



Monday, 14 June 1982,
at 11.05 a.m.

NEW YORK

Official Records

President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

***Tribute to the memory of His Majesty King Khalid
ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud of Saudi Arabia***

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I regret to have to announce to the General Assembly that the Head of State and Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud, has passed away.

2. On behalf of the General Assembly, I extend to the family of the late King and to the Government and people of Saudi Arabia our most sincere and heartfelt condolences on this tragic event. May God grant the people and Government of Saudi Arabia the courage and the patience to bear this loss. We belong to God and it is to God that we return.

3. I now invite the representatives to stand and observe a minute's silence in tribute to the memory of King Khalid.

The members of the General Assembly observed a minute of silence.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I call on the Secretary-General, on the representatives who have asked to speak on behalf of their countries or the groups of States they represent, and on the representative of the United States, the host country.

5. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: We have all learned with the greatest sadness of the death of King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud of Saudi Arabia. In his seven years on the throne of Saudi Arabia, King Khalid proved himself to be not only a staunch leader of his people but also a force for moderation and reason in the affairs of the world. As the leader of a country which occupies a place of crucial importance in international affairs, King Khalid was constantly sought out for advice and help by the leaders of many other nations. Here his previous experience, which incidentally included representing his country at the United Nations, stood him in good stead.

6. In the modern world of technology, King Khalid drew strength from the ancient traditional life of his people. He sought rest and renewal in the desert in order to bear the very great burdens of responsibility which his unique position placed upon him.

7. We at the United Nations deeply appreciated not only King Khalid's constant striving for peace but also the invaluable support he gave us in our endeavours to ensure the economic and social advancement of all peoples.

8. He will be greatly missed in the community of nations. I wish to extend my sincere condolences to

the Government and people of Saudi Arabia in their great loss.

9. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): The countries of the group of Asian States learned yesterday with great sadness the news of the sudden passing of His Majesty King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud of Saudi Arabia.

10. The late King was respected throughout the world and was a champion of peace on earth. His Majesty, a fervent Moslem, was a resolute defender of the common values and interests of his co-religionists throughout the world, and in particular of the Holy Places of Islam. As the sovereign of one of the most powerful Arab countries he was also one of the greatest defenders of Arab causes, above all of the inalienable rights, especially the right to self-determination, of the Arab people of Palestine, to whom he unfailingly gave his staunchest support. His Majesty had the rare ability to view international relations in all aspects and as a whole. He distinguished himself by his serenity, his wisdom and his vision of the future, and by the initiatives that these qualities inspired him to take.

11. The world has lost a great leader; Turkey has lost a valued friend. Our only solace is that another great leader, His Majesty King Fahd ibn Abdul Aziz has succeeded him, and King Fahd is a man with the same lofty qualities and the same virtues.

12. In paying a tribute to the venerated memory of King Khalid, I, as chairman of the group of Asian States and as representative of Turkey, offer my most heartfelt condolences to His Majesty King Fahd, to the royal family of Saudi Arabia, to the people and Government of the sister nation Saudi Arabia, to the whole Arab world and to the Organization of the Islamic Conference, of which King Khalid's country is one of the pillars.

13. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): On behalf of the group of Western European and Other States, I have the sad duty of paying brief but sincere homage on the passing away of a statesman of stature and a man of peace, who must in his last days have felt keen disappointment at the violent eruption of conflict in an area for which he constantly advocated moderation and peace. His name in fact will always be associated with an initiative which, despite temporary setbacks, will remain alive. We would therefore associate ourselves with the Secretary-General's appraisal of the contribution made by his late Majesty to his people, to the region, and to this Organization. May he now rest in peace.

14. Through the mission of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, I wish to convey on behalf of our group our collective feeling of respect and our condolences to the people and Government of the Kingdom of Saudi

Arabia and our best wishes to King Khalid's distinguished successor in office, who has already shown his dedication to the causes espoused by his late Majesty.

15. Mr. SEWRAJSING (Suriname): On behalf of the group of Latin American States, I have the honour to offer condolences to the Government and people of Saudi Arabia on the sudden death of King Khalid of Saudi Arabia. The passing away of King Khalid, who was well known for his modesty, in accordance with his strong Moslem beliefs, is a great loss not only for Saudi Arabia but also for the world as a whole. King Khalid was a great protector of Islam and had dedicated his life to the service of his country and people. The tragic loss of this wise and brilliant leader will cause a great lacuna in the Middle East.

16. Finally, the group of Latin American States expresses its sympathy to the immediate family and friends of the late King.

17. Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): In my capacity as chairman of the group of Eastern European States, I express our deeply felt condolences to the Government and people of Saudi Arabia on the untimely death of His Majesty King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud, Head of State and Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, a tragic loss for the people of Saudi Arabia, particularly at this critical time when a new Israeli aggression is being carried out against the neighbouring Arab countries, especially against the people of Palestine. We ask them to accept our deep sympathy and respect on this occasion.

18. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It was with the most profound regret that we heard the announcement of the death of one of the greatest leaders of the Arab world, His Majesty King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud, after a long life of great service to his country and to the Arab world, as well as to the Islamic world. On behalf of the group of Arab States in the United Nations and on behalf of Oman, I extend to the delegation of Saudi Arabia our most heartfelt and sincere condolences. We request the delegation of Saudi Arabia to transmit to the royal family and the Government and people of Saudi Arabia our hope that they will be able to bear this grievous loss.

19. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of my colleagues in the group of African States, I wish to extend to the delegation of Saudi Arabia our most sorrowful condolences on the occasion of the passing of His Majesty King Khalid. The links which unite Africa with the Arab world are well known to the delegation of Saudi Arabia. The Saudi Arabian delegation is also aware of the hope that we have always placed and will always place in the co-operation which unites our two worlds.

20. In offering our condolences we must say that in a family there are always some who are closer to the event than others. But we believe that we are all members of a family and that we are all struggling for the same cause, that of justice and peace. We should like to say to the delegation of Saudi Arabia that we share fully in the trial and the suffering which the people of Saudi Arabia are now undergoing.

21. The people of Saudi Arabia will surely in its wisdom find the strength needed to overcome all the difficulties that may arise.

22. Once again, I assure the delegation of Saudi Arabia of our brotherly and very sincere compassion.

23. Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): This is a message from Ronald Reagan in the White House:

"I was deeply grieved to learn of the death of His Majesty King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud of Saudi Arabia, who ruled his country with honour, dignity and wisdom. His goodness and understanding commanded the respect of all. I extend my personal condolences and sympathy, as well as those of the American people, to His Majesty King Fahd, the royal family and the people of Saudi Arabia, a country with which we have enjoyed more than half a century of warm, constructive and mutually beneficial relations."

The message is signed "Ronald Reagan, The White House, 13 June".

24. Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): On behalf of the Government and people of Saudi Arabia, I wish to offer our sincere thanks to all the delegations that have expressed their condolences on the sad passing of King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud. His late Majesty died at a time when the Arab world is facing a very difficult situation. He devoted his life to the service of his country, the Arab world and the Moslem world. It is said in the Koran: "Ah, thou soul at peace! Return unto thy Lord, content in His good pleasure. Enter thou among My bondmen. Enter thou My Garden." [Sura LXXXIX:27-30.]

25. I thank the Assembly and promise to transmit the condolences that have been expressed to my Government.

26. We belong to Allah, and it is to Allah that we return.

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (*continued*)

27. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now hear a statement by the President of the Republic of Panama. On behalf of the Assembly, I have the honour to welcome to the United Nations Mr. Aristides Royo Sánchez and to invite him to address the Assembly.

28. Mr. ROYO (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like first of all to state that the people and Government of Panama join the international community in its expression of grief at the death of His Majesty King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud of Saudi Arabia. We extend our sincere condolences to his family, to the Government and people of Saudi Arabia, and to the Arab world for the irreparable loss of one who was a tireless fighter for peace.

29. Aware of its responsibilities as a founding State of the United Nations, a Latin American member of the Security Council, a member of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries and a member of the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disar-

mament, Panama is attending these meetings to reaffirm its faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter and to contribute to all activities designed to achieve the objectives of disarmament, first and foremost nuclear disarmament, without undermining the right of every State to security and to maintain that security with a level of armaments sufficient for that purpose but below the present level of armaments.

30. In the face of so great a task, Sir, it is of great significance that the presidency of this session is in the hands of a statesman of your worth, whose ability, integrity and wisdom are fully appreciated by the international community. We are also aware of the significant contribution being made to the international disarmament strategy by the new Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, an eminent Latin American personality who has won the confidence of all the nations of the world.

31. In the spirit and conscience of the peoples of the world there is at this time no more profound and ardent desire than that for peace, nor a conviction firmer than that the primary means of ensuring it is general and complete disarmament. Before Saturday, 12 June, that statement might have been open to challenge, but that can no longer be so. On that day there paraded before the Headquarters of this Organization and later gathered in New York's Central Park a multitude of more than three quarters of a million people. Human beings came here from every corner of the world to make known to those who pretend not to know, or who do not wish to know, that the hour has struck for the United Nations to fulfil the purpose and promise that gave rise to its establishment, that of freeing mankind from the sinister scourge of war.

32. I must add, so that there may be no mistake in this respect, that the peace that all mankind aspires to and calls for is not a false peace imposed by force of arms nor a precarious peace based on the fallacy of balance of arms, but a firm and lasting peace based on a new economic order that offers security to every nation, uniting all nations by relations of interdependence based on a new international division of labour that guarantees to all the use of their resources for their own benefit and for that of the international community.

33. I speak on behalf of the people of Panama. For me, the demonstration on Saturday was also an appeal for the unity of all the peoples of the world and, in a reverse sense, a repudiation of the present division of the world into two constellations of military power which have claimed for themselves the authority to determine the destiny of the millions of men, women and children who populate the earth.

34. I believe it appropriate to summarize the course of events that have led to the situation facing us. The use of atomic energy for arms radically changed the concept of war, peace and security. The annihilation of the populations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945 revealed the atomic weapon's colossal capacity for extermination and aroused horror among the very leaders who had decided to build and use it, and among the scientists who had devised the formula to produce it. This state of mind gave rise to the idea of prohibiting the manufacture and stockpiling of

atomic weapons and of destroying those then in the arsenals.

35. At its first session, in London in January 1946, the General Assembly established the Atomic Energy Commission, giving it the urgent task of preparing specific proposals for the elimination of atomic weapons and any others intended for mass or indiscriminate destruction of everything human and material. That promising beginning was very quickly frustrated. Soon after the end of the war the Powers that had subscribed to the Atlantic alliance divided into two wings, which a growing rivalry was to harden into two opposing blocs. Thus began the arms race, both in atomic weapons and in those described by a convenient and perverse euphemism as "conventional" weapons.

36. Disarmament measures were thus turned into a power play of the two greatest world Powers that covered up the struggle to achieve primacy in research into, manufacture and stockpiling of atomic weapons, in their capacity for annihilation and in their means to launch them against the territory of their rival with greater speed and accuracy. General and complete disarmament, which one of the super-Powers had once proposed, was replaced by the limitation, reduction and control of arms, with a selective criterion. Security became an insane illusion, since it can never be achieved and maintained in a desperate race with no finishing line.

37. Every year the cost of this insane rivalry increases, reaching \$600 billion in 1981, a figure that may be increased by \$50 billion this year. The economic, social, political and spiritual consequences of the arms race are extremely grave.

38. Military expenditures, particularly those on arms production, absorb material and financial resources that would, if applied only in part to satisfy the economic, social and cultural needs of the developing countries, give a vigorous impetus to their efforts to overcome the backwardness, poverty and lack of culture that afflict them today. Hundreds of thousands of hectares could be dedicated to the production of food. Thousands of schools, health schemes, tools and machinery for a diversity of industrial activities could be paid for by international co-operation with what is wasted in a single day by the great Powers on manufacturing arms and maintaining their armies.

39. It has been proved that the gigantic military expenditures that will be incurred in 1982 will exceed the total income this year of the 1.5 billion people who live in the 50 poorest countries of the world. No less irritating is the fact that the arms rivalry of the two world blocs is reflected in the third world countries that are their clients and that, with the mistaken security concept of the super-Powers, are wasting on arms enormous sums that they should be using for their own development.

40. The initiative for holding a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament came from the non-aligned countries. Thanks to this, there is recognition of the primary and urgent importance of this question, and it has been possible to submit it to open consideration and to remove it from the closed room where it is subject to the manoeuvres of the super-Powers. A problem on whose solution the future

of mankind depends cannot be left to the exclusive decision of the two Powers that are struggling for world hegemony, which none can retain for itself, and which they cannot even share. It is a problem whose decision is the proper task of all mankind, which it affects.

41. At the tenth special session all aspects of the question were debated. The work done was collected as a consistent body of principles and tasks in the Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*] adopted by consensus on 30 June 1978. There the problem in its totality and diversity is focused on, and there is a coherent correlation of all its aspects. A Programme of Action [*ibid.*, *sect. III*], directed towards the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament, is formulated.

42. At the twelfth special session, which we have just opened, we must examine the results of the Programme of Action adopted by consensus four years ago. The report of the Preparatory Committee [*A/S-12/1*] being considered by the Assembly makes clear, despite its measured and delicately balanced language, that the results obtained are lamentably modest compared with the tasks of achieving the final objective, which, I repeat, can be none other than general and complete disarmament.

43. It is enough to observe the world scene to see that the arms race, far from having been contained, proceeds apace, both in the field of nuclear weapons, strategic or tactical, and in the field of the so-called conventional weapons. The military expenditures of the three worlds rise to dizzying heights. Internal and international disputes are multiplying and intensifying, thus aggravating general insecurity. The economy of the industrialized countries is foundering under the weight of inflation and unemployment, which are the counterpart of military expenditures.

44. Poverty and unrest are making further inroads in the underdeveloped countries, giving rise to bloody political confrontations, *coups d'état* and various forms of terrorism. The two super-Powers are hardening the terms of their relations and are continuing their quantitative and qualitative escalation of the manufacture of more deadly weapons. Their bureaucrats use the language of war with a harshness approaching arrogance. Only the pressure of world public opinion has been able to force them to the negotiating table, albeit not to deal with disarmament but only reluctantly with the limited regulation of the nuclear arsenal.

45. The arms race between the great Powers is naturally of concern to all of us, since it is one of the principal causes of the world economic crisis and the maintenance of an unjust international economic and political order, and is the most serious threat to the very survival of a large part of the third world and almost all of Europe. The arms buildup of the smaller Powers and the underdeveloped countries is also of concern to us, however, creating as it does so many dangers and so much misfortune, destruction and poverty.

46. An integral part of the system of tension and arms buildup is the network of sales, purchase and distribution of arms and military technology by means of which an economic, technical, military and political

dependency is imposed upon the weaker nations. From that system also stems the installation, use and abuse of military complexes in the territories of other countries, which, often against the will of the peoples of those countries, are used not only to keep them in a subordinate position but also to threaten or commit aggression against third nations.

47. Such factors must not be underestimated. "Conventional" non-nuclear weapons account for 80 per cent of the amounts spent on armaments. In 1980 the countries of the third world had already doubled their military expenditures in comparison with 1971, and at the present time 75 per cent of total of weapons bought and sold in the world are destined for the underdeveloped countries. In many of our countries, the acquisition of weapons exceeds defence needs and the capacity of the economy. Such arms and military technology are imported by using resources and foreign currency holdings that are being diverted from peaceful development. Seventy per cent of those weapons come from the following countries, in this order: the United States, the Soviet Union, France, Great Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy; and since 1945 the use of those weapons has cost the lives of more than 10 million people.

48. Of course we criticize the régimes in the underdeveloped countries that embark upon the arms race, but we must likewise denounce the Powers that advocate the export of arms and, more specifically, those that promote policies of tension or threats, provoking an arms buildup among those who feel threatened.

49. Nevertheless, some more precise remarks must be made on this subject. On the one hand, as long as unresolved historical differences exist, and as long as those and other differences are exploited or provoked by powerful third Powers, the acquisition of weapons will continue to be advocated and, thus, the arms race among small countries that feel impelled to defend themselves against each other will continue. What is still more serious, however, is that, while the great Powers continue to ignore their fundamental international commitments to eliminate colonialism and other forms of hegemony, to non-interference and to respect for the self-determination, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of our peoples, they force us to arm ourselves to defend ourselves against overt or covert abuses by them.

50. Although disarmament may be considered to be a fundamental human right, so also is the right to be armed in order to defend the security, independence and integrity of our nations, even though that means sacrificing certain other priorities, for recent experience has proved that colonialism, neo-colonialism, and hegemonism continue to represent real threats.

51. I come from a nation where, by good fortune, our military leaders, inspired by a General who hated war, chose to become a part of the instruments devoted to the overall development of the country. Omar Torrijos also taught us the best military and political strategies; namely the difficult but creative road of dialogue as a way to face problems and co-operate in their solution. With him we learned about the key role of détente, the political settlement of disputes,

the reordering of international relations, the transformation of unjust socio-economic structures and co-operation for development—crucial matters that must be considered in any serious discussion of development and disarmament. Respect for the rights of other countries by the military and economically powerful nations should be an essential part of these principles, for the repeated infringement of those rights compels each of us to be vigilant with regard to the quality of our own armed forces.

52. We are pacifists and we are in favour of general and complete disarmament, but we are not therefore anti-militarists; rather we cultivate a definite concept of our military forces, linked to the protection and development of our rights and national heritage. That concept was put forward by Omar Torrijos, and we believe it to be valid for the majority of the countries of the third world. We must point out that Latin Americans and other third-world peoples have in our history had many patriotic military leaders who are identified with the best national and democratic causes of their respective peoples.

53. We do not conceive of disarmament as the elimination of armed forces, but as a suitable reformulation of the role of the armed forces in society. What we criticize is the insistence of privileged minorities and alien interests on humiliating the military institutions by committing them to anti-national and repressive ventures and to the defence of obsolete and unjust structures. For we want our armed forces to be identified with the legitimate interests of sovereignty, the participation of the people and genuine national self-determination. We wish to see military institutions committed to the nation's integral development, civic minded, participating in the life of the people and helping with the technical, productive and social tasks for the development of their own countries. Those are the military forces that can best contribute to security, stability and peace.

54. Furthermore, our military leaders must participate in the tasks of détente and disarmament, for such tasks necessarily require their co-operation. It is also with their co-operation that alternative projects must be formulated, which will be more feasible if worthwhile and creative roles are assigned to those who must carry them out.

55. In this connexion, each of our countries has an absolute right to arm itself according to its own defence and security requirements, but not so as to threaten the security of other nations. More specifically, those that claim to be concerned about the dangers, threats and expenses of armaments must act consistently in such a way as to halt arms proliferation among the countries of Central America. This holds true for those who acquire more arms than they need, but above all for those who foment an atmosphere of international tension in the region and who furnish such weapons. Both sides are equally responsible for the tragic paradox that countries in which there is a shortage of schools, hospitals, food and roads are squandering their modest resources on the display of modern fighter aircraft and tanks.

56. In the tragic Central American reality, there are those who call for the political negotiation of solutions among the parties to the conflict and those who

try to impose purely military solutions or to promote them from outside. The latter are already responsible for the destruction of many thousands of human lives. It is time that all confidence and initiative be placed in the hands of those who advocate the negotiation of multilateral political and diplomatic solutions to this set of conflicts. In this respect we wish to reiterate the mediation proposals made by Panama on 30 September 1981, at the 20th meeting of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, as well as our support for the proposal made by the President of Mexico on 21 February 1982.

57. In the same context, Panama intends to sponsor the organization of a conference on co-operation and security in Central America and the Caribbean, inspired by the good precedent set in Europe, which led to the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, signed at Helsinki on 1 August 1975.

58. On the other hand, an analysis of the armaments buildup, the conditions that have led to it and its consequences would be incomplete without a thorough condemnation of all the modalities of mercenarism as well as the recruitment, training and infiltration of armed bands in the territory of other countries. Panama insists on the need to investigate the actions of the bands of mercenaries in Africa, in the Indian Ocean, in Latin America and in other areas until they have been fully identified and until those who are responsible and who sponsor them have been punished. This demand is all the more urgent now that the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has included as part of its punitive expedition against the Argentine Republic a battalion of Gurkha mercenaries.

59. Another subject that is a cause of constant concern is nuclear proliferation. Of course, the developing countries have a legitimate right to install nuclear plants for the production of energy for peaceful purposes. That right provides vast possibilities of access to technology of any origin that might be agreed upon without restrictions, exclusions, conditions or political reprisals. Nevertheless, to prevent the use of nuclear technology for military purposes, the IAEA monitoring system must be strengthened and the interests of the countries that have not yet signed and ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] must be taken into account. This requires complete guarantees that countries that have no nuclear weapons will not be threatened or blackmailed by those that do, for we cannot forget that the indispensable corollary of this Treaty is the commitment—yet to be complied with—that the nuclear Powers will in turn proceed to dismantle their respective nuclear arsenals.

60. In this respect I think it worthwhile once again to emphasize the important example of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).¹ A collective effort is needed to bring about its signature and ratification by countries that have not yet adhered to it, meeting their reasonable hesitations but ensuring effective compliance with the purposes of the Treaty. Fidelity to its letter and spirit means maintaining a constant demand that the great Powers respect and comply with it in each of the positions they occupy or use anywhere

in Latin America and the Caribbean. This means that those Powers will not use nuclear military means against the countries of the region and thus requires energetic condemnation of the recent and unwarranted mockery of that Treaty through the introduction of nuclear-powered British submarines in the Malvinas Islands zone.

61. The incredible events in the South Atlantic seem to have returned us to the days of the pirates. We never expected that to the iniquities we still witness in our times we should have to add this shameful colonialist spectacle, which is more typical of the last century than the present one. The nostalgia for brutal imperial glories has suddenly led to efforts to reconquer what was once usurped by force. It is an outrageous breach of the law and a rejection of the use of diplomatic means to obtain a peaceful solution to the conflict, a conflict which should never have arisen in view of Argentina's indisputable sovereignty over the Malvinas.

62. Is patriotism any consolation, and can there be any satisfaction for the widows, the children and the mothers of the British soldiers that have fallen in that strange and remote war? Can the leaders face the bereaved and explain why their husbands, fathers or sons have had to die in such an expedition?

63. What is more, whereas decolonization has been advancing throughout the world, there is now something which does not augur well: In the conflict in the Malvinas, other nations of the North have precipitously banded together, abandoning their partners in the South. The very ones who sold weapons to Argentina are imposing economic and military reprisals, now that that Latin American country has used those weapons to claim its territorial integrity, questioning the international hegemony born of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

64. Those who accuse Argentina of having had recourse to the use of force seem to forget that this was a legitimate decolonizing action carried out without bloodshed. Rarely have the colonialists allowed our peoples to win their national independence and integrity by peaceful means. The arrogant demonstration of Great Britain's capacity for violence, supported by Powers in the North, is supposed to be a preventive warning to any other country that may aspire to its legitimate rights.

65. A surprising and revealing lack of compliance by the United States with its duties and inter-American commitments and its identifying itself with those who have carried out this open demonstration of anti-Latin American violence have rendered negotiations more difficult and reduced the possibilities of arriving at a diplomatic solution to the conflict. This and the arrogant intransigence of Britain have caused increasing loss of life. Furthermore, continental relations have been infected by a lack of confidence. Thus, the Malvinas crisis has shattered one of the few systems of political North-South integration that has been historically constituted—the inter-American system—by proving that the reciprocal commitments among the Powers of the North have pre-eminence over continental solidarity.

66. We wish to preserve the best relations with the United States, a country with which we are linked

by a long history of co-operation which we wish to strengthen in terms of equity and mutual respect. But it would be futile to deny that the recent experience has imposed on us the need to bring to fruition and give deeper roots to the significance of a true doctrine for national security based on closer links in Latin American solidarity. This experience has compelled us to realize that the concept of reciprocal assistance for collective defence and security in our America has to be an essentially Latin American concept, and as such it should be institutionalized, because we have seen that the insertion of a northern Power into this family may be tantamount to the insertion of a Trojan horse.

67. The non-aligned countries, the neutral States and the other developing countries achieved the inclusion in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session a clear recognition of the relationship between disarmament and security as well as of the fact that the security of States must be viewed not only in its military aspect but also in its economic and social aspects.

68. Nevertheless the Malvinas crisis has made it obvious that Great Britain and the United States view their security in terms of their own selfish interests and those of their allies. The great lesson that has been given to Latin America resides in the fact that the United States has refused to comply with the obligations imposed upon it by the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance signed at Rio de Janeiro on 2 September 1947² and decided to turn its back on Latin America to join the United Kingdom and, thanks to its vast military assistance, make it possible for Great Britain to carry out a retaliatory expedition and a colonial war against Argentina, 8,000 miles from the British Isles, which is intended to restore a colonial situation to a Latin American territory contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and the many General Assembly resolutions on decolonization.

69. The hostile, aggressive and warlike acts carried out by Great Britain against Argentina have aroused the just indignation and resentment of all the Latin American peoples and at the same time rendered more acute the institutional crisis of the United Nations, irreparably traumatized the inter-American system and destroyed the system of collective security of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

70. Great Britain, the United States and several European countries have behaved in an arrogant, unfriendly and unjust way to Argentina, thus showing their scorn for the Latin American countries, which they seek to treat as second-class or third-class countries, totally ignoring the stature of Latin America in the contemporary world.

71. But there are other consequences of the Malvinas crisis which must also be assessed. One of them is that once again the concept which still prevails regarding the use of the right of the veto within the Security Council has been revealed to be obsolete and unrealistic. This is a prerogative that is still the privilege of a few States on the basis of the consequences of a war that ended almost 40 years ago. This privilege no longer reflects the structures of the present world and is a flagrant violation of the principle of

the equal sovereignty of States, which is enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

72. In connexion with the crisis in the South Atlantic, that prerogative enabled one State, a party to the conflict, to use its privilege of veto to obstruct a balanced diplomatic solution of the problem, to the detriment of the other affected country, which lacked the same privilege. We believe that the Security Council should not be conceived of as a body within which hegemonic injustices can be sanctioned by means of this questionable use of the right of veto by one of the parties to a conflict to make a solution more difficult to achieve.

73. The Malvinas crisis is not over. The pressure exercised by the British retaliatory expedition not only is illegitimate but constitutes a brutal political mistake which has caused losses, resentment and suspicions that will have devastating consequences and give rise to larger conflicts. It is late to correct many of the mistakes committed, but we must ask the British Government to return to civilized paths, call on the American authorities to adopt a position of effective neutrality and recommend to the members of the European Community that they practise a policy regarding Latin America that is more in accord with their own interests.

74. They must all now strive to ensure that this crisis is not the origin of a new arms race in the region or the source of other acts of aggression or injustice. This is the responsibility not only of the countries of the area but also of those which provide military technology and weapons. But essentially each must realize that this crisis and its consequences cannot end until there is full justice for Argentina and Latin America. We trust that the great Powers will have the common sense to co-operate so that this justice may be brought about soon by peaceful means, because it is the thirst for justice that brings together the countries of the third world in a conference on disarmament, security and development.

75. Meanwhile, in another area of the world the flames of war have been rekindled. Israel's unjust intervention against Lebanon not only makes more remote the possibility of attaining a just and lasting peace in the area but also renders an explosive situation even more likely to lead to a war of much greater proportions. Panama, as a Latin American member of the Security Council, voted in favour of resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), in which the Council demanded that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon and further demanded that all parties cease immediately all military activities within Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border. Our sensibilities are shocked by the new misfortunes suffered by the Palestinian people. The greatest effort must be made to end this painful situation as soon as possible in such a way that Israel's presence in Lebanon, with its consequent dangers for world peace, does not continue in any form.

76. The promptness and diligence with which the Security Council proceeded in the case of Israel and Lebanon to appeal to all parties to cease forthwith and simultaneously all military activities highlights the very different attitude taken by the United States

and Great Britain in the Malvinas crisis. The cease-fire or cessation of hostilities between Great Britain and Argentina could not be decreed by the Security Council because of the veto cast by the two Anglo-Saxon Powers. Nothing would be more appropriate than to create a favourable atmosphere for the work of this special session devoted to disarmament by examining anew and thoughtfully, the situation in the South Atlantic, reviewing the decisions adopted and convening the Security Council once again to order a cease-fire and the resumption of negotiations under the auspices of the Secretary-General.

77. We are participating in the Assembly also because Panama is a small, peaceful, but unquestionably sovereign country and possesses a natural attribute which, since the arrival of the Europeans on the American continent, has always been coveted by the great Powers. At the same time, Panama is a living demonstration that the most serious international differences and the most essential national claims can be settled by means of a negotiated political solution by peaceful means as long as the parties to the conflict maintain an attitude of mutual respect and a will to understand and reconcile their common interests.

78. Therefore we are concerned about respectful, responsible and complete compliance with the letter and spirit of the Panama Canal Treaties,³ which are not only a valued achievement of the two countries that freely agreed to them and ratified them, but also an exemplary precedent and heritage for all men and nations which trust in the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

79. The neutrality pact, which is an essential part of those Treaties, allows for the temporary presence of United States armed forces in the territory of our country, and the number of troops and installations for military use is to decrease gradually until they disappear totally and forever on the last day of this century. I must point out that, in accordance with those Treaties, those forces can only be stationed in Panamanian territory for the sole and exclusive purpose of defending and protecting, together with our national armed forces and in co-ordination with them, the present Panama Canal, and only during the years when those Treaties are in force.

80. Consequently, any participation of personnel or use of those installations on Panamanian soil in activities which directly or indirectly serve other purposes or are detrimental to any Government or country would constitute a grave violation of those Treaties. Panama will always reject such interpretations or actions, all the more so when they may be considered to be harmful to other Latin American peoples or Governments or imply some form of intervention in the internal affairs of other countries of the region. That is why we duly requested President Ronald Reagan to give us a formal promise on behalf of his Administration that United States military personnel and installations in the Panama Canal area will not carry out activities which could be directly or indirectly harmful to the interests of Argentina or benefit British operations in connexion with the Malvinas.

81. The international community, which stands to benefit most from the efficient, neutral and peaceful

operation of the Canal, should be as interested as we are in the faithful compliance of both parties with the Treaties which govern it. That is an effective contribution to détente, to peace and to disarmament. The Latin American community and the other peoples of the world who contributed so significantly to the peaceful conclusion of those Treaties must still stand by us in solidarity so that those Treaties will always be complied with harmoniously, respectfully and effectively.

82. We can therefore state the case thus, as part of a collective commitment, because Latin American nations have become fully aware of their cultural heritage, of the potential of their natural wealth and resources and of their military strategic importance, which give them considerable weight in the context of international relations. Our region has reached a degree of maturity which compels our countries to consult with one another in order to give shape to the institutions of a new Latin America, whose choices cannot be nor should be circumscribed to joining one or the other of the power groupings under the leadership of the United States or the Soviet Union.

83. It has been rightly affirmed that in the Latin American countries the concepts of the military and independence have been identified from the time when our republics came into being and that the first citizens of our free countries were the soldiers who fought for them. The disappointment felt by Latin America as a result of the unexpected decision of the United States to invalidate the Rio Treaty has made it clear that Latin America is not a part, nor has it any reason to be a part, of any military alliances of either the East or the West. Latin America must therefore strive to rediscover the values which prevailed when it became independent and which, regrettably, in some of our countries still must be improved in many ways.

84. The resurgence of Latin American national solidarity, as a result of the colonial war against Argentina and the new situations in the world and in the hemisphere, obliges the Governments and peoples of Latin America to rebuild the alliances that were forged during their struggles for emancipation in order to create their own Latin American security machinery which guarantee their permanent sovereignty over their natural resources and economic activities for the benefit of their genuine development, and to pledge themselves to a policy that is truly independent of the world power centres.

85. It is therefore logical for our Latin American countries to consult with one another for the purpose of consolidating our views in order to face our defence problems and to study the feasibility of setting up Latin American collective security machinery that will be completely autonomous, regardless of the power game of the super-Powers. That machinery must be in accord with the genuine interests of the Latin American countries as a whole, free of any desire to provoke antagonism or conflicts with any State in particular.

86. We believe that Latin America has a leading role to play in bringing about conditions for peace in the world, and particularly in its own geographical region, and that we must urgently convene a conference

of heads of State or Government of Latin America and, concurrently, a conference of the chiefs of staff of Latin American countries, to lay the foundations for establishing the institutional machinery for the collective defence and security of Latin America, with an exclusively Latin American character.

87. Those views that I have put forward constitute the reply of Panama to the essential purposes of this Assembly, since the objectives of détente and disarmament are inseparable from those of our self-determination and sovereignty.

88. The PRESIDENT: I wish to thank the President of Panama for the important statement he has just made.

89. The Assembly will now hear a statement by the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Helmut Schmidt. I have great pleasure in welcoming him, and I invite him to address the General Assembly.

90. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany): The Assembly is meeting at a time when people in many regions of the world are falling victim to war. In Afghanistan, in Cambodia, in the South Atlantic and in South-West Africa, in Iran and Iraq and in Lebanon, men, women and children are dying. The spark of military conflict threatens to spring over to many other areas of conflict in the world. The danger of a nuclear war has still not been contained, and every limited war can bring us closer to that danger.

91. It is at this time that the representatives of the peoples of this world have gathered here to debate disarmament problems. I wish to thank the President of the Assembly, Mr. Kittani, for giving me the opportunity to speak on the subject; at the same time, I also wish to greet the Secretary-General, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar. I share their great concern for peace.

92. On behalf of the people of my country, I should also like to express to the delegation of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia our sincere condolences on the death of His Majesty King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz Al Saud. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has lost a great monarch and the entire Arab nation has lost a wise leader.

93. It was due in large measure to him that the great influence of Saudi Arabia in international relations and the respect it enjoys among the peoples of the world have been employed in the service of reason and reconciliation and peace.

*[The speaker continued in German.]**

94. Concern for peace is at this time a bond not only among responsible political leaders. More than ever before, the nations of the earth are longing for peace. The threat to peace and the safeguarding of peace are no longer exclusively the concern of Governments; in many countries, they have become the focal point of discussion by the citizens themselves.

95. This holds true for countries where free expression is one of the fundamental rights that are taken for granted. But it also holds true for those countries where free expression is suppressed, where those who try to exercise this right are persecuted.

* The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

There, too, there is a growing fear that in spite of all the passionate attempts to make peace more secure the efforts made so far may not have been adequate. Our peoples note with dismay and fear that the threats are not diminishing and that attempts at reconciliation are being regarded with suspicion.

96. At the same time, however, there is a growing awareness that it is not only weapons that threaten peace. The Independent Commission on International Development Issues, under the chairmanship of my friend Willy Brandt, has expressed this as follows: "History has taught us that wars produce hunger, but we are less aware that mass poverty can lead to war. . . . Where hunger rules peace cannot prevail."⁴

97. Not even one generation has passed since my people learned from firsthand experience that war begets hunger. It is from this experience and from our awareness of the guilt for a war whose victims included five million Germans and 20 million citizens of the Soviet Union, millions of persecuted persons and millions of Europeans and North Americans—from these feelings and experiences we Germans derive a special sense of responsibility for peace.

98. That is why we see in the Assembly an opportunity to make progress towards the safeguarding of peace. This special session of the General Assembly can emit a signal that will be an even greater encouragement to Governments and peoples to stand up for peace. It can point to roads that can be taken, roads along which peace can be maintained and made more secure.

99. The political task—indeed, the moral obligation—of every Government today is to conceive of its security policy as part of a global policy for peace and to act accordingly. Only such a security policy can stand up to the judgement of history and to the growing criticism of the citizens of all countries of the world.

100. Recalling my speech four years ago at the tenth special session [5th meeting], I should like now to point out a few essential elements of such a policy.

101. The first element is balance. In that part of the world in which we Germans live, Europe, there can be no security without an approximate balance of military forces. No responsible Government can accept a situation in which its country is threatened by an excessive arms buildup by one side, in which it could be subjected to political blackmail.

102. We in the Federal Republic of Germany are directly affected by the predominance of the Soviet Union and its allies in the field of conventional weapons and by the installation of hundreds of new intermediate-range nuclear weapons, a great many of which are targeted on our country.

103. One of those modern, highly accurate missiles with three warheads would be capable of destroying my home town of Hamburg and the neighbouring cities of Lubeck and Kiel at one fell swoop. Together with our partners, therefore, we are striving for a stable military balance between West and East, to be achieved through agreements.

104. The second essential element I wish to mention is non-alignment. An agreed military balance between West and East would also contribute to stability in

the world, because those who accept balance as the basis for their own security must recognize that the East-West conflict must on no account be carried over into other regions of the world.

105. Indeed, in the last few years it has become increasingly clear that the non-alignment of the third-world countries is a critical factor for stability and peace in the world as a whole. Accordingly, respect for non-alignment is an essential element in a global peace policy.

106. The more clearly non-alignment is respected as an element of peace in the world today, the less cause will there be for the countries of the third world to allow themselves to be drawn into an arms race and for the export of weapons to third world countries to be promoted.

107. At the 9th meeting, on 11 June, Foreign Minister Cheysson of France emphasized the importance of collective security within a regional framework for the countries of the third world, and I feel that this conceptual approach should be followed up by the Assembly.

108. The third essential element of policy I would refer to is partnership in treaties. Efforts to achieve balance are not enough by themselves, because there is an inherent danger that an arms race could, as a result of mutual suspicion, push that balance to higher and higher levels. Moreover, an exaggerated desire for security, however understandable it may be in the light of historical experience, holds the same danger. Excessive security for one side means insecurity for the other. Accordingly, four years ago I called upon all concerned to safeguard peace through partnership in treaties, through partnership for security. In the relations between East and West, only agreed security based on a contractually agreed balance at a low level can offer genuine security and true stability.

109. A partnership for security is the logical consequence of the realization that we can prevent war only by working together. In this way compliance with treaties becomes an element of our common security.

110. The fourth element of policy is dialogue and trust. Treaties, however, can be negotiated, concluded and fulfilled only if each partner can trust the others, and trust can develop only if the behaviour of both parties in situations of crisis is calculable, if the politicians and leaders on each side know each other.

111. For this reason, the security dialogue among the partners must not be disrupted and we must not allow negotiations on arms control and disarmament to be broken off—even in times of increasing political and ideological tension and even if one partner has a real or imagined cause to direct serious charges at the other side.

112. The creation, maintenance and promotion of these foundations of a partnership for security are, in my opinion, indispensable if we wish to pursue a policy of peace. That is why my Government has for a long time been trying to establish reasonable relations with the German Democratic Republic and the Eastern European countries, and that is why I welcome the intention expressed by President Reagan and General Secretary Brezhnev to meet for talks during the course of this year.

113. Now let me say a word about the instruments of peace policy.

114. The most important instrument of peace policy is the renunciation of force. Unfortunately, this principle of international law has been violated on several occasions recently. Once an attempt is made to settle a conflict by force, nobody knows where, after the first step has been taken, the military conflict will end. The responsibility for the unforeseeable consequences must be borne by those who take the first step and use force first.

115. We must all insist that the prohibition of the use of force is as fully applicable as is laid down in the Charter of the United Nations.

116. The 16 members of the Western alliance, to which my country belongs, reaffirmed at their recent meeting at Bonn that none of their weapons would ever be used except in response to an attack. They have thus reaffirmed the central principles of the Charter: the prohibition of the use or threat of use of force and the right to self-defence.

117. The ban on the use of force outlaws any war; it is applicable to the use of all weapons. Conventional weapons also, not only nuclear weapons, today have an unimaginable destructive capacity.

118. Those who would limit the comprehensive ban on the use of force to the first use of certain weapons appear to be saying that there may be other types of war which might be permissible. We should not accept that. There is no such thing as a just war. It is only and exclusively permissible to defend oneself against aggression from outside.

119. Along with the central concept of the renunciation of the use of force, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] is likewise an instrument of peace policy. My country, in ratifying that Treaty, has assumed the important obligation not to have nuclear weapons at its disposal. After a long debate years ago in the German Bundestag, my parliament, the majority voted in favour of our acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. There are many who have rejected it on the ground that it is discriminatory. At the time of the Bundestag vote, I fought in favour of it because in my view the aim of nuclear arms limitation and reduction should have priority.

120. Because my country has carefully observed the Treaty's obligations, we have every right to insist that the nuclear-weapon States too should meet their commitments after such a long time, especially their commitment under the Treaty's article VI, that is, "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race . . . and to nuclear disarmament". We insist on our right and our claim to nuclear disarmament.

121. On the basis of the Non-Proliferation Treaty we also advocate the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We hope that the working group set up by the Committee on Disarmament will make rapid progress.

122. A few days ago the heads of State and Government of the North Atlantic alliance adopted at Bonn a programme for peace in freedom, a programme which

reaffirms the primary objective of the alliance's security policy, that is, to prevent wars and to lay the foundations for lasting peace, while at the same time preserving freedom. The basic elements of our security policy are oriented towards that goal: deterrence and defence on the one hand, along with arms control and disarmament on the other.

123. The alliance's declaration underscores the intention to negotiate for militarily significant, equitable and verifiable agreements on arms control and disarmament, and it makes a broad-ranging offer opening the way for the establishment of a stable balance between East and West at the lowest possible level. That offer of negotiations embraces all elements of the military power relationship between East and West.

124. First, in the field of intercontinental strategic weapons, it becomes possible, as a result of the United States proposal for substantial reductions, to make a decisive contribution to future stability. We are gratified to note that neither side to the negotiations intends to do anything that would undercut the provisions of SALT I and SALT II, and we welcome Mr. Brezhnev's acceptance of Mr. Reagan's proposal for an early commencement of the START negotiations, with the result that they will begin on 29 June. Moreover, President Reagan, during his visit to Berlin, introduced a new important topic: confidence-building measures to prevent a nuclear conflict resulting from an accident or a misunderstanding between these two great nuclear Powers.

125. Secondly, with regard to intermediate-range nuclear weapons systems, the negotiations on that subject began at Geneva on 30 November 1981. We give our unqualified support to the proposal that the United States and the Soviet Union should forgo all longer-ranged land-based intermediate-range nuclear missiles. The elimination of an entire category of weapons would be a major step towards genuine disarmament. We shall do everything in our power to help make that proposal a reality.

126. Thirdly, with regard to conventional forces, we shall shortly be putting forward in the negotiations at Vienna on mutual balanced force reductions a new Western initiative, the object of which will be to give a long-overdue stimulus to the negotiations so that agreement can be reached on equal, collective ceilings on both sides in central Europe. I attach the greatest importance to the Vienna negotiations because military stability should not be restricted to nuclear potentials alone; it must also embrace the conventional component.

127. Fourthly, with respect to confidence-building and security-building measures in the whole of Europe, we have reaffirmed our intention of supporting proposals at the Madrid meeting of representatives of the participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe for a mandate for a conference on disarmament in Europe. Its object must be to promote stability and calculability through measures that will be valid in the whole of Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals.

128. Finally, we realize that stable peace also requires partnership between North and South in the field of security policy in all regions of the world. That is why we have stressed, in the Bonn declaration, the

importance of the negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament and the hopes we have pinned on this special session of the General Assembly.

129. The realities of the present show us how far we still are, all over the globe, from the goal of stable peace. On a global scale, therefore, the efforts to achieve concrete results by negotiation must be intensified. Every region should make its own maximum contribution towards the maintenance of international peace. I very much hope that this special session will prove conducive to the achievement of that goal.

130. Let me in this context put some ideas to the General Assembly. First, the Federal Republic of Germany has made the concept of confidence-building measures the focal point of its endeavours within the United Nations in the field of security policy. The twelfth special session has before it a study entitled *Comprehensive Study on Confidence-Building Measures*,⁵ which was commissioned by the Secretary-General and drawn up over a period of two years. Since we Germans provided the initiative for this study, we are pleased that experts from all regions of the world have been able to agree on recommendations which may enhance the process of confidence-building within the United Nations.

131. My country will continue to play an active part in the further development of confidence-building measures. At the present time we are making preparations for, and will extend invitations to, an international symposium on confidence-building measures to be held in the Federal Republic of Germany next spring. What we have in mind is a working meeting of experts from the various regions of the world.

132. Secondly, there is the matter of openness and calculability. Stability presupposes the openness, explicitness and calculability of military potentials and activities. Impenetrable secrecy sows the seeds of mistrust and impedes the conclusion of concrete agreements. We therefore support all efforts aimed at greater explicitness and openness worldwide.

133. This year, for the third time, my country has submitted its figures to the standardized reporting system of the United Nations for military expenditure. The number of countries participating in this reporting system is increasing, but unfortunately these countries still represent only a minority of the Members of the United Nations. In 1980 and 1981 they numbered a total of 18 countries—12 Western and 6 non-aligned States. So far the countries of the Warsaw Pact have not participated at all.

134. I appeal to all Governments to join in these important efforts aimed at greater openness in military expenditure. This would be a first step on the path towards establishing comparability. Without openness and comparability, agreements on verifiable reductions in military budgets are inconceivable.

135. At the tenth special session I expressed my support for a commitment by all countries involved in arms exports to make such exports public. Since then the danger of an arms race in the third world, too, has grown. Consequently, we must ask ourselves: should we not join together in seeking new ways of limiting the transfer of arms by mutual agreement? I propose that this question be examined in connexion

with the planned study on conventional weapons [see A/S-12/3, annex III].

136. Now let me say a few words about verification. For a long time my country has attached the highest importance to adequate verification. This constitutes the primary difficulty in numerous current negotiations.

137. This is true particularly of the negotiations concerning a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons. Four years ago I issued an invitation to an international seminar concerning the problems of verification as regards chemical weapons. That seminar was held in our country in 1979. In order to make a further contribution to a solution of the problem of the verification of a ban on chemical weapons and thus to pave the way for the conclusion of a treaty, I hereby extend an invitation to a second international seminar for experts, to take place in 1983.

138. I was glad to take the opportunity to speak at the twelfth special session of the General Assembly, since I am firmly convinced of the importance of the dialogue which is being held here. The Assembly must provide a strong impetus for both the current and forthcoming negotiations. The consensus reached four years ago must be reaffirmed and developed further. One central task is to draw up a comprehensive programme for disarmament on that foundation. I hope that this special session will prove successful in adopting a programme that both is realistic and provides a guidepost for the future.

139. Not only here in New York, but in many cities in many countries all over the world, we have been witnessing during these days and weeks of spring 1982 gatherings of young and older people who are voicing their fear of a terrible and excessive arms buildup and an overkill that surpass all understanding. They no longer accept the logic of the old Roman saying, *Qui desiderat pacem, praeparet bellum*.

140. Today it is not only idealistic pacifists and starry-eyed Utopians who are protesting against such concepts. Doubts are more and more urgently being raised as to the wisdom of the strategic thinkers, the diplomats and the statesmen and as to their capability finally of breaking out of the vicious circle of armament and still more armament.

141. The slogan "Create peace without weapons", or the other slogan "Beat swords into ploughshares", is sending clear signals to political leaders. Among the younger generation the suspicion is growing that one day nuclear weapons might perhaps no longer be regarded only as a means of deterrence. There are many who are afraid that some day someone may lose his nerve and in fact make use of the nuclear arsenal to impose his will on a political rival.

142. Moreover, these citizens also have the support of scientists of international rank in their profound fear and doubt. For they too are by no means certain that the next world war will not take place just because it would be tantamount to collective suicide.

143. The impatience of the people—and not only of younger people—is therefore growing. There is impatience with Governments that appear to be doing no more than talk while at the same time they are developing, producing and installing ever more deadly

weapons. There is impatience with those in positions of political responsibility who permit more and more resources to be taken away from the fight against hunger and poverty and invested instead in armaments.

144. We must be conscious of the danger that our citizens, frightened of the terrors of a nuclear holocaust, may soon no longer be able or willing to understand why negotiations concerning practical steps towards disarmament go on and on for years—why, as they see it, and they must see it, the idea of national prestige has a greater effect on the decisions of Governments than do the necessities of mutual security, security that can be achieved only on a partnership basis.

145. I know that a reduction in the weapons arsenals that are filled to overflowing cannot be achieved through plebiscites. That can be accomplished only by means of untiring and difficult negotiations. I know that the great breakthrough that would eliminate the danger of war once and for all remains a dangerous illusion. I also know that unilateral disarmament, opening the door to pressure by other Powers, must be recognized by any reasonable person as extremely dangerous.

146. Nevertheless, we should not underestimate the great and positive moral force that emerges in the movement for effective disarmament. We should not simply push aside those who support that movement, dismissing them as amateurs who lack sufficient insight. Instead, and on the contrary, the driving force that has become apparent in the unrest of many of our fellow citizens must be regarded as a motivation and a moral obligation for us.

147. If we are to conquer fear, we must harness the power of reason. It is for this purpose that this special session of the General Assembly has convened. The hopes of so many nations are pinned on its success. Those hopes must not be disappointed.

148. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly I thank the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany for the important statement he has just made.

149. Mr. CZYREK (Poland):* Allow me, Sir, at the outset to congratulate you on your election to the office of President of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Your great experience, as well as your awareness of the importance of this momentous event, as reflected in your opening statement, constitutes one of the substantial guarantees for the efficient guidance of our deliberations.

150. I wish also to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, whose dedication to the cause of disarmament has been and will remain of great value in the efforts that are being undertaken by the Organization.

151. The problem of disarmament is the most important challenge for the world of the nuclear age, because not only the attainment of the paramount objective of the Organization to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" depends on its

settlement, but the fate of contemporary civilization as well.

152. The Polish people, who have been subjected to so much suffering in their history and who in the Second World War came to the brink of total extinction, are among those who know well the high price of peace. That is why the Government of the Polish People's Republic welcomed with appreciation the decision to convene this session. We have come to it with a belief that its outcome will meet the needs and hopes of nations. We are resolved to contribute to its work and results to the best of our ability.

153. We are taking part in the work of the session with a feeling of deep concern. The world is now living through one of the most difficult periods in the development of international relations since the Second World War. A number of negative phenomena have accumulated in the political, military and economic spheres.

154. The pace of armament is accelerating while the attempts to halt it have diminished and are hardly effective. In the race between the growth of armaments and the efforts for their control and limitation we are all losers. We can hardly fail to notice, as well, that this constant quantitative and qualitative growth of armaments gives rise to new and dangerous tendencies.

Mr. López del Amo (Cuba), Vice-President, took the Chair.

155. The readiness to use force or threats of force in international relations is increasing, while efforts to prevent and settle situations of conflict are of little effect. This leads to the persistence of dangerous international conflicts. Is it not, indeed, highly regrettable that the start of this session devoted to disarmament should have coincided with new loss of life and human suffering caused by Israeli armed aggression against Lebanon?

156. Preparations for new conflicts are being undertaken, as is demonstrated by the development of intervention forces and increased military presence abroad. The discussion of the possibility of carrying on and winning limited nuclear wars is being revived, as are speculations concerning the feasibility of a preemptive first strike.

157. Particularly menacing are the plans to deploy Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western Europe and to produce neutron weapons, accompanied by theories on the possibility of a limited nuclear war in Europe. In fact, such a war would bring about not only the annihilation of that continent but also, through unavoidable escalation, a catastrophe for the whole world.

158. The new phenomena and trends that have appeared in the field of armaments and in current ideas on war do not flow merely from the inherent dynamics of the arms race. They also reflect specific conceptions backed by certain political decisions. In the present circumstances they appear first and foremost as a manifestation of a dangerous evolution in the policy of some countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO], the United States in particular. This evolution in its essence consists in departing from the agreed and mutually advantageous principles governing relations between States with different

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

socio-political systems, in striving to impose a policy from a position of strength and diktat, in openly interfering in the internal affairs of other States and in limiting dialogue and political and economic contacts. Under this policy the intensified arms race is viewed not only as a way to destabilize the balance of forces and to gain military superiority but also as an instrument to disturb the economic development of other States.

159. Such an approach can hardly remain without an impact on the state of political relations, and thus it becomes the major source of increased tension and erosion of confidence in international relations.

160. The alarming development of the international situation following the tenth special session of the General Assembly, fraught as that situation has been with so many threats to the peace, unfortunately could not but leave its mark on the implementation of the session's decisions.

161. The Programme of Action [*resolution S-10/2, sect. III*] adopted at that session has after four years retained its great importance and topicality. We may therefore ask why we must speak today from this rostrum about the lack of progress in the cause of disarmament and the suspension or deadlock of numerous negotiations on that subject.

162. Yet it is a fact that during these four years efforts on the part of many States to carry out the Programme of Action in the field of disarmament have not been wanting. Poland, together with other socialist States, has considered it a matter of constant concern. Our joint commitment has been manifested in important initiatives put forward by the socialist States at various forums for the disarmament dialogue within and outside the United Nations. It has been expressed in readiness to embark upon substantive discussion and the quest to reach agreement so as to curb, halt and reverse the arms race wherever it threatens and above all in the field in which it is most threatening—that of nuclear weapons.

163. We highly appreciate the efforts made by the non-aligned States to reach the same goal. We support their action aimed at obtaining from the nuclear Powers guarantees for non-nuclear States under international law on the non-use of nuclear weapons against them.

164. In our view there is no other way to eliminate the growing dangers to the world than persistent and continuing negotiations, to be conducted with due respect for mutual interests of equal security. The fact that the international situation is deteriorating and that new dangers are appearing should make all States increase their disarmament efforts. We share the profound thought expressed recently by Pope John Paul II that peace is not only the absence of war; it also involves reciprocal trust between nations which is manifested and proved through constructive negotiations that aim at ending the arms race.

165. The special importance of dialogue on disarmament between the great Powers, as well as their special responsibility for progress towards disarmament, does not detract from the value of and the need for a positive contribution by other States, whether medium-sized or small. Such a contribution is

needed now more than ever. It can help to create an atmosphere of urgency for enduring disarmament efforts and facilitate the search for solutions.

166. A full engagement by these States in disarmament discussions and the rejection of a wait-and-see attitude is not only a matter of sharing responsibility for the development of the world; it is a matter of vital interest to them.

167. We believe that the present session will mark an important stage in the efforts to reverse the dangerous trends in the military and political fields. Its success, however, depends on a common acceptance of the fundamental principle of undiminished equal security for all States. It can be attained only through common efforts.

168. Refusing to take part in negotiations, stretching them out or using them merely as a camouflage for efforts to gain specific political, military or economic advantages are, indeed, actions that harm the interests of every nation and of humanity at large.

169. However, this truth must have been overlooked or neglected by the very group of States which must be primarily called to account for the deterioration of the international situation. These States seem to have subordinated the international disarmament dialogue to their policy of confrontation, thereby leading to a weakening, a slowing down or, in some cases, even a breaking-off of this dialogue.

170. The tenth special session greatly increased the opportunities for the consideration of disarmament issues within the framework of the United Nations. Its decisions have certainly resulted in a wider and more thorough debate on disarmament problems in the United Nations, in negotiations on those problems in the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva and in their presentation to public opinion in a manner which reflects the weight and urgency of these problems. We regard the framework for United Nations disarmament efforts set up at the first special session to be appropriate today also, just as we consider the substance of the Programme of Action in the field of disarmament to be topical and unquestionable. There is, however, the question here of insufficient, unsatisfactory effectiveness of so many valid resolutions of the world Organization in the field of disarmament. In other words, it is a question of genuine goodwill on the part of all States—and in particular those with the greatest military capability—to co-operate in their implementation.

171. Because of the very lack of political will on the part of some of its members to reach agreement, the Committee on Disarmament has failed to achieve the results one could have expected on the basis of the Programme of Action and the tasks recommended at the last four regular sessions of the General Assembly.

172. I believe that the present session, while giving full support to the work of the Committee and emphasizing the urgency of that work, will further enhance its importance and—what is most significant—have a substantial influence on the adoption of a constructive approach by all its members and consequently on accelerating the elaboration of urgently needed disarmament agreements.

173. The major task of this twelfth special session is to overcome these obstacles and barriers to the disarmament dialogue, which originate in the confrontational trend in the policy of some countries. In the best conceived security interest of all the States of the world we should convince them that they should participate effectively in this dialogue.

174. To this end it is necessary, referring to the decisions of the tenth special session, to reaffirm fully the Programme of Action in the field of disarmament, its priorities, objectives and principles. It is then necessary to take decisions that will assist in the solution of concrete problems of disarmament and the implementation of concrete steps for disarmament. An essential part in arranging United Nations disarmament efforts should be played by the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

175. It is the common belief of the Assembly, as recorded in its numerous resolutions, that it is a matter of the highest priority to prevent the mounting and most serious threat of nuclear war by halting the nuclear arms race and limiting and reducing nuclear weapons with the objective of achieving the total elimination of those weapons.

176. In view of the importance of limiting the strategic armaments of the United States and the Soviet Union in the interest of world security and the progress of the cause of disarmament, we cannot but welcome with satisfaction the announced resumption later this month, after an interval of three years, of the talks on this matter, as well as the proposals of Leonid Brezhnev on freezing strategic weapons and refraining from actions that would impair the stability of the strategic situation. These proposals are a valuable contribution in ensuring the success of the imminent talks. We hope that they will meet with a constructive response and that the talks will soon bring substantial results that will be meaningful to the world.

177. A task of the utmost urgency is the conclusion of a treaty on the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear tests; the discontinued tripartite talks between the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States on that subject should be completed. The Committee on Disarmament should be enabled to work out this treaty.

178. The international régime on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons requires strengthening and consolidation.

179. As the United Nations, we should spare no effort to banish the idea of nuclear war from the mind of man, ethics and the law of nations. Hence our support for the Soviet initiative concerning the prevention of nuclear catastrophe.

180. Poland is directing a great deal of initiative and effort at the important problem of banning chemical weapons. This urgently requires solution because a real threat exists of unleashing an extremely dangerous arms race in this field. This session should strongly recommend to the Committee on Disarmament that it urgently conclude its work on the draft convention on the elimination of these weapons and should prevent their proliferation.

181. Poland's security is very closely linked to that of Europe as a whole. Comprehension of this relation-

ship and awareness of the threat posed to European States by the present arms race make us deeply anxious that military confrontation in Europe should decrease.

182. This concern was reflected in the well-known Polish proposals for a nuclear-free zone and a zone of nuclear-armaments freeze in central Europe. In October this year it will be 25 years since we submitted, for the first time here in the United Nations, the plan which has passed into the history of post-war diplomacy under the name of the Rapacki Plan [*see 697th meeting*].

183. Like a later Polish proposal concerning a freeze on nuclear weapons, the Plan played an important role in the discussion of ways of strengthening security in Europe and in the world.

184. First advanced by Poland, the idea of nuclear-free zones was taken up and implemented in Latin America. It is also reflected in the proposals to establish similar zones both in Europe and in other parts of the world.

185. It is with particular satisfaction that we note the renewed interest in the ideas contained in the Polish proposals. We are convinced that the idea of a freeze on nuclear armaments and of their elimination from certain areas of Europe continues to provide important guidelines in the search for ways gradually to free Europe from the nightmare of the nuclear arms race and nuclear war. We continue to be ready to make our contribution to the search for solutions that will help us to achieve this objective.

186. We support the proposals concerning the establishment of nuclear-free zones in northern Europe and in the Balkans. We take careful note of the interesting concepts concerning disarmament measures in Europe worked out by the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues.⁶

187. At the same time we have always maintained that the problems of curbing the arms race and of European disarmament cannot be submitted for effective consideration if separated from other issues, in particular the organization of security and peaceful co-operation in our continent. That is why the question of parallel efforts to ensure the consolidation of security and peaceful co-operation among European nations has always occupied an important place in our thinking. We have pursued this line in both bilateral and multilateral relations.

188. We have thus contributed to the gradual yet consistent building of the structure of security and co-operation, the highest achievement of which to date has been the Final Act of Helsinki and the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. This provides an important platform for contacts and for the search for solutions to basic European problems. It also creates more favourable conditions for undertaking disarmament measures in the continent. However, we must not fail to recognize the threat to the stability and viability of this Conference process posed by the unlimited arms race and the phenomena it entails.

189. It is therefore essential to halt the arms race on the European continent, not only in order to reduce the danger arising from the current situation but also

as a condition of the maintenance, strengthening and development of those structures of security and co-operation which are the historic achievement of the European nations. It is an urgent necessity to supplement these by concrete stabilizing measures, by building confidence and by limiting the process of the accumulation of the most threatening military potential.

190. This is the motive behind the idea of a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe put forward by Poland and its allies and our involvement in the efforts to convene such a conference. We hope for the successful conclusion of the work undertaken at the Madrid meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe on the mandate for a conference on confidence-building measures, security and disarmament in Europe, which is to be an essential and integral part of the multilateral process initiated by the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

191. The recognition of the mutuality and equality of the security interests of all its participants is an indispensable prerequisite for the successful conclusion of this work.

192. The aggravation of the international situation and intensification of the elements of confrontation also threaten the infrastructure of international co-operation created through bilateral and multilateral efforts. In the Final Act, that co-operation was elevated to the rank of one of the basic principles of European security. The idea of economic confidence-building measures and establishing a system of economic security derives from our conviction of the necessity to protect that co-operation.

193. The proposal to establish such a system was recently advanced by the Prime Minister of the Polish People's Republic, Wojciech Jaruzelski. Based on the observance in inter-State economic relations of the principles of equality, sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs, the system would prevent the use of economic pressure for obtaining political goals. Having in mind the role played by the equality of rights in economic relations for strengthening international security, we should like to stress that this idea has broader relevance extending beyond Europe.

194. The Soviet-American negotiations on limiting intermediate-range nuclear weapons are of fundamental importance for strengthening security in Europe and the world. We welcome the Soviet initiatives pertaining to those negotiations as a particular expression of goodwill and a true desire to reach agreement. The decision concerning the unilateral moratorium on the deployment of intermediate-range missiles in Europe or targeted on European States and their unilateral reduction not only provide favourable grounds for further negotiations; they also constitute, together with the Soviet decision of 1979 unilaterally to withdraw 20,000 troops and 1,000 tanks from central Europe, one of the very infrequent concrete steps taken on the European continent to limit armaments and armed forces. We wish to believe that the Soviet steps and initiatives will be met with an appropriate response from other States, in both their decisions and behaviour. It is high time to prevent

the beginning of a new, extremely dangerous stage of the nuclear-arms race in Europe.

195. The Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe remain an important forum for the European disarmament dialogue.

196. An agreement concerning the first stage—reduction of Soviet and United States troops and the parallel freeze of the overall numerical strength of forces in central Europe—could be reached soon if the Western States responded constructively to the comprehensive compromise proposals submitted by Poland on behalf of the socialist States, direct participants in those negotiations, in February this year. Those proposals sum up over eight years of negotiations and take into account the positions of all the negotiating States. Thus the first agreed disarmament step could be effected, starting the process of military détente in the heart of Europe and lowering the level of military confrontation between the opposing groupings along their contact line.

197. We are very hopeful that the present multilateral efforts by European States to build a lasting regional system of security and disarmament will not remain an example of a missed opportunity and that they will yield concrete and substantial results. We hope that the present session will be a stimulus for speeding up those efforts too.

198. Public awareness of the dangers stemming from the present situation is becoming ever more widespread in the world. The growing peace and anti-nuclear movements have to be perceived as a spontaneous impulse of self-defence by peoples facing the mounting threats, as an expression of their instinct for self-protection.

199. Those movements are our invaluable ally. The United Nations should hear their views, make use of their passion and broad social appeal, and promote through them the great cause of disarmament among the nations of the world. The goal of lasting and long-range prospects for the cause of disarmament and of basing them on the consciousness and activity of the millions is furthered by the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace [*resolution 33/73*], adopted on the initiative of my country at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly. The United Nations, the Governments of Member States, educators, teachers, scholars and humanists should consistently implement the tenets of this Declaration in order to form minds and forge character in the spirit of eradicating the evil of war and aggression, promoting peace, coexistence and international co-operation.

200. These are difficult times as the General Assembly gathers for its second special session devoted to disarmament. These times cast a dark shadow on the problems of disarmament to be discussed and settled at this session which in themselves are difficult enough. We realize that the path to disarmament agreements is not an easy one. However, we firmly believe that this will not plunge us into resignation. For the present situation requires special and redoubled efforts and great political imagination to find the necessary, yet mutually acceptable, solutions. This attitude and these actions are required of us by the sense of responsibility for the fate of our countries, in order to protect the heritage of past genera-

tions, to save those to come from a nuclear disaster and to create for all nations, particularly the most needy ones, the opportunity of unhampered social and economic development.

201. Unswervingly linking its future and development with the building of international security based on détente, disarmament and co-operation among nations, Poland, together with its allies, is ready to do its utmost to ensure that the prospects of a lasting peace for the world will, as a result of this session, become a reality.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.

NOTES

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326.

² *Ibid.*, vol. 21, No. 324 (a), p. 93.

³ See *The Department of State Bulletin*, vol. LXXVII, No. 19999 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978), pp. 483-496.

⁴ *North-South: A program for survival*; report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues, under the Chairmanship of Willy Brandt (Cambridge, Massachusetts, The MIT Press, 1980), p. 16.

⁵ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.3.

⁶ See "Common Security: a programme for disarmament" (A/CN.10/38, chap. 6, sects. 1.4-1.7. See also A/CN.10/51).