



President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now hear a statement by the President of the Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. On behalf of the General Assembly, I have the honour to welcome Mr. Petar Stambolić and to invite him to address the Assembly.

2. Mr. STAMBOLIĆ:* Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, and to express our satisfaction at your election as President of this important session, especially since you are the representative of a non-aligned country with which Yugoslavia maintains friendly relations. I also wish to avail myself of this opportunity sincerely to congratulate Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar on his election as Secretary-General at a time when the United Nations is expected to render a decisive contribution to the solution of many pressing issues which are adversely affecting international relations.

3. I am addressing this most representative Assembly on behalf of a country that has in its history, during the Second World War in particular, experienced all the horrors of war and suffered enormous human and material losses. That is one of the reasons why I wish to confirm the vital interest of Yugoslavia in the halting of the arms race and the launching of a process of genuine disarmament.

4. Disarmament, the vital prerequisite for peace in the world, has been the focus of activity of the United Nations since its inception, and the first resolution of the General Assembly, of 24 January 1946, related precisely to disarmament. To this very day, the world Organization has been dealing with the arms race, which represents a major obstacle to the realization of the purposes and principles of the United Nations proclaimed in its Charter and of the lofty ideals of peace, and is in itself illustrative of contradictions existing within contemporary society. The world Organization is the most appropriate forum of the international community for effective international action to eliminate this contradiction and to strengthen peace in the world.

5. We see the exceptional importance of this session in the very role it has in eliminating the dangers of war overshadowing the world today. Therefore, we

must approach this session with a sense of responsibility for the future of mankind—responsibility to present generations and to generations to come. The international community must resolutely and without delay deal with the major problems of the present-day world—namely, the strengthening of international security and the promotion of economic development and social progress, which are directly connected with disarmament. We believe that this representative gathering is in itself proof that we share such a feeling of responsibility and that, in spite of differences and disagreements and often even crises in mutual relations, we do not forget what we have in common, nor do we neglect our constant commitment to surmount all that divides us. Today more than ever before the destiny of the world is indivisible and every nation has the right to participate in resolving international problems.

6. There is no doubt that international relations are in a state of grave crisis. Today we are confronted with a policy and practice which are contrary to the aims and principles of the United Nations. The right of peoples to lead an independent life in peace and freedom and to decide freely on their socio-economic development and foreign policy is frequently threatened. In many regions there has been recourse to the threat or use of military force. The big Powers and bloc rivalry are leading the world to the brink of war. The arms race is being intensified as the consequence and reflection of deeply rooted contradictions and lack of confidence between the blocs and, above all, between the two big Powers that are fully responsible for this development.

7. In such a situation, instead of a process of disarmament, weapons are being stockpiled; instead of the hotbeds of crisis being extinguished, the present ones are being exacerbated and new ones created; instead of negotiations, force is used; instead of respect for independence, there are attempts to legalize interference in internal affairs under various pretexts aimed at spreading spheres of influence. Since the tenth special session of the General Assembly, the first devoted to disarmament, we have witnessed numerous military interventions and interference in the internal affairs of States, as well as overt violations of their integrity and sovereignty. Further support is being given to the aggressive racist forces resisting the elimination of colonialism, while aggressive acts aimed at denying the inalienable right of peoples to freedom and independence are being encouraged.

8. The latest brutal Israeli attack on Lebanon shows what happens when Israel's aggressive policy of many years towards the Arab countries and peoples is tolerated. Yugoslavia resolutely condemns the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and against the people of Palestine. We call for the taking of urgent and effective

* Mr. Stambolić spoke in Serbo-Croatian. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

measures in order to put an end to Israeli aggression in the Middle East, this being the essential precondition of the solution of this deep international crisis which poses a dangerous threat to world peace.

9. I should like to remind the Assembly of the danger to the world's peace and security inherent in the further dramatic expansion of inequitable economic relations between the industrialized and the developing countries. The inherited relations of domination and exploitation are being either maintained or further exacerbated, while the burden of the economic crisis is shifted to the developing countries. All this is narrowing the scope for economic co-operation and development in the world. The awareness that such trends are also harmful to the long-term interests of developed countries has not prevailed everywhere. Inequitable economic relations give rise to political crises, which are accompanied by an increasing role for military power. Today this is one of the most dangerous sources of instability in the world.

10. We are deeply convinced that effective negotiations that will lead to changing the present situation are indispensable and are the only way to check growing disproportions in world economic development and continuing deterioration of the position of developing countries. We see the global negotiations as the road to that end.

11. Mankind in its history has never been faced with such a threat as that posed today by the arms race between big Powers and blocs. This race is even more dangerous since it appears both as the cause and the effect of confrontation between the militarily and technically most powerful countries in the world, consuming enormous material and human resources and giving rise to emotions and irrational passions which easily escape the control of sound judgement. That is why it is indispensable not only to perceive the nature and effects of the arms race at this session, but also to find ways and means of halting and reversing it.

12. The first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, held in 1978, adopted a world disarmament platform and a Programme of Action [see resolution S-10/2] spelling out concrete measures. Hopes were raised that a process of reduction and elimination of dangerous military arsenals would be set in motion. Today, however, we must note that those hopes have been betrayed. No practical disarmament measure has been undertaken. The arms race has accelerated in the past four years. The fact that the world this year is allocating \$200 billion more to military budgets than at the time of the tenth special session is undoubtedly a dramatic warning and a reason for serious examination of responsibility for the non-fulfilment of the commitments made.

13. The arms buildup, increased military forces and strengthening of blocs have not brought greater security either to the world or to individual countries, nor could they do so. On the contrary, overall security has been reduced to an even lower level. Not only are there more weapons, but those weapons are increasingly used for threatening the freedom and independence of a growing number of States and peoples.

14. The nuclear-weapon States have continued to increase their arsenals, regardless of the recommendations and commitment to reduce armaments. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex] is flagrantly violated. The threat of a nuclear war has increased lately as a result of doctrines asserting the possibility of a limited nuclear war, as well as the buildup and sophistication of theatre nuclear weapons intended for such a war. This opens wide the door to general nuclear catastrophe. The survival of mankind is at stake. Hence, both the nuclear-weapon and the non-nuclear-weapon States have the right and responsibility to give priority to, and exert maximum efforts to achieve, nuclear disarmament. Nuclear-weapon States undoubtedly bear the greatest responsibility for the present unsatisfactory state of negotiations on nuclear disarmament, and also an obligation to overcome this without delay. The resumption of American-Soviet negotiations on the reduction of specific types of nuclear weapons with a view to reaching concrete agreements as soon as possible would constitute a very important step in that direction. Therefore, we support all the initiatives taken by the statesmen of the two countries conducive to the launching of substantive negotiations on disarmament.

15. In the presence of nuclear danger, a major race in conventional weapons is continuing and accelerating. A particular threat comes from the development of new chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction, whose lethal power has become equal to that of nuclear weapons. Peace in the world and the independence of many countries are increasingly threatened precisely by the widespread use of conventional weapons in many local wars and armed interventions. All this justifies the demand for parallel efforts to reduce both nuclear and conventional weapons.

16. I should like to point to one of the gravest consequences of the arms race, that is, the serious deterioration of the position of non-aligned and other developing countries with respect to their security. The forces threatening freedom, as well as the instruments of military intervention, have been growing much faster than the national defence capabilities of threatened countries. This is one of the major causes of the current deterioration of international security. This should give cause for concern to all countries and to the international community as a whole. The threat to the security of any country in today's interdependent world rapidly becomes an international issue menacing all countries, large and small alike.

17. The world is faced with the crucial question how to eliminate growing danger and how to reverse current trends in the interests of peace and stable international relations.

18. Proceeding from the original principles and goals of the policy of non-alignment, the non-aligned countries have always focused their activity on strengthening peace and international security and co-operation. They have pointed to the untenability of the bloc concept of international security and relations based on domination and hegemony. Non-alignment is essentially a negation of such a policy. The present crisis in international relations unequivocally discloses all the dangers inherent in the bloc

division of the world and in the system of security based on the balance of force and terror. Being unreconciled to such a system of security, the non-aligned countries have offered a new concept of international relations, the essence of which is active and peaceful coexistence, equitable co-operation and equal security for States and peoples. As is well known, they initiated the convening of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, as well as a number of proposals conducive to launching the disarmament process. They have also launched numerous initiatives for solving other major issues of the world today.

19. It is our deep conviction that we can strengthen peace and build more stable international relations only on the basis of equitable co-operation, equal security and a policy of mutual confidence, and in conditions of a sizable reduction of armed forces and armaments in the world. The main objective of our action should be to guarantee the security of every State at the lowest possible level of armaments and military forces. This makes it incumbent on the international community to exert resolute efforts to establish a system that will prevent the use of force in international relations. We consider it indispensable to elaborate within the United Nations an effective and mandatory system of measures for the peaceful solution of disputes among its Members based on the principles of the Charter.

20. We are firmly convinced that progress in the interests of all can be achieved only by exerting parallel efforts to settle disputes and crises by peaceful and political means, which would contribute to strengthening confidence and open the road to disarmament. By the same token, practical measures of disarmament, even those most modest in scope, would also have a positive impact on improving the political climate and settling disputes and crises by peaceful means.

21. In the absence of the genuine reduction of stock-piles of weapons, measures of so-called arms control amount merely to control of the arms race. It has been proved that these measures do not and cannot prevent further proliferation, both quantitative and qualitative, of all types of weapons.

22. I wish to emphasize in particular the duty of the States possessing the largest military arsenals to accept unconditionally and without delay specific obligations with respect to halting the arms race and reducing their armed forces and armaments. It is the duty of all States to make an effective contribution to disarmament efforts, but also it is their right to take part in all multilateral negotiations involving their security.

23. We attach great significance to the further democratization of international mechanisms for disarmament negotiations and, in particular, to the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in this field. This calls for more effective and substantive work on the part of the Disarmament Commission. It also calls for the full and equal participation of all members of the Committee on Disarmament and countries concerned in negotiations on all questions under consideration in that Committee.

24. We feel that regional disarmament efforts can play a primary role in international action for disarmament. Full support should be rendered to efforts to turn certain regions into zones of peace and co-operation or into denuclearized zones, for instance the Indian Ocean, northern Europe, the Mediterranean and so on.

25. Recent developments in Europe have confirmed the validity of the thesis of the indispensability of universal détente, which should be in the interests of all peoples in the world. It has become apparent that tensions and conflicts in certain regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America have a direct impact on the situation in Europe and on the process initiated in Helsinki. Also, the situation in Europe, with its huge bloc concentration of nuclear as well as sophisticated conventional weapons, has an impact on the situation in other regions of the world. The nations of Europe are aware of this, which is dangerous for their own survival and for the future of the whole world. It is precisely the population of Europe that has strongly manifested its awareness of the fact that disarmament is not a matter of concern to Governments only but is in the vital interests of all people. The streets of cities in Europe have been crowded with hundreds of thousands of people of different political orientation demanding strongly and resolutely that the race in the production of means of destruction be stopped and peace and greater security for all ensured.

26. Opening the process of disarmament in Europe is an absolute imperative. We hope that the difficulties encountered by the Madrid meeting of representatives of the participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe will be overcome and that it will adopt at its resumed session this autumn a decision on convening a conference on disarmament in Europe. I wish to emphasize in particular the role of non-aligned and neutral European countries and their efforts to strengthen security and co-operation.

27. The situation in and security of the Mediterranean are most directly related to security in Europe. We attach great importance to the efforts to transform that region into a zone of peace and co-operation. The development of that region has been followed by disturbing events which threaten peace. In order to overcome this situation, it is indispensable to create conditions for the elimination of the existing focal points of tension, to intensify co-operation and to build confidence among the States of the region. Prospects would thereby be opened up for achieving the goals of disarmament in this region as well. We believe that a positive development of this process could lead to the convening of an international conference on the Mediterranean as a zone of peace and co-operation under the auspices of the United Nations.

28. In this context, we attach exceptional importance to the transformation of the Balkans into a zone of peace and co-operation, free from nuclear weapons. The realization of this idea presupposes the development of relations between Balkan States based on full respect for the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-interference and peaceful coexistence and with a permanent orientation towards good-neighbourly relations. Furthermore, it also presupposes the inadmissibility of the threat of force or

use of any type of weapon against any Balkan State. The success of the action to transform the Balkans into a denuclearized zone depends, of course, on the overall situation in the broader region of the Mediterranean and Europe. The denuclearization of the Balkans would be an important factor in opening up a broader process of disarmament in Europe.

29. At this grave moment in international relations, the hopes of mankind as a whole, of all of us, are set on the success of this session. Great responsibility has been laid upon us to exert maximum efforts and to demonstrate the necessary political will to fulfil such expectations. We are called upon not only to make a critical assessment of the developments between the two sessions but also to reaffirm in a creative manner the decisions of the tenth special session by assuming concrete commitments, by defining ways and means for launching substantive negotiations and by taking practical disarmament measures without any further delay.

30. It is our view that at this session the Assembly should focus its attention on the final elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Difficulties should not serve as a pretext for abandoning the idea of such a programme. The attitude of countries towards the comprehensive disarmament programme and towards assuming commitments as specific as possible will be a test of their political will and readiness to make the necessary contribution to strengthening international security and to disarmament.

31. At the current session the Assembly should, in our opinion, avail itself of this opportunity to set specific tasks to be fulfilled in the field of disarmament, with time-frames that are as precise as possible. Here we have in mind primarily the elaboration and adoption of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, a comprehensive test-ban treaty, an agreement on effective reduction of strategic and theatre nuclear weapons, the convening of a European conference on disarmament and the launching of a process of disarmament in Europe and so on. It goes without saying that this cannot be a substitute for a comprehensive disarmament programme, which should remain an indivisible entity and the main objective.

32. We consider that a decision on convening the third special session devoted to disarmament should be adopted at this session. It seems to us that the four-year interval has proved to be practical and politically acceptable to all participating States.

33. In conclusion, I should like to quote certain ideas from the message of President Tito to the tenth special session which, I believe, are equally topical and valid at this moment:

"I am convinced that the present and future generations will not judge countries or statesmen by the destructive power of weapons in their possession, but rather by the genuine efforts and contribution towards stopping destruction and self-annihilation and towards placing human energy, wisdom and wealth at the service of the security and prosperity of all countries, of all peoples, in the service of the most humane ideals of man."
[2nd meeting, para. 2.]

34. We live in an age of crucial decisions whose postponement could be fatal. If this session proves to be a positive turning point, then it could also mark the beginning of the realization of the age-old dream of mankind to live in peace based on justice and security, since peace can be neither lasting nor just unless it is founded on these highest values of humanity. The whole history of mankind shows that there is no peace without freedom or freedom without peace.

35. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly I wish to thank the President of the Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for the important statement he has just made.

36. Mr. FISCHER (German Democratic Republic):* This is the second time in its history that the General Assembly has devoted a special session to matters of disarmament. This is of particular importance, since peace is more gravely threatened today than at any time since the Second World War. Therefore the maintenance of peace must be the goal of all action. There is only one way of preserving life on our planet, and that is arms limitation and disarmament. Any step, however small, that brings us closer to that objective would be an effective contribution to lessening tensions and would be likely to instil greater trust in the world. That, in the view of the German Democratic Republic, is the imperative mandate of this session, one that also derives from the Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*] of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, held in 1978. He who acts differently contradicts that mandate and life itself.

37. The obligation to work for peace calls for a sober assessment of what has been done during the four years since that special session, when the General Assembly, by mutual agreement, adopted the Final Document, which contains a Programme of Action for disarmament, either to implement its objectives or to oppose them.

38. Socialist States, including the German Democratic Republic, have left no stone unturned at the United Nations and other international bodies and in their bilateral relations to bring about a radical turn towards disarmament and peace. With their support, between 1978 and 1981 the General Assembly adopted 178 resolutions on disarmament matters alone. The socialist States have not only put forward proposals but have also taken unilateral steps to open the door to the scaling down of military confrontation. Only recently the Soviet Union combined weighty proposals for disarmament and détente with the proclamation of a unilateral moratorium on the stationing of medium-range nuclear weapons. What is more, it has meanwhile even begun to dismantle a certain number of its medium-range nuclear missiles in the European part of the Soviet Union.

39. Let me also recall that three years ago, pursuant to a relevant agreement with the German Democratic Republic, 20,000 Soviet troops, 1,000 tanks and other military equipment were transferred back to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

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

40. Up to the present time, unfortunately, all such unilateral steps taken by the socialist States have not been matched by similar action by the other side designed to limit armaments, nor has there been so much as a gesture along those lines.

41. Wide-ranging efforts in favour of the Programme of Action have also been made by other States and by political and social forces throughout the world. Thus, the non-aligned States, in their Political Declaration of Havana in 1979, pledged themselves to the endeavour "to consolidate détente; to extend it to all parts of the world; and to avert the nuclear threat, the arms build-up and war".¹ That unambiguous and responsible political commitment, which is also reflected in the Final Communiqué of the Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Havana from 31 May to 5 June 1982,² is in our view all the more significant since the non-aligned movement, which today embraces more than 100 countries, carries increasing weight and exerts a growing influence on international affairs.

42. And does not the peace movement, which is growing stronger and stronger in many countries, show that the desire for arms limitation and disarmament reflects the will of the peoples? A continually growing number of people are beginning to defend their most important human right, namely, the right to life. It is inspiring to note that the growing awareness of the dangers to peace is accompanied by an increasingly active commitment to peace.

43. It is timely and fitting, therefore, that I state the following: the German Democratic Republic most strongly condemns Israel's bloody aggression in Lebanon. This war of extermination is fresh proof that Israel does not want a peaceful balance of interests and apparently does not shrink from a new war in the Middle East, with all the dangerous worldwide consequences such a war entails. In the interest of world peace, we demand the immediate withdrawal of the aggressor from Lebanon, and we reaffirm our unswerving solidarity with the Palestinian and Lebanese people.

44. In connexion with the problems under discussion here, the work of scientists of all disciplines deserves the highest appreciation. They help to dispel the smoke-screen that is designed to create the notion that a nuclear war and its devastating consequences may not, after all, be so terrible.

45. Such encouraging trends come up against strong forces that block all progress in bilateral and multi-lateral bodies and carry confrontation directly into international relations.

46. Those forces are guided not by the Programme of Action [*resolution S-10/2, sect. III*] for disarmament adopted here four years ago, but rather by the long-term super-armament programme of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*] that was decided on in Washington at the very same time. Since another NATO summit conference is being held today, parallel with this United Nations disarmament forum, one would hope that no new arms programmes will be adopted there, but that goodwill and reason will prevail, opening the way to negotiations to reduce the risk of war and on effective steps towards arms limitation and disarmament. I feel compelled, never-

theless, to voice our concern that at the NATO summit meeting scheduled to begin today at Bonn, the capital of the Federal Republic of Germany, yet another drive towards super-armament will be agreed on. The fact that the United States alone is planning to spend \$1.6 trillion on armaments over the next five years cannot but give rise to alarm. That is many times more than has ever before been expended, in peace or war, for armament purposes.

47. What those forces are aiming at is not the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, but rather a nuclear first-strike capability that will ensure victory in a nuclear war. Their craving for military superiority has made them move away from the signed SALT II treaty. They are even preventing symbolic reductions of forces and armaments at the negotiations that have been under way at Vienna for more than eight years now. Instead, they want—and this is reflected in the Brussels decision of December 1979—to tip the military balance in central Europe decisively in NATO's favour by stationing 572 United States medium-range missiles there.

48. In an all-too-familiar fashion, they are bent on rearranging the world, proclaiming vast areas of continents and the seas as spheres of what they call their "vital interests". They resort to sanctions and blockades to disrupt normal intergovernmental relations and international trade. They replace reasonable dialogue and the joint search for a balance of interests by peaceful means with stock phrases about freedom. Their talk of defending democracy against communism clumsily camouflages their constant threats to use armed force. According to statements recently made by what we must suppose to be a competent high official, NATO plans to extend its activities beyond the borders of its member States. This is obviously designed to intimidate and eventually to discourage the world. Such a policy frustrates all efforts made to achieve progress in terms of arms limitation and disarmament.

49. For the German Democratic Republic—for a socialist country—peace has never been merely an abstract ideal but a pre-condition for economic and social development necessary for the well-being of mankind.

50. When the German Democratic Republic was founded in 1949, it made the historic pledge to ensure that never again would a war begin on German soil. That is what the people of the German Democratic Republic are working for, many of whom belong to generations that have indelible memories of the terrors of the Second World War.

51. To keep all generations constantly aware that hatred among nations and instigation to war are grave crimes against humanity and to imbue them with the spirit of peace and international understanding is for us a matter of course.

52. In the German Democratic Republic, the defence of peace is a constitutional precept binding on all its citizens. No one can evade this commitment to peace and no one wants to do so. The German Democratic Republic's policy is one that seeks and promotes a peaceful balance of interests in international relations. It has been, is and remains ready to replace confrontation with dialogue, trust and co-operation

beneficial to all sides. Such a policy does not give rise to tensions, nor does it adversely affect the international climate. On the contrary, such a policy serves détente and prosperity. It is always calculable because—contrary to well-known public statements of others—for the German Democratic Republic there are no “things more important than peace”.

53. Approximately four years ago representatives of all United Nations Member States meeting in this Hall to discuss disarmament noted the following: “Removing the threat of a world war—a nuclear war—is the most acute and urgent task of the present day. Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation.” [*Resolution S-10/2, para. 18.*] Since that time, political and military insecurity in the world has perilously increased, and one wonders whether those who are responsible for this state of affairs are unaware of what dangers this poses to the existence of all peoples.

54. Nuclear weapons pose the gravest threat to mankind. By now there are so many of them that either side could, according to calculations made by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, destroy the other a thousand times over. I say that even one single time is too many times. Therefore, the German Democratic Republic advocates that in its decisions at this session the Assembly should give prominence to the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

55. What is it actually that prevents some nuclear-weapon States from making the solemn pledge—as called for in the relevant declaration initiated by the USSR and adopted at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly [*resolution 36/100*—that they will not be the first to use nuclear weapons? After all, there are in this connexion neither legal nor verification problems.

56. The argument that a prohibition of the first use of nuclear weapons was favouring the use of conventional arms is not tenable either. Those who fear that need only accept the proposal put forward by the socialist States to renounce the first use of both nuclear and conventional weapons.

57. What we consider particularly important, even though this would be only a first step, is the freezing, at long last, of nuclear-weapon potentials at their present levels and the discontinuation of nuclear-weapons production. Is there any need for increasingly perilous nuclear weapons to be accumulated in ever larger quantities? Certainly not. The quantity of nuclear stockpiles, even at this stage, is so large that there is the equivalent of three tons of TNT for every human being on earth.

58. This does not ensure greater security for anyone. What must be done to achieve a tangible lessening of the risk of nuclear war has long been clear. What we must seek is an immediate halt to all nuclear-weapon tests, the early discontinuation of the production of nuclear weapons and the immediate freezing of nuclear-weapon potentials.

59. Why is it that negotiations on the reduction of nuclear weapons must lag behind the arms race? Why is it that the arms race cannot be brought to an

immediate halt but is instead constantly steered in new directions?

60. The German Democratic Republic, like the other States of the socialist community, is prepared immediately to conduct negotiations on the prohibition of the production, on the reduction and, eventually, also on the liquidation of all types of weapons, pursuant to the principle of equal and undiminished security.

61. Be it agreements on weapons of mass destruction or conventional weapons, be it drastic reductions or the comparatively modest objective of confidence-building measures, be it in a world-wide or regional framework, the socialist States—and I repeat this—are immediately prepared for it all. They do not demand from other States more than they are ready to do themselves.

62. No doubt, the fact that the SALT II treaty signed in 1979 has not been ratified and that one of the parties refused for almost 18 months to resume negotiations on strategic weapons have beyond all doubt seriously affected the international climate, all the more so since, during that period, again and again key members of Governments who really should know what they say have openly proclaimed that there would have to be further arms buildups first, in order to be able to enter into negotiations on strategic weapons from the required position of strength.

63. It would be encouraging and beneficial to the cause if, at the start of such negotiations, as repeatedly proposed by the Soviet Union, a moratorium could be agreed upon whereby strategic weapons and their modernization would be frozen. However, mutually acceptable agreements obviously cannot be reached if one side demands drastic reductions from the other while leaving its own strategic weapons untouched.

64. The actual purpose of all that, which nothing can conceal, is to tip the military-strategic balance in favour of one side. However, productive agreements on arms limitation and disarmament and, even more so, on all nuclear-weapon systems can be achieved only if the principle of equal security is strictly observed, that is, if account is taken of the other party's legitimate security interests. By contrast, striving for unilateral military advantages and military superiority is a dangerous illusion. Those who follow such a negotiating concept obviously do not want those negotiations to produce results.

65. It should be clear to everyone that the German Democratic Republic and its allies do not only speak about disarmament but are fighting for it in the best sense of the word—and we have not been content with words. Only a few days ago, at Whitsuntide, more than 4 million mainly young people everywhere in my country demonstrated for peace and disarmament and against confrontation and super-armament. They thus added further to the call for peace and against the deployment of new United States nuclear weapons in Western Europe, signed in 1979 by more than 13 million citizens of the German Democratic Republic. The German Democratic Republic Peace Council has during the last ten months received over 33,000 resolutions bearing the signatures of 1.7 million citizens, demanding the prohibition of the neutron weapon.

66. Situated on the dividing line between the Warsaw Treaty Powers and the NATO Powers, the German Democratic Republic takes a special interest in negotiations on the reduction of nuclear weapons in Europe. Even today, NATO's nuclear-weapon stockpiles to the west of our State frontier are larger than anywhere else in the world. Plans to add new and even more dangerous missiles are bound to meet with ever broader opposition, for everyone realizes that such a move cannot but heighten the risk of the sudden outbreak of a nuclear war. Therefore the German Democratic Republic supports all proposals leading to a drastic reduction of the nuclear weapons of the NATO Powers and the Warsaw Treaty Powers in Europe. The Soviet Union, in its posture, has shown a constructive approach.

67. There are no indications so far of the other side's taking a similar posture. Accordingly the suspicion is voiced, not only by ourselves but also by politicians of Western countries, that at the moment only one thing is to be ensured: the deployment in 1983 of United States medium-range missiles in Western Europe. It should be clear, however, that the one who permits such a deployment on its territory will have to bear the consequences and will assume a heavy burden of responsibility towards both its own people and all nations of the world.

68. The German Democratic Republic attaches great importance to the official negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments, due to begin at Geneva on 29 June, and expects tangible progress to be made.

69. At the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly the German Democratic Republic introduced a draft resolution on the prohibition of the neutron weapon and its stationing in other countries, proposing a corresponding international convention. That question remains on the agenda.

70. As far as chemical weapons are concerned, the German Democratic Republic stands resolutely for their complete prohibition. In particular, a ban on the production of an especially insidious generation of chemical weapons, the binary weapon, as well as on the deployment of chemical weapons in other States, admits of no delay.

71. Repeatedly from this rostrum stress has been laid on the necessity to divert the resources squandered on armaments and preparations for war to satisfying the basic needs of mankind. The study entitled *The Relationship between Disarmament and Development*, made on the instructions of the Secretary-General, clearly reflects the disastrous consequences of super-armament and confrontation for all sectors of the economic and social development of peoples. No one can ignore the statement in the study that the arms race is "socially harmful, economically unjustifiable, politically counterproductive, ecologically hazardous and morally intolerable".³

72. In his personal message to the President of this special session, the head of State of my country, Erich Honecker, emphasized that only very few meetings in the history of the United Nations have attracted so much attention from the world public as the present session. The peoples of the world expect

much from it. The arms mania must be brought under control, so that man may breathe freely and, without fear of the future, develop his creative talents. Nothing is more important than peace and nothing more important than ensuring the right to life. Negotiations must not be allowed to be misused as an alibi for accelerated arms buildups. To achieve this, work at this session must be marked by a sense of responsibility and political realism. To achieve this, the proposals and ideas put forward here must be imbued with the principles of equality and equal security. To achieve this, the principles adopted four years ago by consensus must be upheld, an effective contribution must be made to their implementation and a comprehensive disarmament programme must be adopted, aimed at the speedy achievement of concrete results. Finally, to achieve this, this session must give encouragement to the peace movement, which has grown so powerful that it can no longer be ignored, and it must, through its proceedings and results, give support to that movement.

73. We are convinced that common sense, realism and far-sightedness will make it possible to reach an understanding on a single but crucial question, that of war or peace. Today our planet Earth is already too small to bear the arms potentials amassed upon it. Whether wanted or not, there can be only one common security for the peoples on our planet. This implies a shared responsibility to make every effort to ensure that neither Europe nor any other part of the world becomes the theatre of senseless military conflict. Proposals and initiatives are not lacking. What must now be proved above all is that there really is the will to action. Wars are not a law of nature. They are made by man and they can—indeed must—be abolished by man.

74. Mr. YAQUB-KHAN (Pakistan): I am most honoured to participate in this important session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Pakistan sincerely hopes that this session will signal a positive turn towards a more peaceful and secure world.

75. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep satisfaction at seeing you preside over the deliberations of this session. We greatly admire the skill and distinction with which you have guided the work of the General Assembly since last September.

76. I take this opportunity also to express my Government's sincere appreciation to the Secretary-General of the Organization, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar. His abiding commitment to the ideals of the United Nations and his untiring and imaginative endeavours to promote just and peaceful solutions to recent international crises have gained the approbation of the world community.

77. I sincerely hope that the very moving and eloquent statements made by the Secretary-General and by you, Mr. President, at the opening of this session will inspire Member States to demonstrate the political will to reach the decisions the peoples of the world expect.

78. It is a tragic failure of world statesmanship that the political conduct of States stands in sharp contrast to the principles and purposes espoused by them under the Charter of the United Nations. The militarily

powerful States seek absolute security for themselves; they entertain national ambitions which all too often trample upon the vital interests of the smaller and weaker States of the world. Not surprisingly, every State, large or small, puts a premium on armaments to ensure its independence and to safeguard its security.

79. Is it not tragic that, while the world spends nearly \$600 billion annually on armaments, very little is done to prevent millions of children from dying each year from hunger, malnutrition or disease?

80. Is it not a sad irony that, while we have developed the technological means to master our natural environment, we seem prepared to use this prowess to destroy everything that human civilization has achieved?

81. Today, global war implies collective suicide; global peace promises collective well-being.

82. Pakistan is vitally concerned about the success of this session. As a non-aligned and non-nuclear-weapon State, Pakistan's security rests ultimately in the achievement of global and regional disarmament and the establishment of a durable structure of international peace and security.

83. The promotion of disarmament is inextricably related to the achievement of a climate of mutual trust and confidence among States, especially among the major Powers. During the last decade the period of super-Power détente witnessed some limited steps in the direction of arms control, if not disarmament. The process of détente, however, broke down entirely after the military intervention by one of the super-Powers in Afghanistan, and this provided the impetus for a new spiral in the arms race.

84. The situation in Afghanistan is not the only reason for the recent aggravation of the international political climate. Pakistan hopes that the unfortunate confrontation in the South Atlantic will be resolved urgently without further recourse to the use of force and through the available mechanisms of negotiation. Even more, the ongoing and brazen Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the Palestinian people demonstrates vividly that principles are all too often set aside in the pursuit of national ambition, domination and territorial expansion. The Israeli invader must be compelled to vacate this aggression. The goal of disarmament will remain chimerical unless the States Members of the United Nations abide strictly by the central obligations they have assumed under the Charter, that is, to refrain from the use or threat of force and to settle their disputes through peaceful means.

85. The adverse international circumstances and the consequent postures of the great Powers have prevented any progress towards the disarmament measures unanimously adopted at the first special session devoted to disarmament. The most powerful States have proved unwilling to sacrifice their overwhelming military advantage in the interest of security through disarmament. Consequently the arms race is becoming truly global and immensely more dangerous in character. In the circumstances, we consider it imperative to achieve agreement at this session on a comprehensive programme for disar-

mament which would promote a global and integrated process of halting and reversing the arms race in a manner that ensures security for all States at every stage.

86. Pakistan participated actively in the elaboration of the comprehensive programme in the Committee on Disarmament. We believe that the programme should provide for specific measures designed to achieve the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament in clearly defined stages. If the programme is to be a realistic framework for negotiations it must indicate, besides the broad sequence of the disarmament measures to be negotiated, the approximate period within which these measures should be implemented. We consider that the end of the present millenium is a politically feasible and symbolically important date for the implementation of the comprehensive programme. Finally, the comprehensive programme for disarmament must be both a programme of action and a commitment to act. This commitment must be as binding as our procedures will allow.

87. The most urgent goal is to bring the nuclear menace under control. The awful irony about nuclear weapons is that they may deter a deliberate attack by an adversary, but if employed—either in a crisis or through miscalculation—they would destroy the very countries which rely on these weapons for their security. It is evident that the peoples of these countries are no longer prepared to subsidize the suicidal race for the accumulation of nuclear weapons, which are already sufficient to annihilate our civilization several times over. A general consensus has emerged that the largest nuclear arsenals—those of the Soviet Union and of the United States—should be reduced significantly and as speedily as possible. This session should crystallize this consensus into specific objectives to be achieved in a conscious process of nuclear disarmament.

88. Pakistan welcomes the announcement that talks between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear weapons will commence later this month at Geneva. Important proposals have been advanced for these talks by President Reagan and President Brezhnev. One common and encouraging feature of these positions is that both the Soviet Union and the United States are prepared to observe on a reciprocal basis the limitations and restrictions contained in their previous agreements. These agreements freeze the nuclear arms race in important areas. However, it seems essential to hold in abeyance the further qualitative development of nuclear-weapon systems, which may complicate the forthcoming negotiations and make agreement more difficult. Pakistan also shares the view that, in a departure from the past, the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, as well as the ongoing talks on intermediate nuclear forces, will aim at achieving significant reductions in the nuclear arsenals of the two Powers. Given the dangers confronting mankind, it would be tragic indeed if concern over fractional advantages of one side or the other in specific weapons systems or disputes regarding statistics should prevent an early agreement on these central aspects of the nuclear-arms race.

89. The emergence of the dangerous doctrine of limited nuclear war makes it imperative to give early consideration to the problems posed by the so-called tactical or battlefield nuclear weapons, whose use would no doubt precipitate an escalation to a general nuclear exchange. Concern about these mobile and unverifiable weapons systems is not limited to Europe, since they could be employed also in conflicts in other regions of the world and against non-nuclear-weapon States.

90. A most important indication of the commitment of the most advanced nuclear-weapon States to nuclear disarmament would be their agreement to halt forthwith further testing of nuclear weapons. We share the general dismay that a comprehensive test-ban treaty, which was accorded the highest priority, is today even further from realization than at the tenth special session. We look forward to the commencement of concrete negotiations on the subject in the Committee on Disarmament this year, and we hope that these will lead to a treaty which is equitable and acceptable to all States, nuclear and non-nuclear alike.

91. While negotiations on nuclear disarmament are proceeding, the peoples of the world should not continue to live in perpetual fear of a nuclear holocaust. I hope that some political decisions will be taken at this session, especially by the nuclear Powers, to reduce the danger of a nuclear war breaking out through miscalculation or through technical failure. Some suggestions have been made in this context recently, and they deserve serious consideration.

92. Pakistan fully subscribes to the proposition, already endorsed by the General Assembly, that the use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances would constitute a violation of the Charter and a crime against humanity. It remains our hope that sooner rather than later the primordial instinct for self-preservation and the imperative of preserving mankind and our civilization from annihilation will override dependence on nuclear deterrence and lead to an agreement to outlaw the use of nuclear weapons.

93. More than a decade ago the People's Republic of China declared that it would never be the first to use nuclear weapons. At the thirty-sixth session the Soviet Union proposed the adoption by the Assembly of a declaration against their first use.⁴ It is our understanding therefore that the Soviet Union itself is committed not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. We welcome this Soviet position, which, taken together with the declaration made by China, could possibly facilitate a general agreement among the nuclear Powers on this subject.

94. It is a matter of deep regret that negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament over the past four years have not succeeded in producing agreement on the modest and reasonable call by the Assembly at its tenth special session, addressed to the nuclear-weapon States, to conclude effective arrangements to ensure the non-nuclear countries against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The nuclear Powers, with the exception of China, have remained entirely inflexible about contemplating any change in their unilateral declarations, which are designed to preserve their own security concerns while conceding next to nothing to

the legitimate security interests of the non-nuclear-weapon States. The non-aligned and the neutral countries have called on the nuclear-weapon States to review their policies and present revised positions on the question during this special session. There can be no reason to refuse the demand that as a first step the neutral, non-aligned and other developing countries outside the two major military alliances should be provided with legally binding assurances against the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons. We look forward to a positive response from the nuclear-weapon States at this session.

95. The unprecedented and brazen attack launched by Israel last June against the peaceful nuclear facilities of Iraq has added a new and urgent dimension to the nuclear threat confronting the non-aligned and developing countries. The destruction of nuclear facilities can result in effects which are no different from the use of nuclear weapons and should be comprehensively prohibited by an international instrument.

96. In a sense the Israeli attack can be perceived as the inevitable escalation of the campaign of pressure and propaganda that has been waged so insidiously in certain quarters against the development of peaceful nuclear technology by the developing countries. I am glad that there is growing recognition that the resort to coercion is self-defeating and will retard rather than promote the attainment of the legitimate goal of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In accordance with the decision of the tenth special session, urgent efforts should be made to develop an international consensus on this issue which responds positively to the legitimate security concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon States and their right to free and unhindered access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. I hope that an understanding along these lines can be achieved at this session. It could be further elaborated at the United Nations conference on nuclear energy next year.

97. Pakistan is committed to the objective of nuclear non-proliferation. I should like to avail myself of this solemn occasion to reaffirm that Pakistan will not develop or acquire nuclear weapons. We have suggested several approaches towards the objective of keeping South Asia free of nuclear weapons, including the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region.

98. Pakistan is prepared to explore with its neighbours in South Asia any other means to ensure nuclear non-proliferation. We would welcome fresh ideas from the other States of the region in order to achieve an early harmonization of views on the subject.

99. It is generally acknowledged that progress towards nuclear disarmament is organically related to efforts designed to curb other weapons of mass destruction, as well as conventional armaments. The persistent reports regarding the use of chemical weapons in some parts of the world and the decisions to modernize existing arsenals of such weapons have added urgency to the efforts to prohibit chemical weapons comprehensively. Further delay in the negotiations may add the spectre of general chemical warfare to the nuclear shadow which hangs over mankind.

100. This session must initiate more concerted efforts to redress the problem posed by the accumulation of increasingly sophisticated conventional weapons, which are responsible for the overwhelmingly greater part of the expenditure on the global arms race. It is these weapons which are the primary threat to small and medium-sized States.

101. The imperative need to achieve balanced arms reductions in Europe is well established. Success in this task could also contribute to progress in nuclear disarmament by the super-Powers and their allies. It is our hope that the most recent proposals advanced by President Reagan for the Vienna talks signify that more determined efforts will be made to diminish the alarming concentration of armed forces in central Europe.

102. In many parts of the third world the growing accumulation of armaments is often the consequence of the persistence of international disputes and tensions created by the political and military competition between the great Powers. Pakistan believes that the limitation and reduction of conventional armed forces needs to be promoted principally in the context of each region. The co-operation of the major Powers would contribute to the achievement of this objective.

103. This special session could make a singular contribution to facilitating the process of conventional disarmament if it could achieve agreement on the basic principles which should guide negotiations in this field. Among the guidelines for this I should like to mention the following: recognition of the right of each State to acquire the necessary means to safeguard its security; the necessity of maintaining an acceptable military ratio of war potential, especially in regions of tension; the need for reduction of armament levels in the regional context, consistent with the principle of the undiminished security of States; and the creation of confidence-building measures pending conventional disarmament in various regions of the world.

104. The resolution of international disputes and the reduction of tensions is indispensable for the realization of the goals of disarmament. Unfortunately, the entire region in which we are situated is today the scene of turbulence and strife. Pakistan has joined

every endeavour to bring peace and tranquillity to the area. We share the aspirations of the countries of the Indian Ocean region for the establishment of a zone of peace. The President of Pakistan has been actively engaged in the mediation efforts of the Organization of the Islamic Conference to resolve the tragic conflict between Iran and Iraq. Pakistan has been seeking sincerely a political settlement of the situation in Afghanistan consistent with the resolutions of the United Nations. We have co-operated throughout with the Secretary-General in his efforts towards that end. We look forward, in a constructive spirit, to the indirect talks on Afghanistan through the intermediary of the Secretary-General, beginning at Geneva on 16 June.

105. The creation of a climate of peace and mutual confidence among the States of South Asia is indispensable for the progress and well-being of their peoples. My Government is gratified at the positive response from India to the proposal for an agreement on renunciation of the use of force. Official talks between the two countries are to be resumed in the near future. Success in this endeavour will usher in a new era of peace and amity between Pakistan and India.

106. Four years ago, the Assembly succinctly posed the central issue which confronts us: "Mankind is confronted with a choice: . . . proceed to disarmament or face annihilation." [*Resolution S-10/2, para. 18.*] Let us, at this session, make the choice for survival.

107. May Almighty Allah provide us with the wisdom to make this choice decisively and irrevocably.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.

NOTES

¹ A/34/542, annex, para. 25.

² A/37/333.

³ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.1, para. 173.

⁴ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Annexes*, agenda items 39 to 56, 128 and 135, document A/36/241.