



*President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).*

**AGENDA ITEM 8**

**General debate (*continued*)**

1. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker this morning in the general debate is the Prime Minister of the Socialist Republic of Romania. I have great pleasure in welcoming His Excellency Mr. Manea Manescu and in inviting him to address the General Assembly.

2. Mr. MANESCU (Romania)<sup>1</sup>: I have the pleasant duty of conveying the friendly greetings of the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, to you, Mr. President, and to the representatives of Member States of the United Nations. President Ceausescu gives expression to the aspirations of the whole Romanian people—and those aspirations are shared by all peace-loving peoples, who are concerned about the destiny of mankind—in regarding this special session of the General Assembly, the first in the United Nations' history to be devoted exclusively to disarmament, as being one of great importance. I have the honour of conveying President Ceausescu's good wishes for the success of the special session, whose purpose is to open up constructive and fruitful prospects in the field of disarmament and to make possible a definite step forward towards the attainment of this vital goal of all mankind.

3. The achievement of disarmament is a constant preoccupation in the foreign policy of socialist Romania. The building of a world without weapons and without war occupies a central place in the socio-political thinking and activity of President Ceausescu, and constitutes a fundamental element in his intensive and remarkable activity in world affairs. As far back as eight years ago, in his speech at the commemorative session of the General Assembly, the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania said:

“... we believe that it is both imperative and urgent for the United Nations and all States to take most resolute action to achieve general disarmament and, first and foremost, nuclear disarmament.

“The United Nations, the leaders of all States and all statesmen bear a very heavy responsibility towards mankind, towards the future of human civilization, to free

the world from the burden of armaments and the nightmare of an atomic war.”<sup>2</sup>

4. This consistent attitude and constant concern was given practical expression in 1975, when, on the initiative of President Ceausescu, the document entitled “The position of Romania on the problems of disarmament, and particularly nuclear disarmament, and the establishment of lasting world peace”<sup>3</sup> was presented at the United Nations. That document contains a set of concrete and realistic measures for progressing towards disarmament.

5. In that document Romania declared from the very beginning that it was in favour of convening a session of the General Assembly devoted solely to disarmament, considering it to be legitimate and necessary that the most pressing and acute problem of international life should be directly debated in the most comprehensive forum of the nations of the world. We attach great importance to the consensus achieved at the initiative of the non-aligned countries with respect to the convening of this special session.

6. The Socialist Republic of Romania's outstanding attention to and interest in the debates of this session have been expressed in a special decision of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party which includes a number of concrete proposals aimed at establishing sets of principles and at making it possible to proceed to effective disarmament measures. The Romanian people, like all peoples of the world, are hopeful that finally, through the endeavours of all the participants, it will be possible to agree upon a comprehensive document containing generally acceptable measures which correspond to the major imperative, namely, the achievement of disarmament and, in particular, of nuclear disarmament.

7. The attachment of Socialist Romania to the cause of disarmament stems from the very nature of its social system and from the basic tasks of its activity in world affairs. While building a new society and fulfilling large-scale programmes of socio-economic development, the Romanian people are vitally interested in the establishment of favourable international conditions for this eminently peaceful work, in the establishment of a climate of security and co-operation. Our philosophy of life expresses the ideals of the Romanian people to live in a world without arms and without wars, a world of peace and friendship among all nations.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Manescu spoke in Romanian. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1872nd meeting, paras. 101 and 102.

<sup>3</sup> Document A/C.1/1066, dated 30 October 1975.

8. In keeping with these objectives, Romania is strengthening the ties of friendship and multifaceted collaboration with all socialist countries. It is intensifying its manifold links with the developing States and with the non-aligned countries is expanding its relations of co-operation with the capitalist countries and with all States of the world, regardless of their social systems, in a spirit of peaceful co-existence, and is actively participating in the international division of labour and in the world exchange of material and spiritual values.

9. The Socialist Republic of Romania consistently bases its relations with other States and its entire foreign policy on the principles of full equality of rights, national independence and sovereignty, non-interference in domestic affairs of other States, activity for mutual advantage, observance of territorial integrity, the non-use of force and of the threat of force, and the assertion of every people's sacred and inalienable right to develop independently according to its own will and aspirations. In the view of Romania, the promotion and observance of these principles, which are being expressed ever more strongly in world affairs, represent the *sine qua non* prerequisite for new relationships of trust and peaceful collaboration among all nations.

10. Undoubtedly, in the world today great social and national changes are taking place with wide-ranging shifts in favour of peace and progress. A characteristic feature of present international life is the ever-stronger assertion of the will of peoples to do away with the old imperialist, colonialist and neo-colonialist policy of domination and diktat; to secure and consolidate their national independence and sovereignty; to be masters of their own destinies and resources; and to develop freely and to co-operate in conditions of security. The forces declaring themselves in favour of a new and democratic international policy of equality and mutual respect among States are growing in number. Accordingly, in recent years we have witnessed a trend towards a course of détente and co-operation, although it has been of a limited and fragile character.

11. At the same time, we notice that the policy of dividing the world into spheres of influence and domination is becoming intensified, thus causing the negative phenomena in international life to become stronger. The economic, political, social and national contradictions, and the economic disparities among States are growing; the crisis of raw materials and energy, the monetary and financial crisis, and the inflationary phenomena, all of which generate tension and international instability, are becoming ever more acute.

12. We must note with anxiety that lately the international situation has deteriorated. New zones of conflict have appeared, the flames of new local wars have broken out, political and economic pressures upon other States are being resorted to, and the practice of military intervention is being revived. Problems that have been left unsettled by the long colonial domination and controversial issues of a territorial or national nature are being used to increase mistrust and to aggravate relations among nations and as pretexts for interference and the unleashing of armed confrontations.

13. Such developments, which entail grave dangers for the destiny of mankind, including the danger of a new world war, are manifestations of the old imperialist policy of force, diktat and domination, which have been repudiated by the peoples. The rivalries between various States and military groupings, the strategy of redividing the world, with the attributes of political, military and economic interference, create serious dangers for the security of people and pollute the political climate and international life as a whole. Weapons are used as instruments for the perpetuation of relations between States based upon "the law of force", instead of building a world in which "the force of law" should prevail and in which the principles of equality and international legality would be applied, in accordance with the ardent aspirations of all mankind for peace and justice and for freedom and progress. It is crystal clear that in order to build a world without arms and without wars and in order to advance along the path of disarmament, it is necessary to put an end to the imperialist, colonialist and neo-colonialist policy, the policy of spheres of influence and domination, and to observe the right of each nation to develop freely and to organize its life in keeping with its own aspirations.

14. We consider that the problems confronting mankind today require the participation in international life of all countries, and primarily the small and medium-sized countries, the developing countries and the non-aligned countries, which are directly concerned with the abolition of the imperialist policy and with the observance of the right of every people to national independence and sovereignty.

15. Of the utmost importance for securing and consolidating peace are the final liquidation of the remnants of colonialism and neo-colonialism, the abolition of the policy of racism and *apartheid*, the liberation of the peoples in Rhodesia and Namibia and of the majority population in South Africa, and the self-determination and independent development of the peoples of those countries and, indeed, of all peoples in the world.

16. At the same time, on the basis of the facts of international life, the Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania is convinced that everything possible should be done to create conditions for real disarmament and that urgent steps should be taken with greater determination and energy for the political settlement through negotiations of all existing conflicts.

17. In the view of the Romanian Government, disarmament and the peaceful settlement of international conflicts are interrelated and condition each other. The continuance of armed conflicts, hotbeds of tension and war represents a serious obstacle to disarmament.

18. Within this context, Romania deems it necessary that efforts for a political solution to the situation in Cyprus should be intensified on the basis of respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country, while the peaceful coexistence of the two communities and the economic and social advancement of Cyprus are secured.

19. Romania resolutely declares itself for the immediate resolution of the conflict in the Middle East and the establishment of a just and lasting peace on the basis of Israel's withdrawal from the Arab territories occupied during the 1967 war, the observance of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including its right to create its own independent State, and the securing of the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of all States in the region.

20. We are deeply concerned about the worsening relations among various States of Africa and about foreign military intervention and interference in their internal affairs, which endanger the independence of the peoples of those States and open the way for new forms of colonial domination. The vital interests of the African countries and their independent development require that everything possible be done in order to solve their disputes by negotiation and exclude any foreign intervention. We attach particular importance to the strengthening of unity and solidarity among the African countries, since it is a fundamental prerequisite for the consolidation of their national sovereignty and of their political and economic independence, for the securing of their independent socio-economic advancement and for the establishment of a climate of peace, good-neighbourliness, understanding, collaboration and friendship to the benefit of all African peoples and of international security and co-operation.

21. The Socialist Republic of Romania is determined to militate unflinchingly for the political resolution through negotiations of all hotbeds of tension and war, whose perpetuation leads to the intensification and expansion of conventional and nuclear weapons and increases the danger of a new world war. We believe that the peaceful settlement of controversial issues among States through political negotiations in a spirit of mutual respect and in keeping with the basic principles of international relations is an essential requirement for the creation of favourable conditions for the adoption of disarmament measures.

22. In the spirit of the high historic responsibility devolving upon us all, the Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania strongly emphasizes that the continuation and acceleration of the arms race and the refinement of military technologies have nowadays reached an unprecedented degree of intensity and are undermining mankind's security and the right to peace and to life—a fundamental right of all peoples.

23. Huge sums, reaching the level of \$400 thousand million annually, extensive material and human resources and the remarkable potential of the technical-scientific revolution are being diverted from the purposes of achieving social prosperity and squandered on the creation of destructive means that jeopardize mankind's very existence to an ever greater degree.

24. The tremendous proportions of the arms race are giving rise to serious troubles in the world economy; they affect the rate of economic growth of all States whatever their social régime or size; they cause stagnation and even recession in the economic development of various coun-

tries; they bring about disturbances in the balance of payments; and they aggravate and prolong considerably the economic crisis with its entire suite of harmful consequences upon the standard of living of all peoples.

25. It is also common knowledge that the arms race has a negative influence upon the developing countries. In the conditions in which those countries—representing the majority of States in the world—are faced with particularly acute and complex problems, the wasting of huge resources on armaments is hampering their advancement, aggravating their economic situation, leading to the growth of their external debts and generating relations of dependence on the States supplying the weapons. Romania is convinced that the achievement of disarmament would favour the process of building a new international economic order that would secure the establishment of new relations of fair co-operation among all States and that would stimulate the development of less developed countries and the progress of mankind as a whole.

26. Undoubtedly, in circumstances where the danger of aggression continues to exist, the concern of States to ensure their national security is natural. As long as disarmament measures are not implemented, each State has the duty and obligation towards its own people to secure the necessary capacity for self-defence. However, this cannot mean the achievement of a so-called military balance through competition in armaments, which bears in itself the risk of a world cataclysm. Romania considers that, in order to achieve real progress in disarmament and to create conditions of security for all States, it is essential to seek the attainment of a balance through the continuous reduction and lowering of the armaments ceiling through international co-operation and détente.

27. That is why the Socialist Republic of Romania emphasizes that everything possible should be done to halt the escalating arms race, as a vital imperative for international peace and security, for human progress and for the flourishing of civilization.

28. In spite of the urgent need to move without delay to the achievement of disarmament and although many resolutions have been adopted by the United Nations and lengthy negotiations have taken place within the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, the results obtained so far cannot be appraised as satisfactory. They are not of a nature to slow down the arms race; and the arsenals of States have not diminished; on the contrary, they have grown considerably with ever more destructive weapons. At the same time, political and procedural difficulties hamper the direct participation on an equal footing of all States in disarmament negotiations.

29. That is why a radical change is required in the manner in which disarmament problems are approached, with a view to breaking the deadlock and directing negotiations towards concrete results. The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that this special session of the General Assembly can play an important role in this respect and open up new prospects for agreement on guidelines of principle, the programme of measures and the negotiating machinery

that should provide effective momentum towards the achievement of disarmament.

30. On the basis of the realistic understanding that disarmament cannot be achieved overnight, Romania has in mind, first of all, a set of measures of immediate applicability and of a transitory nature capable of generating and developing the process of curbing the arms race, promoting military disengagement, improving the international climate and strengthening international trust. Conditions would thus be created for moving on to the gradual application of measures of increasingly substantial reduction of armaments, in order to attain the final objective, general disarmament, and above all nuclear disarmament.

31. To this end, Romania makes the following proposals.

32. First, as an initial step all participating States should agree to freeze military expenditure, military forces and armaments at the 1978 level, while undertaking subsequently, beginning perhaps as early as 1979, to move on to their gradual reduction. In the first stage, up to 1985, the reduction should be between 10 per cent and 15 per cent of the present levels and should cover all components of the armed forces—that is, land, sea and air forces—and all categories of weapons, both conventional and nuclear.

33. In view of the role and responsibilities devolving upon the larger States in international life and taking into account the fact that they have at their disposal the biggest military forces and quantities of armaments and the largest share of funds for armaments, it is necessary that the measures concerning freezing and reducing military budgets and armaments start with those States. This would undoubtedly make a decisive contribution to curbing the arms race, stimulate the general process of disarmament and benefit international détente and co-operation.

34. The sums of money saved as a result of the measures should be used for peaceful purposes. Romania proposes that part of them should be allocated by each State for the development of its own economy, social activities and raising the standard of living of its own people. The rest should be deposited in a United Nations fund for assistance to the developing countries, primarily those with an annual *per capita* income of \$500 to \$600, in order to speed up their economic and social development. In this way the disarmament process would stimulate the economic progress of all States, including those that are economically developed; it would make it possible to raise the living standard of all peoples; it would be linked from the beginning to the solution of the acute social problems of the broad masses of people in all States and to the elimination of the extremely grave phenomenon of underdevelopment which affects a great part of mankind.

35. Secondly, another group of measures proposed by Romania relates to military disengagement and the reduction of the danger of confrontations among States. Within this framework, we propose that all States should undertake first not to station new troops and armaments in the territories of other States, and then to move on to the gradual reduction of existing military forces and their de-

mobilization, ensuring the withdrawal of all foreign troops within the limits of national frontiers and the liquidation of military bases in the territories of other countries.

36. We propose, as important measures of military disengagement, the establishment of demilitarized security zones for a distance of 15 kilometres to 20 kilometres from national frontiers, a firm undertaking by all States to give notification of troop movements and big military manoeuvres, and the renunciation of military manoeuvres, particularly multinational ones, in the vicinity of the frontiers of other States.

37. Thirdly, Romania is of the opinion that in order to secure détente and peace in the world it is necessary to abolish the division of the world into military blocs. In order to attain this goal, the Romanian Government proposes for the present stage that member States of the various military alliances undertake not to admit new members, not to increase military forces and armaments above the levels of the current year and gradually to reduce the activities of military blocs. In this way the conditions would be created for moving on to negotiations concerning the simultaneous dissolution of the military blocs, including NATO and the Warsaw Treaty countries.

38. Fourthly, an important objective of the measures proposed by Romania is disarmament in Europe and, to this end, military disengagement in that continent, without which there can be neither security nor peace. The fact cannot be ignored that it is in Europe, where the two world wars were unleashed, that there is the greatest concentration of troops and armaments, both conventional and nuclear, and that it is there that the most powerful military blocs face each other. In order to correct that state of affairs, and taking into account the unsatisfactory results of the recent meeting in Belgrade, Romania considers it necessary that all European States undertake firm commitments regarding the reduction and cessation of military manoeuvres and any demonstrations of force at the frontiers of other countries; and the reduction by 10 per cent to 15 per cent by 1985 of foreign troops and armaments in the territories of other European States, with a simultaneous reduction to the same extent of the national troops of all the countries that participated in the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Foreign military bases, and above all nuclear bases, should be dismantled, and all troops withdrawn behind their national frontiers, so that Europe may become a continent in which there are no longer foreign military forces or installations in the territories of other States. Negotiations should begin on the simultaneous abolition of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, accompanied by measures that guarantee the security and sovereignty of all peoples in Europe and exclude the possibility of surprise attack on any country. An all-European pact should be concluded, to which all States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe should be parties and which would involve a commitment to renounce the use of force or threat of the use of force, thus creating conditions for the protection of every nation from the danger of aggression, foreign interference and pressure.

39. Fifthly, Romania firmly maintains that in the efforts

devoted to disarmament priority should be given to nuclear disarmament—an imperative determined by the great dangers that nuclear weapons entail for the destiny of human civilization. In connexion with this problem, Romania declares itself in favour of the conclusion of an agreement by which the nuclear-weapon States would undertake not to use such weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States, this being an essential requirement in order to ensure the security of the latter; the renunciation by nuclear-weapon States of the placing of new nuclear weapons in the territories of other countries; the cessation of the refinement of nuclear weapons and of nuclear-weapon production; the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for military purposes; the gradual reduction of the stockpiles of nuclear weapons and delivery systems until their complete liquidation; and the undertaking by the States participating in this session of a solemn commitment to move on to the negotiation of an agreement on the total prohibition of nuclear weapons.

40. At the same time we propose a halt in the production of chemical, biological, ecological and radiological weapons, including neutron weapons, and any other weapons of mass destruction, their removal from the military arsenals, the prohibition of their use and the outlawing of such weapons.

41. Sixthly, the Romanian Government also wants to reaffirm on this occasion that the steps towards reducing nuclear armaments should by no means hamper the use by all States of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

42. Starting from the fact that in the epoch of the present technical/scientific revolution the peaceful use of nuclear energy is an important means for rapid economic development, attempts to establish monopolistic régimes on nuclear technologies are unacceptable. These attempts are made under the pretext that the dissemination of such technologies would lead to the proliferation of atomic weapons. By virtue of sovereign equality, all countries have the right to benefit from the most recent achievements of science, including nuclear technology. It is precisely that fact that compels us to underline the need to strengthen collaboration and co-operation among States in the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, and to remove any discriminatory practices and secure the unimpeded access of all countries to scientific and technological achievements.

43. In this respect the Romanian Government proposes the preparation of a concrete programme of action, under the aegis of the International Atomic Energy Agency, concerning international collaboration and co-operation in using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

44. Seventhly, with a view to creating conditions for the achievement of nuclear disarmament, Romania deems it necessary that concrete measures should be agreed upon regarding the creation of zones of peace and international co-operation, free of nuclear armaments. Romania firmly supports the proposals to establish such zones in central Europe, northern Europe, the Mediterranean zone, the Middle East, Africa, and the Indian Ocean, just as it sup-

ported the conclusion of the Treaty banning nuclear weapons in Latin America.<sup>4</sup>

45. We will support any such proposals in the future also, in the belief that the creation of such zones, with the consent of the States concerned and provided that their national sovereignty is respected and their security fully guaranteed, would contribute considerably to the stimulation of good neighbourly relations and fruitful co-operation among States, would continuously reduce the area of dissemination of nuclear weapons on our planet, and would create ever more favourable conditions for nuclear disarmament.

46. In this context the Romanian Government reiterates its proposal to make the Balkans an area of good neighbourliness, peace and broad-based co-operation, without nuclear weapons. That would respond to the interest of all Balkan peoples in peace, collaboration and security; at the same time it would represent a major contribution to the achievement of security in Europe and throughout the world.

47. We particularly emphasize that to our mind the States of the nuclear-weapon-free zones should be given real guarantees by the nuclear-weapon States that never in any circumstances would nuclear arms be used against States belonging to such zones, and that their free access to nuclear technologies for peaceful purposes would be secured.

48. Eighthly, Romania, firmly declaring itself by word and deed for the achievement of disarmament, considers it necessary to underscore the undeniable right of every State to develop in conditions of complete security; to ensure its capacity for defence so long as disarmament has not been achieved; and to enjoy firm guarantees against any interference in its domestic affairs, and against the danger of an armed aggression. All disarmament measures that are agreed upon should guarantee conditions of security for States which should be assured that they will not become the victims of attacks and that their national independence and sovereignty will not be impaired.

49. For that purpose and in order to make sure that countries will not be involved in military conflicts, Romania proposes the conclusion of an international agreement by which all States should undertake to settle any disputes and controversial issues exclusively by peaceful political means through negotiations between the parties concerned. Undoubtedly, the conclusion of such an agreement would have a profound and positive impact upon the world political climate; it would facilitate the rapid extinguishing of hotbeds of war and would create a particularly favourable framework for progress to disarmament measures.

50. In the same context, the Socialist Republic of Romania proposes the setting up of a body for good offices and conciliation, responsible to the General Assembly. Its purpose would be to contribute to the prevention of tensions and of military conflicts, and to help interested States to find solutions based on reconciliation, good neighbourliness and peaceful coexistence.

<sup>4</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 283.



51. Ninthly, in defining, establishing and implementing disarmament measures, the Socialist Republic of Romania attaches the utmost importance to the strengthening of the role of the United Nations.

52. We have in mind here the fact that a problem of such dimensions and implications as disarmament, and first of all nuclear disarmament, in which all States are vitally interested, cannot be resolved unilaterally, bilaterally or within limited groups of States. In order to reach lasting, fair and generally acceptable solutions it is absolutely necessary that all States should participate in the solving of disarmament problems on a completely equal footing. Every nation is entitled to security and peace. There is a legitimate right of all States to take part in the world effort to settle the problems of disarmament and the United Nations, because of its universal character, offers the most appropriate framework.

53. We consider that the United Nations, through its supreme body—the General Assembly—should systematically analyse activities in the field of disarmament; should define the principles governing negotiations and monitor their observance; should formulate recommendations for deliberative and decision-making bodies and receive periodic reports on their implementation and observance; and should pursue the effective achievement of disarmament and, above all, nuclear disarmament.

54. In this respect, Romania declares itself in favour of convening in the future other sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which would analyse the stage of implementation of the measures to be agreed upon at the present session and would establish new steps along the path to disarmament.

55. We also share the idea of a world conference on disarmament under United Nations auspices, which should meet with the agreement of all States and have as participants representatives of broad political, public and social spheres.

56. At the same time, we think it is necessary to adopt measures for improving the function and enhancing the efficiency of the Geneva Committee on Disarmament with a view to making good the deficiencies in its structure, form and methods of activity which have led to its carrying out the mandate entrusted to it in an unsatisfactory manner. Specifically, we propose the adoption at this session of the General Assembly of recommendations that should ensure that the Committee will focus its activity on the essential problems of disarmament, the democratization of the organization and conduct of its debates, the abolition of the system of co-chairmanship, the participation on an equal footing of all States interested in the negotiations and the open character of debates so that they may be subject to the control of public opinion.

57. Tenthly, the interests of all States in international security require that the implementation of the measures relating to the cessation of the arms race and progress to disarmament shall be carried out under appropriate international control. The object of control, the ways of

exercising it, and its machinery must be established through the agreement of all interested States. We consider that it would be useful for the agreements on military disengagement, the reduction of armaments and the realization of disarmament to include appropriate measures of verification to ensure that the obligations assumed by States are properly fulfilled in good faith and in their entirety.

58. On the basis of those considerations, Romania proposes the setting up of an appropriate international body for disarmament, open to participation by all States, which should function within the United Nations under the direct authority of the General Assembly. We also consider that it would be appropriate for the First Committee of the General Assembly to deal exclusively with the problems of disarmament, an essential component of ensuring international security.

59. The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that, to be fruitful, the debates of the present session of the General Assembly should be held in a businesslike and constructive spirit, with all efforts being focused on the working out of a comprehensive final document containing clear and binding provisions in all of its components—the declaration, the programme of action and the machinery for negotiations. Our session will have to open up a new prospect in the approach to disarmament problems, and to work out clear recommendations aimed at bringing about real progress in disarmament and at establishing the framework of future disarmament negotiations, whose final objective should be the conclusion on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under concrete and effective international control.

60. Since disarmament is the main desire of all peoples in the world, the attention of international public opinion is focused upon the debates of this session. The peoples themselves are the creators of history, of civilization and of the destiny of mankind. That is why we believe it is necessary to act more positively to mobilize world public opinion and advanced political and social forces throughout the world so as to bring about a vigorous general movement towards disarmament.

61. We hope that those responsible, the Governments of all countries, will act with all their energy and perseverance to accomplish genuine steps towards the solution of the disarmament problem. On instructions from the President of Romania, Nicolai Ceausescu, I solemnly declare from this rostrum that Romania will make every effort to contribute to the success of this session, to the achievement of disarmament in accordance with the wishes of all mankind and in the interests of peace throughout the world.

62. Mankind today is at a crossroads. It has wonderful opportunities for progress and prosperity, but at the same time it is threatened by the spectre of the ever-more serious dangers entailed in the continuation of the arms race. That is why we want to state here in the supreme forum of the United Nations, that there is no cause more noble, no cause in whose name nations should be more united, than

that of disarmament—the surest guarantee of peace. By uniting the efforts of States and peoples, let us open up broad prospects for the final removal of weapons and wars from the life of society, and for the building of a world of peace and co-operation, in which the work and the conquests of human genius would serve the welfare and happiness of all the peoples on our planet.

63. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the General Assembly, I thank the Prime Minister of the Socialist Republic of Romania for the very important statement he has just made.

64. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): Mr. President, may I associate my delegation with others which have preceded it in expressing to you the most sincere felicitations and gratification that this historic special session of the General Assembly, addressed exclusively to the paramount issue of disarmament, is being conducted under your wise and experienced leadership. The tribute is addressed to you personally, President Lazar Mojsov, and to the friendly Government of Yugoslavia, whose contributions to peace, justice and a rational international order under the great leadership of President Tito have been persistent and monumental. I feel in duty bound to pay the highest tribute to the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, for his exertions and for all his efforts to make this historic session a success.

65. Unless disarmament is dealt with in historical perspective with a coherent and integrated approach and within the framework of life as a whole, human nature in its complexity and the political, social and economic dimensions which it inherently reflects, the debate will at worst come to naught and at best produce a largely cosmetic change with minimal impact upon the movement towards self-extinction of the only planet in the universe where so far scientists have discovered that conditions are amenable to the existence of life as we know it. Statesmen world-wide must be profoundly conscious of this unique phenomenon and make it the overriding consideration in their decision-making.

66. The First World War, with its savage and ferocious trench warfare, was proclaimed by the then great statesmen as the war to end all wars. With hindsight, that proved to be little more than wishful thinking.

*Mrs. Gbujama (Sierra Leone), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

67. A mere two decades later, an even more ferocious war erupted, leading to the mass killings of 60 to 70 million souls. Again the slogans were, on the one side, "to create a new order to last for 1,000 years" and, on the other side, "to make the world safe for democracy and humanity". If we have not had a third global war as yet, it is not because of any lack of slogans, moral compunction or remorse. It is largely because a third global war would indeed fulfil the proclamations of the first World War, namely, that it would be the war to end all wars, because it would end existence and livable life on this small planet, and would consequently prevent the human animal from indulging in the atrocious game of war.

68. The fact is that mankind has for the first time in recorded history become super—not in ethics, morality or humanity—but in its ability, through mastering and manipulating the latent forces of physical nature to a sufficient degree to inflict upon itself the supreme act of total self-extermination. As a human being, entrusted by the Creator with the unique privilege of developing and enriching human life, he has remained, in the ethical scale, an infantile delinquent. Neither moral imperatives nor pure reason seem to ensure meaningful constraints upon his behaviour.

69. With all due respect to the powers that be—and they are basically a handful—I feel compellingly saddened when I read that the question of disarmament is still being negotiated in terms of X number of intercontinental ballistic missiles, mobile versus silo-launched missiles, long-range bombers, cruise missiles, nuclear submarines, neutron bombs, quantities and magnitude of payloads of destruction and so on and so forth.

70. What difference would it make if the planet, or mankind for that matter, were brought to extinction by 500, 2,000 or 5,000 missiles?

71. I am sure that many in this prestigious high-level gathering will be raising their eyebrows at what seems a theoretical and unrealistic theme. They have agonized for years, if not decades, in their painstaking search for a viable solution. Massive retaliation, deterrence, flexible response, sufficiency, equilibrium, equivalence, test-ban treaties, underground, over-ground, non-proliferation, the stratosphere and who knows what comes next.

72. Einstein was asked a quarter of a century ago what he thought would be the level of armaments in a third world war. His reply was: "I cannot tell what level it would be for a third world war, but I can tell you what armaments would be used in a fourth world war: sharpened rock-stone and sticks!"

73. Man's curiosity and yearning to discover the unknown is limitless, as indeed it should be. This is what the mind is endowed to perform. The answer of statesmen so far has been to keep up with new situations as they arise, in concrete terms which are viable and temporarily manageable.

74. Their approach has averted a nuclear holocaust, a micro-description of which makes hair-raising reading in the illustrated booklet by Mr. Takeshi Araki, the man of Hiroshima, entitled "Unforgettable Fire". But nonetheless what seems theoretical sermonizing reflects the real, specific dichotomy and the fate of humanity hinges on the solution of the problem.

75. No matter what may be the considered judgements of distinguished statesmen and experts in halting the arms race—gradual disarmament, non-proliferation and eventual total disarmament—I am certain of one thing: that they share with my delegation—indeed with all distinguished delegations—a traumatic concern for the survival of this planet and humanity. Indeed, the big Powers appre-

hensions are, I presume, the more formidable because they have a greater inside knowledge of what the capabilities of the arsenals of destruction are and will be, than representatives of small and medium countries. The genie is irreversibly out of the bottle; our task is to work out how best to harness its awesome power to life-sustaining rather than life-destroying purposes.

76. There are certain basic instincts in mankind which have been the fountainhead of every good thing that mankind has achieved throughout history; and there are equally pernicious instincts which have been the cause of all human calamities and sufferings. I do not share the fear that these instincts are immutable and intractable, although the necessary mutations do not take place overnight, nor do they occur haphazardly and without articulate and persistent effort and awareness. They are pivotal to the paramount issues of war and peace, disarmament or a continuance of the arms race. Let us examine some of them.

77. First, greed is a human instinct which nuclear warfare has rendered obsolete and meaningless, because there can be no bounty or booty in an extinct world. In national societies, laws curb the excesses of greed. In the international arena that must inescapably be done by the negotiating forums which are constantly in progress amongst developed countries, and are already under way in the developing world, with a view to creating a new international economic order, hopefully more just and equitable. It is perfectly feasible to contain and eliminate greed, as distinct from legitimate rewards, as one of the instinctive causes of war.

78. Second is the penchant for power and dominance, which nuclear war has likewise rendered unrewarding for there can be no victor or vanquished after the deluge. Such an instinct can be channelled into peaceful and gregarious competition, and egos can and should be deflated to avert disaster. Greatness is in humility and not in arrogance.

79. Thirdly, fear is a very potent and real instinct and is probably one of the main obstacles which has impeded and continues to impede disarmament. But fear can sometimes reach neurotic proportions and be inflated to the extent of becoming ludicrous. At any rate, a gradual, calculated and rational appraisal of matters relating to armaments, under adequate national and international supervision, can allay and eventually erase hysterical fears.

80. Fourthly, the search for justice, or the genuine feeling of flagrant injustice, has always been one of the major causes of war. The recognition of the necessity of ethics as conducive to peace is perhaps too far-fetched for the near future as a guarantee of peace. Earlier philosophers recognized that peace will only come about when international law is powerful enough to create a system of international arbitration and to ensure that its judgement is binding in all conflicts between two or more nations. Its authority would be based entirely on the ever-increasing respect with which mankind would come—for purely practical reasons—to regard the law as such. It should be the natural culmination of a system of law, which we now refer to as the interna-

tional order, which will in time perfect itself. Nature will work upon mankind—very gradually and over a lengthy period of time—until the march of history and the sheer horror of war will between them persuade us all to agree to an international covenant to guarantee perpetual peace. How much more pertinent is this analysis and panacea when we find ourselves saddled with the ultimate weapon of nuclear power and acknowledge its implications.

81. The world, in the meantime, has travelled very far indeed in creating the laws, the institutions and the mechanisms to achieve peace, the rule of law and justice. The principles and laws are in the United Nations Charter. The institutions are the various organs of the United Nations, primarily the General Assembly, the moral conscience of mankind and its resolutions, translating its conscience and adjudication into concrete and unmistakable resolutions. And last, but perhaps most important, is the Security Council, the highest and most competent law-enforcement mechanism, which has jurisdiction to ensure perpetual peace with justice and the rule of law. It would be a fatal disservice to mankind and to its survival if the authority of the General Assembly and of the Security Council were to be subverted, undermined and flouted with impunity. The guidelines, the principles and the mechanisms are all here within the United Nations. Repudiation of them or permissiveness regarding compliance with their decisions can only result in a relapse to what Hobbs described as a war of all against all, which would be a return to the jungle.

82. This special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament cannot, nor is it expected to, achieve in five weeks of debate either the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament or the short-term measures of halting and reversing the arms race. But its objective, apart from any concrete steps that might be agreed upon, is to bring to the surface the deep-seated and latent concern that afflicts us all and to create the momentum for a world-wide movement in the cause of disarmament and a massive grass-roots movement to do something about it. Our deliberations—and all of us are fully aware of this—are not designed either to minimize or to cut across the highly delicate and all-important bilateral and multilateral negotiations that are at present under way to curb the arms race, and to bring about reciprocal and balanced armaments reductions and the renunciation of no less devastating weapons such as those of biological, radiological and chemical warfare. On the contrary, this special session—initially and persistently advocated by the non-aligned countries and others since the early 1960s—is intended to highlight the lamentable fact that the arms race has been accelerating rather than de-escalating and to reinforce all current efforts to reverse this trend. Four hundred thousand millions of dollars have been wasted this year alone on wasteful and destructive armaments, ironically at a time when social and economic stresses and strains in developed and developing countries alike are intensifying and playing havoc with normality and cohesion in societies all over the world. Historically—and this fact cannot be over-emphasized—adventurism has been at the roots of almost all warfare regardless of the masquerade behind which such wars had erupted. The arms race, therefore, will not provide the security that it is supposed to afford. It will in-



evitably create pressure situations where war becomes less onerous in the consciousness of the suffering and the deprived than perpetual misery and injustice. If anything, it is escapism from intolerable realities.

83. In 1932, under the auspices of the League of Nations, disarmament talks were convened, high hopes were raised and peoples were elated. The only difference between those conferences and the current one is that the early ones were guided by the formula of a "balance of power" translated into a question of how many battle-ships, cruisers, tanks and other conventional weapons of that era each side should possess. Today, the concept of a balance of power has lost much of its validity. It has been replaced at present by a "balance of terror", and even that description falls short of adequately describing what mankind faces today: its ability to destroy the world many times over.

84. The only balance that therefore retains any meaningful validity and power of deterrence is that achieved by precluding a first-strike capability that is not countered by the ability to make a response in kind. Technological progress being what it is, however, break-throughs cannot be precluded.

85. The answer then should be a freeze on unilateral technological advances in militarily oriented sciences enforced by legally binding conventions to this effect. The various proposals that have been put forward by statesmen of the world pertaining to monitoring devices, satellite surveillance, the establishment of an advisory panel and institutes to assist the Secretary-General on disarmament issues are all constructive and conducive to a relatively enhanced degree of security or, at least, to the pursuit of security.

86. But such measures, and others suggested in this hall, are negative insurance and palliatives that do not go to the core of the problem. Where, then, should we go from here? In a general debate such as we are conducting, it is time-wasting to enumerate the detailed suggestions so ably prepared by the Preparatory Committee under the wise leadership of Mr. Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina. It would be equally repetitious to sing the praises of the sincere and dedicated efforts and proposals evolved over almost two decades by the movement of the non-aligned countries to which Jordan belongs and is committed. I will therefore try to focus attention on a few salient, but none the less vital, points about which my country feels strongly, in pursuit of disarmament.

87. First, I entirely share the view of the President of France [3rd meeting] that the world is now basically made up of two polarized zones. There is a vast zone that extends over the greater part of the northern hemisphere from America to the Soviet Union via Europe. In this large constellation, the super-Powers and nuclear Powers come face to face, and if a conflict should break out it would devastate mankind. The other zone is, obviously, the rest of the world.

88. Almost all the speakers here have stressed the universality of the ever-growing powder keg of armaments.

They have also, in the best spirit of the United Nations, advocated the participation of non-super-Powers in all discussions pertaining to disarmament. But generous expressions are not always coterminous with practical deeds. They should not absolve the major Powers of the responsibility that devolves upon them towards their own people and to mankind in its entirety. There is little reward in disarming the already relatively sparsely armed small and medium-sized nations, particularly if what little they have is for legitimate self-defence. If the rule of law and justice is respected, that also can be considerably reduced. Law courts can, after all, rule impeccably on the merits of each case, regardless of extraneous considerations. Why cannot the Security Council? It also can meet, if it so wishes, at the level of summitry.

89. Success or failure depends, first and foremost, on the agreement between the super-Powers on such things as a complete nuclear-test ban, a reciprocal yearly reduction in military budgets of, say, from 5 to 10 per cent, a freeze on military-oriented scientific break-throughs, respect for the demands of other regions for a cessation of overt and covert interference to the detriment of the tranquillity of their region, except for purposes of legitimate, honest and friendly competition and co-operation. These regions do not wish to become involved in "cold wars" and spheres of influence. This is what non-alignment is all about. The Security Council should then play the role of arbitrator in any internecine and regional conflicts. But it should act impartially and be guided by the principles of the Charter. Favouritism can be the most destabilizing factor jeopardizing peace.

90. Secondly, there is the question of regional security and nuclear-weapon-free zones. Here again we must recognize that what we describe as regional is really global and can bring about or escalate into global conflagrations. The world has become so interdependent that we should never be complacent about regional conflicts. The hot spots in the world today are the Middle East and the continent of Africa. They seem to be getting hotter and hotter, with no rational advantage to any side.

91. The powers that be have neither solved the elemental, legitimate and inalienable rights of the deprived and the dispossessed, foremost of whom are the suffering Palestine people and the peoples of southern Africa, nor do they seem to realize sufficiently that they might well be, like Sarajevo, the spark which kindles a world conflagration.

92. What is compounding the situation in both areas is that through permissiveness, individual or group, one-sidedness and irresponsibility, nuclear capabilities have been allowed to make their way into Israel and South Africa by the transfer of the most up-to-date technology, fissionable material and a constant flow of expertise. Is it wise, feasible, acceptable or possible that the two countries be allowed to hold entire areas to ransom and flout every rule of international law and ethics, apart from endangering the security of the world in its entirety, while the world watches almost unconcerned? Moreover, should the cradle of civilization, which has given so much to the march of humanity, be the victim of the inferno?

93. The Middle East has been, on the initiative of Iran and Egypt, proposed as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. All the countries of the area have acclaimed this worthy cause with the exception of Israel. Procedures and semantics can in no way deny this fact. It is after all a universal and not a regional concern, and many countries which have the technical know-how have unilaterally renounced the fatal option of acquiring nuclear capabilities, by deeds and not by words, and under appropriate international verification.

94. How much validity remains in the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone if one Member State refuses to accede? The zone will remain a mockery until it does accede, and until the permanent members of the Security Council are willing to provide, in advance, categorical and unequivocal guarantees against nuclear aggression to States which have committed themselves to a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and elsewhere. It is hardly the answer for super-Powers—as I have heard during the debate in this hall—to give solemn pledges that they will not launch nuclear attacks against non-nuclear States. The super-Powers do not need to deploy nuclear capabilities against the much weaker nations. A realistic answer would be a super-Power guarantee that they would not tolerate third parties igniting a fire that could engulf them all.

95. Thirdly, there is the inter-relationship between the monstrous military expenditures and the new international economic order. It should be stressed in the clearest terms that the developing world is not out for a grab, a handout or charity. The proposed conversion from war-time to peace-time allocations—and the current budgets are as near to war-time as can be—is primarily designed to free resources, over a scheduled programme and time-table, for urban renewal, education, health, research for new sources of energy and other worthy causes in developing countries which have suffered for lack of funding. Moreover, in purely economic terms and quite apart from ethical imperatives, a healthy world economy can only be attained if the have-not two-thirds of humanity can be galvanized into becoming a vital part of the mainstream of international economic life. Developed countries cannot continue to sell additional refrigerators to homes already full of them. But they can sell billions of such commodities, if the deprived are enabled to stand on their two strong feet. This is not charity; it is elemental economic common sense.

96. Fourthly, there is the need to strengthen and solidify a peaceful, just and equitable international order. There can be no predictable peace except the permanent peace of the grave, if injustice and the repudiation of the rule of international law, and fomenting the fires of mistrust, are to reign unchallenged. The supra-national Organization, which is the United Nations, can easily discern what is right and what is illicit and act accordingly.

97. But the Member States must act in concert, and in profound recognition of their unity in diversity. Détente must be evolved into constructive and co-operative friendship and not simply stagnate into reluctant coexistence. After all, we do not hail from different planets, but belong to the same human race.

98. My fifth and last point is obviously that everything that we have talked about depends, in the final analysis, on the political will, integrity and rational discernment of statesmen and decision-makers in all countries of the world. We should, therefore, not leave the issue and the "will to survive" to them and to them alone. Some of them may mistakenly believe that by acting hawkishly, they gain greater popularity.

99. A week ago I had the pleasure of receiving a Japanese national delegation of non-governmental organizations, which informed me that they had already received the signatures of more than 17 million people for the outlawing of nuclear arms. I suggested that if their national organization were to establish international branches in every village, town and city in the world, they would get 3,000 million spontaneous signatures. Such grass-roots movement would indicate to all politicians and statesmen how their people feel, including their own children, about survival.

100. As a child from Jerusalem, where prophecies and legends persist from generation to generation, I remember the elders saying: the world will last its first thousand years, but not its second thousand. Without sounding gloomy, and unless the present trend towards disarmament is fundamentally altered, I feel, as of now, that the chances of survival through the second millennium are, optimistically, 50 per cent. Legend or prophesy, this is the painful picture. Let our present efforts prove them both wrong.

101. I would have liked to end my statement right here. I had intended it to be dedicated to the paramount issue of ultimate and complete disarmament, which I fervently believe is the only salvation of mankind. Nothing was farther from my thoughts than to blunt the solemnity of this historic session by any diversions.

102. But I am compelled to say a few words which unfortunately blunt my basic approach, by reason of the statement made at the 12th meeting by Mr. Herzog before this august Assembly on disarmament.

103. Few people have suffered as much from calculated aggression and its consequences as my people have. Currently they are homeless refugees under every sky, displaced persons and oppressed inhabitants of the occupied territories. All of them are living—or should I say existing?—in the dark alleys of the shadow of death and psychological torture, not knowing what tomorrow will bring, and in constant fear of the now all too familiar cycle of aggression and displacement, generally once every decade. They have no rights, no hope and no future, and that is even more true of their offspring. Their lands, holy shrines, lives and human heritage are openly and flagrantly confiscated or forfeited at will or whim. It is a situation which hardly has any parallels in the whole world.

104. All reputable strategic studies—and these have been boastfully verified by the Israelis themselves—prove that Israel's armaments industry, quite apart from its nuclear activities, has reached a point where it now ac-

counts for perhaps the major item in the country's export inventory. In figures it ranges between \$500 million and \$1,000 million. I do not think I need elaborate on what is universally known.

105. Listening to Mr. Herzog enumerate the awe-inspiring figures of Arab armaments, whose level he claims already exceeds that of the NATO countries and will soon overtake that of the Warsaw Treaty countries, I felt deep compassion for the two great alliances. I also said to myself that it must have sent a chill down their spines, a chill which should impel them to convene emergency meetings in order to discuss the ominous revelations. I even thought that, better still, the two giants should, for the moment, forget their concern about each other and, perhaps, work out a mutual defence agreement to withstand the formidable Arab threat. However, I thought that, in order to avoid turning friends into enemies, it would be more appropriate and more statesmanlike for me, on my own behalf and on behalf of the neighbours of Israel, to whom Mr. Herzog referred, to use this occasion to make a solemn offer to the NATO allies and the Warsaw Treaty countries of a non-aggression pact with each of them.

106. If they accepted our offer in good faith—and there would be no reason why they should not—it might allay their fears and enable their leaders to sleep more easily. How absurd can one be? Are there no limits to unreason? Or does Mr. Herzog think that the United Nations is an assembly of immature kids?

107. When, a little while ago, thousands of Lebanese and Palestinian women and children, neighbours of Israel, were put into an inferno by F-15s, cluster bombs, napalm and other weapons of destruction, they suffered their crucifixion with bare hands, bare chests and innocent faces. There was not even a child's kite to defend them.

108. Let me tell Mr. Herzog that if only Israel, which is now 10 times its original size, reversed its colonialist policy of aggrandizement, by withdrawing from the occupied territories and restoring to the Palestinian people their legitimate rights, the Arab countries would be more than happy to settle for nothing more than the rifles, revolvers and tear gas necessary for internal security and policing. Laughing gas might be better than tear gas because the crowds would go home in a jovial mood instead of weeping. We need every cent for the betterment of the quality of life of our people. We do not need any lectures on this score. Mr. Herzog knows very well that, despite their crushing defence burden, Israel's immediate neighbours have, on a *per capita* basis, one of the highest standards of education in the world. It is at least equal to—if not higher than—that of Israel. Besides, we educate our people; we do not import them ready-made. I know for certain that this is true of the Palestinian people, as well as of the people of Jordan, a country which started almost from scratch and has borne additional brotherly responsibility for the Palestinian refugees from Palestine. Jordan's outlay in this field for the year 1976-1977 alone was \$27 million. That figure may be found in the most recent report of the Commissioner-General for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees in the Near East.

109. This debate is not an exercise in sabre-rattling or boasting. It is an historic occasion for seeking ways and means of saving the world from extinction by bringing about disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, and by creating a fair, just and equitable international order. Let us keep the debate within those confines.

110. Mr. GYEE (Burma): We are assembled here once again under the presidency of Mr. Mojsov, this time to address ourselves to the problem of the continuing arms race and to put nations on the path to general and complete disarmament under effective international control. We are particularly reassured to have the benefit of Mr. Mojsov's wisdom and experience in the guidance of our historic deliberations. The delegation of Burma welcomes the convening of the special session devoted to disarmament as timely and relevant, coming, as it does, at a most crucial phase in the nuclear era in which we live.

111. Since its inception the United Nations has been seized of the central question of disarmament. This follows logically from the fact that the primary task of the Organization is to maintain international peace and security. There is no nation that does not share the view that the on-going arms race is a constant threat to international peace and security. The history of disarmament negotiations is not encouraging. It has taught us how difficult it will be to attain genuine disarmament, and has made us realize how great an effort will be needed in the future to surmount the obstacles to our efforts.

112. It is common knowledge that the limited agreements which have been reached so far are in the nature of partial measures for the control and limitation of armaments in environments where weapons do not yet exist, environments such as outer space, the moon, the sea-bed and the ocean floor. In other words, these measures have not resulted in an actual reduction of arms. We have no desire to ignore or belittle their importance in reducing the dangers of war, but the inescapable fact is that these approaches have failed to restrain the nuclear arms race, or to prevent the spread of nuclear technology for producing weapons. The world is also fast becoming militarized as a result of the widening scope of the international arms trade. In the ensuing situation efforts at disarmament negotiations fail to keep pace with the development of military technology.

113. As we have often stated, the armaments race has become one of the greatest scourges of mankind. Failure at this juncture to act wisely and effectively to halt and reverse it is bound to confront the world with an irreversible reality.

114. The General Assembly at the present special session has an eminent role to play, not only in pondering over past efforts in the disarmament negotiations but also in looking forward to the future. In identifying issues and formulating principles, it is essential to clarify divergent positions in order to harmonize them and to work out realistic and practical measures acceptable to all. It is imperative that there be a definite positive step forward, if not a breakthrough. We hold that the United Nations, as the most representative and universal forum of today, should

be brought into closer association with any new formulation of principles and mechanisms being devised for disarmament. Only thus can the over-all responsibility of the United Nations in the disarmament sphere be upheld and agreements responsive to the interests of the international community as a whole be achieved. Inasmuch as the peace and security of all nations are affected by the results of disarmament negotiations, the obligation exists for the major Powers involved to keep our Organization accurately informed of the progress of the negotiations being conducted outside its framework.

115. The General Assembly has set itself the task of drawing up a declaration of principles and a programme of action for disarmament to be adopted at this special session. This final document, or documents, would constitute a turning-point in the process of disarmament, should it achieve universal acceptance by an unequivocal and clear consensus. The ominous implications of nuclear weapons continue to impinge upon our lives and the question of nuclear disarmament remains a matter of the highest priority. In this context, we cannot fail to stress the principle of the special responsibility of the nuclear Powers to carry out measures for nuclear disarmament and to refrain from the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. Furthermore, the principles we prescribe would also have to be marked by the balance of mutual responsibility and obligations as between the nuclear-weapon- and non-nuclear-weapon States.

116. We cannot overlook the fact that the problem of disarmament and the questions of economic development are inextricably linked. The increasing arms race has diverted vast physical and human resources that could more profitably be channelled towards much needed economic and social development. It should be clear to all of us that if the world community is to prosper, there must be a release of the resources now being consumed by the burdensome costs of the arms race.

117. At the present special session the Assembly will be examining possible changes in the existing negotiating machinery for disarmament. The future of the multilateral forum of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament will be coming under review. Points of issue concern its structure and co-chairmanship arrangements. In an international body of this nature which has been tackling complex disarmament questions for the last 16 years, there certainly must exist room for improvement to correspond with the requirements of the changing situation.

118. These are in general the views by which the delegation of Burma will be guided on some of the most important aspects of our deliberations.

119. Finally, we earnestly hope that resolute political will and a spirit of accommodation will be displayed by all sides in a measure commensurate with the importance of our tasks ahead.

120. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): I should like first to congratulate the President on his election to the presidency of the tenth special session of

the General Assembly devoted to the question of disarmament.

121. This session has been convened to consider a question which has been debated at great length during preceding sessions. Up to the present there has been a great deal of discussion on disarmament, but no concrete results have been achieved. On the other hand, we have noted that the arms build-up by the imperialist Powers has reached a level unprecedented in the history of mankind and continues to increase rapidly.

122. The tenth special session is being held at a time when the international situation is characterized by many contradictions and major confrontations, at a time when there are complicated and tense situations in the world and new explosive elements are increasing in number.

123. Peoples that struggle to defend or recover freedom and national independence for democracy and social liberation are constantly pitted against their fierce and crafty enemies, from within and from outside, that is, with imperialism, social-imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism and reactionary régimes. The imperialist Powers, first and foremost the two super-Powers, seek by all means to preserve their privileges, to extend their spheres of influence and to establish their domination and hegemony throughout the world. They practise a policy of aggression and expansion everywhere, and unceasingly provoke armed conflicts and hotbeds of war and tension, as in the case of the Middle East, Africa and many other regions of the world.

124. The vast arsenals of weapons accumulated by the imperialist Powers, the feverish arms race and the continual refinement of weaponry are flagrant indications of the dangerous situation which persists in the world and are also a factor which daily aggravates this situation.

125. The two imperialist super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, are at the present time the greatest and the fiercest enemies of peoples, and of genuine peace and security. They have become the greatest military Powers of all time, the main reactionary forces in the world and the principal source of war and aggression. The two imperialist super-Powers are very dangerous, in the same manner and to the same extent, whether they vie with each other or collaborate. American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism base their policy and their strategy on the force of capital and weapons. They have placed at the service of armaments and preparations for war vast human resources, vast economic and financial means and an enormous propaganda machinery.

126. Imperialism and social-imperialism mean war and aggression. In order to wage war and aggression they invent and produce great quantities of weapons of all types, maintain sizeable military forces, build naval and air fleets and constantly improve their military complexes and strengthen the aggressive blocs of NATO and of the Warsaw Treaty countries.

127. We feel that in these circumstances the people must be told the truth. The question of disarmament must be ap-

proached from the standpoint of the interests of peace-loving peoples and countries. It is also important to bring about the failure of any attempts of the imperialist Powers and other adversaries of disarmament to speculate on the aspirations of peoples, sow confusion, conceal their military build-up in order to trouble the minds of peoples and lull their vigilance before using weapons against them.

128. The brandishing of arms, threats, blackmail and demagogic slogans are two sides of the same coin of the policy of the imperialist Powers. The imperialist super-Powers in particular spare no political, diplomatic or propaganda efforts in order to create a deceptive pacifist euphoria. They flaunt everywhere and at all times their time-worn slogans about "détente" and the "miracles of détente", the "limitation and prohibition of nuclear weapons", "European and international security", "the non-use of force" and so forth. All that is in order to sow confusion and camouflage their expansionist and hegemonic designs and aggressive policies, such as those of an "interdependent world" or of "limited sovereignty".

129. We are revolted to hear the imperialist super-Powers claim that they are very concerned, even more concerned than others, at the lack of progress towards disarmament and that they are more anxious than others about saving mankind from the burden and dangers of armaments.

130. The American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists unceasingly claim to be champions of disarmament and pledge aloud that they are prepared to take important steps in that field. They pompously state that thanks to their solicitude, important achievements have been accomplished in efforts to limit armaments and nuclear tests and that better conditions will gradually be established, making it possible to progress more rapidly towards general and complete disarmament in the future.

131. But the facts prove the contrary. Throughout the entire period after the Second World War wars and acts of aggression have never ceased and the weapons used by the aggressors against the peoples of various countries have by far exceeded, quantitatively and qualitatively, those which were used during the years of the last international conflagration. Today the imperialists and the social-imperialists are making unprecedented efforts to turn our entire planet into a destructive arms depot and a battlefield. American and Soviet occupation troops remain in many European countries and behave as if they were at home. The two super-Powers do not even want to hear of the withdrawal of these troops. All they seek to do is to legalize their permanent presence in Europe through bargainings such as that which has been plotted for years in Vienna. Since the two super-Powers make a great to-do about disarmament and détente, European peoples have the right to ask: why speak only of mutual reduction of American and Soviet forces in Europe; why evade the question of their withdrawal? Why do the two super-Powers and their aggressive military blocs organize so many military offensive manoeuvres? Any attempt to justify these manoeuvres would be futile and deceive no one. We know full well that such manoeuvres have always been the prelude to wars and acts

of aggression. It is in order to prepare for wars and acts of aggression that these manoeuvres are organized, even if representatives of the adversary are invited to witness them.

132. The two imperialist super-Powers often admit that they are armed to the teeth. In order to make fear and panic reign, they declare that the weapons already accumulated in their arsenals would suffice to destroy the world many times over. None the less, they are not satisfied and they continue to accelerate the arms race, to increase their war budgets and to announce new ambitious plans for the manufacture and refinement of weapons. Under the cover of scientific experiments, these two super-Powers seek to militarize outer space itself by launching spy satellites or anti-missile missiles and by working towards the establishment in outer space of launching bases from which they could strike targets on earth.

133. It is now commonplace to hear about all sorts of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons and of the uninterrupted perfecting of delivery systems. Rockets and counter-rockets no longer elicit curiosity. Chemical, bacteriological, radiological and many other types of weapons are no longer in the realm of science fiction but continue to be stockpiled in vast quantities and are ready to be used in the arsenals of the imperialist super-Powers. These Powers would even make use of natural phenomena to make war.

134. The imperialists and social-imperialists loudly proclaim the horrors of nuclear war in order to intimidate the peoples and to undermine their will to struggle and resist. They resort to nuclear blackmail in order to force the peoples to close their eyes to the danger posed by conventional weapons and to oblige them to consider the existence of these weapons as a minor danger which can be tolerated under present circumstances. They would like the peoples to cease all opposition to aggressive wars waged with conventional weapons and to live in fear, thinking that the gods of war might be angered and unleash a nuclear war. Of course, if the imperialist super-Powers have not used atomic weapons, that does not mean that they cannot use them one day. It is obvious that these weapons are not being manufactured to decorate museums. Moreover, we should not forget the danger of conventional weapons. It is precisely with such weapons that the imperialist Powers have up to now waged barbarous and devastating wars. It is with these weapons that they prefer to unleash local wars and acts of aggression.

135. The imperialist super-Powers extol the agreements which they conclude from time to time on nuclear weapons and nuclear tests as a great service rendered to mankind, as a sacrifice which they make to avoid the dangers of war. But the peoples have enough experience to see that the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists conclude treaties and agreements in order to legalize and programme the arms build-up and the arms race, to move easily from one stage to another in the perfecting of weapons and, above all, to preserve their supremacy in atomic and conventional weaponry. It is these same goals that they propose to reach through many various negotiations, such as the strategic arms limitation talks, the Vi-



enna talks on the reduction of armed forces in Europe, negotiations on the so-called limitation or prohibition of nuclear tests, on the curbing of the arms trade, on the prohibition of new weapons systems and even talks on the limitation of military activities in the Indian Ocean. Each time that the United States and the Soviet Union produce a new weapon, they also unleash a deceitful propaganda campaign and begin to talk about the imperative need to establish a forum for negotiations aimed at "limiting", "balancing" or "prohibiting" the manufacture of that very weapon.

136. The two super-Powers find a common language and announce with great pomp that their talks are progressing well when it is for them a question of mutual accommodation, of preserving their superiority and of intimidating or deceiving peoples. But they vie with each other whenever their political, strategic and military interests diverge. When they need to justify preparations for war and the arms build-up, they unhesitatingly accuse each other, and each invokes the obstructionist position of the other, each cries out more loudly than the other that it cannot tolerate its interests being harmed, and the balance being reversed to its detriment. Once again we have seen these two-way tactics here in the general debate.

137. The imperialist super-Powers and the reactionary forces that play their game feverishly attempt to provoke a fatalist psychosis. They claim that each people, each country—above all the small—have no choice but to seek shelter under the protective umbrella of a super-Power. These peoples should, the imperialists add, place themselves under the influence of one military bloc to avoid falling into the hands of the other. The imperialist super-Powers also benefit from certain ideas that are being disseminated today which seek to persuade sovereign peoples and countries that the best path to follow is a policy of balance between the super-Powers and to act according to the situation created by the super-Powers and comply with their political and diplomatic game. But it cannot be forgotten that the history of Europe and other regions is replete with examples of the fate of those who placed their hopes on such a policy. Aggressors have often unleashed invasions under the pretext of wishing to "maintain balance" or to "restore balance".

138. The military blocs of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty are the two main pillars on which the United States and the Soviet Union base themselves to achieve their policy of domination and world hegemony and to prepare for another war. The American imperialists and the Soviet socialist-imperialists work relentlessly to strengthen the military potential of these blocs, to perfect their control over them and to expand their zone of activities. They attempt to bring under the influence of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty the greatest possible number of States, even if they do not have the formal status of a member State.

139. Imperialist and social-imperialist propaganda spares no effort to conceal at all costs the aggressive nature of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. The American imperialists and other imperialist Powers claim that NATO is a defensive alliance and insist that its existence is necessary to

maintain the world balance and that this alliance should therefore be further strengthened militarily and politically. The Soviet social-imperialists claim that the Warsaw Treaty is also a defensive alliance indispensable to upholding the policy of détente and that it should also be strengthened, above all militarily. But all the facts demonstrate that NATO and the Warsaw Treaty are both aggressive military blocs, instruments of the two super-Powers. They each pose a very grave danger for the freedom and independence of peoples. It is all too significant that meetings of NATO and of the Warsaw Treaty countries have been convened to discuss the arms build-up and preparations for war at the precise time when the special session of the United Nations devoted to disarmament is being held. Is this not in open defiance of this session and of the idea of disarmament? Consequently we believe that any illusion concerning the aggressive character of either military bloc would be fraught with serious consequences. In our view, we must resolutely repudiate any attempt to camouflage or make more palatable the aggressive nature of NATO or the Warsaw Treaty, any ruse to justify or encourage the strengthening of the military potential of either alliance and their preparations for war against peoples.

140. The arms trade carried on by the two super-Powers and the other imperialist Powers is further proof of the falseness of their disarmament slogans. They use the arms trade for many purposes: to obtain profits, to alleviate the burden of the economic crisis, to intervene in the internal affairs of the countries which purchase these weapons, to impose upon the latter a policy of diktat and to exert pressure on, blackmail or even commit acts of aggression against their neighbours. The United States and the Soviet Union desire to sell arms always and everywhere. That is one of the reasons for which they provoke conflicts and disturbances and stimulate the arms race at the local level, parallel to the American-Soviet arms race. They also profit from the arms trade in order to replenish their own arsenals, get rid of outdated weapons and replace them by new, more advanced and more powerful weapons.

141. In order to make the disarmament farce more attractive, the imperialists and socio-imperialists make wonderful promises and even commit themselves to placing at the disposal of countries in economic difficulties a large part of the funds which would be released through disarmament measures and the reduction of military budgets. However, it is worth recalling that the imperialist Powers have never been concerned with helping other countries to develop their economies. Their only concern has always been to plunder the natural wealth of others. The United States and the Soviet Union do not give a single dollar, a single rouble, without assuring themselves of political, economic and military advantages.

142. The initiatives concerning the establishment of so-called zones of peace or nuclear-weapon-free zones in different regions and ideas such as that of establishing such a zone in the Balkans do not lessen the danger of war and the threat of weapons. The fact that the imperialist super-Powers support and encourage the establishment of such zones, those little islands of peace in an ocean of armaments, show quite clearly their intention to lull the vigilance of the peoples.

143. The United States and the Soviet Union are very anxious that the idea should prevail that it is only thanks to a military balance between the two of them that the risks can be lessened because it is they who can resolve satisfactorily the problems of international peace and security. They arrogate to themselves the right to be the last to disarm because, according to them, they have the special responsibility to establish and ensure respect for law and order in the world, and they must supervise and guarantee the disarmament process. In short, they present the world as being at their mercy and claim that the peoples cannot sleep tranquilly in their beds except under the umbrella of American and Soviet weapons.

144. The imperialists and the socio-imperialists, imbued with hegemonic concepts and designs, cannot imagine that the peoples and the small countries could live free and independent without the economic and military support of a large State. These concepts, of course, must be vigorously refuted. History has proved that peoples can successfully resist and defeat their enemies, no matter how big they are or how powerful they seem, when they are determined to rely on their own strength and unite in militant solidarity. In order successfully to combat any aggressive policy and imperialist and neo-colonialist intervention, freedom-loving peoples and States need sound unity and true solidarity, not false solidarity.

145. The preachings of the theoreticians of the three worlds on the union without any distinction of the truly anti-imperialist forces with the pro-imperialist, reactionary and fascist forces and even with American imperialism weaken the struggle of the peoples against their enemies, the two imperialist super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union.

146. When we reflect on disarmament problems the question arises, who is it that obstructs disarmament, genuine disarmament? Do appropriate conditions exist at the present time for progress towards a real solution of the disarmament problem and, if not, what must be done to provide those conditions? At the moment disarmament seems to be a vague dream. It must be admitted, we believe, that if weaponry has increased beyond all limits, if the arms race continues at a dizzy pace, it is not because the documents and resolutions dealing with disarmament have been insufficient in number, nor is it because mankind has not given sufficient proof of wisdom in its awareness of the dangers of weaponry, but because the true causes are quite different and not at all mysterious. Weaponry, the arms race, preparations for war, are a direct emanation of the aggressive policy of the imperialist Powers, a clear reflection of the aggressive designs of imperialism, social-imperialism and reactionary régimes. For this reason, the delegation of Albania believes that it would be Utopian to hope that the imperialist Powers, and in the first place the United States and the Soviet Union, could take a real step towards disarmament even if the two super-Powers proceeded for demagogic purposes to some limitation or insignificant and purely symbolic reduction of their weaponry or their armed forces, or if they decided to cease provisionally the manufacture of a new weapon. This would not affect their military arsenals or reduce the dangers.

147. It is well known how the imperialist super-Powers have used the discussions in the United Nations and other bodies, as well as the documents that have been adopted, to propagate their thesis and justify their arms build-up. The present special session devoted to disarmament coincides with the end of a period called in the United Nations the Disarmament Decade. How ironic this theme is since the past 10 years have gone down in history as the decade of unprecedented arms build-up. Such a simple but very significant fact is a warning to everybody and shows that it is an illusion to hope that progress towards disarmament can be made by counting on the goodwill of the imperialist Powers. Nor is it any more likely that any concrete results will emerge from this session, still less from the world disarmament conference proposed and advocated by the Soviet socio-imperialists.

148. The peoples desire true disarmament. They oppose and must oppose the arms build-up of the imperialist Powers and their intention to use those arms and to unleash war. The weaponry of the imperialist Powers increases the danger of war. But war is not purely and simply a result of the existence of weapons. War is above all a direct consequence of the policy and the aggressive plans of the imperialist Powers and the reactionary régimes. The interests of the peoples require the denunciation of the slogans and theories preached by the imperialist Powers and the reactionaries of all types in order to justify wars of aggression, preparations for a new world war and the intention to provoke and unleash that war at a given moment.

149. In present conditions, the historic task of the peoples and democratic and progressive forces is to persevere in the just struggle to defend their rights and do everything in their power to prevent the imperialist Powers from unleashing war. The peoples must redouble their vigilance and determination to stay the hand of the aggressors and the warmongers, and be ready to inflict defeat, by means of their revolutionary struggle, on the super-Powers and imperialist Powers if, despite everything, these latter decide to implement their plans to plunge the world into a new conflagration. The leader of the Albanian people, Comrade Enver Hodja, has emphasized the fact that

“...when a people is determined to live free and upright, it resists blackmail, its forces are constantly reinvigorated, its watchfulness only becomes keener, and it is difficult for the aggressor to attack it. . . This means that the peoples must not yield to fatalism, must not become passive observers and must not allow themselves to be taken by surprise, that they must be prepared for the worst and must struggle to ensure that the worst does not happen.”

150. The People's Socialist Republic of Albania forcefully expresses its opposition to the arms build-up and the arms race of the imperialist Powers. We feel that before envisaging the possibility of a serious step towards disarmament there is the need for certain minimum conditions to exist. First of all, this requires the elimination of the military blocs of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Treaty, the withdrawal of American and Soviet troops from Europe and other regions, the

prohibition of the military manoeuvres by the super-Powers and military blocs, the dismantling of the military bases of the United States and the Soviet Union, and the withdrawal of the American and Soviet war fleets from the Mediterranean and other seas.

151. The two imperialist super-Powers have concentrated in the Mediterranean vast naval and military forces that are a constant threat to the peoples of that area. The delegation of Albania feels that freedom-loving States in that region are in duty bound to contribute effectively to eliminating the dangers entailed by the presence of these fleets and to take appropriate measures to remove them. The interests of peace and genuine security in the Mediterranean require that the coastal States must dismantle the foreign military bases that have been installed in their territories and that no mooring facilities be provided to the warships of the two super-Powers, nor should they be allowed entry to those ports for supplies or for so-called friendly visits. The granting of port facilities, as of over-flight rights for the military planes of either super-Power, endangers the freedom and independence of the countries that grant such concessions, as well as that of neighbouring countries and peoples.

152. The position of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania on these problems is well known. We have stated our opposition to NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. For a long time we have denounced the aggressive Warsaw Treaty. We have publicly stated here in the United Nations that we would never enter into military alliance with any State. The Soviet socio-imperialists have dreamed of making Albania a military base and of transforming our ports into bases for their warships and back-up points for activities against our neighbours and other friendly peoples in

the Mediterranean. But the Government of Albania, denouncing threats and blackmail, has repudiated these attempts and has prohibited the stationing of foreign troops on Albanian soil.

153. The Constitution of the People's Republic of Albania clearly stipulates that "the establishment of military bases and the stationing of foreign troops on the territory of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania is prohibited." This vitally important principle reflects the determination of the Albanian people to exercise full and complete sovereignty over its territory. That constitutional provision is likewise the expression of the friendly internationalist policy of principle pursued by Albania to ensure that its territory is never in any circumstances used for the purposes of aggression against neighbouring countries and peoples. In acting accordingly, it has made and will continue to make its modest contribution to the defence of peace and security in the Balkans, the Mediterranean and in Europe.

154. The People's Socialist Republic of Albania has taken measures to defend its freedom and its independence. We have declared that no imperialist Power should attempt to impose its will on socialist Albania or to divert it from its course through pressure or through ruse. The Albanian people is firmly determined courageously to face all its enemies who have aggressive designs and intentions towards it. This staunch unity of the Albanian people and its working party, a party which is truly Marxist-Leninist, under the leadership of Comrade Enver Hodja is becoming stronger day by day. It is that unity which constitutes the best guarantee of victories and of progress in the building of socialism.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*