the non-resort to aggression against and occupation of other people's territory and for the peaceful settlement of disputes would contribute to the lessening of tensions among nations and of dependency upon armaments. If each nation and each region respected the Charter principles there would be no need to resort to arms in order to resolve conflicts. If we all accepted peaceful coexistence, what justification would there be for pursuing a path towards self-extinction?

60. When the tenth special session adopted its Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*] four years ago, we were all hopeful that momentum would be given to the disarmament effort. That document, with its Declaration, Programme of Action and machinery, contains everything needed for meaningful disarmament. The Programme of Action contains priorities and measures in the field of disarmament which States were to undertake as a matter of urgency with a view to halting and reversing the arms race. Unfortunately, no real progress has been made since the adoption of that Programme.

61. Once again, we are meeting in order to review the implementation of the decisions of the tenth special session. After hearing laudatory statements exhorting us towards action in disarmament, we shall end up adopting another final document which, regrettably, may also be ignored or glossed over while the arms race continues. Let us hope that this pessimistic view will be proved wrong and that we shall not allow the lack of progress to date to be a pretext for not pursuing negotiations aimed at adopting concrete disarmament measures.

62. This session should be an occasion for laying down a general framework within which general and complete disarmament can be negotiated. The adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament is not a far cry. I know there are those who will say that general and complete disarmament with specific time-frames and stages is unattainable. They will contend that we are being myopic and unrealistic. But we shall not be diverted by this because we have heard it all before. When we called and worked for decolonization a generation ago, we were labelled unrealistic. If we had been discouraged, where would most of us seated in the Assembly be? If we listen to those who say that restructuring the economic system and the establishment of a new order is impossible, shall we not be condemning millions to perpetual poverty? We must soldier on in search for peace through disarmament. In this respect the two leading nuclear Powers have a major role to play. Let us remind those two super-Powers that in 1977 their leaders offered to reduce their nuclear weapons by as much as one half, on a reciprocal basis. What then has made those Powers retreat from this position? If they cannot stick to their words because of

changing political expediency, how are we to trust them in the future?

63. Interestingly, the two contending alliances want confidence-building measures between themselves for national security and for the avoidance of surprise attacks. What they forget is that confidence-building measures do not apply only between East and West. Confidence-building measures equally apply between the nuclear-weapon States and the non-nuclear-weapon States. We need assurance that nuclear weapons will not be unleashed against those of us who do not possess them. In this aspect of confidence-building, the leading nuclear Powers should provide leadership through self-denying ordinances.

64. Among such self-denying ordinances there ought to be a comprehensive test-ban which should prohibit the testing, development and deployment of nuclear weapons. For many years inconclusive negotiations have been held on banning underground testing, which is the loophole for qualitative improvement of sophisticated instruments of death. An end has to be put to this by the adoption of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

65. How are we to react to the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and appeals to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty if there is no restraint among the nuclear Powers? In order to secure greater acceptance of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the nuclear Powers should follow the Treaty's letter and spirit.

66. We wish to express dismay at the failure of the Committee on Disarmament to reach agreement on chemical and radiological weapons. Our dismay is heightened by the fact that, in an age when we should be talking about prohibiting the use of deadly chemical weapons as a means of war, there are some who countenance their further manufacture in retaliation against the alleged use of these weapons by some Powers. We think this is a retrograde step which will only complicate the arms scene. We urge all parties to put an end to the manufacture and possession of these weapons.

Mr. Kam (Panama), Vice-President, took the Chair.

67. While it is the nuclear-arms race that poses the immediate danger to international peace and security, the conventional arms race too has got out of control. Many countries which can ill afford the conventional arms competition spend resources which could be used to further economic and social development. National pride, perceived security interests and fear add fire to this race. It is said that the third world bears more than its share of blame with regard to conventional armaments. We are in that way reminded from time to time that conventional arms, which have killed millions since the invention of gunpowder, should be dealt with immediately. While it is necessary for the suppliers and purchasers of these weapons to limit and reduce conventional arms transfers, my delegation believes that nuclear weapons still pose the gravest threat to humanity and that they should be given priority. Conventional arms should not be used as an excuse for not moving forward in nuclear-arms control and disarmament.

68. Regional disarmament can be of tremendous help in the global effort. In this regard, the establishment

of nuclear-weapon-free zones would be a tremendous boost towards general and complete disarmament. For our part, we demand the denuclearization of Africa. The people of Africa have problems of decolonization and economic development to deal with. They do not want those problems to be compounded by the introduction of nuclear weapons into Africa. That is why we are more than concerned by the nuclear-weapon capability that South Africa has acquired through collusion with certain countries. Already the *apartheid* régime is engaged not only in the systematic suppression of the non-white population, but also in intensified acts of aggression and hostility against neighbouring independent African States. We call upon those countries which aid and abet South Africa in developing nuclear weapons to desist from doing so.

69. Closely linked with the denuclearization of Africa is the question of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. For over a decade the Declaration on the Indian Ocean adopted by the General Assembly has remained unimplemented. Contrary to the desire of littoral and hinterland States, certain major Powers threaten peace and security in the Ocean by establishing military bases and by introducing warships and other weaponry. The ever-increasing scale of the foreign military presence and rivalry jeopardizes the peace of the countries of the Indian Ocean region. We have also witnessed the obstruction by certain major Powers of the holding of the Conference on the Indian Ocean by the injection of extraneous issues which are of no concern or interest to the littoral States. We hope that there will be a change of mind so that the Conference can take place soon; otherwise our region will be turned into a battle zone for big Powers, to the detriment and destruction of Africa. We call for wisdom and sense to prevail.

70. The dangerous illusion among the nuclear Powers that in the event of a nuclear war there will be those who will be able to avoid the catastrophe and somehow survive—and, it is hoped, emerge as the victors—is probably the greatest stumbling-block in the quest for disarmament. It cannot be over-emphasized—for everybody knows the truth, and all the experts have borne testimony to this—that an outbreak of a nuclear war in the present state of armament would be disastrous for the entire human race. This, we believe, is a crucial message which should be driven home as a matter of the utmost urgency to all those responsible for taking decisions, or in a position to influence decisions, in the field of disarmament. The heavy moral responsibility to take immediate action to avert a cataclysm, and with whom that responsibility lies, is more than obvious. There is no time left for hesitation, prevarication, complacency or self-delusion. No one can afford the luxury of scoring a political point at such a high cost, the cost of risking the survival of all mankind.

71. Mankind wants to continue to live. Mankind wants peace, security and stability in order to develop economically, socially and culturally. The state of armaments is totally incompatible with that desire. That is why people are now speaking out by means of demonstrations and protests against nuclear weapons. We cannot afford to ignore public opinion. We can do so out of stubbornness, but certainly not out of

ignorance of the consequences. Still less can we claim, in adopting such stubborn postures, to represent the aspirations of our peoples.

72. We have no doubt whatsoever that general and complete disarmament is not only possible, but also the only rational choice. This session cannot afford to end in another disappointment to the world community. We hope that at the very least it will lay the foundation for some action commensurate with the gravity of the situation, the rationality and ingenuity of man, and the overwhelming public cry for peace and stability.

73. Mr. BWAKIRA (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): The unanimous decision to entrust to Mr. Kittani the presidency of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament reflects the trust inspired in the Assembly by his qualities as a seasoned diplomat and his experience of international life. We welcome that happy choice and extend to him, and to the other re-elected officers, the congratulations of the delegation of Burundi. We are convinced that Mr. Kittani will impart to our debates the same dynamism and authority that characterized the work of the thirty-sixth session of the Assembly.

74. I should like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who, since his election, has spared no effort to restore peace to regions of the world where it has been breached, and for whom the Government of Burundi reaffirms its support in the discharge of his lofty and noble mission in the service of the international community.

75. In a passage in his statement made from this rostrum on 26 September 1979 to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, Jean-Baptiste Bagaza, President of the Republic of Burundi, said with regard to disarmament:

“The Second World War was enough to demonstrate the drama of mankind’s existence threatened by the huge arsenal of destruction made available to human societies through science and technology. Therefore it is urgent to do everything possible to avoid a new global conflagration and to discourage any escalation of violence, for the very survival of the human race. The only way to achieve this is to carry out complete and general disarmament. This will only be done by promoting a sense of solidarity and friendship among peoples and by making people aware of the danger represented by the arms race.

“In these circumstances, only political commitment by States can unleash the disarmament process. The Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly represents a stage which should be stressed within this context. It is important that the measures recommended in this document should be followed up.” [9th meeting, paras. 51 and 52.]

76. The first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament aroused hopes, since all States reaffirmed their political will to support the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and strictly to observe its principles. It is unfortunately the case, however, that the four years since the 1978 session have been characterized by the threat or use of force

against the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, by interference, military intervention, occupation and annexation and by the denial of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence, in flagrant violation of the Charter.

77. The developing countries in particular have often been the target of aggression and threats. The principle of the inviolability of their internationally recognized borders has been flouted and that of the peaceful settlement of disputes has not always been respected by Member States. Such actions have of course caused concern to the international community.

78. It is therefore not without disquiet that we note a very great tension in international relations, where explosive conflicts are rife and tend to become internationalized in almost every region of the world, continuously increasing the danger of a widespread war and very seriously threatening peace and international security. The situation is even more disquieting when such conflicts directly or indirectly involve the interests of Powers that possess sophisticated weapons.

79. The international community has become disenchanted with costly over-armament, as dangerous as it is useless, and is turning its eyes towards the present deliberations on disarmament at the General Assembly, the agenda of which reflects the concerns of all Governments and all the representative sectors of the world population with regard to the incessant increase in conventional, chemical and nuclear weapons. The convening of this session indicates a determination to improve international relations, to preserve peace and, above all, to avoid a nuclear catastrophe at all costs.

80. Evidence of this is the quality and number of representatives who are participating in this session. They have come here from all the corners of the Earth, not only to express the disquiet and anxiety of their peoples at the threat of self-destruction hanging over civilization and the human species, but also to express their ardent hope that the Assembly will, at the conclusion of these deliberations, take measures inspired by reason and common sense that can put an end to a suicidal venture that could only result in a world order based on the balance of terror and nuclear conflagration.

81. The present international situation is dominated by tensions and hatred. But nuclear weapons and the heedless accumulation of conventional, chemical and biological weapons are certainly not the key to true security and a peaceful future.

82. The Secretary-General quite rightly noted this in 1981 in section V of his report on the work of the Organization⁷ when he stated:

“It must be recognized that the search for absolute security can, in fact, breed further insecurity. History demonstrates that there are times when an arms race can acquire a momentum of its own, quite independent of the political causes which initially provoked it, and lead inexorably to disaster.”

The report also said, in the same section:

“In international affairs, confusion, confrontation and emotion cannot accurately be foreseen forestalled or controlled, and a nuclear war would

be both devastatingly quick and conclusive. If the present nuclear-arms race among the most powerful States is the greatest potential danger threatening mankind, a similar race between additional nuclear States will add immeasurably to that danger and to the risk of the actual use of nuclear weapons."

83. In view of the foregoing, this present session devoted to disarmament cannot be treated lightly, much less with indifference. It calls for a more acute awareness of the threatening danger of the arms race and for sincere efforts, in view of the hopes that we placed in the tenth special session and that have not, unfortunately, been satisfied by any real, tangible progress towards disarmament.

84. As we note in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, the General Assembly has clearly recognized that the security of States must be envisaged not only from the military standpoint but also from the economic and social standpoint, and that a link exists between disarmament and development.

85. Since 1978, we have seen that the continuous increase in military expenditures, in particular in the developed countries, has contributed to a deterioration of the international economic situation and has impeded the economic development of the developing countries.

86. Preceding speakers have eloquently denounced the scandalous diversion for weapons purposes of human and material resources that could have been used to provide health and medical care, housing and shelter—in short, to provide for the well-being of millions of peoples who today are stagnating in poverty and total destitution.

87. The arms race swallows up vast human and financial resources. The statistics of specialized research institutes show that military expenditures increase year by year at the expense of resources elevated to the economic and social development of the peoples.

88. World military expenditures reached \$500 billion in 1980, and in 1981 they reached the colossal sum of \$600 billion. They have increased by 3 per cent a year since the tenth special session. A small portion, a mere fifth of this ill-conceived expenditure, would be enough to ensure financing for implementing the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade [resolution 35/56, annex].

89. The Final Document particularly stressed the transfer and reallocation of the human and material resources swallowed up in the arms race to the economic development of the developing countries.

90. Such an approach, had it been effectively followed up and supported, would have created a climate of trust, facilitated international trade at various levels and made possible effective co-operation between developed countries and developing countries.

91. The arms race is not the cause of the international tension we are witnessing throughout the world; it is its consequence. The causes of the deterioration in international relations lie elsewhere. They derive from the inequality and injustice which characterize the present world economic system. To remedy this,

we must restructure economic relations in the world and establish, for the well-being of all humanity, a new economic order to reduce the gap separating the rich from the poor nations.

92. Non-compliance with the Charter is another source of destabilization and of tension among States. It engenders a feeling of insecurity and fear which impels States to arm themselves and even to overarm themselves to ensure their security and to defend the vital interests of their peoples.

93. As regards Africa in particular, resolution 1652 (XVI) of 24 November 1961 to establish a denuclearized zone has never been implemented. However, the first ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Cairo in June 1964, also stressed the necessity of denuclearizing the African continent.

94. We are far from attaining that goal; quite the contrary. The arms race of the racist régime of Pretoria has brought in its wake the use of force in its relations with the front-line States and non-respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of these African States, thus dashing any hope of peaceful coexistence among nations in southern Africa.

95. The illegal occupation of Namibia, the repression by South Africa of the populations of that territory and the repeated attacks against the front-line countries and particularly against Angola, part of whose territory has been occupied by the *apartheid* régime, are all illegal and barbaric acts which only confirm Pretoria's strengthening of its war machine, thanks to the complicity of certain military Powers in violation of the arms embargo against Pretoria as stipulated in resolution 418 (1977) of the Security Council.

96. The threat posed by the South African régime to international peace and security is aggravated by the foreign military presence in the Indian Ocean. Neither General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) of 16 December 1971 nor the proposals of the *Ad Hoc* Committee nor the frequently expressed desire of the countries of the region to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace—none of these has prevented military escalation in the Ocean.

97. Apart from southern Africa, other pockets of tension still concern States Members of the Organization and international opinion: for example, the Middle East, Western Sahara, the South Atlantic and South-East Asia.

98. The case of the Middle East is even more distressing: Israel's use and threat of use of force in international relations, its acquisition of Arab territories by force and their occupation and annexation are acts which flout the Charter of the United Nations and international law. Israel's illegal occupation of Lebanon, at the very time when the twelfth special session is being held, constitutes an act of defiance of the international community. It is a serious threat to international peace and security.

99. Burundi has always supported and continues to support the initiatives taken to create nuclear-weapon-free zones. Accordingly, it is imperative to take appropriate steps to implement the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, to create a nuclear-

weapon-free zone in the Middle East and in South-East Asia and to seek compliance with the treaties and protocols banning nuclear weapons in Latin America.

100. The tenth special session, in the Final Document adopted at the end of its work, and particularly in its Programme of Action, laid the foundation for a progressive and balanced reduction of nuclear-weapon stockpiles. It recommended, *inter alia*, stopping the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the development of new types of such weapons. Unfortunately, such was not to be. Trust gave place to suspicion, and weapons arsenals are being filled as never before. The super-Powers now seem to be concentrating their efforts on the quest for nuclear supremacy in regard to one another rather than on a genuine reduction of their weapons.

101. Bilateral negotiations, begun with the aim of bringing about a mutual reduction of weapons, are marking time, and certain juridical instruments, which were the outcome of the first stages of negotiations, have not even been ratified, nullifying all the efforts which had been made to that effect. Worse still, some seem to wish to give substance to the idea that a limited nuclear war is conceivable, and efforts are being undertaken to win it. Overarmament has become a very enticing slogan in certain circles. The result of this is increased mistrust and tension.

102. Rivalry and influence-seeking are not limited any longer to various continents or to the seas and oceans which surround them. Military competition seems to be encroaching on outer space, as if the nuclear weapons stockpiled in terrestrial arsenals were not enough to cause, as one author said, "the explosion of millions of 'Hiroshima suns' and the annihilation of the human race".

103. It is therefore high time to halt this kind of suicidal arms race and to envisage a strategy which is constructive rather than destructive.

104. The measures set forth in the Final Document, which sanctioned the work of the tenth special session, have lost none of their relevance. That is why my delegation is happy to note that the will on the part of the two Powers to resume a dialogue still exists.

105. We see but one approach to attain disarmament, namely, that outlined in the Final Document which said in its paragraph 109 that we should attain "the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control . . . in a world in which international peace and security prevail and in which the new international economic order is strengthened and consolidated."

106. We are in the Second Disarmament Decade, proclaimed by the United Nations since 1979. To attain comprehensive disarmament, which Burundi yearns for, there are some prerequisites: scrupulous respect for the Charter and for international law in international relations; a halt to the arms race in order to devote to development resources being swallowed up by the production and acquisition of deadly weapons; the establishment of a new world economic order which would make it possible to create just and equitable trade in international economic relations and to bridge the immense gap which separates the North

from the South; respect for human rights and the rights of peoples and the abolition of social injustice; and finally, the reaffirmation by this session of the validity of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly.

107. Thus, in the view of my delegation, the conditions will have been created that will allow progressive disarmament for peace and co-operation among peoples.

108. Mr. SALLAM (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): First of all, I should like to congratulate the President, Mr. Kittani, on the expression of the trust placed in him by the international community in electing him to the presidency of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly, the second devoted to disarmament.

109. The delegation of the Yemen Arab Republic is fully confident that the work of this session will, under his presidency and leadership, be crowned with success thanks to his wide experience, his sagacity and his well-known political experience.

110. I should like on this occasion to extend, on behalf of the delegation of the Yemen Arab Republic, our sincerest condolences to His Majesty King Fahd ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud and to the royal family and people of Saudi Arabia on the occasion of the death of His Majesty, the late King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud. May God receive him among the faithful and endow his people with patience and strength in their sorrow.

111. Twenty-three years ago, in November 1959, the General Assembly expressed hope of achieving tangible progress in the field of general and complete disarmament under effective international control [*resolution 1378 (XIV)*]. In December 1961, the Assembly reconfirmed the same objective in its resolution 1722 (XVI) and set up a committee of 18 to undertake negotiations to that end. In 1969 the Assembly established the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [*resolution 2602 B (XXIV)*], which worked until 1978 without achieving any basic or tangible progress in this field, in spite of the fact that the General Assembly had at its twenty-fourth session declared the 1970s as the Disarmament Decade [*resolution 2602 E (XXIV)*]. Now, after all this time, these many years in which the international community has been exerting tireless efforts and spending great sums of money, we are asking ourselves whether anything fundamental or essential has been achieved in this respect. In the view of the delegation of the Yemen Arab Republic, nothing tangible has been achieved. On the contrary, the Middle East, for example, has been subjected to wars, and military expenditures have doubled and today exceed \$600 billion per year. The conventional and nuclear arms race has accelerated, intensifying the threat of the use of nuclear weapons; and the production of chemical weapons and new weapons of destruction has increased, and unfortunately the peoples of the Middle East have become the testing-ground of their destructive capacity through their use by Israel against the States and peoples of the region.

112. Four years after the first special session devoted to disarmament, which adopted numerous resolutions aimed at general and complete disarmament under

effective international control, we, the peoples of the Middle East, have not witnessed anything new in the field of disarmament. On the contrary, the conventional arms race in the region has accelerated and the small States are now at the mercy of a State which is alien to the region, namely, the State of Israel, which does not respect the principles of the Charter or of international law and does not even respect the customs, traditions and principles of good-neighbourliness. Since its creation and to this very day, Israel has refused to ratify the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and has not subjected the major part of its nuclear installations to international safeguards. In paragraph 6 of its resolution 34/89, of 11 December 1979, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General, "with the assistance of qualified experts, to prepare a study on Israeli nuclear armament and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session".

113. The findings of this Group of Experts to Prepare a Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament⁸ are as follows.

114. First, there is no doubt that Israel does possess the technical capacity to produce nuclear weapons and that it does possess the means of delivering them to their targets in the area.

115. Secondly, there are important indications that confirm that Israel has been a nuclear-weapon State for at least 10 years.

116. Thirdly, in the view of the Group of Experts, Israel can contribute to averting a nuclear-arms race in the Middle East region by subjecting its installations to international guarantees and pledging to establish a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East in accordance with paragraphs 60 to 63 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly and with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 35/147 through its accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Will Israel respond to this resolution and fulfil its obligations to the international community?

117. My delegation believes Israel will not carry out its obligations and commitments, because it is a State whose leadership is pledged to violence, arrogance and disregard of United Nations resolutions. From this starting-point Israel began this important second special session on disarmament by launching a war of extermination against the Palestinian people, involving the destruction of Lebanese villages and towns and the killing of thousands of defenceless Palestinian and Lebanese civilians, old people, women and children, with its armed forces militarily supported by the United States. Israel has used its invading forces, equipped with the most up-to-date weapons from the United States arsenals, to apply the most violent methods of destruction devised by the military technology of the United States against the peaceful people of Palestine, which was uprooted from its own territory and has continued to claim its liberty and the restoration of its usurped rights for the past 33 years. Is it just, is it fair that a great super-Power and a permanent member of the Security Council directly responsible for the preservation of international peace and security should place at the disposal of a handful of murderers and hatred-filled Zionist terrorists the most up-to-date destructive weapons produced by American arsenals?

118. The Arab Palestinian people and the Arab and Islamic peoples will not remain indifferent and inactive, no matter what the sacrifices in lives, property and equipment may be and whatever the suffering and the bloodshed, until the people of Palestine has recovered its inalienable rights.

119. What Israel is aiming at in the region through the use of force and the threat of force, using the arms supplied by the United States, is the subjugation and humiliation of the peoples of Palestine and Lebanon. Israel wants to compel the Palestinians to surrender to a handful of Zionists, a group that does not know the true meaning of peace based on justice and that disregards the spiritual, religious, humane and moral values which the peoples of the Middle East cherish. What is most surprising to my delegation is that those who were tortured and humiliated, who suffered and were made homeless through the Nazi holocaust, are the very ones that today are carrying out a war of extermination and making the Arab Palestinian people and the heroic Lebanese people homeless, using incendiary cluster bombs and sophisticated missiles, burying alive many women, children and old persons in the debris of houses that have been destroyed and causing the death by starvation of freedom fighters. So where is the world conscience? Where are those Governments and peoples that invoke the principle of peace based on justice? Where are the Governments and peoples that invoke the principles of human rights? Where are the Governments and peoples that constantly invoke the principle of the right of peoples to freedom and self-determination? Has not the international community—with the exception of Israel and the United States, of course—recognized the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people? Has not the whole world recognized the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people? Yet nobody has done anything, and the Palestinian people are being subjected to a war of extermination unprecedented in history, except for the genocide carried out by the Nazis against the good Jewish people.

120. We call on the Assembly and the international community to take effective international deterrent measures to bring about conventional and nuclear disarmament by those countries that want to exercise hegemony over other States, and to protect non-nuclear-weapon States from the use or threat of use of such weapons against them.

121. The international community has entrusted the preservation of international peace and security to the big Powers. The two super-Powers are completely and directly responsible for the preservation of international peace and security throughout the world. The rivalry between those two super-Powers in dividing the world into their respective zones of influence and calling that defence of their vital interests is a major cause of the tension and the trouble-spots in the world today. Again, the two super-Powers are responsible for the production of sophisticated conventional and nuclear weapons and their sale to the small developing countries, which desperately need the transfer of resources and modern technology so that they may develop their own economies and natural resources.

122. The international community demands a radical change in the objectives of the foreign policies of the

two super-Powers. They should be guided by the principles of the peaceful coexistence of States with different economic, social and political systems and of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. There is also a need for goodwill and true seriousness in the constructive work for the welfare of mankind as a whole.

123. The scope for competition for the welfare of mankind is very wide. The super-Powers could compete in exploring new sources of energy and in finding new sources of protein in the seas and oceans to feed the hungry and needy. They could compete in the exploration of outer space and in discovering new means of dealing with diseases which are at present incurable and with ignorance and backwardness throughout the world.

124. World Bank statistics show that 570 million people are today suffering from malnutrition, 880 million are illiterate, 1.5 billion lack medical services and 250 million children do not attend school. Yet the world community spends about 8 per cent of the world's resources on armaments.

125. In 1980 world expenditure for military purposes rose to \$500 billion. This sum was equal to all the investments made in the developing world and was 20 times the official development aid extended by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development to the developing countries. The volume of the resources devoted to armaments during the past 20 years increased at an average annual rate of more than 3 per cent. On this basis, world military expenditure in the year 2000 will reach \$940 billion at 1980 prices, according to the World Bank report.

126. The Yemen Arab Republic delegation has repeatedly expressed its deep anxiety regarding the continually increasing military activities of the big Powers, headed by the two super-Powers, in the Indian Ocean. The climate of peace and security in that region is deteriorating daily in spite of the unceasing efforts of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean to keep their region free of the struggle between the two super-Powers for zones of influence in that region.

127. The growing military activities of the two super-Powers have increased tension among the States of the Indian Ocean owing to the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other destructive weapons. The Government of the Yemen Arab Republic wishes to emphasize the importance of the participation of all the big Powers in the Conference on the Indian Ocean and its work in connexion with the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

128. My country wishes to stress equally the need to eliminate the increasing strife between the two super-Powers in the Red Sea area.

129. My delegation listened very carefully to the statements of President Reagan of the United States and Mr. Gromyko, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, and it does not doubt the good will and good intentions expressed by both parties concerning the adoption of the necessary effective measures to bring about nuclear disarmament. But what worries our people is the vertical and horizontal escalation of the production of what are now called conventional weapons, which are very accurate and

have tremendous total destructive capacity. Consequently, the delegation of the Yemen Arab Republic appeals to the two super-Powers and to the international community to take the necessary measures to halt the development of military technology in this respect.

130. The Charter of the United Nations starts with these historic words: "We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". The peoples of the world have expressed in various ways their profound discontent at the pursuit by Governments of the arms race. Therefore we, the representatives of those peoples, should respect their feelings and carry out their wishes.

131. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Four years ago, on the initiative of the non-aligned countries, the General Assembly convened its first special session devoted to disarmament. We were then all optimistic and enthusiastic because we believed that general and complete disarmament would be achieved and that thereby many problems between the East and the West and between the North and the South would be solved. We believed that the process of disarmament would further strengthen the security of all States and meet the aspirations of peoples by creating an atmosphere of general tranquillity and mutual confidence that would lead to sound international relations free from violence and threats. We pinned our hopes on the possibility of creating an international community based on true equality of all and mutual co-operation beneficial to all, thus bridging the gap between the poor and the rich, between the weak and the strong.

132. However, we are meeting here again today at the highest level to evaluate what has been done to implement what we agreed at that time would bring about a better world—that is, the comprehensive strategy whose details are contained in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly. Even a quick review of the achievements, however, confirms that the international situation has in fact deteriorated since 1978 and that international relations have gravely worsened. Not one State can feel that its security and stability are guaranteed. There is a conceptual and a real link between international peace and security and disarmament. In fact, the main prerequisite for disarmament is sound international relations in a favourable climate, free of all tensions.

133. The last four years have proved not only that we have failed to achieve any of the declared objectives of the Programme of Action but that we are in fact witnessing a spiralling of the arms race. We must ask what are the real reasons behind this deterioration in international détente and the increasing number of hotbeds of tension. We are all the more pessimistic at the present special session because of the clear disparity—indeed the contradiction—between declared intentions and actual deeds. There are certain ominous developments which warn us that this world of ours is swaying closer to the brink of disaster. We believe that the principal cause is the revival of international imperialism, which is trying to expand its domination over the world, in particular over the

third world, as a source of wealth as well as an open market for their ambitions. In fact, the third world holds the strategic position for all aggressors. World imperialism has turned the concept of self-defence into a pretext for it and its agents to justify aggression and set up military bases, to deploy its military presence, nuclear as well as conventional, in strategic positions, to repress the aspirations of peoples and deny them the right to exercise self-determination. They have, in fact, obstructed the establishment of a new international economic order reflecting the legitimate claims and rights of all developing countries.

134. The United States of America has played the leading role in spoiling the international climate by resorting to the logic of strength. It has mounted military, political and economic offensives against the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. We refer by way of example to the United States efforts to counteract the Iranian revolution, its bolstering of South Africa in that country's repeated acts of aggressions against Angola and continued occupation of Namibia, its sabotage of and threats against Nicaragua, Cuba and other countries. There is no doubt that the Middle East conflagration has come about as a result of the aggressive imperialist policy, which has two objectives: first, to maintain domination over the Middle East and control its destiny; and, secondly, to work through its agent, Israel, to repress the Arabs, whether they be Palestinians, Lebanese, Syrians or others, and to allow Israel to strengthen its expansionist policy at the expense of the sovereignty of the Arab people in Palestine and in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights. Israel's barbaric attack against Lebanon is but an extension of the imperialist policy of domination and an attempt to strengthen the United States-Israeli military presence in the Middle East in connexion with the perfidious Camp David agreement, which was achieved at the expense of the Arab people—indeed, of Arab national interests. The timing of the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and against the Palestinian people in Lebanon and in the occupied territories to coincide with the present session is not coincidental. In fact, it serves to confirm that the United States and its agent, Israel, have exploited the noble objectives of the session in order to undermine the concept of security, the basic condition for the success of the disarmament process.

135. We heard the speech of President Reagan [16th meeting] and drew the ominous conclusion that limited nuclear war was considered feasible. Just one day later the terrorist Begin came here to give us a lesson in so-called self-defence, falsely claiming that God Almighty had given the Zionists in occupied Palestine the mission of self-defence, restricting it to them alone, and that that right was conferred upon them so that they could carry out their expansionist, murderous operations. However, Begin was snubbed by you when you deprived him of the honour of your presence. He left here to beg his United States masters for more money and sophisticated weapons to continue the massacre in Lebanon, to step up violence against and persecution of the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories.

136. The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic wishes to express its great appreciation of and satisfaction with the Soviet declaration that the Soviet Union

will not be the first to use nuclear weapons against any other country [12th meeting].

137. The question of Israeli nuclear armament is one of the most crucial before us, because it will not be possible to make the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone as long as Israel continues to possess nuclear weapons that are not disclosed and are not subjected to international safeguards and control. The so-called Israeli project to set up a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East is only nuclear blackmail from a position of strength; it is a falsehood intended only as misleading propaganda to cover up the Israeli crimes, which have led to tens of thousands of dead and injured and hundreds of thousands of displaced people in Lebanon.

138. All the indications are that Israel possesses nuclear capability. Information in United Nations documents confirms that, in collaboration with South Africa, Israel has carried out more than one nuclear test. It committed aggression against the Tamuz nuclear plant, which was intended for peaceful purposes, thus threatening the right of developing countries to use nuclear technology for development and scientific research, in accordance with the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which Israel has categorically refused to sign. Every State that provides Israel with nuclear know-how without laying down conditions, such as the acceptance of international control through IAEA over all open and secret nuclear facilities in Israel, is contributing to the threat to the daily life of the Arab population in the area. We hold such States responsible for contributing to the threat to our people and placing them at risk from Israeli madness.

139. The Secretary-General's report on Israeli nuclear armaments states:

"The Group of Experts considers that the possession of nuclear weapons by Israel would be a seriously destabilizing factor in the already tense situation prevailing in the Middle East, in addition to being a serious danger to the cause of non-proliferation in general. However, they wish to add the final observation that it would, in their view, contribute to avoiding the danger of a nuclear-arms race in the region of the Middle East if Israel should renounce, without delay, the possession of or any intention to possess nuclear weapons, submitting all its nuclear activities to international safeguards, through adherence to a nuclear-weapon-free zone in accordance with paragraphs 60 to 63 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2) and with Assembly resolution 35/147, through accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, or by unilaterally accepting such safeguards."⁹

140. With regard to nuclear collaboration between the racist régimes in Tel Aviv and Pretoria, we wish to draw attention to the special report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*,¹⁰ which confirms, on the basis of certain American sources, that Israel and South Africa have carried out a joint nuclear test. We are sure that the peoples of Africa and the Middle East are the targets of that collaboration, which is aimed at the actual use of the nuclear option. All

this is done to further the objectives of the old and new strategic alliances between Washington, Tel Aviv and Pretoria.

141. It is noteworthy that the establishment of bases and the carrying out of manœuvres under various names, such as "Operation Bright Star", are accompanied by the stockpiling of nuclear weapons and their deployment in the area extending between South Africa, the Indian Ocean and the Middle East. Where is the security that we seek in order to achieve general and complete disarmament in the foreseeable future?

142. All these unfortunate developments are inconsistent with the most rudimentary objectives of general and complete disarmament. In fact, they undermine the concept of security and its credibility in our area.

143. We should like to express our satisfaction with the efforts of the relevant working group of the Committee on Disarmament in connexion with a general and complete ban on nuclear tests [A/S-12/2, para. 38]. We also wish to urge the Committee on Disarmament to continue its work to end once and for all chemical weapons and to expand the system provided for in the 1972 Convention on biological weapons [resolution 2826 (XXVI), annex]. The Viet Nam war and its atrocities are still fresh in our minds. Let us bear in mind the information that Israel and South Africa are steadily developing such lethal weapons.

144. I wish to remind the Assembly that the United States has made our land and its population—Lebanon in particular—together with its heritage of culture and civilization and its social and economic institutions, a testing-ground for the sophisticated conventional weapons which it provides to its agent, Israel. In fact, the Pentagon experts, supported by dealers in death and Israeli generals, are competing in their praise of the effectiveness of the weapons used indiscriminately against unarmed civilians and densely populated civilian targets. They actually boast of the effectiveness of those destructive weapons and of the possibility of developing weapons that would bring about total destruction. Ordinary people are unable to distinguish between death from conventional weapons and annihilation by nuclear means. At a time when Washington, by misusing the veto, is encouraging Israel to commit its barbaric crimes against our people, it is undermining the Security Council's ability to maintain international peace and security and its obligation to put an end to the aggression and punish the aggressors.

145. In conclusion, our delegation has not dealt at length with certain questions relating to disarmament, including the question of the relationship between disarmament and development, or to current bilateral, trilateral and multilateral negotiations at Geneva and elsewhere. We have not dealt with certain aspects of disarmament, because despite their importance, they have not yet achieved the specific results envisaged in the Programme of Action adopted at the tenth special session. This cannot be interpreted as indifference to those important aspects; it is due to the daily situation in which we are living, the problems we are facing in our area concerning the security of

the region and indeed international security. We therefore call upon all countries to adopt serious measures to put an end to the aggression. Nevertheless, the Syrian Arab Republic is contributing positively to all international efforts to fulfil the aspirations of the international community for general and complete disarmament.

146. We are convinced that all peoples seek security and peace. In fact they can clearly see the relationship between security and disarmament. People everywhere are demonstrating in favour of nuclear disarmament and against the stationing of nuclear missiles in their territories. They are vehemently protesting against all policies that would intensify the prevailing tension. The question of security and disarmament is no longer confined to diplomatic circles; in fact, it now concerns all peoples. We are confident that this world-wide awareness of the destructiveness of these lethal weapons will induce those who possess nuclear technology to cease their frenzied arms race and consider the reasons that lead to conflicts before it is too late.

147. I shall conclude by addressing, on behalf of my delegation, our condolences to the Saudi delegation on the death of King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz. May his soul rest in peace.

148. Mr. BLANCO (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Let me begin by greeting President Kittani and expressing my pleasure at the fact that once again we can rely on his expert guidance of our work. It is also a pleasure this afternoon to see the representative of Panama presiding at a time when it is my turn to state my country's position.

149. I wish also to greet the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, and to express the deep satisfaction of my Government with his incessant efforts in various parts of the world for peace, in particular for his efforts in the South Atlantic conflict which so profoundly distresses Uruguay. My Government firmly supports his action and trusts that, given new developments in the conflict, the Secretary-General will continue his efforts to achieve a permanent and just peace. It is Uruguay's hope that through this peaceful negotiated process the legitimate right of the Argentine Republic to the Malvinas Islands will be finally recognized.

150. It is truly significant that the present special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is being held precisely at a time when arms are being used in various parts of the world, with painful consequences. These tragic events, concurrent with this session, nevertheless do not render our deliberations meaningless; rather, they make them more urgent and dramatically emphasize our responsibilities. We are not discussing concepts on arms in the abstract; we are living amid the reality of wars.

151. Present events, with all their impact, reinforce the views duly presented by Uruguay.

152. Uruguay participated in the work of the first special session devoted to disarmament in a constructive spirit and gave its complete support to the Final Document then adopted.

153. At a time when we are evaluating the results achieved and preparing measures for the future, my

Government wishes solemnly to reaffirm its support for the principles, goals and objectives established in that Final Document. They constitute basic guidelines to which my country adheres firmly and unreservedly, as to the spirit of peace and concord which inspires that document.

154. This reaffirmation is not part of a policy of expediency. It reflects a line of conduct, a national way of life, invariably united with peace and the harmonious coexistence of all countries. This has been reflected in an unswerving effort by Uruguay, together with other nations, to establish legal machinery for the settlement of conflicts and to promote understanding, such as this very Organization and the International Court of Justice at The Hague. The Court's automatic jurisdiction was recognized promptly by my country, which, furthermore, in Mexico in 1901 accepted general and binding arbitration for the settlement of disputes.

155. When we look at the time that has elapsed since the tenth special session and observe the present situation in regard to armaments, together with the consequent frustration, the need to consider the factors of the world political context which have weakened the disarmament process is clear.

156. It is indeed a delusion to believe that the machinery designed to this end will bring about results by themselves, through negotiations deprived of context. Strictly speaking, they have to operate among great tensions, in a world divided, often in confrontation, and full of distrust. However perfect the negotiating machinery and however sophisticated the chosen legal procedures, in such an environment the growth of arsenals will be inevitable, as is shown by the present state of affairs. At the same time, the increase in arsenals will aggravate tensions and distrust, giving a new impetus towards ever higher levels of armament. Thus there is a vicious circle, a rising dialectic of tensions and arms buildup which reinforce each other reciprocally. The history of this century shows how powerful initiatives have failed when it has come to deeds, through being locked in this dialectic, as were the League of Nations itself, the Locarno Pact and the Geneva Disarmament Conference of 1932.

157. The primary necessity for breaking this vicious circle is to lessen tensions through common efforts by the members of this community of nations to create a climate of confidence, in which disarmament will be negotiated gradually and patiently. Clearly, tensions will not cease from one day to the next; nor will confidence return at once. This task has a definite starting-point: compliance, scrupulously and in good faith, with the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law.

158. At this time of scepticism and disillusion, invoking international law and the machinery of the Organization may seem like making rhetorical references to a distant ideal. Yet what appears to be most Utopian proves to be in fact most practical. As long as peoples and Governments do not feel secure in a world governed by law, even though there may be transgressions at times, the need to arm for self-defence will exist and the temptation to arm for conquest will continue unhindered.

159. If there is to be peace and confidence, if we are to succeed in lessening tensions, if we are to reach a stage of civilized and fruitful coexistence, there must be general compliance with at least some essential principles, which my Government emphasizes as basic, including the non-use of force in international relations, non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States and absolute respect for the territorial integrity of States.

160. Indeed, daily experience eloquently shows that the departure from these principles and from international law in general is the cause of the tensions and conflicts which afflict the world. Violation of the established legal order, even in the absence of a collective sanction, causes a toll of distress and sacrifice which unfortunately extends beyond the transgressor.

161. On the other hand, confidence will return and security will become tangible in so far as States act in appropriate fields in accordance with the law, thus cancelling out power policies and attempts to influence the course which others set for their own internal and external conduct. Thus we shall move towards a community of nations with neither tutors nor pupils which will express the legal equality of States by a policy of full respect for the right of each to develop its own destiny freely and without interference or aggression.

162. According to this line of thinking, the United Nations can and should fulfil a relevant role in accordance with its primary goal of preserving peace, which is the very reason for its existence. To this end the machinery must function at the appropriate time in accordance with the ways and means provided for in the Charter to stifle conflicts and seek the settlement of disputes.

163. We know this has not often happened in the past, sometimes because of attempts to impose radical solutions not in keeping with reality and the necessary harmony among the elements involved, and at other times because of support for formulas that were too timid and not adequate to deal with the issues. In other cases, in addition to the frustration generated in peoples and Governments, the way to confrontation and violence is left open and tensions are aggravated, and ultimately this encourages an arms buildup. While this is serious in any of the organs of our system, it is even more significant in the Security Council. We therefore regret that in respect of the most recent and dramatic events the use of the veto prevented action being taken to bring about peace. Today, with the passage of time, in the light of such a wealth of lessons drawn from so much experience and while recognizing the origin of this legal-political construction designed to balance the delicate interests which were at stake when the Charter was being drafted, it is appropriate to examine the possibility of considering a more effective way of organizing the voting system in the Security Council, above all to preserve intact its constitutional ability to act to maintain peace.

164. My Government is prepared to support all efforts designed to strengthen the Organization and to ensure that it shoulders its responsibilities. This will make a decisive contribution to creating the climate of dialogue and confidence which must surround the disarmament process. But this new climate we are

trying to create must be nourished by specific steps and actions in the field of disarmament. Just as disarmament is not possible without a minimum of confidence and a lessening of tensions, so the latter will not be possible or lasting without effective steps towards disarmament. These must of necessity come from the great Powers, which have the principal responsibility for setting in motion a true process of disarmament. In this context, the recent statements by the United States and the Soviet Union on the forthcoming START talks on strategic nuclear weapons and the understanding that in the meantime the provisions of the SALT I and SALT II agreements will be observed give grounds for hope, and Uruguay warmly welcomes them.

165. To these are added the talks at Geneva on intermediate-range nuclear weapons and at Vienna on conventional forces, which constitute other facets of the disarmament problem. Even with the realistic recognition of the existing limitations and the obstacles to the achievement of immediate results, these are steps in the right direction and will contribute also, apart from their own merit, to lessening international tensions.

166. As part of the political context of disarmament we must also note as positive steps the unilateral declarations by some nuclear-weapon States that they will not be the first to use nuclear weapons and that they will not use them against non-nuclear-weapon States. Although we recognize the political value of these actions as points of reference for global negotiations, it would be desirable for them also to be reflected in binding legal instruments, thus consolidating the steps taken and facilitating the participation of other nations.

167. The progressive development of international law as a means for restoring peace and generating trust, thereby helping the cause of disarmament, is a process with its own momentum. Beyond political positions, the fact of an interdependent world in which relations become closer and more numerous requires, because of its very nature, legal regulation and organizational norms.

168. Examples of this tendency—which my Government favours and vigorously supports—are the work to define a new law of the sea and efforts to do the same with regard to outer space.

169. Those sectors of our planet offer the opportunity to carry out a large-scale collective task to recognize the existence of a common heritage of mankind in the service of all and free from the threat of war. As in the case of the endeavours with regard to the Antarctic, we may hope that for these zones still on the threshold of exploration, statutes can be formulated forbidding *ab initio* armaments and the use of those zones for the purpose of war. This is an opportunity for legal regulation to get the march on technological advances and practical use, thus creating conditions favourable for peace before *faits accomplis* cause the transformation of those areas into further theatres of confrontation. That is why my Government views with concern the growing use of outer space for military purposes.

170. It is also appropriate to welcome the establishment of nuclear-free zones as a step forward, although

a geographically limited step, on the path towards disarmament. In this respect, Latin America can be proud of being in the vanguard with the Treaty of Tlatelolco,¹⁰ which my country has ratified, which is a positive, concrete contribution to the cause of disarmament. It is to be hoped that that path may eventually be followed in other geographical areas and that the space made free from the nuclear threat may thus be gradually increased. Parallel with this, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is a useful instrument for making this principle universal, and it is to be hoped that its coverage will become complete. Indeed, my Government considers that vertical nuclear disarmament—to freeze and ultimately dismantle existing arsenals—is not enough; horizontal spread to nations which do not possess those weapons must also be halted. This must be balanced by a guarantee from the nuclear States not to use such weapons against those States which have signed agreements renouncing their use.

171. With equal emphasis, Uruguay calls for the right of access by developing nations to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Just as the spread of nuclear weapons causes increasing and intolerable dangers and is therefore unacceptable, it would likewise be unacceptable to exclude a substantial part of mankind from the advantages of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Clearly, this requires all the means of international control necessary to prevent the clandestine use of peaceful techniques for military purposes; these means, of course, we have always supported.

172. The 1963 Moscow Treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water¹ should now be followed by a general and complete prohibition of such tests; from this the cause of disarmament would gain as much as the cause of preserving the environment.

173. Without claiming to have listed all the measures which my Government considers appropriate, I should like to refer to the need for a convention putting an end to the use of chemical weapons, as well as the need to ban certain conventional weapons which are particularly injurious but which are not included in the 1980 Convention⁵ on that subject.

174. False opposition should not be sown between the various forums for dialogue and negotiation. Sometimes, delicate political requirements call for restricted meetings to lay the first foundations of trust and understanding. Thus, as part of a general outlook, and although they are procedurally separated, all these forums contribute politically to disarmament and peace.

175. Nevertheless, my Government would like all efforts ultimately to be undertaken within the United Nations framework, which would give them a truly world-wide scope and permit each State, large or small, to exercise its legitimate right to participate in the legal regulation of armaments. The present special session provides an opportunity to do responsible work on this question.

176. The comprehensive programme of disarmament is the main objective. The draft programme [A/S-12/2, appendix I] originated and has developed within the United Nations system and now, with efforts by

us all, it can be finalized and adopted by the General Assembly. We hope that it will be a firm and accepted guide for disarmament, particularly its chapters on measures and time-frames, to which my delegation will devote special efforts. Likewise, we shall emphatically support the steps to ensure the allocation to economic and social development of resources which are now being used for military purposes and which will be freed by disarmament. It is enough to recall the figure of \$600 billion spent on arms—which is the equivalent, as the Secretary-General noted, to an annual expenditure of \$112 for every inhabitant of the world—to realize the magnitude and urgency of this question.

177. Consistent with its pacifist tradition, Uruguay will make a frank and positive contribution to all aspects of the disarmament process, in accordance with its stated positions.

178. We are witnessing the tragedy of regional wars, but we are witnessing also the clamour by many people in many parts of the world, often through enormous public demonstrations, for an end to armament, especially nuclear armament, and for real steps towards genuine and stable peace. Sometimes the call for unilateral and unconditional disarmament is the expression of a given political ideology more than a deep vocation for peace, but undoubtedly the vast multitudes which spontaneously rally round the call for peace are expressing an authentic sentiment of the peoples, a desire that is truly felt by the silent majorities everywhere and that is now openly expressed and has come to constitute a new political reality. In the words of His Holiness John Paul II, "the world wants peace; the world needs peace". It would be desirable if these demonstrations covered the whole political spectrum of nations and thus could exercise a more balanced and far-reaching influence.

179. To be viable, disarmament requires balanced compliance by the great Powers so that none of them acquires an advantage as a result of the process, or feel threatened that that might occur. The stability of today's world—a stability among political blocs and military alliances—derives precisely from the strategic balance, which is a deterrent to nuclear war. This situation, however, cannot be considered a goal. We will not be content with peace through fear. We wish to work to build more solid, human foundations for the coexistence of nations. Nor is a scheme for strategic balance satisfactory or acceptable, for it does not exclude so-called peripheral wars waged outside the territories of the great Powers or in areas remote from their main interests. In the scenarios of the predictors of the future and in war games, those peripheral areas seem to be the most probable battlegrounds for confrontation in the era of vast means of mass destruction.

180. It is obvious that an order that permits international terrorist activities and co-operation with subversive movements is not acceptable either. Those are real and tangible dangers for many countries and direct threats to their security. Unless such factors are recognized, the urgent task of development will be made more difficult and even impeded.

181. In spite of this, the existing order cannot be dismantled overnight, leaving the world to chaos and

opportunism. A balanced and gradual process is required, with safeguards and guarantees that through negotiation and agreements can lead to a stable system based on law and with appropriate control and verification machinery. Thus, gradually, it will be possible to compile a series of international agreements, some by geographical area, others by types of weapon and others, finally, drawn up on the basis of nuclear or non-nuclear-weapon States. Each of them, and all of them together, will bring us closer to the final objective of universal and complete disarmament. Let us try, by stages, to draw nearer to the goal of security under law.

182. In the tragic circumstances of armed conflicts, and with direct relevance to Latin America, such events, although painful, have strengthened its sense of unity through trial.

183. In this connexion, Latin America can and must play an even more significant role in the Organization as a moderating force with its own identity—a force which, without confrontation or arrogance, will naturally take up the lofty position in keeping with its dignity.

184. Mr. DEL ROSARIO (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Dominican Republic is a small country of 5.5 million people, and we are one of that large number of developing countries that seek, through dignity, respect and labour, to raise the standard of living of our peoples.

185. My country shares the island of Santo Domingo with our neighbour the honourable Republic of Haiti, with which our relations of respect and dignity cannot be better and with which we have no problem but, rather, a mutual desire on the part of both our Governments to work to improve the life of the inhabitants every day.

186. The foreign policy of my Government and people is based on peace and on total and resolute respect for such principles of international law as non-interference in the internal affairs of States, the self-determination of peoples and that often-violated principle so essential to the peace of mankind which holds that might is not right.

187. The Dominican Republic, with a democratic Government and people, has no atomic bombs, no nuclear warheads, no sophisticated and terrifying deadly weapons. It does, however, have the moral courage to take the floor during this twelfth special session of the General Assembly, a session devoted to disarmament, to appeal—to plead, if you will—from the deepest Christian feelings of my Government and people: enough, enough, enough! Enough of this insane arms race that we are now witnessing.

188. Let us begin today—not tomorrow—to convert those factories of weapons of mass destruction into factories for tractors, ploughs, medicines, books and tools for peace and for a better life for mankind, which today lives in anxiety haunted by the horror of a nuclear war in which there can be no winners but in which everyone will lose.

189. Although public opinion is focused on the appeal for nuclear disarmament, conventional weapons are no less tragic and devastating, and they have been employed in the shameful wars of this century.

190. In this sacred precinct, we often hear high-sounding statements about respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, for international law and for that vast body of treaties and conventions that is the product of the arduous labour of our predecessors in the diplomatic arena.

191. In spite of those beautiful speeches of intent, actions speak otherwise, and we believe that the time has come to call a halt, a dramatic halt perhaps, on the brink of a holocaust that could occur unless immediate measures are taken to check once and for all this almost collective madness of unbridled and absurd arms buildup.

192. If we say with sincerity and if we truly believe that might is not right, we must then fight for disarmament to become a reality, without failing to respect the safeguards that each State must maintain in order to defend its sovereignty and independence within a framework of peace.

193. Why should millions and indeed billions be wasted on weapons that are unusable after they have been stockpiled for a time and that must then be destroyed, when so much of the world is suffering from hunger? For there is hunger in the world.

194. The Dominican Republic is a party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco¹¹ against the proliferation of nuclear weapons in Latin America and has supported and will continue to support every initiative towards its goals.

195. According to reports, the world's military budget amounted last year to \$650 billion. If that sum were to be distributed equally among the States Members of this world Organization, each State would receive approximately \$4.2 billion, four times the national budget of my country for one year.

196. Let us reflect for a moment on the basic facilities such as irrigation canals, hospitals, aqueducts, schools and so forth that could be constructed throughout the world with all the money that is wasted every year on weapons, and we will surely see that the poverty and hunger of much of the world would be greatly reduced and that the very highly developed countries would benefit because exports of their products to the third world would increase in proportion to the growth in the annual income of those countries.

197. We are almost within 18 years of the end of the twentieth century, with all its marvelous scientific and technological progress and with all the shame of its two world wars and the various others that were not called world wars but were just as bloody and as shameful.

198. We believe that there is still time to work for peace and international security and to try to resolve economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems, while at the same time promoting respect for human rights, as the Charter of this honourable Organization says. And we believe that to that end we must start on genuine disarmament, trying in this way to hand down to our children and grandchildren a twenty-first century which holds more promise for peace, understanding and mutual respect.

199. If there is at this moment in mankind one feeling that unites the public opinion of all the peoples of the world, regardless of race and political or religious

creed, it is the desire to see general disarmament which would put an end once and for all to the threat of war.

200. Looking at the world press, we can see that editorials and articles everywhere are at one in calling for disarmament, and the numerous demonstrations taking place *urbi et orbi* are a poignant demonstration that our peoples want peace with dignity and bread, and not the scourge of war, with its accompanying destruction, famine and death.

201. Mr. MOSELEY (Barbados): Sir, the Government and people of Barbados would wish me first to extend to Mr. Kittani sincere congratulations on his assumption of the heavy responsibilities of the presidency of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. To these congratulations must be added the earnest hope that this special session, under his able guidance and with the outstanding diplomatic skill and experience of the Secretary-General, will produce solid ground for the banishment of despair from and the renewal of optimism in the hearts and minds of those millions all over the world whose lives, whose fate and whose future depend so utterly upon the outcome of this noble exercise upon which we are now embarked.

202. It is inevitable, as we meet in the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to the consideration of the awesome subject of international disarmament, that there should be some contemplation in retrospect of the progress made since the matter was considered in 1978. At that time high hopes were enshrined in the Final Document, which was adopted by consensus, and all pledged a conscientious drive towards international disarmament, deeming it an indispensable factor in any formula for achieving international peace and security. Such contemplation must, alas, be very largely an exercise in melancholy.

203. On good authority we learn that the total military expenditure of the world, which was said to be \$400 billion in 1978, now well exceeds \$500 billion. The report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, under the chairmanship of Mr. Olof Palme,⁶ contains, *inter alia*, the following chilling passages representing findings of fact.

First, on page 71:

“Poverty, unemployment, inflation, the threat of world recession: the problems that make people and Governments insecure are economic as well as military. In the 1980s, these economic problems are likely to become worse, not better, as a result of military spending.

“The increase in military spending now under way threatens the economic security of all countries. The economic difficulties of the 1970s have shown that the benefits of postwar growth can no longer be taken for granted. In these circumstances, the sacrifice of human, material and technological resources required by military spending is likely to be particularly costly, for rich countries as well as for the countries which still live in poverty.

“The costs of worldwide military spending are so vast that they have assumed a sort of deadening familiarity. Total military spending in 1982 will

amount to over 650,000 million US dollars. This is more than the entire income of 1,500 million people living in the fifty poorest countries. The price of a single modern fighter plane would be sufficient to inoculate three million children against major childhood diseases. The price of one nuclear submarine with its missiles would provide a hundred thousand working years of nursing care for old people."

Secondly, on pages 2 and 3 we find:

"Together, the nations of the world spend the equivalent of about \$650 billion on their armed forces each year, more than one twentieth of their total annual incomes. Three quarters of this huge sum is accounted for by the industrial countries, but military expenditure by developing States is far from trivial, and is growing rapidly."

I continue, from pages 88 and 89:

"The overall increase in military spending was fastest in the mid 1970s. But the early 1980s appear to have brought a new acceleration. Rich and poor countries have participated in the military buildup. In the oil-exporting countries with surplus capital (Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Libya, and the smaller Gulf oil exporters) military expenditure increased more than sixfold in real terms in the 1970s, and Saudi Arabia has surpassed Britain as the sixth largest military spender. Yet the capital-surplus countries still accounted for only one third of all military spending by developing countries. Oil-importing developing countries doubled their military spending in real terms in the 1970s, as did the poorer oil-exporting countries.

"Arms imports increased even more rapidly than overall military spending. Cumulative arms imports by developing countries were worth \$65.2 billion in 1975-79 in constant 1978 prices, \$32.3 billion worth by OPEC countries, and \$32.9 billion worth by other developing countries. Developing countries imported \$5.6 billion worth of weapons in 1970 (measured in constant 1978 US dollars) and \$16.1 billion worth in 1979. All categories of countries participated in the expansion. In 1977-79, the capital-surplus countries accounted for less than a third of developing countries' arms imports. In those years, six oil-importing developing countries—including two with *per capita* incomes below \$200 in 1979—imported more than a billion dollars' worth of arms. The composition of military spending has thus shifted, as it is shifting in developed countries, towards the procurement and maintenance of armaments and away from paying armies."

204. It is at this point that I recognize a certain difficulty. In a steady stream since the opening day of this session, speaker after speaker has bemoaned the tragic facts I have just quoted while pledging his country's dedication to continuing the struggle to attain the stated goal and lofty ideal of world peace. It follows therefore that speakers in the later stages of this session will find it increasingly difficult to find new perspectives to introduce into the debate. As the session continues it will become almost impossible to find any useful argument or plea which has not already been stated and repeated several times over.

205. Happily, however, my country, though extremely small and militarily insignificant, does not see its

sole function in making a statement before the Assembly as one merely of bringing to bear something new by way of argument or perspective. Neither lack of size nor lack of military clout deters Barbados from its duty to add its voice to the record of the many voices which tell of the tremendous interest of the whole civilized world in a subject which may be said to embody the very moment of truth for all mankind.

206. And yet, however difficult the task, we must not despair in the search for some new perspective, some new argument, which may just possibly bring about an escape from the slough of despair and frustration which threatens to be the inevitable result of a seemingly endless repetition of the details of the tragedy which presents itself in the failure of the efforts made thus far to achieve significant international disarmament.

207. Thus it is with some diffidence that, at the risk of being justly accused of suggesting too naive and simplistic an approach, and rather in a frame of mind similar to that which must have moved Hans Christian Andersen's little boy to comment on the emperor's new clothes, we venture to suggest that the true basis of the problem of international disarmament is in fact a moral one.

208. Many and varied are the formulas proposed for achieving the desired goal of international disarmament as an indispensable factor for world peace. To some, the way to go is by declaring non-first-use. To others, verification and inspection are crucial. There is a call for a nuclear-arms freeze, followed by phased reductions, first of nuclear weapons and then of conventional arms. There is also the call for the immediate outlawing of chemical warfare. It is our suggestion that none of these laudable and necessary pragmatic steps will by themselves avail if international moral integrity is lacking. We further suggest that the proper exercise of international moral integrity lies in the faithful adherence to the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

209. Four years ago, when my country made a statement at the tenth special session [25th meeting], my predecessor on that occasion introduced a hypothetical visitor from some other world who would estimate "what fools these mortals be" on the basis of a comparison between the deficiencies in mankind's basic needs and the expenditure of the earth's resources on armaments.

210. I would crave the indulgence of the Assembly to invite that same hypothetical visitor from another world to look at the logic of a situation in which *homo sapiens* rushes headlong to self-destruction despite every convincing argument which proves the futility and utter peril of an arms race and of nuclear confrontation. Our hypothetical visitor will be bound to examine the logic of a situation in which mass genocide and human degradation are bitterly lamented as a holocaust when it occurs in Europe, but treated with excuses and a shameful tolerance when it takes place in southern Africa. Our visitor will wonder about the confrontation between an ideology which will urge millions to throng the streets in awe and respect before a holy man of peace and another ideology which will postulate self-defence, the so-near kin of revenge, as

the noblest act of man. Proceeding onwards, our visitor will without a doubt wonder whether anything useful will emerge from all the warnings that security in the nuclear age means common security, that superiority in nuclear terms is meaningless and that provisions for inspection and verification without international trust will be of no avail.

211. However, in spite of all this, our hypothetical visitor will not go away empty-handed, and by the same token Barbados does not limit its consideration to an idealistic agony over the failings of international morality—judging by the standards of angels rather than of men. In the pragmatic world of what is, rather than what we think should be, my country is aware of the hope for all mankind which lies in the phenomenon of thousands upon thousands of people, chiefly the young, rising up in spontaneous protest and the seemingly inexorable march of mankind to its own destruction. My country is aware of the bright ray of hope held out by the very act of holding this second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

212. My country recognizes that the appointment of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues constitutes a significant step towards finding an answer to the central problem. I am instructed briefly to set out the broad parameters of measures and policy which Barbados has supported in the past and continues to support as a contribution towards the achievement of the ends so fervently sought and hoped for by all mankind.

213. What, then, is the position of Barbados? For the Government of Barbados, disarmament has emerged as probably the most burning topic on the United Nations agenda today, not because of its vital relationship with international peace and security, which are the foundations of the Charter, nor because disarmament is so essential to economic and social development, which developing countries in particular have also long perceived, but because—with the proliferation of demonstrations in the United States and Europe against “nukes”, that is to say, nuclear arsenals, with the growing unpredictability and uneasiness of situations such as those in Poland and Afghanistan, with the experience of ever-present tensions, as in the boiling Middle East cauldron, and with the call to arms in the Falklands, where every conceivable problem from colonialism to aggression, from self-determination to sovereignty, from vertical to horizontal accumulation of nuclear weaponry, has got enmeshed—there is a genuinely increasing awareness on the part of the world community that the arms race will spare no country or individual in its blind sweep to universal self-destruction unless something is done to stop it.

214. The fact that Barbados is a militarily insignificant State and is, fortunately, removed from situations of physical international conflict makes a negotiating role for this country in any disarmament talks unthinkable. Yet it would show nothing short of complacency and irresponsibility if Barbados did not participate in the multilateral deliberations conducted within the General Assembly, for in at least two related aspects, security and development, the concerns of the inter-

national community are very much the concerns of Barbados. In brief, a most important element of the Barbados position is the conviction that the role of the United Nations must be central to all effective steps towards achieving international disarmament, and the Charter and its principles and United Nations resolutions are the surest bulwarks of world security.

215. The Executive Board of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, at its special meeting at Brussels in November 1981, linked the single topic of peace, security and disarmament with the issues of unemployment, hunger, poverty and oppression. The Confederation rejected as a myth the view that nuclear weapons are only for defence, pointing out that the deterrent effect is outweighed by the threat to security.

216. The Confederation therefore appealed to all Governments concerned to abandon the illusion that they can achieve security by increasing nuclear and conventional forces, to resume immediately negotiations leading to effective disarmament measures under international control; to take and implement confidence-building measures; to enforce existing treaties fully, particularly on the non-proliferation of nuclear arms; to commit themselves to promoting détente between East and West and the resolution of conflicts through negotiation and agreement; to agree immediately on the withdrawal and termination of production of SS-20 missiles by the Soviet Union and the abandonment of the production and deployment by the United States and its allies of cruise and Pershing II missiles and the production of radiation (neutron) weapons.

217. The Confederation noted that about 60 million people were employed world-wide in the arms industry and the armed forces, while resources crucial to the development of the third world were being diverted. The Confederation therefore urged the cutting of military budgets and the reallocation of the resources to development.

218. The position of the Confederation stated in 1981 is in harmony with the principles adhered to by Barbados, though Barbados is probably not competent to offer advice on the specific amount and timing of the cutbacks.

219. Perusal of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly will reveal that all the proposals made by the Confederation are a mere tinkering with the Programme of Action recommended by the international community. There would have been no Falklands war if that document, and indeed the Charter of the United Nations, had been treated with due respect by all parties.

220. As I say this there comes to mind the very telling points made by the Prime Minister of Canada a few days ago when, in the course of his address to the Assembly, he said: “Periodically, some people call for a commitment from us not to be the first to use nuclear weapons . . . the Charter already prohibits the first use of force—any use of force. That is the law that binds us.” [18th meeting, paras. 63 and 64.]

221. That both the United States and the Soviet Union are reluctant to roll back the production and deployment of their missile and weapons systems is a

source of much concern. If the Confederation's proposal perhaps does not go far enough, it must be commended from the point of view of what is practical and attainable. Barbados reiterates the line it took in 1978 by calling on all nations to respect the institutions they have built and to honour the undertakings they have entered into. Barbados speaks out again firm in the conviction that the United Nations and its Charter are the guardians of international morality without which no amount of agonizing over the billions of dollars spent on exquisite refinements of destruction while millions suffer degrading deprivation and want will save peoples from the logical consequences of cynically brutal conduct towards each other unrestrained by a moral conscience and respect for the rule of law.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

NOTES

¹ Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964, p. 43).

² *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1982*, document S/15183.

³ *Comprehensive Study on Confidence-building Measures* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.3).

⁴ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 105, document A/5975.

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

⁶ A/CN.10/38. See also A/CN.10/51.

⁷ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 1*.

⁸ *Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.2).

⁹ *Ibid.*, para. 83.

¹⁰ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 22A and Corr.1*.

¹¹ Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326).