



Wednesday, 9 June 1982,
at 3.20 p.m.

President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. HAMEED (Sri Lanka): Mr. President, the international community already had ample evidence of your fine qualities when you presided over the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. Your experience within the United Nations system has given you a vital insight into the working of the institution. The Sri Lanka delegation pledges its support and co-operation to you in the complex and arduous task before us in the weeks to come, and we are confident that under your guidance we will be able to work in a useful and purposeful manner.

2. I have already conveyed to the Secretary-General our congratulations on his election to his high office. This is the first formal occasion on which I have the pleasure of assuring him of my country's continued support in the fulfilment of the onerous duties entrusted to him.

3. This second special session devoted to disarmament convenes in an atmosphere of foreboding and gloom. While we are here urging disarmament, three separate wars are being fought. To talk about them may be regarded as a departure from the main goals of this special session. I am nevertheless constrained to refer briefly to the tragedy that has befallen that small country, Lebanon, whose territory has again been invaded and occupied. Two Security Council resolutions this week¹ have brought no relief. The people of Lebanon, whose courage and capacity for survival against overwhelming odds is almost legendary, deserve better of the Organization than they have received thus far.

4. When I spoke in the 4th plenary meeting of the tenth special session, the first special session on disarmament, just four years ago, I recalled that, after its first resolution, of 24 January 1946, which dealt with arms control, the General Assembly had met on 32 occasions to discuss disarmament and had adopted nearly 300 resolutions towards that same end. I mentioned the record of the debates, proposals and recommendations on disarmament reaching Himalayan heights. We concluded that special session after perhaps one of the most tedious negotiation exercises in disarmament history to reach that Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*] by a consensus which was widely acclaimed. We accepted that consensus even while preserving our reservations concerning what we had reached as a compromise in order to arrive at a document to which all of us were equally committed.

5. On the same occasion, I remember, I remarked that we were not sitting here in judgement but rather that it would be the international community and posterity who would judge us on how we measured up to their expectations. Today, four years later, with a further accumulation of well-intended resolutions, not to speak of the volume of documentation, I would say again that we have not come to judge. In saying so, however, we would be doing less than our duty if we avoided making an effort at some candid assessment of how all of us have succeeded in or fallen short of fulfilling the undertakings to which we were committed in June 1978.

6. Although all of us have the obligation to make this assessment, Sri Lanka has been fortunate in being afforded perhaps some extra insight for making an evaluation. We joined the non-aligned movement in that initial call for a special session on disarmament in 1961. We functioned as spokesman for the non-aligned at the special session in 1978. We became a member of the Committee on Disarmament when that negotiating body was reconstituted. For the last 11 years Sri Lanka has been Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean. Since 1979 we have been Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the World Disarmament Conference. Sri Lanka has been a member of two expert groups—one on institutional arrangements relating to disarmament, the other on disarmament and development. I have myself been a member of the Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies. While there was no lack of effort in each of these bodies to advance their respective mandates, we were constantly encountering the same problems, the same attitudes from, as one might expect, the same sources.

7. In order to attempt an evaluation of our performance since the last special session we need to look at the order of priorities for negotiation which we established in the Programme of Action set forth in section III of the Final Document. At the very top of that list we placed nuclear weapons. Immediately after that we placed other weapons of mass destruction, chemical weapons, conventional weapons and finally the reduction of armed forces. The order of listing was not intended to defer negotiation on one while seeking agreement to implement another. We agreed that parallel or concurrent negotiations would take place for all the defined priorities.

8. I should like here to refer to the first priority, nuclear disarmament, which was, of course, addressed in particular to the nuclear-weapon States. The record of the past four years is, to say the least, a total disappointment. In the Committee on Disarmament there has been no more than sterile debate, restating well-known perceptions of security and deterrence and a confirmation of the unwillingness of some

Member States to set up even a subsidiary organ of the Committee to identify the very elements that would go into the formulation of any agreement. Rather than a reversal, in that brief period of four years there has been a further accumulation and refinement of nuclear weaponry, as if to ensure the multiplication of the annihilation of mankind as compared with the possibilities of 1978.

9. We are told again and again that the fragile peace that the world has had since the end of the last world war owes its existence to the deterrence of the nuclear weapon. This dangerous proposition is perhaps true for a part of the world that lives on a confrontational footing in the hope that the trigger will not be pulled. Beyond its periphery there have been over 125 armed conflicts of varying magnitude, including the present one in the South Atlantic, and 95 per cent of these have been in developing countries. Peace, therefore, has by no means been universal.

10. We are told that the alternative to peace between the two major military alliances sustained by the nuclear deterrent is a nuclear holocaust of 800 million lives in a few hours and that once begun it cannot be contained. The record, however, shows that a peace through the nuclear deterrent has been kept only with an accelerated and competitive level of nuclear destructiveness. It therefore seems obvious that security through the nuclear deterrent and a reversal of the nuclear-arms race are utterly incompatible. We therefore urge the General Assembly at this second special session on disarmament to declare that neither the doctrine of, nor the continued reliance on, the nuclear deterrent is consistent with a commitment to disarmament. In today's context a call for the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons will be strongly resisted. We should, then, at least demand a joint or individual declaration by the nuclear-weapon States that they will not be the first to use nuclear weapons.

11. At its special session in 1978 the General Assembly called for the conclusion of the tripartite negotiations on a nuclear test-ban treaty and the submission of a draft treaty to the multilateral negotiating body at the earliest possible date. The tripartite negotiations can be described as spasmodic at best. The controversial question of verification has, on the available evidence, been overcome. Yet there has been no draft of a treaty from the tripartite negotiations. Instead, perhaps to smother an outcry in this special session, the Committee on Disarmament has been entrusted with a mandate [*ibid.*, para. 120] that can at best be described as elementary. The Committee can now take the procedural step of setting up a working group, a procedural step that was strenuously resisted for the past four years. In all these circumstances, the least we can do is to reiterate the appeal made in 1978 that, pending the conclusion of a test-ban treaty, there should at least be a moratorium on nuclear tests.

12. At the tenth special session the Assembly called for the earliest possible conclusion of the SALT II treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms and for the transmission of the text of that treaty to the General Assembly [*ibid.*, para. 52]. The hopes entertained by many were dashed. That treaty went unratified on the ground that parity had been upset

and that that must first be rectified. We welcome the renewal of negotiations on strategic weapons and can do no more than exhort both parties to persevere in working out mutually acceptable arrangements.

13. The special report of the Committee on Disarmament [A/S-12/2] gives a concise account of what it has been able to accomplish and how it might proceed in the future. In the nuclear area the Committee has been immobilized and limited to the restatement of well-known perceptions of security and deterrence. The prospects of the Committee's engaging in any serious negotiations are almost non-existent, because some members of the Committee have made patently clear their opposition to negotiations on nuclear disarmament. The Committee will continue to have little to show on this account so long as such an attitude persists.

14. A convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and a treaty on the banning of radiological weapons have been slow in coming. We can only express the hope that the Committee at future sessions will move faster towards drafting those legal documents. Three years of negotiation on effective assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use of nuclear weapons have produced little that is tangible. Existing assurances and unilateral declarations fall far short of the credible assurance that non-nuclear-weapon States seek. This special session offers nuclear-weapon States an opportunity to submit proposals that can break the deadlock of three years. The Committee has commenced informal meetings to consider prevention of an arms race in outer space, the dangers of which are both real and imminent. The consequence of such a race will make disarmament more complex and intractable. We favour a comprehensive approach and trust that the Committee's work on this issue will be broadened.

15. The only draft of an agreement produced by the Committee on Disarmament for this special session is the one before us on a comprehensive programme of disarmament [*ibid.*, appendix I]. It is the product of protracted negotiations based on guidelines and elements that came out of the tenth special session, the debates in the General Assembly and the Disarmament Commission. We regret that it is not a final product and that the level of agreement has been minimal. This session offers an historic opportunity in which to work together to narrow these differences and eventually eliminate them. We have the possibility of finalizing the comprehensive programme of disarmament so that out of this session can come one tangible achievement that launches the world on a well-charted road to the goal of general and complete disarmament.

16. Three and a half years may be too short a time to make an evaluation of the Committee as an institution. Nevertheless, we must say that its negotiating character has been less than fully realized. There has been a marked tendency for it to be regarded as yet another forum for deliberation. Events elsewhere, the retreat from détente and the deterioration of East-West relations have impeded the Committee's work. The constant linkage made between events outside and the work of the Committee has diminished its negotiating capacity. Admittedly disarmament cannot take place in a vacuum, but it seems legitimate to

ask whether that single multilateral negotiating forum can survive, let alone function, if it is unduly subordinated to linkage with every dissenting development outside. Despite its modest achievements, in the absence of an alternative the Committee must continue.

17. For nearly 10 years the littoral and hinterland States have persisted in their efforts to implement the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace [resolution 2832 (XXVI)]. For over a decade the great-Power rivalry had been leading to an escalation of their military presence in the Indian Ocean, and the acceptance of a zone of peace, it was believed, would arrest this trend. We, Sri Lanka, introduced the draft resolution on the zone of peace 12 years ago. In 1979 we were glad to welcome the permanent members of the Security Council and States having important maritime interests to an expanded *Ad Hoc* Committee. As Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, we looked forward to the conference at Colombo which had been scheduled for 1981. That conference has now been rescheduled for 1983 [resolution 36/90, para. 5], and we would urge that the special session reaffirm the urgency of convening that conference as scheduled as part of the process for implementing the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

18. I had the honour of placing before the tenth special session, at the 4th plenary meeting, a proposal for a world disarmament authority by Mr. J. R. Jayewardene, President of Sri Lanka.² The proposal was elaborated in a working paper submitted to the first session and was included among other proposals in the Final Document. We are encouraged by the responses it has received, including the scope for its integrated inclusion in the long-term machinery of disarmament. Institutional arrangements relating to disarmament have been reported upon by the Group of Governmental Experts to Study the Institutional Arrangements relating to the Process of Disarmament,³ which has taken into account Sri Lanka's proposal. We shall at this session support any measures taken in furtherance of the objectives of this study.

19. Existing institutional arrangements need to be measured against the new demands that have emerged and will emerge in the wake of this session. We approach this issue in a pragmatic way. We would wish to see adequate consideration being given to this issue, taking into account the study by the Group of Governmental Experts and the wide variety of proposals that have been made and those that perhaps will be made at this session. The criteria for a choice or change must be the responsiveness and adequacy of the institutional arrangements for current and future needs that can be perceived at the present time. Let us be realistic, but also visionary, in our approach to this issue.

20. The special session has before it the study by the Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.⁴ I shall not elaborate on the evidence and arguments advanced in that study, which delves into two of the most critical issues of our time. The expert group's study proposes ways in which an orderly and just arrangement could be developed for what might be described as the disarmament dividend. The defence budget of Sri Lanka is one of the smallest when compared with

those of other Member States, and that also applies to our per capita income. We would nevertheless welcome disarmament for its own sake. That in itself would be a worthwhile goal, not attached to any benefit that developing countries might derive from even a fraction of the estimated \$US 550 billion now disbursed on armaments.

21. One of the most heartening developments of the last few months has been the widespread and mounting opposition, if not resentment, among ordinary people everywhere to the escalation of the arms race. That protest has been especially articulate and affirmative in the open societies in proximity to areas having the highest concentration of nuclear weaponry. The earlier dismissal of this popular reaction is now subdued because it was much too spontaneous and widespread to be ignored as partisan political propaganda. It is here that the non-governmental organizations that have contributed so effectively towards disarmament in the past can continue to perform a valuable role. I should like to commend and encourage them to greater efforts. I should also wish here to express our support for the World Disarmament Campaign which you, Mr. President, inaugurated at the opening of this special session [A/S-12/PV.1, para. 114]. If such a campaign is to be a fitting response to the spontaneous upsurge of popular opposition to armaments it must go beyond political and geographical frontiers and reach the people everywhere.

22. We shall end this special session with another resolution or final document. We cannot quarrel with those who might remind us that another document will not necessarily hasten disarmament. The Final Document of the Tenth Special Session is not lacking in content or guidance as to how disarmament should be approached or advanced. The evaluation, the principles and the Programme of Action of 1978 remain valid. They also remain largely unfulfilled. Their fulfilment will not be brought any closer by denunciations, worn-out rhetoric or ideological tirades. If some part of the commitment long given to the arms race were diverted to the human race, this special session would bring us closer to the goals we set ourselves in 1978.

23. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now hear a statement by the Prime Minister of Japan. On behalf of the General Assembly, I have great pleasure in welcoming Mr. Zenko Suzuki and in inviting him to address the General Assembly.

24. Mr. SUZUKI (Japan):* Mr. President, on behalf of the Government and people of Japan, I wish to express to you my sincere congratulations on your assumption of the heavy responsibilities of the presidency of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly, the second devoted to disarmament. I hope that this special session will produce fruitful results under your fair guidance and with the benefit of your ample knowledge and experience of the United Nations.

25. Four years ago, at the tenth special session of the General Assembly, the first devoted to disarmament, nations of the world gathered for the first time to

* Mr. Suzuki spoke in Japanese. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

discuss seriously how to achieve everlasting peace, which is the common aspiration of humanity. It is still vivid in our memory that, as a result of this discussion, the Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*] pledging international disarmament efforts was adopted by consensus. This was an epoch-making achievement for the United Nations, for the maintenance of international peace and security is the Organization's paramount objective.

26. Looking back, however, we cannot say that conditions have developed in the direction called for in the Final Document. The world has advanced very little towards disarmament, while the buildup of world armaments, including nuclear weapons, has continued. The total military expenditure of the world, which was said to be \$400 billion four years ago, now well exceeds \$500 billion.

27. Nuclear weapons have been technically upgraded and their numbers have increased, and it is said that today there exist in the world nuclear warheads equivalent to more than 1 million Hiroshima-type atomic bombs. Nuclear test explosions for the development of nuclear weapons have not decreased in number, even since the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water came into force. As many as 200 nuclear explosion tests have been conducted in the past four years alone. Furthermore, there is a continuing danger of nuclear proliferation, despite the existence of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

28. Increasing threats from conventional weapons cannot be overlooked either. The more than 100 armed conflicts that have broken out since the founding of the United Nations have all been waged with conventional weapons of growing destructive power, causing wider devastation. International transfers of conventional weapons have greatly increased in recent years, seriously escalating the danger of regional conflicts.

29. In other words, during these four years the arms race has exacerbated the threat to peace, heightening the anxieties of peoples and imposing heavier burdens on each nation at the expense of its economic and social development. This is truly regrettable.

30. I am fully aware that it is easier to talk about disarmament than to achieve it.

31. Looking back on our long history, we realize that war and peace have always been mankind's gravest concern. War and peace continue to be so, and with a new sense of urgency. Our forefathers from all the continents continually stressed how precious peace is, urging us to banish war from our history. So far, however, mankind has engaged in almost endless wars, wasting countless human lives, destroying nature and wreaking repeated havoc and devastation. In the aftermath of every war there have been those who, appalled by the destruction and waste, have initiated various attempts, including disarmament proposals, to prevent war. However, mankind has yet to succeed.

32. Even while deploring innumerable wars, the human race has not yet been able to eradicate the roots of mutual distrust in the international community. As a result, nations have been trapped in a vicious circle, seeking their security solely by building

up their armaments, thus further intensifying mutual distrust. With the emergence of the terrible technologies of nuclear weapons, it is the nuclear arms race that now confronts mankind.

33. Today, enormous stockpiles of nuclear weapons have reached the level of overkill. The situation is such that, once nuclear war breaks out, the very survival of human beings, whether friends or foes, will be at risk.

34. Our hesitation today on disarmament will lead to our self-destruction tomorrow. We must have the courage to change the direction of our times. The survival of humanity requires that we make disarmament a principle of common action. Progress towards disarmament will increase the security of all, and increased security will make further disarmament possible. On the basis of the invaluable efforts of our predecessors, we need to build confidence among States so that we can take resolute new steps towards disarmament.

35. The two Houses of the Japanese Diet, prior to my departure for this special session, unanimously adopted identical resolutions on the promotion of disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, as an expression of the aspirations of the Japanese people to a lasting peace.

36. I stand here today in this Assembly Hall representing the collective will of the Japanese people as expressed in those resolutions. I am convinced from the bottom of my heart that the common aspiration to peace of all the peoples of the world is concentrated in this chamber. Our mission here is to combine our efforts in response to this common aspiration of mankind and to move decisively together on the road to peace.

37. Now is the time when, responding to our heavy responsibilities, we must demonstrate to the people of the world that we can act to attain the fruits of disarmament. Only then will this special session become truly meaningful. Let us reaffirm the guidelines for disarmament laid down in the Final Document. Let us renew our pledge to implement those guidelines with unfaltering determination.

38. I wish to point out that there are today three aspects to our efforts towards lasting peace through disarmament: first, reversal of the trend of the ever-increasing arms race by promoting mutual confidence among States—in particular, nuclear disarmament should be pursued with the utmost urgency, as nuclear weapons pose the greatest threat to the survival of mankind; secondly, utilization of the human and physical resources released by disarmament to alleviate the poverty and social instability which breed conflict; thirdly, the strengthening and reinforcement of the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations in order to promote disarmament. Only through complementary efforts in all three aspects—military, economic and political—treated as one functionally organic strategy can we open the road to lasting peace. These I wish to call the three principles to achieve peace through disarmament.

39. I should like to take up disarmament itself.

40. The long road to disarmament must begin with the building of mutual confidence among States.

However, I must point out, regrettably, that underlying today's arms race there are certain undesirable developments in the international situation which are seriously undermining the mutual confidence among States which is indispensable for the promotion of disarmament. In particular, the heavy increase in recent years in the deployment by the Soviet Union of its mobile and accurate intermediate-range nuclear weapons has in response induced the plan to deploy intermediate-range nuclear weapons in Western Europe. The Soviet deployment is also increasing security concerns in Asia. The Soviet Union has committed a military invasion of Afghanistan in violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and it has shown no sign of withdrawing its troops. In Kampuchea, military intervention by foreign troops still continues. Furthermore, in other parts of the world tensions and destabilizing situations are intensifying. We are particularly distressed at the developments of the past few days in the Middle East. Even at this very moment wars are being fought and human lives are being lost.

41. In order to seek lasting peace through disarmament, I strongly urge that these situations be improved without delay.

42. In today's international society it cannot be denied that international peace and security are maintained by the balance of power among States. Bearing this reality in mind, we must start by lowering, even little by little, the level of the balance of power as we move towards disarmament.

43. It is said that even a journey of a thousand miles starts with a single step. In order ultimately to arrive at general and complete disarmament we need to take measures which are feasible under the prevailing international circumstances.

44. Among the objectives of this special session is the drawing up of a comprehensive programme of disarmament leading to general and complete disarmament. Japan has participated actively in the drafting efforts in the hope that this programme will be fruitful. I fervently hope that the programme will provide us with a realistic and practical framework for the achievement of general and complete disarmament.

45. I now wish to state the views of Japan on major disarmament issues.

46. First, our most urgent priority is to achieve genuine nuclear disarmament.

47. It is the earnest aspiration of the people of Japan, who alone have experienced atomic bombs, to achieve a world without nuclear weapons—a world where nuclear catastrophe will never be repeated. Surely this must be the common aspiration of all the peoples of all nations. If we are to meet that aspiration before it is too late, we must steadily build a structure of concrete nuclear disarmament measures. Therefore I appeal to all the nations of the world—in particular, to all the nuclear-weapon States—to take effective measures to ensure that nuclear weapons will never be used again. The major nuclear Powers must take the lead and make serious efforts to curtail drastically their nuclear-weapon stockpiles.

48. From this viewpoint, Japan whole-heartedly welcomes the recent announcement that on 29 June the United States and the Soviet Union will begin

negotiations aimed at reducing their strategic nuclear forces. I earnestly appeal to both States to negotiate seriously to bring about significant reductions in their strategic nuclear forces and to spare no effort to reach agreement.

49. I also appreciate that the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on intermediate-range nuclear forces have been under way at Geneva since the end of last year. I urge that, through these negotiations, the Soviet Union abolish all ground-launched intermediate-range nuclear missiles throughout its territory and that the United States, in its response, not deploy its planned new missiles in Europe, thereby greatly enhancing the security not only of Europe but also of Asia and consequently of the world as a whole.

50. Secondly, to halt the nuclear-arms race the brakes must first be applied on the further sophistication of nuclear weapons. Japan has hitherto expressed its opposition to nuclear test explosions of any kind, undertaken by any State. From this viewpoint, we appeal to every State to participate in the partial nuclear test-ban treaty. This spring the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva finally agreed on the establishment of a working group on a nuclear-test ban [A/S-12/2, para. 38]. We welcome this. My country very much hopes that this fresh development will give new momentum to negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament and will provide impetus for the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty.

51. Thirdly, the Non-Proliferation Treaty forms the most important foundation for preventing an increase in the number of nuclear-weapon States. Japan urges anew all States, whether nuclear or non-nuclear, that have not yet acceded to the Treaty to do so at the earliest possible date. To prevent nuclear proliferation, my country favours continuing international endeavours to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones where suitable conditions exist. Furthermore, efforts should be made to advance further the work undertaken by the Committee on Disarmament, to ensure security from nuclear threats for non-nuclear-weapon States that have renounced the nuclear option. It goes without saying that the maintenance and strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation régime must be backed by the efforts of nuclear-weapon States themselves to pursue negotiations in good faith on measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race and to nuclear disarmament.

52. Fourthly, I wish to turn to the problem of peaceful uses of nuclear energy. It is of great importance to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, a vital source of energy for the future of mankind. In this connexion, we must make nuclear-energy development compatible with the prevention of nuclear proliferation. It is a matter of great concern for countries of the world to be relieved of anxieties in regard to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. It is important, in particular, to ensure and guarantee the security of nuclear facilities for peaceful purposes, and Japan hopes that international efforts towards this end will be successful. My country, for its part, wishes to contribute positively to these efforts.

53. Fifthly, Japan places great importance on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction. These weapons are second only to nuclear weapons in their power of mass destruction. We ardently hope that, in response to the powerful demands of the international community, the Committee on Disarmament will exert further efforts for the early conclusion of a treaty for this purpose and also that the United States and the Soviet Union will promptly resume their bilateral negotiations.

54. Sixthly, I wish to take up the question of conventional disarmament. There is no doubt that nuclear disarmament is the task of utmost priority in disarmament. However, it is also clear that general and complete disarmament, including the abolition of nuclear weapons, cannot be achieved unless conventional-weapon disarmament advances in parallel with nuclear disarmament.

55. My country, as a nation firmly committed to peace, maintains the policy of generally refraining from exporting arms. Consistent with this position, Japan advocates the placing of restrictions upon the unlimited international transfer of conventional weapons and, as a first step, has proposed accurate international monitoring of inventories of conventional weapons and analysis of the real state of international transfers of conventional weapons.

56. The United Nations is to carry out a study on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces, and my country intends to participate actively in this study.

57. Disarmament is closely related to each nation's security, and progress in disarmament is inconceivable unless that fact is taken into account. Therefore measures of verification which fully ensure mutual compliance by the nations concerned are indispensable. The way to make disarmament most effective is to advance steadily, step by step, on the basis of arrangements accompanied by such verification measures.

58. Arms technology, however, is making remarkably rapid progress, and the problems of verification are becoming increasingly complex. Japan has been co-operating in particular in the efforts to establish an international system to detect and identify seismic events in the context of a comprehensive nuclear test ban. We will continue to participate actively in such efforts, contributing our advanced knowledge and technology in the field of verification.

59. In the light of the central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament confirmed at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, Japan deems it desirable to form an international verification unit within the framework of the United Nations. I call on the United Nations, as a first step in this direction, to accumulate all available information and knowledge on verification techniques and applications.

60. The Final Document states, in paragraph 15:

“It is essential that not only Governments but also the peoples of the world recognize and understand the dangers in the present situation. In order that an international conscience may develop and

that world public opinion may exercise a positive influence, the United Nations should increase the dissemination of information on the armaments race and disarmament with the full co-operation of Member States.”

61. I agree on these points. Japan will co-operate in the implementation of a fruitful world disarmament campaign under the auspices of the United Nations. In this connexion, on the occasion of this special session, I express my hope that the precious documentation and materials of my country concerning our atomic bomb experiences will be installed in the United Nations in order that they may be easily available to peoples of all nations in support of renewed efforts towards nuclear disarmament. Japan would also like to offer its co-operation under the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament to enable young people, who will shoulder the responsibilities of the next generation, to visit Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

62. I should now like to turn to the importance of the effective use of human and other resources released as a result of disarmament. This is the second pillar of the three principles of peace through disarmament.

63. Paragraph 35 of the Final Document states:

“There is also a close relationship between disarmament and development. Progress in the former would help greatly in the realization of the latter. Therefore resources released as a result of the implementation of disarmament measures should be devoted to the economic and social development of all nations and contribute to the bridging of the economic gap between developed and developing countries.”

64. Recognizing our growing interdependence, we must meet on a global scale such challenges as the North-South problem, resources and energy, food and environment. Therefore, this proposal set forth in the Final Document has gained even more urgency today.

65. In this regard, the Constitution of Japan also declares that “We recognize that all peoples of the world have the right to live in peace, free from fear and want”.

66. We must recognize that the world has become a single community and utilize all available human and material resources throughout the world by ensuring their effective, appropriate and just distribution. Current world military expenditures, however, absorb as much as 6 per cent of the gross world product, and expansion of those expenditures will impose enormous economic and social pressures on both developing and developed countries. On this planet, while new and advanced weapons are produced one after another, vast numbers of the world's people are suffering from starvation and extreme poverty. These conditions create social instability and may even give rise to regional conflicts.

67. By overcoming the difficulties now facing the developing countries and by improving the welfare of their peoples through dynamic development, we shall contribute not only to the economic and social stability of those countries, but also to world peace

and stability through the attainment of the harmonious expansion of the world economy.

68. I appeal to the entire international community to devote serious attention to promoting disarmament on the basis of this awareness. In this context, Japan is determined to strengthen further its economic co-operation with the developing countries.

69. As regards the third pillar, I would like to review the question of how to enhance the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations.

70. The United Nations was established 37 years ago as a universal international organization entrusted with the lofty role of maintaining international peace and security and bringing prosperity to all mankind. Utilizing the experience accumulated over the years, the United Nations has been carrying out its peace-keeping operations to prevent regional conflicts from recurring and expanding. I believe that the role of the United Nations in these operations is helping to prevent large-scale wars and deserves to be highly valued. The United Nations, however, has yet to build that universal security system originally envisaged when the Organization was established.

71. In order to arrest the arms race and to achieve concrete progress in disarmament, a system must be set up which can respond promptly to international conflicts by further intensifying and enhancing the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations and by strengthening its functions. I am convinced that this will contribute to preventing international conflicts and fostering trust among States, under the authority of the United Nations, opening the way to progress in disarmament.

72. In order to reinforce the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations, Japan has advocated strengthening the fact-finding functions of the United Nations in international disputes and has made proposals on the functions of the Secretary-General in this field and on restriction of the use of the veto.

73. On this occasion, I request that the United Nations speedily carry forward its studies on the following three points: first, on the role of the United Nations in the prevention of international disputes and their peaceful settlement; secondly, on the system of co-operation among Member States in the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations; and, thirdly, on the possibility of establishing a mechanism whereby both global and regional military situations can be monitored and made public as deemed proper. Japan, for its own part, would like to extend its full co-operation in the carrying out of these studies.

74. Japan will also increase its co-operation in regard to reinforcing and strengthening the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations.

75. As I have explained, I firmly believe that these three principles in combination will provide the driving force for a durable peace: first, to move towards effective disarmament by promoting mutual confidence among States; secondly, to divert the resources freed by disarmament to the development of the world economy and the promotion of peace in a spirit of mutual assistance; and, thirdly, to reinforce the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations.

76. This morning, in the presence of the Secretary-General, I tolled the peace bell which hangs near the entrance to this building. The bell was presented to the United Nations 31 years ago by the people of Japan, with their prayer for the achievement of peace through the United Nations. Earlier, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, Mr. Sakurauchi, deposited with the Secretary-General, in my presence, our Instrument of Acceptance of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects and our Instrument of Accession to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques. In addition, Japan has also acceded to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction.

77. In anticipation of this special session, voices for the elimination of nuclear weapons have risen in Japan like a flood-tide. Many people from all walks of life in Japan are now visiting here, greatly outnumbering those who came from Japan on the occasion of the tenth special session, and many of them are present in the Assembly Hall in order to convey their earnest wish to the United Nations.

78. During the Second World War, my country had its land reduced to ashes and lost millions of irreplaceable human lives. The cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki experienced the unprecedented horror of nuclear weapons. As a consequence, we Japanese pledged never to go to war again, and we pray that a nuclear holocaust will never again be inflicted on mankind. These feelings are deeply etched in the mind of every Japanese and will never be erased.

79. In keeping with our pledge, Japan established after the war a Constitution that proclaims peace as the national commitment. This Constitution states:

“We, the Japanese people, desire peace for all time and are deeply conscious of the high ideals controlling human relationship, and we have determined to preserve our security and existence, trusting in the justice and faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world.”

My country is determined under this Constitution not to become a military Power, and to continue to maintain, as a matter of national policy, the three non-nuclear principles of not possessing nuclear weapons, not producing them, and not permitting their introduction into Japan.

80. It was amid the ruins of war that I determined to pursue a political career, and ever since I have endeavoured to work for a peaceful society free from war, which is the ideal of our Constitution. Thirty-five years have passed since then. In my personal determination to devote myself to peace I remain undaunted. And now, from this podium, I appeal to all the peoples of the world to share in the aspirations of the Japanese people for the elimination of nuclear weapons and for peace.

81. When I was young, I used to associate myself closely with the sea, and as I watched from aboard ship countless beautiful stars twinkling in the sky,

I would feel a sense of mystery overwhelming me. It is said there exist hundreds of billions of stars and planets in our universe. To the extent of our knowledge, however, among all these heavenly bodies, the only one where life exists is this planet where we live.

82. It is not permissible for us to destroy this precious planet entrusted to us by our ancestors by making a reckless choice. Whether our fate be prosperity or extinction, the choice is ours.

83. Let us follow our reason, joining our creative energies to make the right choice now, as we stand at this crucial crossroads of history. Let us decide to hand down to future generations an earth where all can live a better life, in peace and full of trust.

84. In conclusion, I wish to voice my hope that at this special session the international community will take a firm step to fulfil with renewed determination its responsibility to generations yet to come. I pledge that Japan is determined to make every effort within its power towards this end.

85. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I thank the Prime Minister of Japan for the important statement he has just made.

86. Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is a pleasure to add my voice to the voices of those who have spoken before me, Sir, and extend to you the congratulations of Kuwait and its delegation on your election as President of this special session on disarmament. We are sure that your presidency will prove a continuation and a reaffirmation of the wisdom and foresight you demonstrated during your presidency of the thirty-sixth session and the subsequent session. There is no doubt that the dexterity with which you have conducted the affairs of the General Assembly during periods not devoid of difficulties and crises merits your endorsement as President of this special session, which will debate the fate of international security and disarmament and, consequently, the destiny of mankind.

87. Speaking here today before this special session of the General Assembly convened to discuss matters relating to disarmament, the second session on the subject since 1978, I stand as a representative of one small country among a great number of small nations which look on amazed and helpless as the world moves with increasing velocity towards total destruction.

88. In this age, when the human mind has reached the pinnacle of scientific advancement and technology, the world unfortunately ignores the inevitability of the destruction which mankind faces if it continues its present march—a blind march leading the world towards total destruction through the amassing of weapons of destruction, the development of war machines and the huge expenditures allocated to this end, at a time when the urgent needs of mankind call for the dedication of all those resources to the purposes of economic development and reconstruction.

89. There is no need to point to those responsible for this grave situation: that is a well-known fact, and the whole world knows where the unprecedented arsenals are to be found and which countries are

racing towards that goal. Thus, while dealing with the causes of the present international security crisis, the countries of the third world, represented by the non-aligned movement, have realized that all countries should have their say in planning programmes and policies conducive to ending the arms race. That is their objective in convening annual meetings to discuss this problem, and that was what they meant when they called for the first special session devoted to disarmament.

90. Now that four years have passed since that session was held, it is incumbent upon us to pause briefly to contemplate what happened during those years. The arms race did not stop. As a matter of fact, it escalated, and as a result the world situation has worsened and world security and peace have been jeopardized more than at any time in the past. In addition, military expenditures were not reduced but, rather, enormously increased. The figures given by the Secretary-General in his annual report show that such expenditures have increased from \$500 billion to \$600 billion. During that four-year period the number of nuclear weapons has increased until it includes almost 25,000 nuclear warheads, in addition to independently targeted intercontinental ballistic missiles.

91. It might have been hoped that negotiations would adequately reflect the potential catastrophe threatening mankind, but the countries which are negotiating seem to ignore that threat and to be more interested in bolstering their security through an increase in the number of nuclear weapons they hold, in the hope that those weapons will protect them or help them avoid the catastrophe. This is a complete illusion, because when the disaster strikes it will engulf everybody and there will be no conqueror and no conquered.

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

92. In view of that grim background, it is the conviction of my country's delegation that there is an urgent need to deal with this horrible situation and that it is imperative that serious and responsible action be taken to stop the deterioration of the world situation in this respect.

93. This is an awful situation, the consequences of which will not be confined to the military Powers involved in the arms race and the political, economic and social repercussions of which will affect all the countries of the world, because it has now been well established that security for any nation can be provided only by armament and even more armament, and this has led to the spread of the arms race to regions other than those of the big military Powers. This has been so not merely to increase safety and security but in many cases to make it possible to carry out certain missions within the framework of planned strategies which do not serve the best interests of those countries but in the long run have adverse effects on their economies and their security. This is an important aspect of the disarmament problem, which should be dealt with within our agenda.

94. My country's delegation sees some hope, however, in the demonstrations and protests against the nuclear armament policies of the big Powers. The demonstrations which have taken place in a number of countries provide some encouraging signs inasmuch

as they could be an element of pressure on Governments to transfer part of their military allocations to finance programmes and projects aimed at improving the living standards of the masses.

95. The gloomy international political and economic situation demands our attention and should be dealt with in this session, in an effort to solve it before it is too late. This session has been convened to review the results of the tenth special session and to continue efforts to find a successful solution to the security problems facing the international community. The current session will have before it the comprehensive programme for disarmament to which the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva has devoted two years of negotiation. We believe that this programme should be the cornerstone of any programme adopted by the world organization to deal with disarmament problems. Its importance, in the view of my delegation, is that it constitutes a practical step that will guide disarmament policies and regulate them within an agreed framework, providing security for all parties.

96. While attaching so much importance to disarmament, we, as a small developing nation, attach special importance to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and endorse the right of developing nations to utilize nuclear energy for peaceful purposes in the service of economic development. I say this, bearing in mind the events of last summer, when Israel committed its wanton aggression against Iraq, sending its planes to destroy the Iraqi nuclear reactor which was being constructed for peaceful purposes, after the IAEA inspectors had testified to the fact that it had no non-peaceful elements. Despite that, Israel committed its aggression and by so doing directed a severe blow to the Non-Proliferation Treaty which guarantees, as does the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the right of non-nuclear countries to develop their own peaceful nuclear programmes.

97. This aggression raises many questions for the countries of the region about their security as well as their right to use nuclear energy and technology for peaceful purposes. It also raises speculation as to the value of international treaties and conventions. Such speculations arise when the issues of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the security of the non-nuclear countries and the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against them are raised.

98. At this critical period in the Middle East, the new Israeli aggression against Lebanon, perpetrated with huge numbers of tanks, war planes and heavy and light weapons as well as thousands of soldiers, comes as a living example of the policy of extensive armament which has become the cornerstone of Israeli policies, with American blessing and support, and has driven the region to the brink of an arms race, with each Arab country trying to defend itself, its sovereignty and its honour against ferocious invasions and unlimited expansionist policies. The sovereignty of Lebanon has been violated by land, air and sea, and Israel has inflicted heavy losses among innocent women and children.

99. Thanks to the tremendous quantities of the most up-to-date weapons taken from the American arsenal,

Israel is planning to control the entire Arab area. One wonders with a heavy heart: if this arsenal of American weapons is what emboldens Israel to perpetrate one aggression after another against the Arab nation and to commit one violation of international law after another, is it not time that the United States began to feel that halting its dangerous arming of Israel is the only means—as proved to some previous Administrations—to force Israel to respect international law and abide by United Nations resolutions? But it seems that the United States does not only continue its supply of instruments of aggression to Israel but is also bent on continuing to use its veto power not only in isolated cases but rather as an everlasting instrument to protect, not Israel, but the criminal and brazen Israeli expansionist policies, against the unanimous will of the international community. It is the conviction of my country's delegation, therefore, that the world community should unanimously point its finger of accusation at the real intentions of the United States towards peace and justice in the Middle East.

100. Israel has been able to manufacture and produce scores of atomic bombs in collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa and, by so doing, has driven the region towards a new arms race for the possession of nuclear weapons, a race which will drain the resources of the countries of the region and, therefore, block their economic and social development.

101. Kuwait supports the principle of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones not only as a means of reducing nuclear proliferation but, most importantly, as a guarantee of the security of the non-nuclear countries. Hence our support and advocacy for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

102. Kuwait also supports the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. This Declaration has long been in existence, but its implementation has been hampered by the policies of the big Powers which do not accept the need to withdraw the bases in the Indian Ocean region and transform it into a secure area. Kuwait therefore reiterates its call for the implementation of this Declaration and for the establishment of other peace zones in the world, because of its conviction that this will serve and reinforce world peace and security.

103. We believe in the necessity of strengthening and enhancing the United Nations role in the field of disarmament. The current special session will review a great number of items, including the mechanism by which the United Nations would implement disarmament programmes or assume its responsibilities therefor.

104. The Committee on Disarmament works according to an annual schedule or programme of work which includes the basic issues which should be negotiated. Regardless of the results or lack of results emerging from those negotiations, it is noticed that what is lacking here is not an additional mechanism or a new methodology for the negotiations, but rather the political will which should be expressed by the basic negotiating Powers—particularly the nuclear Powers among them—in a way that would lead to results.

105. On the other hand, the Disarmament Commission has been holding its annual meetings as the body which the General Assembly created at its tenth special session to serve as a forum for deliberation and discussion and to give all Members of the United Nations the opportunity to participate effectively in discussing matters relating to disarmament in addition to their participation in the First Committee, which is restricted to reviewing what has been achieved in disarmament matters. In the last two years, however, the Commission has held shorter sessions, which is perceived by some as an effort to reduce its importance. We want to refer here to the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session when this Commission was created [*resolution S-10/2, para. 118*] and express our support for any arrangement authorizing it to assume its full responsibilities.

106. Kuwait believes in an international security order organically linked to disarmament. There will be no world security without disarmament. Moreover, there will be no disarmament without having in the world some kind of an international security order which will take into consideration the security of all nations. It is our conviction that such an order will benefit all nations, big and small, because it will allow them to concentrate on the economic and social problems they confront, which get worse every year, in the spheres of development, recovery, reconstruction and the achievement of a better life for man.

107. This leads us to say that the establishment of a new international economic order, which is one of the objectives of the international community, will have to depend on the close relationships between development and disarmament. The relationship between peace and development is unbreakable. In this respect reference should be made, and recognition should be given with a great deal of appreciation, to the study carried out by the Secretary-General, with the help of a great number of international experts, entitled *The Relationship between Disarmament and Development*, a study presented to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session.⁴ Any reduction in the level of armaments and military expenditures will provide the opportunity to transfer the savings to economic and social development in the developing nations. My country is watching with a great deal of interest the course that the United Nations will follow to implement the recommendations of the study.

108. Mr. MARTINI URDANETA (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like at the beginning of my statement to congratulate the President on presiding over the second special session devoted to disarmament. We have faith that his outstanding diplomatic skills and ability, which we appreciated during the thirty-sixth session and the ninth emergency special session, will help us to succeed in the work of this session to enable it to have a positive impact on disarmament and world peace.

109. The subject that brings us together here today is of special significance for my country within the context of its foreign policy, which is democratic and participatory, as an effective formula for peaceful coexistence between peoples and nations of the world. Its relevance is emphasized by the daily succession of events and situations in every latitude, characterized

by violence and aggression, arrogance and lack of understanding, and, basically, the persistence of a policy of blocs, clearly imperialistic and hegemonistic, with no qualms about driving us to ruin so long as they can maintain their claims to dominion in every field, thus running counter to the course of history and civilization.

110. Without doubt the Organization, with a universal vocation and of contemporary relevance, is based on definite purposes and principles such as the maintenance of peace and relations of friendship and cooperation, sovereign equality between all States, independence and sovereignty, respect for the human being and the preservation of future generations from the scourge of war. Those are the theoretical pillars supporting the structures that must make real and give content to the hope for peace in a better world.

111. The harmonization of the instruments that make it possible to achieve those purposes and principles, the progressive development of positive measures that clearly give a framework and shape to those objectives, is the primary task of the States Members of the United Nations. Among those actions disarmament stands out, stemming from the need of each society to rely on organs that can give it concrete security so that it can move forward towards a world free from threats.

112. We should bear in mind that the first special session devoted to disarmament was held on the initiative of the developing countries and of other neutral States that do not belong to any military alliance. It was the result of an unprecedented joint effort to achieve tangible progress in a situation of deadlock in the disarmament negotiations, in particular with regard to nuclear disarmament.

113. On that occasion the General Assembly adopted by consensus, after lengthy negotiations, the Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*], in which the Member States declared their readiness to implement faithfully and fully the Programme of Action included in it and, in paragraph 126, solemnly 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.”

114. The most significant contribution of that special session was the restructuring of the negotiating and deliberative bodies of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, which made it possible to include a significant number of developing countries, including Venezuela, in the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva. Our conduct in that Committee reaffirms and strengthens the purpose of encouraging the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament to make it possible for the objectives, principles and intended measures in the Final Document to be adopted, through a process of review, constant evaluation and

negotiations which can be translated into concrete agreements.

115. We pay a tribute to the important work done by the Committee on Disarmament since it was restructured in 1978. We know that the negotiations are slow and complex, but it is also true that at the Committee level there have been created a series of mechanisms such as the working groups, which have the difficult task of negotiating and concluding specific agreements on priority subjects.

116. The critical tensions of recent times make even more acute the need to continue exploring ways in which to achieve those concrete results. One outstanding way is this second special session devoted to disarmament.

117. The General Assembly's principal task is to adopt a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Moreover, it must examine and evaluate the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the first special session devoted to disarmament.

118. The comprehensive programme of disarmament should be conceived with the idea of achieving, on the basis of the renewed commitment of the wills of peoples and Governments gathered together here, global disarmament under the conditions and terms proposed, in response to the general principle of achieving general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

119. My Government considers that this programme should provide the necessary framework for furthering substantive negotiations on disarmament with a view to applying a balanced and orderly set of the largest possible number of concrete disarmament measures to be implemented in various stages. This set of measures should be interrelated and applied by means of a process that will guarantee security to all States. The comprehensive programme of disarmament should promote security by means of disarmament.

120. Venezuela hopes that this set of measures will be included in an instrument which will constitute a solemn commitment and, if possible, even a binding commitment.

121. The measures to be included in this programme should be based on the priorities established in the Final Document adopted at the tenth special session, which means an immediate halt to the nuclear-arms race and the elimination of the threat of a nuclear war would be given primary consideration.

122. Venezuela comes to this forum with the determination and readiness shared with the countries of the third world to shoulder its responsibility and urges States which bear primary responsibility to shoulder theirs.

123. Although nuclear disarmament and the prevention of a nuclear war have the highest priority, we face a situation in which there is no ratification of the SALT II treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms, nor do we even perceive any resumption of talks to that end, far less any negotiations for an agreement on SALT III. There has been no moratorium in nuclear testing; there has been no progress in the negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament to arrive at an agreement that offers

guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of the use of those weapons. Furthermore, the only inhabited area of the world which is protected by a denuclearization status, namely, Latin America, is at present suffering military aggression from a nuclear Power from outside the continent, a State party to the Additional Protocols of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)⁵ and to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, a State which is using nuclear-powered submarines in contravention of the spirit of the Treaty which bans nuclear weapons in Latin America. This fact could lead to a reformulation of the concept of what constitutes a nuclear-weapon-free zone and to a re-evaluation of its effectiveness as a non-proliferation measure.

124. The non-proliferation policy on nuclear weapons implies obligations and responsibilities on the part of both nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States. The full implementation of all the provisions of existing instruments regarding non-proliferation, such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or the Treaty of Tlatelolco, would represent an important contribution towards that objective.

125. At the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, held from 11 August to 7 September 1980, it was clear that the non-nuclear-weapon States were unhappy when no final declaration was adopted, because those States became convinced that the nuclear-weapon States did not comply with the commitment entered into under that Treaty to hold negotiations in good faith on effective measures for halting the nuclear arms race in the near future, for nuclear disarmament and for a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control. Added to that was the uncertainty caused by the absence of a legally binding guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons by States possessing them.

126. Until we reach the goal of nuclear disarmament, the highest priority should be given to the question of adopting an international agreement banning the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, as a measure which would endeavour only to correct the imbalance of responsibilities and obligations between nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States.

127. It is likewise regrettable to note that there have been no concrete results in respect of any of the other priority disarmament measures, not even with respect to agreement on a convention banning chemical weapons, which has been the subject of prolonged and intense negotiations. What is even worse, the arms race has been extended to the realm of the oceans and of outer space. Nevertheless, the adoption by the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session of resolutions designed to prevent an arms race in outer space is a hopeful sign.

128. We can say that this second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in addition to trying to consolidate the tasks which have already been begun, should concentrate its energy on

creating an international atmosphere of greater confidence. There should be confidence in the objectives, confidence in willingness to reach the goals and, finally, confidence in the responsibility incumbent on the United Nations for the maintenance of peace, confidence in the participants themselves and in the aims being pursued.

129. We insist that disarmament efforts are closely linked with the establishment of a new international order. Events prove that the concept of a world divided into military blocs, based on theories of strategic or tactical superiority, still prevails, where what is basic may become a political game, a concept which necessarily leads the power centres to adopt new policies of colonialism constituting a threat to all the initiatives designed to establish this new, more just and equitable order, which is to lead to the strengthening of peace and to international social justice.

130. The Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, in one of the most wide-ranging reports carried out under United Nations auspices, reached the conclusion that an effective relationship between disarmament and development can and must be established. What is more, it places the disarmament-development relationship in the context of a triple interaction: disarmament-development-security. Venezuela fully shares the conclusions and recommendations of that study,⁴ which confirm the need to reach a global understanding of international co-operation, with a warning once and for all of the need for a genuine will to make the changes for which the international community clamours.

131. On numerous occasions Venezuela has emphasized the importance that it attaches to efforts designed to promote the mobilization of international public opinion in favour of disarmament.

132. It has been demonstrated ever more clearly that there is a need to set new mechanisms in motion and to improve existing ones, with a view to informing the public properly about the implications of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, and on the growing risks and dangers of the arms buildup. The growing rejection of an arms buildup which is being manifested in various parts of the world is a constant encouragement to the United Nations in its task of disseminating information on disarmament. We therefore consider the launching of the World Disarmament Campaign to be a positive step in the mobilization of public opinion in favour of disarmament.

133. To conclude, I wish to reaffirm once again our desire for peace and our faith in the creativity of man and his ability, through dialogue and determination, to find promising roads towards understanding.

134. Mr. DE MEDINA (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): At the outset I should like to congratulate Mr. Kittani on his election as President of this special session of the General Assembly. I am particularly happy to see him presiding since I know that his competence, experience and wisdom will help the Assembly attain the objectives it has set itself.

135. I should also like to congratulate the other members of the General Committee, whose high qualifications are a guarantee of the success of our work.

136. Dissatisfaction over the lack of visible progress in efforts to reduce military arsenals to levels compatible with the legitimate right of States to security led the Assembly to meet four years ago in special session to deal exclusively for the first time with disarmament questions. That special session of the General Assembly thus became a major international event, awakening and catalyzing hopes for strengthening international peace and security.

137. There might be disagreement as to how to interpret the results obtained at that time, which fell short of expectations. However, it was a stage in the disarmament process. The Final Document which was adopted then is a positive step, particularly because it contains provisions designed to give an impetus to the deliberative and negotiating bodies and in its Programme of Action indicates the priority areas in disarmament.

138. It was not easy to get those results, given the very different positions of States within the context of international relations. But the determination to arrive at agreement on points of difference, enabling the Assembly to adopt its decisions by consensus and to embody them in a document which remains valid today, was significant.

139. Now it is incumbent on us to ensure continuity along the paths to solutions that have been outlined, to demonstrate in practical terms the determination of the Organization and the firm will of Member States to continue to seek means of achieving true and verifiable disarmament. However, we cannot fail to note that disarmament is not a separate category in international relations. It is, on the contrary, an integral part thereof and reflects a much more complex reality. Its viability depends on how each State deals with the conduct of other States within the context of the interests that they deem essential. Action or failure to act that could introduce elements of distrust in international relations will therefore be particularly harmful. In order to attain real progress towards disarmament it is essential to create an atmosphere of trust in international relations, which can exist only if there is respect for the rights of other States. We thus feel that the extent to which a State is integrated into the international community must be determined not on the basis of attitudes that are assumed in isolation, but rather on the basis of its overall conduct in its relations with other States.

140. However, we must recognize that developments in international relations have not been favourable to the attainment of the objectives set out in the Programme of Action in the Final Document. In the meantime, hotbeds of tension have continued to broaden; in many cases those tensions have become armed conflicts, with losses of human life and material damage that have led to paralysis or delay in economic and social development. These conflicts, even when they remain local, are still a danger to international peace and security, for the interests at stake usually go beyond the interests of the parties to the conflict. Armed aggression—which, incidentally, is incompatible with peoples' desire for peace—is condemned by the Charter of the United Nations. But as long as such aggression continues, as long as it is possible for a major political and military Power to invade a neighbouring State to ensure ideological

obedience and to impose by force solutions that are contrary to the widespread feelings of the people there, progress in disarmament will be difficult and precarious.

141. In the light of conditions that are so unfavourable to the attainment of disarmament objectives, the meagre results obtained to date and the continuing trend towards an increase in military expenditures is not surprising. This reality is clearly illustrated by the fact that the money spent on arms is more or less equal to the total investment in the developing countries as a whole.

142. It is for the more powerful military States, those which account for most of those expenditures, to set an example and to encourage others to limit their military expenditures, thus making available resources which could be used to better effect for economic, social and cultural development and to improve the level of well-being of the peoples.

143. Against this background, mention should be made of expenditures called "research and development expenditures". It is difficult to calculate the amounts involved here, given the secrecy surrounding them and the fluid boundaries between military applications and civilian applications. However, special attention should be devoted to this by the international community with a view to the adoption of measures that could limit innovations in military technology. This will not be easy and the results will not be immediate. More information must be made available on these expenditures, and they must be comparable. The major military Powers must arrive at some agreement to reduce these expenditures to levels compatible with their security, in accordance with acceptable conditions of verification. This is in accordance with the principle that scientific progress must serve peaceful purposes and help to satisfy mankind's needs, and should not serve for the production of means of self-destruction.

144. If such action can help to limit the arms race or even to reverse it, the best way of attaining the objectives in the Final Document would seem to us to be the adoption of true measures for disarmament or effective verification. Such measures would have a direct impact on the quantitative and qualitative levels of the arms race and would allow for a selective effort focused on specific groups of weapons for which control is particularly desirable. Accordingly we have supported all proposals offering real possibilities for moving towards effective disarmament subject to effective international verification acceptable to all States.

145. Since the Assembly declared nuclear weapons the priority in disarmament efforts, we note with the greatest apprehension that nuclear arsenals have continued to increase quantitatively and qualitatively. This substantial increase and consequently the danger of the destruction of mankind are the inevitable result of the search for new and more sophisticated weapons carried out by those countries having the necessary technical resources. It is therefore urgent that the international community agree on means to remedy this situation. Accordingly we welcome the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet

Union for the reduction of intermediate-range nuclear weapons that have been or are to be placed in Europe.

146. We believe that the complete elimination from Europe of the threat of intermediate-range nuclear missiles would be of the greatest importance in the disarmament process and would contribute to the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security. That is why we support the proposal made on 18 November 1981 by the President of the United States, acceptance of which would be a decisive factor in moving towards the attainment of our objectives.

147. The proposals made to freeze the current situation do not, however, seem to us acceptable. They would mean maintenance of an imbalance if adequate measures to ensure a new balance were not taken. Clearly these are proposals that do not serve the interests of peace.

148. We would therefore call for continued negotiations for the withdrawal of intermediate-range nuclear weapons from Europe, which would be the best means of arriving at a balanced and verifiable agreement of historic significance. But the dangers of nuclear proliferation are not confined to the continent of Europe and intermediate-range nuclear weapons. We therefore also support negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union for the control of strategic nuclear weapons.

149. This view has already been expressed in respect of the SALT negotiations, and we stand by it because we feel that that dialogue is essential to the preservation of peace. The recent proposal of the President of the United States for the beginning of the START negotiations is aimed at establishing more stable relations that would go beyond fears of vulnerability that could dramatically increase the risks flowing from any international crisis. It also envisages, for the first time, a substantial reduction of existing weapons and does not confine itself to codifying the terms whereby the growth of nuclear arsenals should continue.

150. The increase in the number of countries choosing the nuclear solution to their energy problems will inevitably lead to a proliferation of nuclear technology. Several of those countries will be in a position to produce their own nuclear weapons, and it has been estimated that by the end of this century about 40 countries of various continents will have that capacity.

151. The dangers of being confronted with conflicts in which nuclear weapons might be used will increase dramatically. In these circumstances we find it extremely urgent to strengthen the international system for the non-proliferation of such weapons. Despite its limitations, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons has won broad international support. But it will not attain its full moral and political dimensions until all States, particularly those with advanced technology, become parties to the Treaty and undertake to use nuclear technology only for peaceful purposes.

152. The creation of denuclearized zones, on the initiative of and with the agreement of States of the regions, should be supported, as should guarantees given by nuclear States to non-nuclear States on the

non-use of nuclear weapons against the latter, in accordance with formulas that could safeguard the legitimate interests of all parties.

153. Although nuclear weapons are the most serious threat to the human race and the survival of civilization, and although the adoption of urgent effective measures for the elimination of such arms is imperative, it cannot be forgotten that threats to international peace and security also derive not from one specific type of weapon but from the general existing potential for war. Many countries have based their defence effort on conventional weapons. At the regional level these are of even greater and clearer importance. Suffice it to recall that in all conflicts since the Second World War, only conventional weapons have been used. Moreover, the amount spent on conventional weapons and armed forces in the world military expenditure is large, which shows their importance in the world's armed forces as a whole. This highlights two aspects of the matter: first, the need to accord greater importance to conventional weapons in disarmament negotiations in general, for everything would lead us to believe that this matter has not been given adequate attention by the international community; and secondly, the need for greater knowledge of the various aspects of conventional weapons, particularly in respect of their importance in working towards disarmament and the impact of disarmament measures in this area on international peace and security.

154. In view of what I have said, the Portuguese delegation supports the decision of the Disarmament Commission to proceed to a study on all aspects of conventional weapons and armed forces [see A/S-12/3, annex III].

155. In its first special session devoted to disarmament, held in 1978, the Assembly declared "The complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction represent one of the most urgent measures of disarmament." [Resolution S-10/2, para. 75.]

156. However, significant progress has not been made in this area. Negotiations are dragging on, blocked mainly by the lack of agreement on mechanisms for verification.

157. We consider the possibility of inspections *in loco* to be compatible with the sovereignty of States and absolutely essential in order that the parties can assure themselves that the commitments entered into are being applied on both sides. Rejection of this would prevent effective movement towards the desired goals and would arouse doubts about the intentions of certain States *vis-à-vis* the objectives of the negotiations.

158. There is now information leading one to believe that we are close to a chemical-arms race by a very limited number of countries having the sophisticated technology required for research on and the development and production of such weapons. The recent use of certain chemical weapons already prohibited by the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925, and the continued production of

chemical weapons are contrary to the objectives that the General Assembly has proposed and constitute a serious threat to the human race.

159. Therefore it is necessary to arrive at an agreement leading to the complete prohibition of the development and production of chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles. This agreement should provide for the appropriate machinery and procedures for effective verification of the implementation of commitments entered into, including on-site inspections when that is considered necessary.

160. My delegation has already emphasized the fact that disarmament is closely linked to the development of international relations. The attainment of these objectives could thus be greatly facilitated by the adoption of collateral measures to create a climate favourable to the success of negotiations on disarmament measures or arms control. Reference has been made to some of those measures, particularly those that could lead to a reduction of the current volume of military expenditures, but we also attach the greatest importance to those designed to create a climate of confidence.

161. Such measures have already been dealt with in a study prepared pursuant to a decision of the Assembly. The conclusions arrived at show how important they are for the creation of such a climate, and they suggest paths that could usefully be explored. My country is already participating in efforts under way to create a climate of confidence in Europe, and we are open to any constructive proposals that could amplify in valid terms the relevant provisions of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, signed at Helsinki on 1 August 1975, in this regard.

162. Experience in recent years leads us to conclude that the adoption of similar measures in other regions, adapted to their specific conditions, would be a useful contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security.

163. The draft comprehensive programme of disarmament which the Assembly will be called upon to consider has the greatest scope and the greatest significance. Being all-embracing, this programme will become a basic element in all the programme resolutions approved in international forums, and it will have an importance similar to that of the Final Document. In rendering the Programme of Action more precise and more detailed, the comprehensive programme of disarmament will, because of its nature and its objectives, along with the Final Document, constitute the guide to the efforts of States in the field of disarmament.

164. Flexibility in its objectives, allowing for a realistic adaptation to developments in international relations, must be one of the fundamental features of the programme.

165. Although we recognize the increased responsibility of those States with the greatest military power, particularly the nuclear-weapon States, it is nevertheless undeniable that the other States also have something to say in the negotiation of agreements in this regard, for their security is also involved.

166. Although that fact seems to have been taken into consideration in respect of the Disarmament Commission, the same cannot be said in respect of the Committee on Disarmament, whose limited membership excludes most members of the international community from the negotiations.

167. The need for efficiency might argue against any expansion of its membership beyond certain limits, but in our view this is not sufficient to make us forget that its method of functioning is not in accordance with the spirit that gave form to the doctrine underlying the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session.

168. The Portuguese delegation would nonetheless like to stress the importance it attaches to the activities of the representatives of States currently members of the Committee on Disarmament. Despite the difficult conditions, they have spared no effort to find appropriate solutions to the many difficult problems that they have had, and still have, to settle.

169. However, my delegation feels that this special session provides an appropriate opportunity for us to consider possible and desirable changes in the Committee on Disarmament so that it can be made more representative and more effective.

170. International peace and security cannot be based on arsenals that constantly grow quantitatively and qualitatively. The balance of terror which is the basis for them is not a guarantee of stable and lasting peace; it implies an arms race, and the competition among the great Powers is one of the most dramatic and dangerous aspects of it.

171. History has given us this opportunity to seek together new paths to peace and security. We must not disappoint the hopes that have been awakened by this session.

172. Mr. JAMEEL (Maldives): First of all I wish to associate myself with previous speakers in congratulating Mr. Kittani on his election as President of this important special session of the General Assembly. My delegation is indeed happy that the convening of this special session coincided with the term of his presidency of the General Assembly, and we are confident that his wisdom and long experience in the field of international relations will enable him to guide our deliberations so that they will result in significant achievements.

173. I also wish to take this opportunity to extend the greetings of my delegation to Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, Secretary-General, and to convey to him the assurances of my country's appreciation of and continued support for his dedicated efforts in upholding the vital role of the Organization in maintaining peace and security in the world.

174. We share the concern expressed by the President about the world situation, in which aggression, intervention and war have again constituted the theme for the events in our lives. The aspirations of mankind to peace, security and justice—and even survival—are being disregarded in the wake of a renewed trend of confrontation and self-interest. We frequently see among ourselves those who, often neglecting the will of their own people and more often the rights of other peoples, resort to the provocation of conflicts, the

violation of the peace and serenity of peaceful co-existence. Regrettably, the armed strength they possess and their capacity to strike and destroy the enemy remain the driving force of this madness and self-destruction. What we are witnessing today in the Middle East is an example of the arrogance of the powerful—one who has all the dreadful means of destruction and who does not hesitate to use his devices in order to achieve his selfish objectives, disregarding all human values and norms of behaviour. First of all, the role played by those who supplied the monster with his tool or helped him develop his arsenal should be acknowledged. It is not only in the Middle East that such events have taken place; the same scenario is being repeated in southern Africa and in many other parts of the world.

175. This is the world in which we are living today: a world of armed conflicts, wars and destruction. After the Second World War it was the consensus among us not to allow further destruction but to save the generations to come from the dangers of war.

176. We all had sincere hopes for genuine peace and security, for equal rights for all peoples and for a better future in every respect for our children. It is true that we inherited many disorders from the past, but we have been discussing, across and around conference tables, the multiple symptoms of that sorry past, and we have been able to identify remedies for many of our illnesses. However, with the arms race casting its dark shadow over our shoulders and onto the path ahead of us, many in the world community have been tempted to return to walking with their guns ready in their holsters, as if their security depended entirely on the power of what they were carrying. Endless amounts of resources and energy have been consumed in this process, when mankind as a whole has sorely needed to utilize them in other, constructive, ways.

177. The perils and agonies of war, so frightful are they, remain in our minds. Wars are to be condemned and deplored, whether they are conventional wars or nuclear wars, because they result in death, destruction and human suffering. For my delegation, war is a danger and a dreadful concept that should not be feared solely in the context of its mathematical consequences. At the same time, we recognize the devastating effects of a nuclear war, a war that, if started, will not last long, since its very beginning means the end of everything, a war that will neither allow us any chance of survival nor test any misleading theories of limited engagements.

178. We believe that the only approach to preventing a nuclear war is total nuclear disarmament. Perhaps we should start with an effective freeze on the development and production of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery. The system of collective security should be strengthened through the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the complete cessation of nuclear tests. The ultimate objective should be the total elimination or dismantling of nuclear weapons throughout the world, and in outer space—if there are already any there. It is obvious that such an ambitious objective would not be easy to attain. The main role must therefore revert to the nuclear-weapon States themselves, which still remain suspicious of each other. However, we feel that the present situation is

so grave that it is essential for those States to initiate and pursue serious negotiations among themselves and with others that share with them the responsibility for survival, with a firm will to bring such negotiations to a successful conclusion.

179. While we embark on arms-limitation talks with the eventual aim of complete disarmament, my delegation believes it is also necessary to promote the concept of creating nuclear-weapon-free zones by allowing the States of the region concerned to take the action required free from outside pressure or interference. The regional approach to disarmament has proved to be viable not only because it enhances the opportunity for consensus, but also because it provides a firm and relatively durable basis for the modalities worked out through such an approach. Regional disarmament could be an effective measure for strengthening the security of the countries of the region while at the same time strengthening international security and contributing to preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

180. In this context, we feel a personal and deep concern about the question of the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean and the proposals for declaring the Indian Ocean a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Similarly, we look forward to the day when all of Asia becomes a nuclear-weapon-free zone under an effective instrument similar to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin American (Treaty of Tlatelolco). Maldives has always supported the zonal concept of peace and disarmament, and it will continue to do so with all the sincerity of its convictions and beliefs. It has supported the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and has endorsed General Assembly resolutions calling for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in Asia, the Middle East, Africa and other regions. We remain committed to doing whatever we can to strengthen and consolidate this concept wherever applicable in the world. As a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Maldives will continue to implement all measures to prevent the presence of nuclear weapons within its territory, even on a temporary or transit basis.

181. When dealing with the question of disarmament, we should also think of ways of reducing the production of conventional armaments and of reducing

military expenditures in general, not only because they increase the dangers of war and add to the escalation of world tension, but also because we need to save the enormous amounts of resources that are now being drained at such expenditures with no real benefit to anyone. It is our view that through the reduction of arms expenditures and a reallocation of resources a greater degree of social and economic development would be attained. The result of such a policy would be felt not only on the domestic level, but throughout the world economic order.

182. My delegation welcomes all the efforts that are being made, within the United Nations or on regional and bilateral levels, to ensure arms reduction. However, we feel that the role of the United Nations in this process should be strengthened because of the wide base it provides for reflecting world opinion and because of the universal nature of this important issue. We also feel that while Governments are seriously debating effective means of achieving results it is also important that public awareness of the dangers of war—and in particular nuclear war—be increased.

183. Since this special session is a unique opportunity for us to focus our attention seriously on all aspects of disarmament, we appeal to all Member States not to allow this event to pass without achieving specific and concrete results. This session is definitely not going to be the last occasion for discussing this important issue, but let us all sincerely try to come up with positive results and to offer some hope to the millions of people who await impatiently, counting on the Organization and on the sincerity of its Members to bring an end to their agonies and anxieties.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1982, resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982).*

² A/S-10/AC.1/9 and Add.1.

³ A/36/392, annex.

⁴ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.1.

⁵ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326.