



*President:* Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

**AGENDA ITEM 8**

**General debate (continued)**

1. Mr. LOS (Papua New Guinea): Since this is the first time that I am speaking in my capacity as Permanent Representative to the United Nations, I should like to join the previous speakers in extending to you, Sir, my congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly and of this very important second special session devoted to disarmament. We have every confidence that under your leadership this special session will be guided to a successful conclusion.

2. The pursuit of international peace and security is the most important and fundamental task facing the United Nations today. The special session is being held at a time when three separate armed conflicts are being waged in various parts of the world. At the same time, calls for disarmament through which international peace and security can be achieved are growing louder. Peace and harmony between nations is the greatest catalyst for developing an equitable international community, in which any nation—large or small, impoverished or wealthy—can seek productively to improve the lives of its people.

3. Today we are witnessing a destabilization of international security brought about by territorial greed and ideological ambitions, and tensions are growing between the super-Powers, bringing the world closer to the brink of nuclear confrontation. The effects of these tensions have been felt by the majority of the world's population, the innocent bystanders who have not contributed and may not contribute to these rivalries.

4. We strongly believe that lasting peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weapons. We do not subscribe to the philosophy that an increasing buildup of arms, both nuclear and conventional, acts as a deterrent to armed conflicts. Indeed, the contrary is clearly the case. Genuine and lasting peace can be created only through the effective implementation of the security system outlined in the Charter of the United Nations. General and complete disarmament under effective international control should be the principal objective in order to ensure the survival of mankind and eliminate the danger of war, thus ensuring that war is no longer used as an instrument for settling international disputes. It is my Government's desire that the peoples of this world have peace and security so that we can all concentrate our efforts on the development of the economic and social conditions of our peoples.

5. However, disarmament, as a realistic avenue to peace, does not seem to have achieved any positive results. As of today, there has not been any meaningful reduction in the development, production, stockpiling and strategic positioning of nuclear weapons. The arms race, rather than being slowed or reversed, is escalating to new peaks of sophistication and destructive force in both its conventional and nuclear aspects. Added to this already alarming situation is the production and stockpiling of chemical and biological weapons, not to mention the use of such weapons. We note with concern that no real progress has been made towards a reduction of arms, nor have there been any negotiations leading to a treaty on general and complete disarmament. We are therefore disappointed by these developments and believe that there must be a point where reason triumphs over suspicion and distrust, where a common threat to mankind is honestly acknowledged and nations of influence resolve to redress this problem with single-minded purpose.

6. While the arms race continues to escalate, economic and social conditions are taking a downward trend. Military expenditures are steadily rising and have reached the level of over \$500 billion dollars annually. Such a trend clearly indicates the scope of the global arms race and the relentless rush to still higher levels of intensity. If the present trend continues, world military outlays will soon surpass the level of \$600 billion a year.

7. At the centre of this arms race is the military rivalry between the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, which account for a majority share of global military outlays. Papua New Guinea believes that if a significant portion of these colossal military expenditures were diverted to improving the economic and social conditions of the world, some of the prevailing economic and social diseases could be reduced to manageable levels. It is also our belief that just and lasting peace cannot be built on poverty, starvation, unemployment and inhuman living conditions. Genuine and lasting peace, in our view, will be brought about through the utilization of some of the resources, human and material, at present being used for military purposes.

8. The ever-increasing international trade in arms and military hardware reflects two of the most dangerous trends: the improvement and sophistication of weapons and technology throughout the world and the role of Governments of industrialized nations in aiding and abetting proliferation. The competition for sales heightens as more countries, including developing countries, enter the market with weapons to sell. It has been established that very sophisticated weapons can often be purchased on the arms market by the developing countries even before they enter the

arsenals of the producer countries. The question we may ask is: where will all this end? If one thing is clear from a review of the arms race in recent years, it is that the intense competition in refining the weapons of war will not diminish and die of its own accord. There is no end in sight unless there is a strong and genuine political will to reverse, if not halt, this dangerous trend. The will to make a political decision requires more serious and innovative diplomacy than has recently been evident.

9. Papua New Guinea recently acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*]. Our decision to this effect is based on our desire to see the world free of the indiscriminate use of nuclear technology and the spread of nuclear arms to all parts of the world. However, we note with some disappointment that the recent Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons ended without achieving any tangible results. It is our strong view that the proliferation of nuclear weapons poses a grave danger to mankind and, if not properly controlled, could mean the end of civilization as we know it today. We recognize the right of all States to develop and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. But those who undertake such programmes must ensure that nuclear energy intended for peaceful purposes is prevented from being used for nuclear weapons. We urge that international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy be conducted under agreed and appropriate international safeguards applied on a non-discriminatory basis.

10. I now turn to the question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. In my Government's view, the establishment of such zones in various regions of the world constitutes an important disarmament measure. To this end, my delegation wishes to draw the attention of this gathering to resolution 3477 (XXX), of 11 December 1975, which deals with the concept of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific. It is our view that such a regional agreement would be in conformity with the objectives of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session [*resolution S-10/2*]. It is also the collective wish of the peoples of the South Pacific to keep their region free from all forms of nuclear activities and from rivalries between the big Powers for influence and dominance.

11. Member States of the South Pacific community, to which Papua New Guinea belongs, are concerned about the arms race and its serious consequences. We are even more concerned about the security and welfare of our peoples because of the continuing nuclear testing in the region. The peoples of the South Pacific are anxious to keep the region free from the risk of nuclear pollution and conflict. In this connexion, on 3 July 1975 the Heads of Government of the South Pacific Forum adopted a communiqué calling for the halting of all forms of nuclear testing in the region. The communiqué commended the idea of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region as a means of achieving that aim. The adoption of the communiqué was noted in resolution 3477 (XXX) endorsing the concept.

12. In spite of these measures, testing of nuclear devices still takes place. Further tests will undoubtedly

cause serious damage to life and the environment in the area. In spite of the repeated calls by the people of the region for the cessation of these tests, nuclear testing is continuing unabated, as evidenced by the recent testing of the neutron bomb, the effects of which are even more devastating. We urge those responsible to restrict the testing of these catastrophic and inhuman weapons to their own soil.

13. The Papua New Guinea delegation's opposition to all forms of nuclear testing, atmospheric or other, has been made known on many occasions in various forums, including that of the General Assembly. We are equally opposed to dumping nuclear wastes everywhere, in particular in the South Pacific region. We therefore once again call upon those responsible to cease all forms of nuclear testing and desist from their stated intention to dump nuclear waste in the Pacific. To this end, I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to the statement made in the general debate during the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly by the Foreign Minister of my country on 9 October 1980, when he said:

“... we do not believe that the tests and low-level nuclear waste dumpings in the Pacific region are harmless. Indeed, the long-term effects could be catastrophic. As a demonstration of faith in their own technology, the nations responsible should carry out their nuclear tests and dumping of nuclear wastes within their [own] immediate boundaries.”  
[30th meeting, para. 57.]

The South Pacific should not be used as a nuclear-waste disposal dump.

14. The SALT II Treaty, a bilateral effort between the Soviet Union and the United States, appears to have stalled indefinitely. Papua New Guinea has supported and continues to support any efforts by the two super-Powers directed at the limitation or reduction of strategic arms. However, we note with dissatisfaction and concern that the ratification process has been delayed, thereby preventing the implementation of the agreement. We had hoped that both the signing and the ratification of the agreement would set limits on strategic offensive weapons systems, hence providing the political climate for future efforts towards general and complete disarmament. It is our view that the two super-Powers, which account for the bulk of conventional as well as nuclear weapons in the world, must play a positive and leading role in the attainment of this goal. They have a special responsibility to the international community.

15. In conclusion, I should like to reiterate my Government's view that any negotiations on partial measures of disarmament should be conducted within the context of more comprehensive measures with a view to arriving at a treaty on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. It is also our view that universally accepted disarmament agreements would help create confidence among States. It is our hope that, in order to create favourable conditions for success in the disarmament process, all States will abide by the provisions of the Charter. It would also be helpful to refrain from actions which might adversely affect efforts in the field of disarmament. There is clearly also a need for a display of a constructive approach to negotiations and the polit-

ical will to reach agreements. We commend the various efforts that have been made by the United Nations and its related agencies concerning this vitally important task of reducing the threat to mankind posed by the arms race.

16. Mr. HAZOUMÉ (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, my delegation is convinced that, because of your talents and the wisdom which is so typical of you, our debate will attain the success that the world expects. Benin ventures to hope that this session will not be a mere series of brilliant rhetorical exercises or choice morsels of futile propaganda. For, when the time comes to take stock, we shall all of us, great and small, be accountable for the destinies of our peoples, for which any new or gigantic Hiroshima will bring everything but eternal happiness.

17. The tenth special session enriched the history of the Organization with useful and coherent documents. By its unanimous resolutions and clear decisions, it opened the way that could have led us to fruitful multilateral negotiations. But we must reckon with the selfishness of the great Powers, the desire for domination, the cold-blooded strategic calculations and the frantic search for relations of power which will bring about hegemony and superiority.

18. Today the range of constantly renewed and ever more sophisticated weapons possessed by both blocs is nothing short of stupefying. The arsenals of the super-Powers contain enough explosive power to lead us to collective suicide. When we say this and cry it aloud we are not merely airing popular slogans or displaying an infantile sense of catastrophe, as certain schools of thought or fashionable theoreticians of nuclear strategy like to claim with quiet cynicism.

19. In the terrifying world of modern weapons, reality often outstrips fiction. The inventive genius of man which is so good at creating works of art and science, the most beautiful and the greatest known in the history of mankind, is, tragically, the same genius that in research laboratories is producing the most refined technological means of massive destruction and death. The most audacious discoveries are in competition in the development and stockpiling of weapons which are making fortunes for the enterprises of the military-industrial complex. And while their order books are filled by the options and programmes chosen by Governments and prepared by military staffs, official propaganda is serving and warming up as day follows day fallacious ideological justifications for this race to the abyss and to the catastrophe. Thus the peoples of the world do not succeed in preventing madness or technical error from annihilating what their creativity and their labours have so arduously built up for the benefit of progress and well-being. Thus ballistic missiles, multiple-warhead nuclear rockets, are criss-crossing the oceans and the toxins, gases and poisons of chemical and bacteriological warfare are being accumulated and added up in distressing and competing statistics. Further, the neutron bomb, which can eliminate human beings while preserving the steel and concrete of cities or the mines and equipment of industry, has just been added to the proud panoply of certain Powers. So-called conventional weapons are becoming ever more accurate and powerful, while the military use of spacecraft and satellites is no longer a secret.

20. The bomb which on 6 August 1945 was dropped on the city of Hiroshima has become, in comparison with the latest technological exploits of the engineers of cataclysm of our day, a primitive and almost backyard device. Of course, we say this with a shudder, but also with the fierce determination of the weak, defenceless and poor countries to fight for peace. Those who excel in the theory of strategic games or devise doctrines of anti-forces strategy, anti-towns strategy, flexible and graduated response, or other analyses that stimulate academic discussion, are quite aware that a few thousand megatons would cause millions of victims in the city in which we are now gathered. They know that all their mathematical projections will not succeed in forcing us to accept certain gruesome bookkeeping. The apocalypse, as was so eloquently stated by the Secretary-General, is no longer merely a biblical image. And if war, according to the celebrated Clausewitz, could once have been considered the continuance of a policy by other means, in the nuclear and thermonuclear age no political life and no policy would survive the hail of missiles.

21. Perhaps we appear to be stressing the obvious, but Benin is part of the third world, which has been robbed and exploited. My country is among those calling for a new international economic order in which justice and development would ensure true and lasting peace. And when we realize that in 1981 some \$600 billion were devoted to military purposes, when certain calculations reveal that that amount is equivalent to the total annual income of the poorest, most underdeveloped half of the world population, the nobility and extreme gravity of the universal duty to work and fight for peace become clear.

22. It is in our countries and in the third world, which aspire only to freedom and dignity, that imperialism wants to impose its law and order and is strengthening and reactivating its bases by exporting oppression and seeking to destabilize, if not to reconquer, lost colonial positions and by tolerating the fact that Israel and South Africa are terrorizing and massacring those who refuse to bargain away their right to independence and life. It is in order the better to control our natural wealth and to confiscate that wealth at its pleasure that imperialism is developing so-called rapid deployment forces and wants to assert its role as world police and world ideological censor.

23. The most modest step towards disarmament and peace is much more important for us than the sonority or literary elegance of any propaganda or pronouncements of might and power. It is for that reason that Benin welcomes the historic and positive commitment made here by the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons [*12th meeting*]. We are also pleased at the Chinese decision to undertake to reduce its nuclear arms programme if the two super-Powers set the example by reducing their own arsenals by 50 per cent. Those initiatives should be encouraged, and we would express the hope that they will increase in number and encourage in the minds of all those who are fighting for peace the magnificent hope for life and a future which inspires them.

24. This session should, thanks to the unique diplomatic crossroads that it represents, explore new channels and concretely and substantially enrich the subjects of discussion which the Preparatory Com-

mittee so patiently grouped together and identified, under the competent leadership of its Chairman, our brother Mr. Adeniji. When we have evaluated, on the basis of our resolutions of 1978, the progress achieved from the triple standpoint of the analysis of facts, the development of armaments and negotiations, a first series of objectives will have been achieved.

25. However, it will be much more productive for the global programme of disarmament to acquire all the necessary coherence and support to make it credible and realistic. From the standpoint of the creation of machinery, Benin hopes that those will not be mere cumbersome and complex bureaucratic structures and that in their tasks of conception, codification and stimulation, non-governmental organizations will become increasingly involved, as well as all persons whose competence and testimony could be useful and valuable.

26. In the course of the World Disarmament Campaign we must urge that a true education for peace be created and developed so that the education and training of citizens and young people in the world will give root to their convictions and nurture their ideals. The effort to be made seems immense because all the chauvinism, great-Power complexes and often unavowed racism will also contribute to promoting, through the mass media, the case for force or strategies of imperial domination.

27. Furthermore, Benin expresses the hope that the right to peace will be given increasing currency and will be taught, thanks to the work of the International Law Commission or other private institutions. In proposing these ideas and these codes of law, we would thereby be consolidating the historic work of peace and concord among nations by the updating and the patient improvement of existing treaties and the drafting of new instruments to be negotiated.

28. The tasks which I have just mentioned should form part of a global action and a single strategy.

29. Today Israeli bombs, which destroyed the Iraqi atomic centre in Tamuz, are sowing once again death, destruction and hatred in Lebanon. The Palestinian Arab people will never be wiped from the pages of history or from the map of the world, any more than the Jewish people were by the unconscionable Nazi genocide.

30. Yesterday in Kassinga, Angola and in Matola, Mozambique, South African weapons inflicted a heavy toll of their crimes and threats on the brother peoples. Those same armed forces of the *apartheid* régime, with the help of valuable outside aid, now possess atomic weapons. That is what makes it so necessary to bring about the rapid and effective denuclearization of our continent and to ensure awareness of the threats to our security and the peace of the world represented by the South African nuclear armament.

31. With respect to the Indian Ocean, of which South Africa is a coastal State, it should become a zone of peace, free from the military bases which are multiplying there and free from the powerful fleets which are competing there with each other. We hope that the forthcoming conference at Colombo will make it possible to create on the regional level conditions for the success of this new peace endeavour.

32. It was by struggle that our peoples won their independence and, thanks to international solidarity, asserted their rights in the eyes of history. Today they want their States, which are being strangled by debt and the imported economic crises, to develop in justice, without restrictions on their access to the secrets of the prodigious feats of contemporary technology. Beyond the question of ethics, however, or the simple accounting action of transfer of resources, the study of the links between disarmament and development should be undertaken in further detail and courageous solutions should be proposed. In the face of our poverty and our immense needs and the intolerable spectacle of children destroyed by famine, for how many years or even decades to come are we to tolerate the outrage of certain kinds of waste and extravagance or the selfish arrogance of those who dream of transforming us into the collective beggars of the planet?

33. That cry of our revolt is above all a message of peace and hope, a message which the verses of one of our elders of the Ivory Coast, Bernard Dadie, expressed in a beautiful poem, parts of which I quote:

“O sky of Africa!

May thy sun scorch the ravenous vultures' wings  
And singe the fetid, gluttonous hyenas' pelt,  
For, be it known, O sky of Africa,

Pure, azure sky,

Sky of peace,

That we shall pounce upon the warmongers

And lay bare their evil deeds to the glaring light of day.

The guns are still ablaze.

And they would fain have more!

The widows still mourn.

And they would fain have more!

The orphans still bewail their fathers who filled the breach and died.

And they would fain have more!

No crutches yet nor wheelchairs for the crippled.

And they would fain have more!

The death-rattle of the valiant, shroudless fallen lingers in the air.

And they would fain have more!

But we say 'No'.

We say 'No more war'.

Over the warmongers' lies,

Over the panoply of guns,

Over the clouds of superfortresses,

Let us raise a bulwark against war

By pouncing upon the warmongers,

For we want to live.

We want peace!”

34. We do not hope for miracles at this session, but, with patience and determination, we must do everything possible by means of dialogue and tolerance. For the most deadly barbarism lurks behind civilization, and it may rise up at any moment from our humanity of scientific prodigies if certain powerful people continue to remain indifferent to the cry for justice and peace.

35. Ready for the revolution, the struggle continues.

36. Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago): First of all, Sir, I should like to congratulate you on your election to the presidency of this special session of the

Assembly devoted to disarmament. The admirable and skilled manner in which you have conducted the Assembly's work so far justifies the confidence unaniously placed in you by the Assembly in electing you.

37. In a little over two months from now, my country, Trinidad and Tobago, will be celebrating the twentieth anniversary of its birth as a sovereign independent nation. This, for us, historic event was quickly followed by another when Trinidad and Tobago was admitted and took its place in this very Hall as a Member of the United Nations. To us, a small nation with no pretensions to military might, there was great faith in the world Organization and in the Charter which inspired and guided its foundation. Thus we pledged ourselves, in the words of the Charter's Preamble, to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. We reaffirmed our faith in fundamental rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small. We undertook to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security and to ensure that armed force shall not be used save in the common interest. Beyond this, we committed ourselves to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples.

38. As we take stock of the situation in the world today we should be more than ever convinced that the suspicions and tensions of unprecedented proportions existing in the world today are a direct result of the failure of each and every one of the 157 Member States represented in this Hall to live up to the pledges made and commitments undertaken on joining this the world Organization. While old conflicts continue to fester and to pose obstacles to peace, new conflicts have arisen which threaten international peace and the security of whole regions. There can be no denial of the fact that there is a direct relationship between the increase in the world's arsenals and the diminishing sense of national and international security obtaining today.

39. Four years ago, at the end of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, there was hope that the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control was attainable. In its Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*], the Assembly at that session approved a Programme of Action [*ibid.*, *sect. III*] which embraced virtually all disarmament issues and set priorities for future disarmament efforts. Regrettably, even the most optimistic of us have been forced to concede that in the interim there has been a notable lack of progress towards the targets set in that Final Document. As the Secretary-General said in his statement at the opening of the present session:

“The fact must now be faced that the Programme of Action has largely remained a dead letter. Indeed, the goals set forth in the Programme are further from our reach now than they were four years ago. The hope and euphoria of 1978 have been replaced by stalemate.” [*1st meeting, para. 39.*]

40. It is a sad reflection on our times that more than a hundred countries, in all regions of the world, are engaged in the arms race. According to some calcula-

tions, some 130 countries together devoted nearly \$500 billion, or 6 per cent of world output, to military expenditure during 1980. Of that amount, however, the members of the two major military alliances, together with two other countries, accounted for some 80 per cent.

41. Between 1960 and 1980 the volume of resources devoted annually to military purposes almost doubled. Were this trend to be repeated between now and the end of the century, it would produce in the year 2000 an arms bill of \$940 billion at 1980 prices. To convey an idea of the magnitude of the resources squandered annually on military uses, it has been pointed out that for many years world military expenditure was comparable to the combined gross national product of all the countries in Africa and Latin America. To make another comparison, it has been estimated that global military expenditure is nearly 19 times as large as all the official development assistance provided by the countries belonging to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. On another level, WHO spent 10 years and less than \$100 million to eradicate smallpox, while one country over the same period spent several times that amount to develop a more advanced version of an air-to-air missile. At whatever level one makes these comparisons, the conclusion is inescapable that the priorities now being addressed by nations—large, medium and small—are, to say the least, absurd.

42. This tremendous waste of resources must be seen against the fact that hundreds of millions of people live in conditions of the most abject poverty. It is estimated that there are some 570 million people who are malnourished, 800 million who are illiterate, 1.5 billion who have no access to medical services and 250 million children who do not go to school.

43. The allocation of real resources to the military sector includes some 50 million people directly or indirectly engaged in military activities, the use of somewhere between 3 and 11 per cent of a selected group of 14 non-energy-producing minerals for worldwide military purposes, and about one quarter of all expenditure on research and development. Perhaps the most sobering fact in all this, however, is that some \$26 billion is spent annually in the international traffic in arms.

44. Without labouring the point of these statistics, it is obvious that the diversion of even a small part of the resources spent on armaments could substantially improve the per capita gross domestic product, industrial employment and capital stock of developing countries. A recent United Nations report entitled *The Relationship between Disarmament and Development*<sup>1</sup> has identified more than 70 possible alternative uses for military research and development capabilities which could be transferred quite easily to, for example, the development, production and installation of solar energy devices, agricultural machinery, fishing technology, machinery for mining, manufacturing and construction, hydropower plants and equipment and personnel for education and health programmes. This senseless misdirection of our energies and resources can perhaps best be summed up in the words of that famous soldier and statesman Dwight D. Eisenhower when he said, “Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in a final sense

a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, from those who are cold and are not clothed”.

45. As we meet today there is a growing awareness among a widening public of the dangers of the uncontrolled arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race. Although nuclear weapons account for only 30 per cent of total world military expenditure, it is a reflection of the unique destructive potential of nuclear weapons that disarmament efforts have largely been concentrated in this area. Thus measures to limit and reduce nuclear armaments are a more urgent necessity than ever before. It is a matter of grave concern and regret to my delegation that the work on a comprehensive ban on the testing of nuclear weapons has made no progress. Such a ban would, in our view, contribute immensely to the peace we all so fervently desire. In this respect 1981 was a year of continued deadlock, for not only did it prove impossible to start negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament on the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, but also the tripartite negotiations which were halted in 1980 were not resumed.

46. With each passing year the quantitative and qualitative level, as well as the stockpiling, of these weapons of mass destruction rises as each of the two super-Powers seeks an impossible position of strength over the other. It has been pointed out again and again that in any conflict involving the use of nuclear weapons there can be no winners. The terrifying consequences that a nuclear holocaust would bring about have awakened peoples across the world. Here in New York City we saw the largest manifestation of this awakening, which in the clearest possible terms sent a message to us, the participants in this special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, that the peoples of the world do not wish to be dragged along in this inexorable march towards the precipice of destruction which the nuclear threat represents.

47. While removal of the threat of nuclear war is the most acute and urgent task facing us today, we cannot afford to ignore the fact that the growing acquisition of conventional weapons, their alarmingly frequent use, the high percentage of military expenditures they consume—not to mention their increasingly destructive capabilities—are cause for concern. Both nuclear and conventional disarmament needs must be regarded as complementary aspects of the common objective of general and complete disarmament. Indeed, it is quite apparent today that any conventional conflict involves a serious risk of escalation into a nuclear war. There is an equal need to halt the development, production and use of chemical, bacteriological and radiological weapons and to destroy stockpiles of these weapons.

48. It would seem that man's ability to seek his own destruction knows no bounds. Even as we marvelled at and applauded man's ingenuity in the conquest of space, we have come to realize that this knowledge has served to enhance the military capabilities of the two super-Powers. The increasing military use of space has become painfully obvious, as anyone who has read today's *New York Times* article on the forthcoming test flight of the space shuttle Columbia is aware. We deplore these dangerous developments and urge that measures be taken to secure the immediate and unconditional demilitarization of space.

49. Much has been heard in discussions on disarmament of the need for confidence-building measures. My delegation believes that there is considerable merit to the concept of a regional approach to security as a means towards this end. For this reason, we have supported the creation of nuclear-free zones and zones of peace. In our own region of Latin America, the Treaty of Tlatelolco<sup>2</sup> stands as a shining example of our determination to prevent the introduction of nuclear weapons into our area. In the Caribbean, a proposal for a zone of peace is currently under study. Such a series of regional measures can, we believe, contribute towards a step-by-step approach to complete global disarmament.

50. War is no longer a threat today; it is a reality. As we began this special session, there were open hostilities in several parts of our world. The dangerous arms spiral in which the whole world is engaged risks bringing about the ultimate catastrophe of a nuclear war as threats to international peace and security multiply. In such a situation it is useless to speak about security in isolation, for security, if it is to be meaningful, must exist for all States—big, medium or small. For small States such as my own, lacking in significant military might, security must mean common security. But just as there is surely no single cause of war, so there cannot be security unless there is economic progress as well as freedom from fear—the fear of the threat of the use of force, the fear of aggression.

51. As we enter the Second Disarmament Decade, this fear remains with us. We will have achieved nothing at the end of this session if we do not adopt some practical measures to halt the arms race and to free the world from that fear.

52. Mr. RENZAHU (Rwanda) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, allow me first of all to congratulate you in the name of the delegation of Rwanda on your unanimous election to the presidency of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly. Your qualities as a statesman and the talent with which you have so skilfully presided over the Assembly since its thirty-sixth session are sufficient guarantee of the success of our work.

53. I should also like to take this opportunity to reiterate my delegation's tribute to Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar on his election to head the Organization and to address to him again, on behalf of my Government and my people, best wishes for success in his noble and important mission. We have followed with admiration his past efforts for peace and understanding among peoples and we assure him of the continuous support of the Government of Rwanda.

54. The international community to which all our countries belong is following, with as much anxiety as hope, the development of this twelfth special session of the General Assembly. To be convinced of this, it is sufficient to note the peaceful demonstrations which have been organized throughout the world, particularly those which, from all corners of our planet, came right in front of the Organization's Headquarters to reassure us in our historic mission, that of persuading all States of the world to refrain from what divides them and thus drives them to self-defence and consequently to the arms race, in order to devote them-

selves to what unites them and promotes understanding, complementarity and peace and therefore a better collective well-being for their peoples.

55. Four years ago, the United Nations convened the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In so doing, the Organization intended to awaken the whole world to the dangers of the arms race. At the end of those debates the Assembly adopted a Final Document, in which it expressed the significant progress made in the long march of the international community towards disarmament and the building of a more peaceful society for future generations.

56. The delegation of Rwanda saw in that the endorsement of the ideals of peace and harmony as contained in the Charter. We saw in it the endorsement of the national motto of Rwanda—peace, unity and development—as well as that of the policy of the Government of Rwanda, which is one of understanding and sincere co-operation, a policy which it continues to promote in its relations with its neighbours as well as with all peoples of the world. It is thus with great disillusionment that we have had to witness the continuous increase of military expenditures coupled with the enormous growth of nuclear arsenals.

57. The international community will never regret sufficiently that the tenth special session only gave rise to a partial awareness of the necessity for peace and that it was followed by the development of new generations of nuclear weapons and of the emergence of new doctrines which render recourse to the nuclear apocalypse increasingly credible.

58. The delegation of Rwanda would again remind the Assembly with some emotion of what Mr. Kurt Waldheim, then Secretary-General, stated in his address to the seventeenth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity. He said:

“In the world today there are more explosives than foodstuffs, measured in pounds per inhabitant. Military expenditures absorb one million dollars per minute. They thus drain resources which far exceed those which would be necessary to fight against disease and to alleviate hunger.”

59. Extremely concerned by this disturbing situation and by the constant proliferation of weapons of all kinds, Major-General Juvénal Habyarimana, President of the Rwandese Republic and founding President of the National Revolutionary Movement for Development, stated here in his address to the thirty-fifth session of the Assembly:

“It is indeed shocking to observe that, at the very time when the international community has embarked upon an era of détente and a disarmament programme, military expenditures have grown, according to known figures, from \$225 billion in 1974 to more than \$400 billion at the present time. Responsible and competent sources have also declared that \$100 million, or in comparative terms the annual budget of my own country, are being devoted every day to the expansion of nuclear arsenals.

“I am firmly convinced that such sums should be devoted, rather, to assistance to the least developed

countries and economic and social projects such as the development of agriculture and cattle-raising, education, the building of hospitals, the development of road and energy infrastructures and the improvement of means of communication and transport. I also continue to believe that this problem is the responsibility of the great Powers, who alone can play a decisive role.

“Realistically, Members of our Organization ought to cultivate understanding and peaceful co-existence among themselves, without any distinction as to political or ideological preferences. Only then can peace and international security, the only pre-conditions of economic development, be preserved and our peoples be spared all the vicissitudes of the spectre of war, which haunts and disheartens us.” [12th meeting, paras. 35-37.]

60. The delegation of Rwanda has noted with horror the reports on military expenditures, which, estimated at \$360 billion in 1978, have today crossed the threshold of \$600 billion per year, or \$112 per person for the population of the planet, an expenditure, in other words, that is far in excess of the annual income of the vast majority of the inhabitants of our underdeveloped countries. My delegation feels itself duty-bound to join the international community in deploring this waste of resources, in such flagrant contrast to the increasing poverty and underdevelopment to which it is reducing two thirds of the world's population.

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

61. Echoing those—the large and small, rich and poor, of all ages and of every continent—who, haunted by the spectre of destruction and desolation, have finally raised their voices to decry the greatest scandal of all time, the Organization decided to convene another special session of the General Assembly, one that history will henceforth remember as the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, that will have brought together here representatives of the major Powers and States possessing weapons of mass destruction and delegations of countries in search of development who have also made it a point to attend this historic meeting.

62. This special session is all the more timely today, in a particularly troubled time marked by all kinds of conflicts, by struggles for influence and hegemony, by the re-emergence of outlawed mercenarism and by wars that are both bloody and futile, in short, by various confrontations that flout the ideals of the Charter, which calls upon all to promote peace and to settle conflicts through peaceful negotiations. My delegation must, therefore, once again condemn the intransigence of the racist régime of South Africa that is perpetuating the hateful policy of *apartheid*, as well as the challenge it continues to pose to the world community by hindering the Namibian people's accession to self-determination and independence. My delegation bitterly regrets the bloody conflicts being provoked by the Zionist State, which have brought grief to the Arab peoples of Palestine and the Arab territories it is so illegally occupying in complete disregard of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. My delegation deplores the fact that tolerance has not prevailed

over intransigence and that parties in conflict throughout the world have not been persuaded to turn to dialogue and negotiation in seeking appropriate solutions to their differences.

63. We have listened with great attention to the many and distinguished personalities from Africa, Asia, Europe and many parts of this hemisphere who have reaffirmed their commitment and that of their Governments and peoples to the Organization's ideals of peace. We have had the great privilege of witnessing the formal commitment made before the international community by the heads of State or Government of the major Powers and developed countries, a commitment by which they have assured the General Assembly of their resolve to spare no effort to preserve peace and to refrain from resorting to force in the settlement of conflicts.

64. My delegation has welcomed the commitments by both sides that so obviously respond to the deep aspirations of their peoples and that are symbolized by the peaceful demonstrations held here in New York and at the very gates of the Organization to demand from all the Governments in the world their effective and wholehearted contribution towards building a society in which life is good, a society free from the spectre of war and self-destruction, a society free from hatred, a society typified by the turning of the profits derived from our planet's resources to the purposes of development through equitable distribution, in short, a society of peace and happiness for every individual, for every people and for the world community as a whole.

65. My delegation also cherishes the fervent hope that this session, as its agenda provides, will adopt the comprehensive programme of disarmament, as well as measures designed to mobilize world public opinion for disarmament.

66. We are pleased to note the emergence everywhere, and especially in the developed countries, of a peaceful movement for disarmament, a movement that fully reflects the ever-increasing awareness of the peoples concerned of the danger created by the strong concentration of nuclear and conventional weapons in their respective territories, a movement that proclaims their weariness of the unrestrained arms race. In the view of my delegation, the international community gathered here must endorse the totally justified claims of such movements for disarmament and must address a firm appeal to the weapon-possessing States, beginning with the two super-Powers, to convince them of the need for the reduction, to the lowest possible level, of military equipment and expenditure and for the negotiations necessary to accomplish that in a spirit of frankness, cordiality and mutual trust.

67. My delegation understands that the first step, which is of course a difficult one, requires a great deal of courage and true resolve. However, we are also convinced that the decision to take it will reflect all the more credit. It will, we believe, be the necessary prelude to achieving the peace we all so much desire.

68. It is in that context that we have welcomed with great satisfaction the announcement that on 29 June the American-Soviet talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons will resume. We see that as a manifestation of the will expressed by both parties

from this rostrum to undertake sincere negotiations on limiting the arms race, a prelude to the general and complete disarmament that is the ultimate aim of the enterprise the Organization has undertaken.

69. In that connexion, my delegation wishes to take this opportunity to express the hope that the resolutions in which the Organization has declared certain areas of our planet, particularly in Asia and Africa and the Indian Ocean, to be zones of peace free from nuclear weapons will be followed and fully complied with. My delegation also wishes publicly to express its Government's concern at the nuclear arms possessed by the racist régime of South Africa, whose only purpose is to disrupt the peace and tranquillity of the African countries, especially the front-line countries.

70. I should like to conclude by inviting the Assembly to meditate once again and to act upon this lesson, which His Holiness Pope John Paul II sent to us in his message barely ten days ago:

“Peace is not a Utopia nor an unattainable ideal nor an unrealizable dream;

“War is not an inevitable calamity;

“Peace is possible, and because it is possible, peace is a duty—a very solemn duty, a supreme responsibility;

“Certainly peace is difficult, and it requires much goodwill, wisdom and tenacity, but man can and must make the force of reason prevail over the reasons of force.” [8th meeting, para. 127.]

71. My delegation hopes that this session can, at the end of its work, respond positively to that generous invitation which, in sum, echoes the appeal that today more than ever the international community is addressing to us, an appeal that every State and all the peoples of the world will refrain in their relations from what tends to divide them, and that they will draw closer together to build a world of justice and peace.

72. Mr. AMEGA (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): The twelfth special session of the General Assembly is being held at a particularly difficult time in international relations. The proliferation and intensification of conflicts in the world, the breakdown of détente in East-West relations, the acceleration of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, the emergence of the notion of “limited nuclear war” are all factors which cause mankind more than ever to feel haunted by the spectre of a clash between great Powers that may entail a nuclear holocaust. In the circumstances the problem of disarmament is no longer one that can be posed in moral terms, in terms of common sense or of legal obligations, but rather in terms of the very survival of the human race. Hence the special importance of this second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

73. Before continuing my statement, Sir, I should like to extend to you the warm congratulations of the Togolese delegation on your unanimous election to the presidency of this special session. The success of previous sessions under your presidency and your wisdom and broad experience of disarmament problems give us the hope that under your leadership the twelfth special session will create the momentum

necessary for furthering the cause of disarmament in the world.

74. I also take this opportunity to convey my delegation's congratulations and thanks to the members of the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament and to the members of the Disarmament Commission and of the Committee on Disarmament, whose tireless efforts have enabled this session to be held in satisfactory conditions. In this regard, I should like to pay well-deserved tribute to the Secretary-General, who has done everything possible for the successful holding of this session.

75. I should like to begin consideration of the subject we are dealing with first by recalling what you, Mr. President, said in your brilliant address to the opening meeting of this session. You said that among the causes which favour disarmament there are the increase in the level of expenditures on armament to \$600 billion, the failure of the negotiating process on strategic weapons, the development of increasingly sophisticated nuclear weapons and the fallacious tendency to accept the idea of a limited nuclear war.

76. Secondly, I recall that at the ecumenical service at Saint Patrick's Cathedral in New York to celebrate Peace Day, the Secretary-General said that

“... disarmament is not a utopian ideal, it is a necessity for a lasting peace. As long as weapons of mass destruction exist in the arsenals of nations and become increasingly sophisticated and numerous, there can be no certainty that they will not be unleashed on defenceless humanity.”

77. The problem of disarmament has been of concern to the United Nations ever since its foundation. Indeed, the first resolution adopted by the General Assembly immediately after the Second World War, in January 1946, was on disarmament. For more than a quarter of a century the General Assembly has continued to include in its agenda at each regular session an item entitled “General and complete disarmament”. The General Assembly in 1978 even held a special session devoted to disarmament. This first special session devoted to disarmament adopted by consensus a Programme of Action designed to speed up disarmament by specific measures to be implemented over the next few years. This session also institutionalized the Committee on Disarmament as the sole organ of multilateral negotiations on disarmament, the committee entrusted with the task of negotiating a comprehensive programme of disarmament. The Disarmament Commission was also established. In carrying out their work, the Committee and the Commission held many meetings. This is a brief review of the efforts of the United Nations in the field of disarmament since its creation, particularly since the tenth special session of the General Assembly. What are the results of those efforts? How does the situation in the world look today as regards international security and disarmament?

78. It is distressing to note that, despite the considerable efforts of the United Nations, the world situation in respect of international security and disarmament has seriously deteriorated. With regard to international security, it should be stressed that the world continues to live in a constant climate of

conflict. In the view of my delegation there are four causes underlying this climate of conflict. The first cause is the polarization of the world into military blocs and alliances, each built on the accumulation of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons. The second cause is the breakdown of détente in East-West relations. In fact, détente has given way to a resumption of the hegemonistic struggle for world domination between the great Powers. The third world in particular is both the stake and the preferred arena for East-West ideological confrontations. The third cause is the increasingly frequent recourse to force for settling international disputes. We are all familiar with recent and older examples of this. The fourth cause, which derives from the first three, is the proliferation of armed conflicts in the world: in Africa with the undeclared war waged by South Africa against the front-line States over Namibia, and the wars in Chad and Western Sahara; in the Middle East, where in addition to the Israeli-Arab conflict we have the Iraq-Iran war; in South-East Asia, with the Kampuchea conflict and the situation in Afghanistan; in Latin America, with the civil war in El Salvador and the conflict in the Falkland-Malvinas Islands.

79. This climate of constant conflict has increased mistrust in inter-State relations and hampered the disarmament process. In the face of ever more frequent recourse to force in international relations and the greed of the great Powers or their allies, the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America have been spending considerable funds on arms purchases in order to guarantee their own security. In the circumstances we should not be surprised that the recommendations of the tenth special session have not been applied and that, for that reason, no tangible progress has been achieved in the field of general and complete disarmament. On the contrary, arsenals of weapons have grown steadily in quantity and quality, and the rate at which they are manufactured has increased. Governments have constantly increased their military budgets. What we have now is a frenzied arms race.

80. The result has been, first of all, the accumulation of an incredible quantity of weapons of mass destruction of the most sophisticated type, and some people have been prompted to say that the world has become a “veritable powder-keg”. According to United Nations studies, there are now in the world more than 40,000 nuclear warheads, which is the equivalent of a million Hiroshima-type bombs. The result also is the unprecedented waste of material and human resources that have been diverted from the task of development to the work of destruction. In this regard it is distressing to note that military expenditures have risen to \$600 billion while the number of hungry people in the world is more than 800 million, and that each year more than 50 million people die of hunger and malnutrition. It is also distressing to note that more than 50,000 scientists and other highly qualified engineers are working in military research areas, that is to say, for purposes of destruction, while many countries in the world are short of doctors, technicians and teachers. Furthermore, paragraph 16 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly showed that: “The hundreds of billions of dollars spent annually on the manufacture or improvement of weapons are in sombre and dramatic contrast

to the want and poverty in which two thirds of the world's population live."

81. Indeed, the proportion of wealth devoted to war and arms is constantly growing, and this diverts resources of the same order, according to experts, as those devoted to investment and production. These are therefore a factor of crisis and unemployment. They in fact exceed the total income of all the States which are most dramatically afflicted by the scourge of underdevelopment and hunger, thus rendering intractable the conflict between the arms race and development. Paradoxically, too, the gap between the industrialized countries and our own countries is growing wider because of this race, which fans international tensions and whets the appetites of the developing countries for sophisticated weaponry. And, as we can see, this places a heavy burden on their budgets, which, even in the aggregate, are not enough to provide self-sufficiency in food.

82. In this regard, we endorse the opinion of the World Peace Council in "Disarmament: The Peoples and the United Nations" to the effect that "just 1 per cent of the military budgets of the developed countries would make it possible to compensate for the insufficient international aid to developing countries to finance the necessary increase in food production and create the requisite emergency reserves".

83. It is high time to put an end to this unprecedented waste of human resources and to the equally unprecedented threat which the arms race now poses to the very survival of mankind. To this end, this twelfth special session of the General Assembly should engender new initiatives to halt and reverse the arms race. In the view of my delegation, the measures to be taken at this session should aim primarily at eliminating fear and mistrust in international relations and restoring the climate of confidence among States. The lack of such a climate has been impeding the implementation of the recommendations of the tenth special session.

84. To this end certain States have been proposing for some years now the conclusion of a treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. In this regard, my delegation believes that the conclusion of a new treaty is not indispensable, because a treaty already exists, that is, the Charter of the United Nations, whose Article 2, paragraph 4, states:

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

That is why my delegation would be inclined to prefer a declaration whereby the signatory States would undertake solemnly not to use force in international relations and, more generally, to abide strictly by the principles in the Charter. However, Togo is flexible in this matter and would not object to the conclusion of a treaty on the non-use of force if such were the wish of the majority.

85. Furthermore, the measures to be taken at this session should be aimed at promoting genuine general and complete disarmament under effective international control. My delegation would like to stress that in this area the example must first of all be set by the

great Powers. They have a special responsibility in this area. Indeed, it is first and foremost the nuclear-weapon States which bear responsibility for embarking first on nuclear disarmament. It is then for the great Powers to exercise the responsibility, in the second place, to embark with other militarily significant States on conventional disarmament.

86. On the question of nuclear disarmament, my delegation believes, like so many others, that a treaty totally banning nuclear tests would be particularly useful. If it were respected by its signatories, such a treaty would make it possible to halt the manufacture of new weapons and to prevent the improvement of existing ones. Furthermore, that treaty would have the merit of preventing the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons.

87. In this respect, I should like to express my delegation's profound concern at South Africa's nuclear capacity. My delegation would like to remind States which collaborate with South Africa in the nuclear field of the imperative need to make the African continent a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

88. The treaty totally banning nuclear tests should be followed by commitments to reduce and subsequently to destroy nuclear weapons on the basis of a precise time-table and under international control.

89. With regard to conventional disarmament, my delegation favours a freeze and the reduction of military budgets and the arsenals of all countries, including the developing countries. Furthermore, we support the proposals for the conclusion of an international treaty banning the manufacture, stockpiling and use of chemical or bacteriological weapons and of high-radiation weapons.

90. My delegation very much hopes that as a result of this special session, the General Assembly will adopt a global programme containing a precise time-table and concrete disarmament measures under effective international control. In our view, such a programme should be binding in nature.

91. My delegation would like to appeal to all Governments to give up the idea of trying to guarantee their security by means of weapons and to take the necessary measures to restore confidence in international relations—because without confidence disarmament is nothing but a mirage. Peace and security can be achieved and preserved only through general and complete disarmament, which would release the vast resources so necessary for development, which could be used to establish a new international economic order.

92. In conclusion, I should like to quote the President of the Togolese Republic, General Gnassingbe Eyadema, on the subject of peace and the relationship between disarmament, security and development.

"The world needs peace. The harmonious evolution of the States which make up the world can be achieved at no lower price. The frenzied race in the most sophisticated weaponry entails grave risks and dangers and at the same time deprives the international economy of decisive means of accelerated development.

"It is the collective responsibility of all countries on the planet to work hard to bring about real

disarmament, which would guarantee the security of our nations and their survival in the future. That is why we welcome all serious initiatives in this area. Let us hope that all attempts made to achieve these ends which are marked with the seal of honesty and realism succeed in bringing about a solution acceptable to everyone and a strengthened guarantee of the survival of mankind.”

93. Mr. OULD HAMODY (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, I have the particular pleasure of extending to Mr. Kittani our fraternal and sincere congratulations on his election to the presidency of this special session. Our delegation takes this same opportunity to reaffirm our confidence in the Secretary-General and our readiness to co-operate with him.

94. I should also like to express our appreciation of the excellent work done and the amount of high-quality information presented both by the Committee on Disarmament and by the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament, as well as by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, as evidenced by the basic documents of our session.

95. We also wish to make special mention of the outstanding contributions of personalities within the United Nations system, in particular the Director-General of UNESCO and the expert groups studying problems connected with disarmament.

96. All of us here—big, medium-sized and small Powers—talk about disarmament and our devotion to the sacred ideals of the human species, to universal civilization, to the survival of man, and so on. This praiseworthy universal consensus is very moving, very admirable. Begin himself came here to speak, with irony and arrogance, of course, of peace, nuclear-weapon-free zones, the eternal values of man and so forth.

97. It will be easily understood that this unanimity, even in good faith, seems somewhat suspect to us. Indeed, together with these touching and unanimous manifestations of pacifism, there is the brutal image of murderous confrontations in all climes, which give the lie, unfortunately, to our good intentions.

98. What are we told every day by the mass media? Over-armed soldiery, full of hatred, arrogant, triumphant, criminal, in the Arab Maghreb; more of the same nature in southern Africa; an over-equipped armada somewhere else; and on all continents the confiscation of entire sovereignties and the denial of self-determination to many peoples. Palestine, Lebanon, Namibia, Western Sahara, Afghanistan, Kampuchea and El Salvador are just some of the places where men are suffering and dying, where the rule of force takes precedence over that of law, at the very time when the international community in this impressive gathering is talking so much about peace and disarmament.

99. In the face of this flagrant contradiction between declared intentions and the real attitude of hegemonism, we cannot but feel legitimate discouragement and profound frustration. And what are we to say about disappointments? Let us recall only the vast

hopes aroused by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] in 1968. Let us also recall the enthusiasm aroused in 1969 by the General Assembly when it proclaimed the 1970s the first Disarmament Decade [*resolution 2602 E (XXIV)*]. And what about the welcome given to the Final Document adopted at the first session on disarmament in 1978?

100. Certain results of some significance have been achieved, of course, since 1959, in particular the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction, the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and so on.

101. We do not want to minimize all these achievements, which are very important, but we have noted that, if the horizontal proliferation admitted was limited, the perfecting of atomic weapons, in particular the single- or multiple-warhead missiles, and of their capacity has undergone a dizzying and menacing evolution. Conventional weapons, which are the essential tool of localized conflicts, are every day becoming more numerous and more destructive.

102. We will add no fresh statistics to those presented by so many delegations which tell us clearly that peace and security in the world are being terribly threatened, that the progress achieved by the hard work of so many generations is liable to be reduced to naught and that the development of the third world is being more than ever threatened by the diversion of vast sums to purposes of death. This negative evolution unfortunately brings a new dimension to the anguish of mankind, which I venture to describe as “psychopathic with marked suicidal tendencies”.

103. But is it possible to make an audience as aware and vigilant as ours even more sensitive? We shall limit ourselves to the presentation of the primary concerns of our country with regard to the crucial problem of disarmament. These concerns are essentially summed up in our appeal, which is that of all non-aligned countries, for the emergence of a sincere and effective will on the part of the principal military Powers, in particular the nuclear Powers, to apply the resolutions adopted at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the recommendations of other relevant bodies of the Organization. Without their adequate political will, no progress can be achieved, and this is obvious. At the present time, this necessary will is dramatically lacking, and the most significant proof of this is indeed the problems concerning the convening of a world conference on disarmament.

104. The report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee has rigorously repeated for three consecutive years that the necessary consensus was not achieved. Without this political will, without this necessary consensus, our debate today will remain futile and our resolutions dead letters.

105. More specifically, the concern—I was going to say “the anguish”—of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania about general and complete disarmament is

perfectly in accord with the concern of the overwhelming majority of the countries represented here. We therefore very much hope for the continuance, free from all demagoguery and propaganda, of negotiations within the most appropriate framework on a freeze of nuclear arsenals at their present levels and then their progressive reduction, and finally—why not?—the ultimate objective of the destruction of the existing stockpiles.

106. Like so many other delegations, our delegation wishes to see the nuclear-weapon States solemnly undertake not to use these arms against countries which do not possess them.

107. We also appeal for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in Africa and in the Middle East.

108. We draw attention to the nuclear co-operation for aggressive purposes that is developing between Israel and South Africa and also to the material and technological assistance from certain Western quarters enjoyed by those two racist régimes, contrary to the objective of non-proliferation.

109. We particularly hope to see a more positive response from those same quarters to the desire of the overwhelming majority of States Members of the Organization that IAEA exercise control over the nuclear installations of certain non-peace-loving countries which are not parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, such as Israel and South Africa.

110. As regards the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania reiterates its support for the efforts of the coastal States to establish zones of peace by the gradual reduction and finally the withdrawal and dismantling of foreign bases and fleets.

111. Our country continues to support the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade [*resolution 35/46, annex*]. We appeal for the application of this important Declaration, and at the same time we hope that the results achieved by the end of the Second Decade will be much more encouraging than those of the previous Decade.

112. Is there any need to repeat, as so many speakers have, that the scant progress achieved by the international community in the search for the limitation, however timid, of conventional and nuclear weapons is a corollary of the scant enthusiasm displayed by the major military and economic Powers for the establishment of a new international economic order?

113. This new international economic order, which will have to remedy the structural imbalances in the world economy and promote third world development, is intimately linked to the financial means which a reduction in military budgets could add to the meagre resources already available. We fully understand the difficulty of reaching agreement on the standard to be applied—as, for example, the simple evaluation of military budgets. But we call for an activation of the work undertaken in this field to make it possible, within a reasonable space of time, for some of the enormous amounts that are wasted on death-dealing devices to be used more properly to increase development aid, which in everyone's view contributes to a lessening of tensions and, hence, to the strengthening of the security of all.

114. Military expenses for 1980 alone, which amounted to \$500 billion, were equal to the gross fixed capital formation of all the developing countries. This equation, established by conscientious experts, requires no comment and speaks eloquently for the decisive choice to be made between a decent life for the poorest and, ultimately, death for all. And, as was said by the head of our delegation at the tenth special session, in 1978:

“It should be stressed, on the other hand, that hunger, ignorance and sickness which continue to rage throughout most of the world are all very serious problems and that their solution should not be linked to uncertain progress in negotiations on disarmament.” [*9th meeting, para. 208.*]

115. The Assembly has before it now a series of reports and studies by disarmament committees, the heads of specialized agencies and groups of experts. The Assembly also has at its disposal the immense amount of theoretical work from the first special session and the evaluation of the first Disarmament Decade. It has had a complete picture of the desires, hopes and nightmares of many heads of State, prime ministers and heads of delegations of Member States. Above all, the Assembly has heard, especially from the imposing public gathering which blocked the streets of this great metropolis, the entreaties of simple, motivated, conscientious and disinterested human beings of every race, religion, sex and social background. And, apart from all that, the Assembly is the repository of the hopes of all the peoples of the world who, forgetting all their differences, aspire profoundly to peace.

116. Peace is not an abstract notion or an end in itself; peace is inseparable from justice and security. Justice for Palestine and for its people, which has been deprived of its basic rights, hunted down within its historic borders and pursued in all its havens and refuges and has seen its holy places desecrated. Peace for Namibia, which has been illegally confiscated and pillaged. Justice and security for the Arab and African peoples subjected to the expansionism and racism of aggressive entities. Peace and justice for all peoples denied their inalienable national rights. Justice for all peoples of the third world, victims of the distortion of economic relations born of the colonial system and other arrangements made without their participation. Security and independence for all the peoples of the world, who, in place of the machinery of terror and destruction, in place also of nightmares and threats of a nuclear holocaust, devastation, death and an uncertain future, want to see a peaceful world in which the school, the field, the factory, the hospital and the socio-cultural needs of mankind take priority over the arms race, madness and the collective self-destruction of our species.

117. Mr. TANNIS (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines): There are two vital areas today which are increasingly dominating the conversation and thoughts of men and women everywhere. One is the attempt to ensure a revitalization of the world's economy by the expansion of world trade, the curbing of inflation and the lowering of interest rates with a readjustment of the flow of capital from the rich North to the poor South. The other is the attempt to bring about greater peace and international safety through disarmament.

It cannot be denied that these areas deserve the attention of all mankind, for, left uncontrolled and unchecked, both will create serious human suffering and misery.

118. However, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines is convinced that disarmament must remain one of the major concerns of the Assembly, for it is in the attainment of this objective that the real hope for peace, stability, security and prosperity lies. This world body, like its predecessor the League of Nations, already recognizes that there is a compelling and urgent need to bring about effective world disarmament, not just between the super-Powers but among all Member States of this world body.

119. It is not necessary now to record the steps taken since 1945 to achieve the major United Nations objective of disarmament. It is enough to confirm agreement with what the General Assembly declared in 1959: that, then as now, complete disarmament is "the most important objective facing the world".

120. Since that time much debate has ensued at different times. Yet one must still question whether any real progress has been made along the road to disarmament. There have been limited successes in certain areas: notably, the 1959 Antarctic Treaty,<sup>3</sup> which forbids military activity in Antarctica. But I expect that it was easy to reach agreement there because of the scientific research interests and the inhospitable nature of the area, as well as the accepted logistical difficulties in fighting a conventional war on such terrain.

121. In the area of nuclear weapons, some degree of control has been achieved by the ban on nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water.<sup>4</sup> The Latin American Treaty of 1967,<sup>2</sup> as well as the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in themselves, on paper, each represent a significant step in the containment of the further spread, manufacture and stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction. However, the great expectations which the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons ushered in have been somewhat disappointed. By that Treaty, the nuclear Powers agreed to act in a particular way, and the 111 non-nuclear States of that time agreed to certain other restrictions. Other States Members of the United Nations, however, regrettably, out of a mistaken idea of national interest, refused to sign the Treaty.

122. Therefore, the present picture of the world's nuclear disarmament scene is as follows. Since 1968, there has been an increase in the number of Powers which have been able to produce and test nuclear devices. Worse still, there are many more countries which, it is believed, are capable of producing weapons-grade material from nuclear reactors, and some which are producing the material and may already be in possession of nuclear devices—countries which in some cases as non-nuclear weapon States were signatories to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. This trend is disturbing and certainly gives cause for alarm.

123. It is clear on a statistical basis alone that as the number of countries possessing nuclear weapons increases the greater will become the probability that a nuclear war could start through an error of percep-

tion or by accident, with disastrous consequences for mankind. It cannot be denied that some progress has also been made since 1975 in enforcing the ban on the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological weapons. However, while it may be said that there has been progress in these areas, albeit of a limited nature, there is still cause for alarm and great despondency. The failure to achieve real disarmament in the areas of nuclear or conventional weapons, on land and sea and in the air, and a reduction of military forces must be a cause of continuing anxiety.

124. Given the suspicion and distrust that exist between countries, it can be appreciated that there are tremendous obstacles to be overcome in bringing about real and lasting disarmament.

125. Countries that have been suspicious of each other for years, and still are, will not suddenly believe each other's words. Therefore, in order to eliminate this element of fear and doubt, which is the result of suspicion and mistrust, inspection and verification must be accepted as an inescapable provision of any such treaty. Any genuine desire to achieve disarmament must realistically accept that States have to move in the direction of an open-door policy rather than a closed-door policy. The prerequisite for reaching agreement on disarmament seems to be the ability of the parties to convince each other that no advantage is sought over the other and that there is nothing to hide by thereby guaranteeing the right of access to each other's territory for inspection. What should then be decided will be who would do the inspection and how such inspection should be carried out—whether by a team selected and controlled by this world body and answerable only to this world body or otherwise. This would actually mean that there would have to be a re-examination of the national concept of sovereignty and territorial jurisdiction. There can be no diminution or compromise of authority in giving to another an entitlement that would be reciprocal. This is the whole concept of ambassadorial and consular representation which specifically limits national jurisdiction on national soil and which encroaches upon national sovereignty in certain cases. This is now an internationally accepted principle set forth in a Convention. There are very rare occasions when this Convention is violated and, when it is, it is as a result of traumatic shocks within a national society. Similarly, what has been achieved in the area of diplomatic reciprocity should prove to be no more difficult in verifiable inspection to achieve disarmament. Willingness to agree to inspection is an indication of acceptance of how crucial inspection must be in reaching agreement on disarmament.

126. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines believes it is unrealistic to assume that disarmament can be achieved all in one phase, that is, in nuclear and conventional arms all at once. The danger in trying to achieve more than is pragmatically possible is that one may not achieve any result at all. Yet, an eventual elimination of nuclear weapons and the end of the arms race should be first priorities and are matters of serious concern to all people of goodwill. The world cannot helplessly contemplate the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, it cannot hopelessly look on as if it must merely await the approach of Armageddon.

127. Since a further problem of disarmament, whether nuclear or conventional, will consist in the desire of each country to make sure that the others do not have qualitative or quantitative advantage—hence the necessity for the machinery for inspection to be in place—we should understand such fears. Yet those fears should not be an excuse for stalling discussions and moving into a phase of negativism.

128. The present mood of demonstrations by people of various communities is conclusive evidence that there exists a high level of fear internationally of the dangers inherent in the existence of nuclear weapons and their increasing sophistication. In 1946 the Assembly established the Atomic Energy Commission, recognizing as a matter of urgency that there was need to formulate specific proposals for the elimination of all forms of mass destruction. Thirty-six years later we are still here discussing the arms race in all its destructive component parts. We are still unwilling to accept that the precious gift of life to mankind is worth preserving; we fail to accept that to fight a war to preserve a heritage only to create a wilderness is a strange and perverse sense of logic. What is strange is that the two super-Powers are aware of the destruction that can be wrought on the civilian population of their respective countries and others. They are aware of the colossal property and ecological damage that can be done and yet, while they accept that it is better to negotiate than risk a miscalculation with all its frightening consequences, they, as well as others, are more preoccupied with scoring points against each other and with securing an advantage. In spite of years of negotiation of the strategic arms limitation agreement, SALT I of 1972, they still deploy weapons of mass destruction on both sides of the Atlantic with their sophisticated delivery vehicles. Many years of discussions have not led to a satisfactory conclusion to SALT II. After years, we now have three suggested approaches towards nuclear disarmament: strategic arms limitation, the suggested freeze and strategic arms reduction.

129. All three approaches seem to have something to commend them. Strategic arms limitation is intended to act as a specific control on the number of warheads and delivery systems deployed. However, it contemplates the continued existence of warheads and the deployment of their delivery vehicles. This approach, even though a step in an acceptable direction, appears more as tokenism to placate dissenters than a willingness to accept the real challenge of nuclear disarmament. The freeze seeks to achieve results immediately and to bring about an end to any increase in production, stockpiling and further deployment of nuclear weapons. However, this leaves the *status quo* intact, with all the massive overkill potential of weaponry still in place, and the elimination of these weapons must still await the same protracted period of negotiation.

130. Strategic arms reduction, while it can only be achieved through negotiation, shows a commitment to tackle the nuclear-arms race head on, to reach to the core of the issue. Reduction could lead by stages to the total phased elimination of such weapons. While it is true that reduction could probably only be partial and not lead to total disposal of nuclear weapons, it seems to offer the best assurance of the intention to

deal in concrete terms with this deadly spectre now plaguing all mankind. The horror of nuclear war cannot be considered as the immediate concern of just the super-Powers but of all the nations of the world, whether large or small.

131. The argument that parity of nuclear weaponry and delivery systems among the super-Powers would be a deterrent and prevent surprise attack, and that an absence of parity or balance, if it is too pronounced, is likely to give one side a first-strike advantage, by its very nature makes an absurdity of the first-strike advantage by the very callousness of treating the loss of human lives in terms of mere statistics. I know that this does not mean that the leaders and planners are cold and heartless, but in referring to people in terms of figures and statistics, there is a tendency and a real danger not to see people as human beings, as members of one's family or as close friends and neighbours, in which case the whole concept of war and aggression becomes non-personal. It is viewing things in such a way that carries the seed of danger to all. If sufficient consideration is not given to the value of human lives that will be lost, the horror of it all will not become revolting. Then we shall fail to see the faces behind those statistics or to grasp the fact that a one-megaton explosion over a city of 4 million may immediately kill 500,000 and injure 600,000, or kill perhaps 2 million and injure 2.4 million, depending on the population density; but the dead and injured would not be figures, they would be people.

132. Therefore, if we are to treat seriously the destructive force of the 40,000 existing nuclear warheads estimated in United Nations figures for 1981, we must find totally incomprehensible the reluctance of the super-Powers and other nuclear nations to call a halt to the production, stockpiling and deployment of all these weapons of mass destruction and to reach agreement on the destruction of such weapons. It may be contended that this is not an attainable objective. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines prefers to contend that it may not be an easily attainable objective but that objectives that were once not considered attainable have been reached by international agreement. The prohibition on the manufacture and use of bacteriological weapons and the ban after the First World War on the use of poisonous gas are cases in point.

133. When the cost of total armament is considered and the steep annual percentage increase in production and sales are estimated, it is staggering. In 1980 alone, \$500 billion were expended, an estimate, from United Nations figures, of \$1 million every second. Developing, underdeveloped and some developed countries spend approximately \$20 billion annually on the purchase of arms. Many of the underdeveloped and developing countries could far more properly spend such sums on improving the health, education and employment opportunities of their populations. Yet they spend such needed sums in the name of national security. Instead of bringing peace and security, the existence of arms seems always to form the basis for their use. The existence of arms seems to give psychological confidence and strength. That confidence can in some cases lead to recklessness and adventurism, with disastrous consequences for a nation through the loss of life and property and the squandering of scarce resources. Such vast sums

spent on armaments and the arms race represent a colossal waste of resources which could better be usefully redirected to improving the living condition of hundreds of millions of the destitute and needy people in the poor, underdeveloped parts of the world.

134. In a world with serious human needs, to spend \$92.02 on armaments for each inhabitant of this world while a mere \$0.59 is spent on education and health indicates that international priorities are wrong. While there is a decline in the level of aid to needy countries, the expenditures on arms world-wide from 1970 to 1980 increased by over 70 per cent in approximate constant terms.

135. No one can direct the rich countries how to spend their money, but we can urge upon them the right course of action in a particular situation. In the light of the North-South dialogue and the meeting held at Cancún in October 1981, it would seem that there should be no real justification for continuing to spend money on such a large scale on armaments. It is equally clear that this world body's concern about disarmament, starting with the resolution of 24 January 1946, did not just provide an opportunity for the expression of views; it was intended that due regard should be paid to the views expressed then and in subsequent years on disarmament.

136. It is clear that this issue of disarmament should not be left to the super-Powers, as I have said before, or to large or medium-sized States, but equally to small and "mini" States. The entire peace and safety of the universe is seriously threatened. And here I wish to make a controversial observation, namely, that good as is the objective intent—and it is good—to establish zones of peace and nuclear-free zones, I believe that it is too late now to pursue this concept. Rather we should work for the complete removal of the cause of the danger itself. A piece-by-piece or step-by-step approach now merely encourages and makes easier tolerance of the danger. Nuclear dialogue must fill the entire frame, the whole spectrum, for when the whole picture is seen countries will then be compelled to confront the problem in its entirety and thereby will be more readily willing to appreciate the need for a comprehensive and not a piece-by-piece solution. For such a solution will lead people to believe that a limited solution is the real answer to this problem. Their sense of urgency in seeking a total cure for the problem is lulled by the belief that for them the danger is removed. But the danger will never be removed, whatever the belief, as long as there exists one explosive nuclear device. We should all remember that whatever man has made can and does malfunction and may land where it has not been programmed to strike because discrimination is not possible.

137. The world belongs to all of us. However, our future safety now lies in the hands of the super-Powers and the major Powers. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines asks them what future it shall be. The answer is theirs to make, but since the world belongs to the people of all nations we are entitled to an answer now. What will it be? Will it be continued rivalry and unyielding competition? Or can it be real peace and plenty through disarmament? Saint Vincent and the Grenadines hopes that this twelfth special session will prove that disarmament is attainable. It

may be well that we all remember the well-known prayer of St. Francis of Assisi and say:

“Lord, make us instruments of your peace.  
Where there is hatred—let us sow love,  
Where there is injury—pardon,  
Where there is doubt—faith,  
Where there is despair—hope,  
Where there is darkness—light,  
Where there is sadness—joy.  
O Divine Creator, grant that we may not so much  
seek  
To be understood as to understand,  
To be loved as to love.  
For it is in giving that we receive,  
It is in pardoning that we are pardoned”.

138. Let us all understand now the import of those words. Let us all by the deliberation of our actions give true meaning and effect to them.

139. Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Sir, I would be grateful if you would convey to Mr. Kittani the message that it is a great pleasure for the delegation of Argentina and for me personally to see him preside over the work of this special session of the General Assembly with the same skill and efficiency he exhibited a few months ago during the thirty-sixth regular session. He is a worthy representative of a non-aligned country, and his leadership is the best possible guarantee of success for the work of the Assembly.

140. It is also a great satisfaction for me to have the constant co-operation of the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar. His election to the high post he occupies today was warmly welcomed in the Argentine Republic. Not only is he a Latin American; he is a son of Peru, a non-aligned country which has shared heroic exploits with my country, a country with which we maintain close fraternal bonds firmly rooted in history and continuously renewed. We recently had direct proof of the Secretary-General's constant readiness to work constructively and indefatigably for peace.

141. It is an irony of history that the statement by the representative of the Argentine Republic to this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is being made at a time when Argentine blood has been shed as a result of the use of sophisticated weapons, the destructive capacity of which has been greatly increased through the application of the most recent advances in military technology. The use of those weapons, many of which were completely new, turned the aggression against the Malvinas Islands into an experimentation and testing ground for the attacking Powers.

142. All that has taken place in the context of a most clearly colonialist operation which seeks the restoration and perpetuation by force of a situation typical of the nineteenth century but which is today an anachronism and a mockery of the most basic principles which this Organization upholds. If the mere existence of a colony is a phenomenon which should be removed from the face of the earth as soon as possible, it is inadmissible for such a colony to last when it is an integral part of the territory of a sovereign nation from which it was snatched by violence,

advantage being taken, as in so many other cases, of higher levels of military might.

143. The Malvinas Islands were attacked and occupied in 1833, in an open manifestation of power politics which is repeated today with equal crudity. The only difference is that at present it is disguised with the argument that principles are being defended, principles the mere invocation of which is an insult to all countries and peoples which have upheld and defended them in bitter and frequently bloody struggles. The United Kingdom has vast experience in concealing its own national interests under the cloak of higher values which no one disputes.

144. The colonialist Power claims to act in defence of the wishes of the population inhabiting the Malvinas. Apart from what the United Nations itself has decided in that area and what has been expressed by the non-aligned countries, the staunchest defenders of the principle of self-determination, it is unthinkable that efforts should be made to grant settlers, brought in by the colonialist Power to exploit the territory forcibly taken from another country, the right to decide on the future of that territory. To support such an absurdity could hardly be explained were it not for the fact that it is an over-ingenious sophistry used in order to maintain indefinitely a colonial situation which is untenable at this stage of the twentieth century, after all the firm, categorical and explicit resolutions adopted by the United Nations regarding colonialism.

145. Worse still, in order to defend and preserve that colony an attempt is now being made to turn it into a military base. This has already been denounced by the Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, which met at Havana, as "a means of imposing imperialist domination on the area and as a serious threat to international peace and security throughout the region of the South Atlantic."

146. Let us not be deceived. This is the case of a colony for which all means are being used to keep it as a part of the colonial metropolis. When a country of the developing world, tired and frustrated after 150 years of futile claims, faced with warlike confrontation and military forces sent to consolidate colonial domination, stood up for its rights, immediately the repressive apparatus of the allied imperialist Powers, Powers which could not tolerate such daring, came into operation. The United States, a super-Power with which we coexist in the western hemisphere, actively co-operated in the undertaking of colonial repossession through many forms of military assistance which had a decisive influence on the course of the operation. Is it not strange that as soon as a colonial empire—or rather the last remnants of a past empire—is involved, the partners in past glories immediately react by imposing sanctions on the party which seeks justice, while they remain idle and passive in the face of acts in other areas which they condemn with pious words?

147. In that mistaken view of the world, colonialism and injustice must be preserved, and when there is a possibility of that objective's being frustrated, they resort, as in so many cases that we witness so frequently, to the right of veto in the Security Council, a right which could be explained, although not justified, in the realities of the world of four decades ago, a right which is exercised today by a party without the

title to it. The right of veto, paradoxically, has become one of the most serious obstacles to the maintenance of international peace and security. Repeated developments on the African continent and in the Middle East are also evidence of the misuse of the right to veto which in recent days has affected the peace in Lebanon and the fate of the Palestinian people.

148. The Argentine Republic is a peaceful nation and has shown this throughout its history. Not a single centimetre of its territory has been taken by force from another country. On 2 April 1982, a deliberate effort was made not to spill a single drop of blood of the illegal occupier. That is a clear indication of the spirit in which the Government and people of Argentina undertook that action, without aggressive intent against anyone and without wishing to obtain anything which was not its own. The contrast between that bloodless action and the indiscriminate cutting down of lives which ensued could not be more eloquent. History will tell who was intent on war and who bears the responsibility. World public opinion has already passed judgement.

149. The case is not closed for the Malvinas Islands, nor is it for the other islands of the South Atlantic—South Sandwich and South Georgia—which are part of the Latin American region. On the contrary, that problem remains pending and will remain so as long as those lands are not finally reincorporated under our national sovereignty. May it be clearly recorded that there will never be any other solution to this conflict, because such are the requirements of history, justice and the unyielding and unalterable decision of the people of Argentina. So long as the colonial situation exists in the Malvinas Islands there will be no lasting peace in the South Atlantic.

150. It is comforting to know that in that endeavour we have the absolute solidarity of our Latin American brothers and of the non-aligned movement, as well as that of countries in other continents, including Europe. Our mother country, Spain, stood faithfully at the side of America in this common enterprise. Throughout this general debate we have heard many expressions of support for the justice of our cause, which it is our duty and our pleasure to acknowledge at this time.

151. It is in difficult times that a country truly knows who its friends are, who its adversaries are and who remain indifferent. The experience of the Argentine Republic in recent months has in this sense been very instructive, and it is obvious that it will not fail to influence our foreign policy.

152. The conflict in the South Atlantic, over and above the grievous losses it has produced, has cast a new light on concepts and systems discussed under the heading of disarmament, which should be re-examined in due course. I shall limit myself to mentioning them today.

153. There has been confrontation between a developing country situated in a geographical area free of nuclear weapons and a State totally alien to that region, a member of the privileged minority of States possessing nuclear weapons, which normally claim for themselves all rights and arrogate to themselves the power to determine what others may have. That nuclear-weapon State has, together with its unconditional ally, systematically stopped all attempts by

the Committee on Disarmament, the only multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament, to undertake substantive negotiations on the essential problem of the moment: the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament.

154. That State has undertaken large-scale aggressive acts 14,000 kilometres away from its territory in an attempt to re-establish its colonial empire by force. Scoffing at signed agreements and declared guarantees, it has introduced the nuclear weapon into areas which it had committed itself to respect. The existence of nuclear weapons in the colonialist expedition has never been denied. Regardless of whether they are used or not, the very fact that they may be there and may be used constitutes a clear example of nuclear threat. Nuclear submarines carried out bloody operations which they could not have undertaken had nuclear power not been used for military purposes.

155. The sinking of ships outside the conflict zone, the attack on ships which were on rescue operations and the use of prisoners for dangerous tasks are violations of the Geneva Conventions and of the basic principles of humanitarian law. The point has even been reached of using the preservation of prisoners' lives as a political instrument.

156. The open use of satellites for aggressive purposes could not but have a profound influence on the treatment by the Committee on Disarmament of the question of the non-militarization of outer space. The prerequisites for regional disarmament cannot be the same when Powers alien to a specific region can penetrate that area militarily with the most powerful means at their disposal, nuclear and non-nuclear. Mercenaries are used to try to restore an anachronistic colonial situation. Enormous parts of the ocean, vast spaces of free sea, were affected by arbitrary decisions by the United Kingdom, as if it still ruled the waves, subjugating peoples and lands in all continents to its imperialism.

157. In the basic area of the use of nuclear energy questions have arisen which require an urgent and satisfactory reply. The international community has always advocated the need for the peaceful use of that new source of energy, and to that end it created an international agency the purpose of which is "to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world", as stated in article II of the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. It consequently has the duty of ensuring that that energy is not used "in such a way as to further any military purpose", which is precisely what the system of safeguards established under article XII of the IAEA statute is designed to prevent.

158. The peaceful use of nuclear energy has always been the purpose and the inspiration of the programme which the Argentine Republic has been developing in that field. In keeping with that policy, we have voluntarily placed all our relevant nuclear installations under IAEA safeguards.

159. In the waters of the South Atlantic the Argentine Republic has been attacked by nuclear-powered submarines, which because of their power source have a destructive capacity which is immensely greater than that of conventional submarines. More than 300 Argen-

tinian youths, sailing outside the zone of conflict, lost their lives because of that. My country, out of respect for commitments it has entered into, has been unable to develop anything of that kind. That means that adherence to the objectives of peace which mankind shares and faithful compliance with obligations entered into left my country no possibility of defending itself against those attacks. What does this situation mean—that, apart from the explosion of a nuclear weapon, there are military uses of nuclear energy which are legitimate, in any case for the privileged few that are beyond all control? What are we to think, all the countries which have chosen the path of the peaceful use of nuclear energy? Is this not one more demonstration of the fact that nuclear policies drawn up in good faith, with the worthy objective of rendering nuclear proliferation impossible, are ultimately translated into the consolidation of the supremacy in the political, economic and military fields of a few Powers, to the detriment of the rest of the world?

160. The competent organizations must issue an opinion on the case I have referred to. As long as that is not done, the Argentine Republic, as stated by the President of its National Atomic Energy Commission before the Governing Board of IAEA, will strictly abide by all the obligations it has entered into but expressly reserves its right regarding the so-called non-proscribed military uses of nuclear energy in the future. At the same time, it will continue to develop unhindered to the highest degree its potential for the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

161. It is very difficult at this stage of the general debate to reflect upon disarmament without repeating or reiterating concepts which have already been expressed here with great eloquence.

162. Throughout his history, man has never had to face the possibility of his own destruction as a species. That moment has now come. This explains the universal concern, one that is continuing to spread to ever-larger sectors of the population and is reflected in the action of many non-governmental organizations whose continuous efforts in this area underlie the interest with which they follow our deliberations. The massive demonstrations of recent days are a serious warning that we cannot disregard.

163. Arsenals, especially nuclear arsenals, are growing to unimaginable levels. The very possibility of nuclear war is being accepted, as if such a war could be limited or as if there could be any victors. The implements of war grow more and more sophisticated. New technological advances, which could be of such benefit to mankind, are promoted and employed to increase the destructive capacity of the military panoply. New weapons of mass destruction are being created and the time that elapses from theory to tangible reality is growing ever shorter.

164. Faced with that disquieting picture, disarmament negotiations, if they may be so called, are not making progress, and in the field of disarmament stagnation is tantamount to regression. When negotiations are held, they deal with marginal areas. The central and priority issue of nuclear disarmament is not touched upon. As long as the international community and, first and foremost, the nuclear-weapon Powers, do not come to grips with that basic and

fundamental problem, there will be no peace or tranquillity for those of us who live on this planet, nor for our children or our children's children, who we should like to know will live and be normal beings.

165. This discouraging picture, however, has been lightened by some positive signs during the course of this session of the General Assembly. The People's Republic of China has categorically reaffirmed its commitment that at no time and under no circumstances will it be the first to use nuclear weapons and that it will never, unconditionally, use them against non-nuclear States. The Soviet Union a few days ago assumed the solemn obligation not to be the first to use that Dantesque tool of mass destruction. We have welcomed with great interest the draft convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons submitted by the Government of India [A/S-12/AC.1/13, annex].

166. In the Latin American region, which is the priority for my country, the statement by Mr. Aristides Royo, the President of Panama [10th meeting], contains extremely important initiatives that should be thoroughly considered by all the States of our continent.

167. Disarmament requires deeds and not words. An effective and well-structured comprehensive programme of disarmament is essential, one that will not be merely an expression of good intentions, one that will not be a document devoid of commitments and soon forgotten or disregarded by those who should abide by it. It is essential that nuclear disarmament be urgently taken up in meaningful negotiations. As a first step, it is essential to freeze the production of nuclear weapons. It is essential to halt the allocation of hundreds of billions of dollars to weapons when there is a third world eager for peace, health, education and development. It is essential that a World Disarmament Campaign be implemented to teach all the peoples of the world about the tremendous consequences of a failure to find a solution to the arms race.

168. The United Nations must be permanently and closely involved in this joint endeavour. To that end, it need not set up new organs nor substantially change those that exist. If there have been no positive achievements in the field of disarmament, it has not been because of deficient machinery.

169. The protagonists are the States, and fruitful results depend on their political will. If that will does not exist, we must face up to the reality that all exercises of the organized community, including this very session of the General Assembly, will be merely movements in a vacuum, giving an illusion of activity that does not in fact exist. Such exercises will deceive world public opinion for a time, but not for long, because that public opinion has grown in maturity and wisdom and can recognize the reality behind outward appearances.

170. The future of disarmament inescapably requires that this session of the General Assembly be a significant step along the rough and difficult path we should all tread, which we must tread. I cannot, however, hide my concern when I note that halfway through this session of the Assembly we still do not see any indications that the all-important documents the

international community is awaiting will be adopted. It is therefore more than ever necessary that, in the remaining few days, we redouble our efforts and work with the greatest possible constructive spirit so that this session will not end in disillusionment. The men and women who mobilized so massively for this event and all those they represent do not deserve that.

171. The Government and people of Argentina sincerely hope for the success of this undertaking, which is our collective responsibility. If we fail, we shall have brought about our own destruction.

172. Mr. SULAIMAN (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is an honour for me to express to Mr. Kitani, on behalf of the delegation of Oman, our sincere congratulations and great pleasure on his election to preside over this second special session on disarmament. All the peoples of the world are looking forward to the success of this session. We are certain that the confidence placed in him by choosing him to preside over it and to guide its deliberations is well founded. During the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, we had an opportunity to witness his competence, his seriousness and his responsible leadership.

173. The responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament is a prime responsibility emanating from the principles and objectives of the Organization and aimed at the establishment of peace, at the promotion of friendship and co-operation among States and at saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war. The Organization solemnly declared its determination to carry out its responsibilities fully and to play its role in this field when the General Assembly adopted by consensus at the first special session on disarmament, in 1978, the Final Document, in paragraph 126 of which the States Members of the United Nations reaffirmed:

“... their determination to work for general and complete disarmament and to make further collective efforts aimed at strengthening peace and international security; eliminating the threat of war, particularly nuclear war; implementing practical measures aimed at halting and reversing the arms race; strengthening the procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes; and reducing military expenditures and utilizing the resources thus released in a manner which will help to promote the well-being of all peoples and to improve the economic conditions of the developing countries.”

174. The convening of this twelfth special session and the preparatory work which preceded it are proof of the positive role which the United Nations must play in redoubling efforts in the field of disarmament and mobilizing full awareness of the real danger threatening the whole of mankind as a result of the stockpiling of weapons and the race for the improvement of their destructive capability.

175. Here I should like to commend the tireless efforts of the Preparatory Committee during the past two years, which paved the way for this session to take practical steps in accordance with the international disarmament strategy defined by the tenth special session.

176. While we express our earnest hope that the deliberations of this special session will lead to positive

results and to the necessary practical measures of general and complete disarmament, we cannot but note with sorrow the deterioration in the international situation since the adoption of the Final Document in 1978. Since then the world has witnessed numerous tragic events, including flagrant violations of the Charter of the United Nations and of the principles of international law, interference in the internal affairs of States to destabilize legitimate régimes, the launching of armed invasions of the territories of others and the occupation of those territories by tens of thousands of soldiers.

177. The current events in Lebanon are but a link in a chain of acts of aggression in which Israel has used the most sophisticated means of devastation and destruction. These acts of aggression and of violence, on which Israel has based its foreign and internal policies, ride roughshod over the purposes and principles of the Organization. The international community is called upon to put an end to the continuous bloodshed in Lebanon by insisting on the implementation of Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which call on Israel to cease all military activities and to withdraw forthwith and unconditionally. In this regard, I would recall that Oman has officially denounced that brutal act of aggression against fraternal Lebanon and against the Palestinian refugees, who are being subjected to systematic and premeditated genocide.

178. Needless to say, the denial to people of the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination, the use of force, the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, the subjection of States to occupation and aggression under false pretexts and inadmissible interpretations of the right of self-defence constitute a reprehensible approach to international relations, based on the law of the jungle and the flouting of the purposes and principles of the Charter. In addition, this gives rise to tension, despair and bitterness and jeopardizes international peace and security. All of this has negative implications for United Nations efforts in the field of disarmament. It seems that the great challenge facing the international community is to deal firmly with international lawlessness by creating conditions of peace and security for all parties and eliminating violence, the use of force and the stockpiling of weapons. Here we clearly see the firm relationship between international security on the one hand and disarmament on the other.

179. In this regard I cannot but commend the valuable report, entitled "Common Security: a programme for disarmament", of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, over which Mr. Olof Palme presided.<sup>5</sup> This report highlights the direct relationship between disarmament, international security and development issues and affirms the importance of and the need for concerted efforts to establish a new economic order and proceed with disarmament at the same time.

180. There is nothing new in saying that disarmament and arms limitation will be achieved only by establishing security, a favourable climate of political stability, economic integration and mutual trust.

181. It is necessary for everybody to be fully aware of this connexion. The responsibility is collective and the destiny is a common one, since the threat represented by the existing arsenals of nuclear and other weapons and the continued race to improve their capabilities is a threat that looms over the entire world, the north and the south, the east and the west. Hence there is disappointment at the meagre achievements of the international community during the four years which have elapsed since the adoption of the Final Document and the lofty ideals embodied therein. Indeed, a quick review of the statistics of the arms race reveals the great intensification which has taken place during this period and the enormous dimensions of the budgets and funds allocated to weapons.

182. In the field of nuclear weapons, the objectives defined in the Final Document are yet to be achieved. Efforts to prepare an international convention to halt nuclear threats are still facing various obstacles, and the Committee on Disarmament has not been able to achieve a consensus on initiating multilateral negotiations on this complex problem or on nuclear disarmament as a whole. There may be a glimmer of hope in the declaration by the two super-Powers of their intention to initiate talks by the end of this month on the limitation of strategic weapons. If those talks lead to the desired reduction—and that is what we hope and expect—that would have a positive effect on the process of nuclear and conventional disarmament and would lead to a further step to limit and halt nuclear tests and to achieve general and complete disarmament.

183. Pending complete nuclear disarmament, the adoption of provisional measures is vital, especially for the protection of the non-nuclear-weapon States. Agreement must be reached on these measures, especially those concerning horizontal and vertical non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

184. Closely related to those measures is the need to achieve a binding international instrument prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear-weapon States. We should like to recall that the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty include a call for the international cooperation in nuclear technology required to enable the developing countries peacefully to harness this immense potential for development purposes.

185. In this connexion, the delegation of Oman has denounced the treacherous Israeli attack on the non-military Iraqi nuclear reactor last year at a time when Iraq had placed its installation under IAEA supervision, while Israel has persistently refused such supervision. In our opinion, the best guarantee against such brutal acts of aggression lies in the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones, as stated in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, since those zones are steps that bring us closer to the basic goal of the establishment of a peaceful world, free from the nuclear threat in Africa, South Asia, the Middle East and the Indian Ocean.

186. Oman supports the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. We have participated actively in all meetings of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean, believing as we do that the declara-

tion of the Indian Ocean as a zone of permanent peace contributes not only to the security of the coastal and hinterland States but also to the strengthening of international peace and security. In this regard, we hope that the Conference on the Indian Ocean will be convened on schedule, without any delay.

187. With regard to chemical and bacteriological weapons, we believe that it is necessary to abide by the provisions of the instruments that ban their use. We must express our concern at reports which refer to the possible use of those weapons in south and central Asia. We believe it is necessary to conclude a comprehensive convention that would impose a total ban on the production of those weapons.

188. As regards conventional weapons and the reduction of military budgets, we recall what we have already stated concerning the need to create a climate of security, in particular for the small and medium-sized States, through absolute compliance with the principles of the non-use of force, the peaceful settlement of disputes, and non-intervention in their internal affairs so that they can devote themselves to the implementation of their development programmes in a climate of peace and security instead of allocating their modest resources to arms for self-defence.

189. We believe that the creation of a favourable climate for the promotion of peace and security requires the establishment of a firm, peaceful basis in order to guarantee respect for the principles of the Charter, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, and non-resort to the use of force in international relations. Those same elements prompt us to place our hopes and confidence in the United Nations and what it can achieve if goodwill and mutual confidence prevail.

190. Finally, we hope that this special session will be able to achieve agreement on the preparation of a comprehensive programme for disarmament. We believe that this is possible if the necessary political will is shown. The demonstrations and processions that call for a halt to the arms race are an expression of the concern the world will feel if the race for the acquisition of weapons of annihilation continues unabated. Therefore, we trust that the hopes placed in this session are well founded and that we shall begin to make serious efforts to achieve agreement on the implementation of the principles and objectives already agreed upon.

191. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at its seventh meeting, I call now on the last speaker for this afternoon, the Observer of the League of Arab States, Mr. Clovis Maksoud.

192. Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): I hardly need to reiterate our heartiest congratulations to Mr. Kittani on his presidency of this session. A son of Iraq, a founding member of the League of Arab States, he has exhibited throughout his career the dynamism of his people's aspirations and the wisdom inherent in his national heritage.

193. Our congratulations go also to the Secretary-General, who has been consistent in reinforcing the principles which have guided the United Nations, for his efforts to strengthen the United Nations machinery

in order to make our deliberations and the resolutions of the General Assembly more meaningful and more immediately relevant.

194. While the focus of this debate is rightly centred on the necessity of revamping an overall strategy for disarmament, our attention is inevitably bogged down in what is taking place in Lebanon, where the most advanced weaponry has been deployed to undertake one of the most devastating, reckless attacks since the end of the Second World War.

195. It was and remains our intention to take part in the search for credible agreements that will not only reduce the level of armaments but also stimulate the necessary confidence and conditions to make the process of disarmament not only desirable but also feasible.

196. The Arabs, being part of the third world, have a vested interest in the promotion of disarmament because, like the other peoples of the third world, they realize that they can thereby channel and harness their wealth and energy towards the task of expediting development and social transformation. So the Arabs have a stake in the outcome of this debate and in the deliberations of the General Assembly. We know also that the industrial world and the armaments industry have developed and grown simultaneously at the cost of eroding social services and the quality of life. That is why the mass demonstrations for a nuclear freeze have been so impressive and have articulated not only the anxieties but also the conscience of mankind.

197. There has been a growing scepticism about the relevance of our deliberations here. In fact, there have been repeated attempts to undermine the credibility and efficiency of the United Nations as machinery and a framework through which the international community can achieve a modicum of rationality and sanity. Yet our insistence on undertaking a collective commitment to the United Nations, to its Charter and its resolutions, to its functions and its role, should not be thwarted by those who flout its resolutions, violate its Charter and demean its functions. It is critically important that we assert the primacy of international legitimacy. It is essential that the strategic objectives of mankind in expediting development while speeding the process of disarmament remain the determining constant of our policies, attitudes and behaviour.

198. It was our intention, bearing these priorities in mind, to express the Arab appreciation of the nobility of purpose that has motivated so many groups and non-governmental organizations and commissions, such as the Palme Commission, which, amidst the growing polarization between the super-Powers, the potential for confrontation and the panaceas for overkill, have persisted in seeking to make their dreams reality. The ideals that we have all cherished as a moral and political force are a counterweight to the oppressive character of naked pragmatism. This constituency of world conscience has kept alive the pressures which have deterred many adventurers from a collision course. To those groups, to their countries and to their representatives here the League of Arab States would like to pay a tribute, because they have kept alive the idea that optimism is irreversible.

199. The drama unfolding today in Lebanon is stupefying. Is it not paradoxical that, while the world is seeking to address itself to the compelling problem and challenges of disarmament, simultaneously Lebanon is being transformed into an arena in which the most structured, devastating, cynical and crushing war machine reveals its naked power and takes pride in its ability to wreak overwhelming and total destruction?

200. Is it not an anomaly that Israel is using in Lebanon today some of the most sophisticated weaponry built and supplied by the United States? Leaving aside the nature of air-to-ground missiles and various electronic devices, it is sufficient to say that the high-powered bombs the Israelis have used, especially the 1-ton bombs, have been partly responsible for the high toll of civilian casualties during the past two weeks.

201. The Commander of the United Nations Force had the following to say about the use of incendiary artillery shells in the attack on Tyre on Sunday, 10 June:

“Incendiary shells, known as white phosphorous, are considered extremely harmful because they start fires that are difficult to extinguish. Phosphorous burns with a minimum of oxygen. It ignites even in water, and it can be put out only by cutting off all oxygen—as with smothering it in foam.”

202. The Israelis also used cluster bombs. A cluster bomb unit is a canister that contains hundreds of bomblets, each of them a sphere slightly larger than a squash ball and equipped with a plunger detonator. The canister breaks open when dropped from an aeroplane and explodes before hitting the ground, spraying the exploding anti-personnel devices over an area the size of a football field.

203. Jonathan Randal of *The Washington Post* reported on 14 June that Israeli cluster bomb units hit a hospital in Aazzouniye, a mountain town 16 miles south-east of Beirut, gouging holes in the driveway at the sanatorium. Randal added: “Lebanese intelligence sources said that the Israelis also dropped CBUs yesterday on Bourj el Brajneh, the Palestinian refugee camp closest to Beirut’s airport.”

204. Laser-guided “smart bombs” were also used in Lebanon. A Lebanese intelligence source commented on the Israeli use of such advanced devices as cluster and fragmentation bombs and probable use of laser-guided “smart bombs” as follows: “Technology is the winner in this so-called war.” He also blamed weapons supplied by the United States and now in the hands of the Israelis for the high civilian toll.

205. General Assembly resolution 36/93, entitled “United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects”, was adopted without a vote on 9 December 1981.

206. Cluster bombs and incendiary shells fall into the category of “weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects”. We only have to ask the people of Tyre, Sidon, Damour and Beirut. And therefore Israel

violated the Convention adopted at that Conference, and in particular its Protocol III, which specifically refers to the prohibition or restriction of the use of incendiary weapons.

207. It was ironic that Menachem Begin stated at the 18th meeting, after three quarters of the delegations had walked out, “Israel is prepared to negotiate and sign . . . a treaty with all its neighbours in the Middle ‘East’ ‘patterned’”, he said, “on the Treaty of Tlatelolco concerning Latin America”.

208. What is the Treaty of Tlatelolco?<sup>2</sup> It is the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, ratified in Mexico on 14 February 1967. Our response to that remark is the following. First, the signatory States of that Treaty had a privileged situation in that their territories were wholly free from nuclear weapons; a fact that imposed upon them the inescapable duty of preserving that situation, both in their own interest and for the good of mankind. This situation does not exist in the Middle East because Israel already possesses nuclear armaments. Therefore the basic assumption that territories are wholly free of nuclear weapons, an assumption on which the Treaty of Tlatelolco is primarily based, is not applicable in the Middle East region. Secondly, the Treaty of Tlatelolco was signed for the purpose of preserving the situation of the non-existence of nuclear weapons in Latin America. Thirdly, the Treaty of Tlatelolco states that Latin American countries should use their right to the greatest and most equitable access possible to nuclear energy in order to expedite the economic and social development of their peoples. Israel has denied the Arab countries that right—for example, when it attacked the nuclear reactor which Iraq had built for peaceful purposes.

209. The starting point of the Treaty of Tlatelolco was General Assembly resolution 1911 (XVIII) on the denuclearization of Latin America, a resolution which expressed the hope that the denuclearization of Latin America would be in keeping with the principles of the Charter and with regional agreements.

210. Israel’s record at the United Nations clearly shows its refusal to comply with any United Nations resolutions, including those that call for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East or pertain to Israel’s nuclear armament. The most recent of these was adopted at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly [resolution 36/98].

211. The most ominous aspect of Israeli-South African military co-operation is in the realm of nuclear weaponry. Evidence of such collaboration has been surfacing for many years and was brought to public attention on 21 February 1980, when CBS News confirmed that Israel and South Africa had co-operated in a nuclear test in the South Atlantic on 22 September 1979. CBS spoke of South Africa’s providing Israel with uranium, while Israel returned the favour by sharing nuclear expertise.

212. Israel and South Africa have also collaborated on the development of delivery systems for nuclear weapons. The Israeli Jericho and Gabriel II surface-to-surface missiles have been sold to South Africa. Both fascist and racist régimes are at present capable of producing cruise missiles, which can deliver an atomic warhead up to 1,500 miles away.

213. The United Nations has repeatedly condemned the nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa, the latest such condemnation being in resolution 36/98 of 9 December 1981 and resolution 36/172 M of 17 December 1981. Yet these two pockets of racism, with their indifference to the United Nations and contempt for its resolutions, are continuing to play havoc with international peace and security. They remain committed to pre-empting and destroying the chances of this session's achieving what it is seeking to achieve.

214. It would be inconceivable for me to rebut here the entirety of Israel's position on the questions of disarmament and nuclear-free zones. Beneath the veneer and the sophisticated pseudo-legal arguments that Israel uses lies a barbaric mind. Israel's behaviour, as well as its objectives, have been both ruthless and reckless. Nowhere else is this more evident than in Israel's advertised concept of "self-defence", which makes a mockery of the very concept, especially in the light of the ongoing invasion of Lebanon.

215. Ever since its inception in 1948, Israel has invoked this principle to strengthen its geostrategic position and achieve its continuous expansionist objectives. We have frequently heard Israeli spokesmen speak of "defensible borders" and of "security objectives" and other slogans. The Israelis have developed their State-authorized terrorism, the record of which is too lengthy for us to enumerate here.

216. However, by developing a nuclear posture and maintaining secrecy about it, Israeli leaders are craftily pursuing the policy of "deterrence through uncertainty". Israel has surrounded its nuclear programme with complete secrecy while using ambiguity in all pronouncements on this subject and showing a lack of enthusiasm for the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

217. At present Israel may continue to rely on its sophisticated military hardware and choose to refrain from the use of the nuclear option. However, the growing paranoia of Israeli leaders may one day drive them to resort to an apocalyptic Samsonic finale.

218. This month of June, as I mentioned earlier, was dedicated by us all to disarmament and development. Israel's invasion of Lebanon is not only a total negation of the purposes and objectives of this special session of the General Assembly; it is a demonstration of the Nazi-like nature of the Israeli régime, which, when unrestrained by the sanctions of the international community, becomes a politico-military monster on the loose.

219. The League of Nations collapsed precisely because it demonstrated a reluctance—which later became paralysis—to deal with the onslaught of those who challenged its authority. Israel today not only challenges the authority of the United Nations and heaps insults on the consensus of its Members and the resolutions they adopt, but endeavours to paralyse its will, in addition to paralysing its function.

220. The records of the United Nations are replete with evidence of Israel's utter and studied contempt for the Organization. However, what is taking place in Lebanon today is most reminiscent of the glory—a

false glory—that Hitler's hirelings thought they were enjoying in the aftermath of his European *blitzkrieg*.

221. Terminology associated with conquest—primitive types of conquest, such as "the final solution"—evokes troubling memories of Nazi Germany intent on imposing a "final solution" on the Jewish people. The horror of this carnage in its genocidal dimensions in Lebanon has virtually stunned the world into inaction. The lies, excuses, distortions, untruths, half-truths and fabrications that are used, marketed and communicated to the world echo in many ways the sort of global justifications that were employed by the Nazis at the beginning of the Second World War.

222. What is it that lies at the roots of a Sharon parading with his tanks near Lebanese symbols of sovereignty and legitimacy except public humiliation? What lies at the background of a Begin, shielding the pursuit of a policy of indiscriminate and savage bombing of villages, towns and cities of Lebanon and of Palestinian refugee camps, causing the death of untold numbers of women and children? What kind of an ideology motivates an Israel to rampage and destroy and to kill innocent human beings and leave them homeless, while remaining indifferent, refusing to be accountable and continuing its bombardment? Those are questions that cannot remain unanswered, and herein lies the responsibility of the United States, which should have been more forthcoming in restraining its protégé, more consistent with its own judgements and beliefs.

223. I find it appropriate here to quote the late President Dwight Eisenhower, who said this about a similar Israeli act of aggression:

"Should a nation which attacks and occupies foreign territory in the face of United Nations disapproval be allowed to impose conditions on its own withdrawal? If we agree that armed attack can properly achieve the purposes of the assailant, then I fear we will have turned back the clock of international order."

I wished yesterday that President Reagan had stated something similar. Another quote from President Eisenhower:

"If the United Nations once admits that international disputes can be settled by using force, then we will have destroyed the very foundation of the Organization and our best hope of establishing world order. The United Nations has no choice but to exert pressure upon Israel to comply with the withdrawal resolutions."

I wish that the United States delegation, when it vetoed the draft resolution which asked Israel to comply, had remembered that quotation.

224. Inspired by the same sense of justice, and un-intimidated by a Congress that has long been unable to criticize or condemn Israel, Representative Clement Zablocki reminded us that the Eisenhower spirit is still alive when he told Begin on 21 June that his hands "were as bloody as those of Israeli soldiers", and reprimanded him for flouting American law by using United States-supplied weapons for offensive purposes. Today the American conscience in the United States Senate adopted a similar attitude towards Begin when he paid it a visit. Yet the teachings

of President Eisenhower and the criticism of Representative Zablocki and a growing number of other fair-minded Americans inside and outside the Administration remain a far cry from United States foreign policy or its strategy in the Middle East.

225. The false precept that the present carnage in Lebanon can provide what is called, in Kissingerian terms, an "opportunity" is but one indication of the dearth of constructive thought regarding our region and comes close to being political obscenity.

226. Our present deliberations, which call for a serious global approach to issues of disarmament, make it imperative for the super-Powers to shoulder their global responsibility by taking sanctions against the culprits and penalizing them as necessary.

227. If we have focused on the Israeli invasion of Lebanon it is because we sincerely believe that the situation there is a microcosm of the holocaust which might befall an armed world. Much of what may be achieved by the session here, on which the Arab world is pinning its hopes, may be tested by the success or failure of the world community to restore to Lebanon its full sovereignty, its absolute unity and its sound development, and to the Palestinians their usurped rights and the opportunity to contribute to world disarmament through their own self-fulfilment.

228. That is the challenge and herein lies the opportunity.

229. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

230. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): My delegation had understood that the subject of this debate was disarmament, and it is on that subject that my Prime Minister will address the Assembly tomorrow morning. However, the representative of Argentina has chosen to deliver the now familiar Argentine propaganda effusion about the Falkland Islands. I do not propose to reply to him at great length. My delegation's views, like his, are well known. But I feel obliged to put the following points briefly on the record.

231. Firstly, there would be no crisis in the South Atlantic had it not been for Argentina's armed aggression against the Falkland Islands and South Georgia. Let this not be forgotten.

232. Secondly, there would have been no need for my country to exercise its inherent right of self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter if Argentina had not evaded all peaceful efforts to bring it to implement the mandatory resolution of the Security Council, which it so implacably defied.

233. Thirdly, the only motive of my Government has been to protect the interests of the small but homogeneous population of the Falkland Islands, many of whom have been in the Islands for longer than a great number of Argentines have been settled in Argentina.

234. Fourthly, there can be no question that the islanders, who claim all the rights of peoples under international law and the Charter of the United Nations, have absolutely no desire to be subjected to Argentine colonial domination, and my Government

is resolutely determined to protect them from this fate.

235. Fifthly, it is for this reason, and this reason only, that we shall have to maintain military forces in the area. We discovered to our cost that 40 marines was an insufficient "colonialist oppressive force" to protect the islanders against "peace-loving Argentina". We shall not make the same mistake again.

236. Sixthly, the representative of Argentina charged the United Kingdom with mocking guarantees regarding nuclear weapons. We have stated both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly that it would be inconceivable that the United Kingdom would use nuclear weapons against Argentina. The very thought is laughable. No doubt the guarantees referred to were those in the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. Argentina is not a party; the United Kingdom has ratified both Additional Protocols, the first as the administering authority of the Falkland Islands and the second as a nuclear-weapon State. The Treaty makes clear that it does not apply to nuclear-powered submarines. I refer members to article V.

237. Finally, the representative of Argentina complained about violations of the Geneva Conventions and human rights. I have replied to all these charges in letters to the Security Council, which are available to members, and I have very little to add. I would have thought that Argentine spokesmen would be well-advised to avoid the subject of human rights.

238. As regards the Falkland Islanders, we are already receiving many disturbing reports about violations of human rights by the Argentine occupying forces. These will no doubt be emerging in authentic detail shortly, but first indications are sombre indeed.

239. Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish very briefly to refer to the statement just made by the representative of the United Kingdom.

240. I should like to recall, with respect to the use of force to which he referred, the fact that it was the United Kingdom which committed aggression against the Argentine Republic in 1833, when it occupied the Malvinas Islands by force. Since that time, each year of its presence in those islands, every day and every minute has been an act of force and a manifestation of the clearest and crudest kind of colonialism.

241. The representative of the United Kingdom also referred to legitimate defence. In this connexion I should like only for members to reflect on the proportion of the means resorted to by the United Kingdom in exercise of this principle which it invokes and also on the act of force which it committed a very few days ago in attacking a scientific installation in the South Sandwich Islands, where 10 scientists lived.

242. The representative of the United Kingdom also spoke of the peace efforts that failed in connexion with this conflict. I must point out that the Argentine Republic repeatedly expressed its willingness to comply with Security Council resolution 502 (1982) in all its parts—I repeat, in all its parts—and not only partially, as claimed by the representative of the United Kingdom. I should like at this time to confirm the willingness of the Argentine Republic to comply

with all the paragraphs of that Security Council resolution. It is necessary to recall also that the efforts of the Security Council to bring about a cessation of hostilities were paralysed by the use of the veto by the United Kingdom, which was the attacking Power in this conflict.

243. The representative of the United Kingdom also referred once again to the right of the inhabitants of the Malvinas Islands to decide on the fate of that territory. I should like to point out in that connexion what I have already stated on other occasions, namely, that that is a group of settlers who were brought into that territory to exploit land wrenched from the territory of the Argentine Republic. The vast majority of those settlers depend directly or indirectly on the British Crown or on the company that monopolistically dominates the economy and resources of those islands, the Falkland Islands Company.

244. Those settlers have been kept in a time capsule, in an artificial state of isolation which makes difficult any contact with the rest of the world and virtually prohibits any significant external presence, particularly from the Argentine Republic. It has been only the Argentine Republic which in recent years has provided those settlers with frequent and regular communication and health and higher education facilities. The Argentine Government continues to be fully willing to provide for the well-being and interests of those people, who, in actual fact—and let us not deceive ourselves—are *de facto* and *de jure* second-class British citizens. To give that tiny group of settlers the authority to decide on the future of a territory which belongs to another country is a simple ruse to preserve British colonial domination over those islands.

245. It is curious that the United Kingdom did not show a similar concern when it came to displacing the inhabitants of the island of Diego Garcia because they got in the way of the installation of a military base. That might have been due to the fact that the inhabitants of Diego Garcia were not white-skinned.

246. The representative of the United Kingdom also repeated what he already said in the Security Council, that it is inconceivable that the United Kingdom would use nuclear weapons in this context. But the fact is that the United Kingdom has never denied that those weapons existed in the colonial fleet and, if they exist, the danger or the possibility also exists that they might be used, and on such an occasion we will not be protected by the United Kingdom representative's thought that their use is inconceivable.

247. The representative of the United Kingdom also referred to the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The Argentine

Republic has proclaimed on many occasions its clear support of the purposes and principles which inspired that Treaty. Its support has been clearly stated in the United Nations and in other forums, and my Government has pledged not to produce or possess nuclear weapons. Proof of that can be found in the broad and open co-operation that we maintain with our Latin American brothers in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the fact that all our relevant nuclear installations are subject to IAEA safeguards. The statements of the representative of the United Kingdom are intended only to distract us from the nuclear blackmail inherent in the nuclear weapons which are included in the arsenal of the expeditionary force.

248. Finally, the representative of the United Kingdom referred to events that have occurred in the Malvinas Islands. I should like to point out that the bloodshed that occurred there was not the result of the action of the Argentine Government, which occupied the islands in an act totally free of bloodshed. It was the British expedition that brought about the bloodshed, which also affected the settlers of the Malvinas Islands, those same settlers whom they claim to protect.

249. Nothing that has been said by the representative of the United Kingdom disproves the determination of his Government to use force to maintain its domination and military and colonial occupation of the Malvinas Islands, the South Sandwich Islands and South Georgia. Is this a hint of what we can expect tomorrow in this same Hall?

250. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): I only wanted to say that I had forgotten when I spoke that the normal Argentine propaganda effusion is divided into two halves and that we had only received the first half on the first round, and I wanted to apologize to the Assembly for being the unwitting instigator of the second half, with which we have just been wearied.

*The meeting rose at 7.05 p.m.*

---

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.1.

<sup>2</sup> Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326).

<sup>3</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 402, No. 5778, p. 72.

<sup>4</sup> Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964, p. 43).

<sup>5</sup> A/CN.10/38. See also A/CN.10/51.