



President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. DOST (Afghanistan): Mr. President, it is a privilege for me once again to have the opportunity of addressing the Assembly, which is under your wise and able chairmanship. Please accept my own good wishes and those of my delegation for the successful conduct of this historic special session on disarmament.

2. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan attaches great importance to the work of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. With the international situation as complicated as it is today, we believe that it is of the utmost importance not to slacken, but rather to intensify, the efforts of all peace-loving States to strengthen peace, eliminate the threat of war and achieve concrete action to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament. It would be in the best interests of all countries if the second special session served this purpose.

3. The entire world is outraged by the most barbarous invasion of Lebanon by the occupationist forces of Israel, which are inflicting great human and material losses on Lebanon, the Palestinian population and the Syrian Arab Republic.

4. This naked aggression takes place at a time when the nations of the world are gathered here to consider disarmament and the abolition of the instruments of war and aggression.

5. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan strongly condemns this aggression on the part of Israel and expresses its full solidarity with our Arab brothers who are being subjected to the aggression.

6. If the Israeli invasion is not checked immediately, it may well develop into a new all-out war in the Middle East which will pose a serious threat to world peace.

7. The fact that tangible achievements in the field of disarmament are meagre and fall far short of the expectations of the international community brings into focus the urgent necessity of designing practical means and applying effective measures to curb the arms race which could eventually lead to the realization of our common objective of general and complete disarmament.

8. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, as a non-aligned developing country, expresses along with other peace-seeking countries of the world the hope that the current special session of the General Assembly on disarmament will adopt decisive measures to promote the struggle for peace and general

and complete disarmament. We earnestly hope that this session will give a strong impetus to the negotiations on the most urgent concrete problems of halting the arms race and of real disarmament. If the session is to be a success, it must pave the way to the convening of the world conference on disarmament, which is the most effective means of coping with this problem in the most comprehensive way and of taking the necessary decisions to ensure progress in the field of disarmament.

9. I should like to assure you, Mr. President, of the co-operation of my delegation in stepping up efforts aimed at genuine and complete disarmament.

10. In the 1970s the relaxation of international tensions in relations between States belonging to different socio-political systems led to the cold war yielding ground. The restructuring of international relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence gained momentum. But as the world entered the 1980s, and especially after the change of leadership in the White House, a sharp change occurred in the policy of the United States and a number of other imperialist Powers. Those in their ruling circles began to set their sights in international relations on force and force alone. United States statesmen and military leaders openly declared that nuclear war, both global and limited, was thinkable. Large regions of the world thousands of kilometres away from the United States were proclaimed to be Washington's spheres of vital interests. The present United States Administration and its bellicose partners in other imperialist countries have set out to upset the military strategic balance shaped during the past decade.

11. Developments in the international arena have taken a sharp turn towards greater military threats and the world has been faced with the bleak prospect of being thrown back to the period of the cold war. Such a situation has been brought about by the policy of imperialist and hegemonist forces which are attempting to undermine the process of détente, ensure military superiority for themselves and create conditions for interfering in the internal affairs of other States.

12. It is quite obvious that in the current complicated international situation the process of détente and of curbing the arms race has been increasingly coming under attack by imperialist and hegemonist forces. Their designs are being countered by broadly based movements of peoples and peace-loving countries, which are increasingly calling for an end to the growth of military arsenals with all their enormous destructive capacity and for their reduction and ultimate destruction.

13. Unfortunately, the objectives set by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to

disarmament appear to be as far away today as they were at that time, because the arms race not only is not slowing down but is being stepped up at a pace far outstripping that of the efforts to halt it.

14. Furthermore, it has not been possible to release even a modest amount of the enormous resources, both material and human, which are wasted on the unproductive and spiralling arms race and which should be made available for economic and social development, especially since such a race places a great burden on both the developing and the developed countries.

15. The constant acceleration of the arms race has been accompanied by a steady deterioration in the material well-being and means of livelihood of millions of people in different parts of the world. The unprecedented loss of human and material resources wasted on the military buildup has a direct and serious bearing on the worsening of the economic situation in many countries.

16. Enormous expenditures on modern weapons look particularly senseless against the background of the tremendous needs of the developing countries. So far these expenditures exceed by almost 30 times the value of aid to those countries. Nine schools could be built with the money spent for the construction of one F-14 fighter; five hospitals are equal in cost to one MX intercontinental ballistic missile. These few figures clearly show what great benefits could be brought to the peaceful economy as a result of practical disarmament measures. The arms race and economic development are incompatible.

17. But, unfortunately, those who profit from the arms race put every obstacle in the way of negotiations on specific problems of disarmament. They effectively block the implementation of the recommendations made by the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. It must be recalled that it was the United States that refused to ratify the SALT II treaty. The United States also unilaterally terminated negotiations with the Soviet Union on such important issues as the prohibition of chemical weapons, the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, the limitation of military activities in the Indian Ocean and so on.

18. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan takes a strong and consistent stand for the prohibition of nuclear arms, for the energy of the atom to be used only for the good of the people and for the prevention of a recurrence of the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

19. But, unfortunately, as a result of United States policy, the world has found itself on the verge of being thrust into a new spiral of the nuclear-arms race. It is today much more difficult to reverse this race and to achieve nuclear disarmament than it was previously. Nuclear arms have now grown into a huge complex of means of destruction of wide-ranging purpose and yield. The production of these weapons continues, and every new step in developing them creates a new threat to peace. In the present situation, we cannot but express a deep anxiety over the ever-growing danger of the outbreak of nuclear war, which would have catastrophic and irreparable consequences for mankind. A nuclear conflict would not spare any country, whether small or great.

20. Bearing this in mind, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, together with all other non-aligned States, expresses its deep concern that, despite the fact that the arms race has continued its upward spiral and the threat of nuclear war has increased, negotiations on practical disarmament measures, especially on nuclear disarmament, have not yet begun. We are convinced that negotiations on the limitation of armaments should no longer be made contingent on further arms buildup or on solutions of other political problems extraneous to disarmament. In the present world, disarmament—and this should be stressed particularly—is not a matter of propaganda or a political game; it is the basic way to survival.

21. Our country favours negotiations on the widest possible range of topics. All disarmament negotiations initiated in recent years bilaterally and in various international forums but which were subsequently suspended or postponed for one reason or another should be resumed without delay. All such negotiations should be conducted in good faith and in an efficient and constructive way rather than serve as a smokescreen behind which the arms race speeds on.

22. Sheer rhetoric and peace phraseology cannot be substitutes for practical solutions of the urgent problems of disarmament. From past experience all of us here know that talks on disarmament may drag on for years and years while the arms race continues unabated. Such a situation will always exist when one side comes out with unrealistic proposals totally unacceptable to negotiating partners as damaging their vital security interests. From this point of view, the recent United States proposals concerning the resumption of negotiations with the Soviet Union on strategic arms evoke serious and well-justified suspicions, since what they demand from the Soviet side is, effectively, unilateral disarmament.

23. Where, then, is the way out of the present impasse?

24. In our firm opinion, it is to be found along the road of the implementation of previous recommendations and decisions of the General Assembly, including those of its first special session on disarmament. An important step to avert the danger of nuclear war was the adoption by the Assembly at its thirty-sixth session of the Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe [*resolution 36/100*], which declares the first use of nuclear weapons to be the gravest crime against humanity. If all the nuclear States followed this Declaration and refused to use nuclear weapons first, there would be no first, nor second, nor third nuclear strikes and thus there would be no nuclear war.

25. Among other vitally important decisions of past sessions are those relating to the cessation of production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradual reduction of stockpiles until their complete elimination, general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons, the conclusion of an agreement not to station nuclear weapons on the territories of those States where there are no such weapons at present, the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world, the prohibition of development and production of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction,

the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons, the reduction of military budgets, and so on.

26. It is our firm opinion that those and some other goals in the field of curbing the arms race and bringing about disarmament should become part and parcel of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, which is to be discussed and approved by the Assembly at the present session. Like all other non-aligned States, we believe that the elaboration and adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament could be one of the most important achievements of the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

27. It is only natural that the measures to stop the production of nuclear weapons and to gradually destroy their stockpiles, as well as other steps to halt the race in nuclear and conventional weapons, should be indissolubly linked with the strengthening of political and international legal guarantees for the security of States. For this reason it is high time to start serious talks on the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. The General Assembly's resolution on the non-use of force in international relations and the prohibition for all time of the use of nuclear weapons [*resolution 31/9*], taken on the initiative of the Soviet Union,¹ creates a good basis for this.

28. Although Afghanistan is rather far away from Europe, we follow with great interest the events in Europe. We support all constructive proposals aimed at bringing down the level of military confrontation on the European continent, remembering that it was there that both world wars started. We wholeheartedly welcome and support the latest initiatives in this respect, particularly the Soviet proposals on total elimination of all medium-range nuclear systems in Europe or their substantial reduction. To facilitate this, the Soviet Union has recently unilaterally discontinued further deployment of medium-range missiles in the European part of the Soviet Union and has even decided to reduce their numbers. These are indeed concrete peaceful actions and they deserve to be applauded. It would be a great pity if the United States and other NATO countries did not reciprocate and a real chance to come to an agreement on this vital issue was missed.

29. Countries in different parts of the world are raising ever-more insistently the question of carrying out regional measures aimed at promoting military détente. This includes the demand that the countries outside a particular region not increase their armed forces or build military bases there. In other words, this is a question of setting up zones of peace.

30. The question of strengthening security and easing tensions in the Indian Ocean has acquired great urgency in the last few years. The right of the nations of that region to a peaceful life and their desire to concentrate efforts on their economic and social development have been jeopardized by the increased military activity of the United States. Afghanistan belongs to the region adjacent to the Indian Ocean, and we have invariably supported the desire of the coastal States of the Indian Ocean to turn that region into a zone of peace, where all foreign military bases would be dismantled and no

one would threaten the security, independence and sovereignty of the States in the region.

31. As the Assembly is aware, in the last few years the imperialist Powers, above all the United States, have followed a policy of building a world-wide network of military bases on foreign territories. At present the United States has over 1,500 bases and military installations in scores of countries all over the world. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan supports all proposals and measures aimed at closing down military bases on foreign territories, regarding them as a threat to international peace and security. The practical deeds of the imperialist Powers clearly reveal the true reason for their reluctance to solve this problem. For instance, the Pentagon is now spending hundreds of millions of dollars on the construction of its naval and air bases on Diego García in the central part of the Indian Ocean, and American troops remain on the bases on Masira Island in the Arabian Sea, in the Philippines and in a number of other regions. The existence of these strongholds of imperialist interference in the internal affairs of other countries is undoubtedly increasing world tension.

32. It is only natural that the problem of maintaining peace and preventing war is given so high a priority. Man has made unprecedented progress in science, production and culture. On the other hand, the militaristic Powers have stockpiled weapons the use of which could result in incalculable disasters for mankind and irreparable damage to our civilization.

33. As a non-aligned developing country, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is always in favour of general and complete disarmament. Among urgent disarmament measures we continue to support the proposals and initiatives on the reduction of military budgets of States, particularly by the permanent members of the Security Council, in order to release substantial resources for international economic and social development activities [*see A/S-12/7, annex, para. 7*].

34. We hope that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will give fresh impetus to constructive dialogue between States on all levels. All sides should make equal efforts to seek mutually acceptable solutions.

35. My delegation will do its utmost to ensure that agreement on a comprehensive programme of disarmament can be reached at the special session, a programme which will set tangible tasks in this sphere and facilitate practical steps on the road towards ending the arms race. We also expect increased public interest in the problems of safeguarding peace, as well as intensified world-wide activity in the struggle to end the arms race.

36. Mr. KUSUMAATMADJA (Indonesia): Mr. President, at the outset I should like, on behalf of the Indonesian delegation and on my own behalf, to extend to you our heartfelt congratulations on your election to the presidency of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Your outstanding qualities and vast experience in the realm of multilateral diplomacy is an assurance of your ability to direct our deliberations towards a fruitful conclusion. My delegation will extend its full support

and co-operation to you in carrying out your difficult task.

37. It is indeed a pleasure for me personally to be in the midst of so many distinguished representatives from all over the world. Their presence signifies the measure of importance that we all attach to this second special session devoted to disarmament and should be helpful for the attainment of the goals that we have set.

38. Even before the Charter of the United Nations was adopted, the international community had repeatedly affirmed the need for disarmament. Members of the Organization have since, year after year, in statements and resolutions, frequently expressed determination to forge ahead in disarmament efforts in order to ensure a safer and more secure world. Despite all this, however, the arms race has continued unabated and increasingly sophisticated weapons have been developed, while disarmament negotiations have been marked by stagnation.

39. It was in response to those developments that four years ago the first special session on disarmament was convened, and it adopted for the first time by consensus an international disarmament strategy, which has the ultimate objective of achieving general and complete disarmament under effective international control. That historic consensus was undoubtedly an expression of the recognition of the urgent need to achieve disarmament so as to ensure conditions of peace and security, as well as economic and social progress. It also accorded the Organization a central role and primary responsibility in the field of disarmament. Hence the adoption of the Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*] justifiably aroused the expectations of the international community that at long last speedy and substantial progress would be made towards the attainment of the goal of disarmament.

40. In this context it is unfortunate that the disarmament strategy adopted at the tenth special session, which might have become a landmark in the quest for a reduction of the burden of arms, has yet to be translated into substantive action. Instead of a reduction in armaments, a further escalation of the arms race has taken place, especially the nuclear-arms race. This is fully reflected in, among other things, the substantial increase in global military expenditures, which last year exceeded \$600 billion; in the competitive accumulation of nuclear armaments; and in the development and deployment of new types of weapons of even more destructive capacity.

41. It is most regrettable not only that the Final Document remains unimplemented, but also that since its adoption we have been confronted with an alarming deterioration of the international situation which has further jeopardized the prospect of attaining meaningful progress in the field of disarmament.

42. We have witnessed the crisis in détente which has posed a serious threat to world peace and stability. The rivalry among the great Powers and their competition for spheres of influence have continued. Within the last four years there has been increasing recourse to the use or threat of use of force, military intervention, occupation and other forms of interference, in violation of the Charter. Focal points of

aggression continue to exist while new conflicts further aggravate international tension and increase the risk of a global war. The latest case in point is the brutal attack by Israel on Lebanon, which should be condemned by all of us.

43. The prevailing threats to the sovereignty and independence of States—especially of those outside major military alliances—arising from such acts of aggression, occupation and interference have therefore become causes for continuing concern. The resulting instability has caused other nations, forced to confront the immediate threats to their security, to increase their armaments, thus detracting from development goals and leading them to a status of dependence on the great Powers.

44. We note with grave concern that such developments have now gone beyond the conventional field, with the ominous extension into a nuclear capability and the consequences that it entails. In fact, the prospects of a horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons may well be an outgrowth of the failure on the part of the nuclear Powers to honour their commitment contained in article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*]; that may well have induced some non-nuclear States to embark upon developing a nuclear capability of their own.

45. Thus we are faced with an arms race, both nuclear and conventional, which is threatening to engulf the whole world and which remains the single cause of the present state of increased insecurity.

46. The greatest peril facing mankind today is the threat of global destruction as a result of nuclear war. The actions of the nuclear States, which are engaged in a new round of the nuclear-arms race, have condemned mankind to live in the shadow of nuclear annihilation. Further, the existence of weapons of mass destruction in the context of strained great-Power relationships has added a frightening dimension to the potentiality for a world catastrophe. Reliance on the doctrine of deterrence has heightened the nightmare of uncertainty and fear. Never before has the world faced such a grim and fearful prospect.

47. The period since 1978 has brought new crises and the international situation has shifted in an ominous direction, rendering existing problems of disarmament infinitely more difficult to solve. Agreements already concluded have not been ratified, negotiations between major Powers have reached an impasse and the Committee on Disarmament—the sole multilateral negotiating forum—has been prevented from discharging its responsibility. In sum, in spite of all the meetings that have been held and the mechanisms that have been established, disarmament seems a more distant goal than ever before.

48. In paragraph 106 of the Final Document, Governments and governmental and non-governmental organizations are urged to take steps to develop programmes of education for disarmament and peace studies at all levels with a view to contributing to a greater understanding and awareness of the problems created by the armaments race and of the need for disarmament. This may create the impression that it is the people who need to have a better understanding and awareness of the need for disarmament,

while in fact it is the Governments themselves, especially of the nuclear-weapon Powers and the militarily significant States, that need a greater understanding and awareness of the problems they create by their armaments race. The many demonstrations and petitions against the arms race and for disarmament, as well as the presence at this second special session on disarmament of so many non-governmental organizations demanding the cessation of the arms race and the initiation of concrete disarmament measures, are ample proof of the awareness of the people of the problems created by the arms race. It is now up to the Governments, especially of the nuclear-weapon States and militarily significant Powers, to rise to the occasion and meet those demands squarely.

49. One of the pillars of policy enshrined in the Constitution of Indonesia reflects the determination of its people to contribute to the establishment of a world order based upon independence, lasting peace and social justice, and we see lasting peace as possible only through disarmament, general and complete disarmament under effective international control, as is very aptly stated in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament.

50. Indonesia, like any other developing country, cannot but be in favour of disarmament. Peace is a vital necessity for the successful implementation of our development programme. Indonesia has participated in the pilot project of the proposed reporting instrument on military expenditures sponsored by the United Nations. Our military budget is very modest indeed and not commensurate with the security needs of a large archipelagic State of more than 13,000 islands straddling the equator over a distance of about 5,000 kilometres and situated at the crossroads between the Pacific and Indian Oceans. We need the resources that are at our disposal for development purposes to bring about the material and spiritual well-being of our people, which is one of the promises of independence.

51. My Government has therefore supported every disarmament initiative both within and outside the United Nations system. Indonesia is a party to the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water,² as well as to the Non-Proliferation Treaty renouncing the nuclear option, despite misgivings about its discriminatory character and unequal obligations between nuclear and non-nuclear States.

52. As set out in item 8 of the agenda for this session, we are gathered here for the

“review and appraisal of the present international situation in the light of the pressing need . . . to eliminate the danger of war, in particular nuclear war, to halt and reverse the arms race and to achieve substantial progress in the field of disarmament, especially in its nuclear aspects”.

53. This session presents a new opportunity for collective reflection on a wide range of issues and to assess the international disarmament strategy adopted at the tenth special session [*resolution S-10/2*]. We earnestly hope that by concentrating on priority questions and eschewing anything which is merely declaratory, this session will provide the impetus for the ongoing efforts.

54. First and foremost there must be a tangible demonstration of a renewed commitment by the major military Powers, as they bear the greater responsibility for the achievement of the objectives of disarmament efforts.

55. It cannot be doubted that the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and the achievement of nuclear disarmament occupy a position of pre-eminence, since these weapons of mass destruction represent an unprecedented threat to the very survival of mankind. However, we continue to witness the dangerous spectacle of a further drift on the nuclear collision course as a result of piling weapon upon weapon. The stockpiles of weapons in the nuclear arsenals of the two super-Powers and other nuclear-weapon States have now reached such frightening dimensions as to defy rational understanding. Even if it were true that the risk of a nuclear war is small, it would be a dangerous gamble with the security of all nations to live any longer in a world threatened by nuclear weapons. Moreover, as there is no guarantee that the risk of nuclear war by design, miscalculation or accident can be avoided, the urgency of nuclear disarmament is self-evident.

56. There is, therefore, an imperative need for the nuclear Powers to enhance international security by negotiating a cessation of the arms race and substantial reductions in and qualitative restrictions on the development of their nuclear arsenals and by effecting extensive reductions in nuclear stockpiles, leading eventually to their total elimination. At this juncture, when the major nuclear Powers appear to be engaged in what seems to be an endless debate on how they should proceed with strategic arms limitation, it is perhaps worth while reconsidering the proposal for a 50 per cent reduction in their stockpiles put forward during the First Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in 1975. My delegation believes that the rationale of that proposal has become even more relevant today. Such a reduction could be initiated through a mutually agreed moratorium on new weapons development and should be rapidly reinforced by formal agreements on weapons reduction among the major nuclear Powers. In view of the enormity of their nuclear arsenals such a reduction would not undermine the security of those States and might well prompt the other nuclear States to adopt similar measures. Such an act would also be an important step in fulfilling the obligations undertaken in the Non-Proliferation Treaty and would increase the momentum towards nuclear disarmament. My delegation is fully convinced that only through such a bold and sweeping departure from the present military postures can we go to the heart of the problem posed by nuclear weapons, which imperils the world.

57. No other question has been the subject of so much international concern in the nuclear-disarmament process as that of a comprehensive test ban. As a party to the partial test-ban treaty of 1963, we note with disappointment that today, after more than 19 years, its objective of achieving the discontinuance of all test explosions for all time has not been reached. Although it is a question of the highest priority, and despite persistent urgings in the General Assembly and in the negotiating bodies, nuclear testing has

continued. The permanent cessation of all tests would act as a test of the determination of the nuclear-weapon States to halt the arms race. Any further delay will seriously erode the value of a test ban in halting qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and also hinder non-proliferation efforts.

58. The continued existence of chemical weapons, the reported intention to manufacture new types of such weapons and the allegations of their use in certain regions of the world have reinforced my delegation's conviction that the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925, should be strengthened. Indonesia is among those States which have advocated a provision on the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons in the future convention now being elaborated in the Committee on Disarmament. The crux of the problem is undeniably the destruction of existing stockpiles. In 1979 my Government ordered the destruction of the chemical weapon agent inherited from the former Netherlands East Indies Government. It was prompted by the realization that to do otherwise might have given reason to question the sincerity of our commitment to adhere strictly to the Geneva Protocol.

59. The question of security assurances to the non-nuclear States, like the other priority issues, has unfortunately eluded solution. To allay the legitimate concerns of those States in ensuring their security, we believe that it is of overriding importance to agree as soon as possible on an international convention incorporating categorical assurances, without conditions, qualifications or limitations. Such a convention must also take into account the special characteristics and geography of certain non-nuclear States. For a country like Indonesia, which is an archipelagic State, the scope of assurances must also take into account the protection of the archipelagic State and its environment in the event of transit of nuclear weapons through its sea lanes.

60. The comprehensive programme of disarmament constituted the central theme of our deliberations, and its importance is such that the success of this session may well depend upon an agreement on this vital question. As far as Indonesia is concerned, this programme should not be a mere compendium of various measures without regard to their implementation in various stages, or a mere political commitment, as was the case with the Final Document. On the contrary, the international community expects concrete action on the basis of an agreed programme in an indicative time-period, so that at least coming generations will be living in a world in which lasting peace prevails. My delegation envisages two consecutive steps in adopting the programme: first, the adoption of the comprehensive programme of disarmament itself by consensus; second, to follow immediately, the adoption of a solemn declaration expressing the determination of Member States to implement the comprehensive programme, to which the signatures of heads of delegations would be affixed. Such an approach would undoubtedly demonstrate our resolute commitment to the programme, and its adoption would without doubt put new life into disarmament efforts, the pace of which has hitherto been so slow.

61. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, one of which already exists in Latin America, must be pursued with greater vigour through the harmonization of the divergent views among the States concerned. In this respect, the results achieved by the implementation of the provisions of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)³ should encourage the establishment of additional denuclearized zones. The establishment of such a zone in our region would, I believe, give practical content to the declaration by the Association of South-East Asian Nations of South-East Asia as a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality. By the establishment of additional denuclearized zones the areas where nuclear weapons exist will gradually be reduced, thus strengthening the prospects for the eventual elimination of those deadly weapons from the arsenals of nations.

62. The continuing efforts to ensure the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace represent another important regional initiative. However, progress in its implementation has encountered formidable difficulties although the Declaration continues to be supported by all the littoral and hinterland States, which have shown an increasing interest in finding ways and means of implementing it. Recent developments in the Indian Ocean and in adjacent areas have added a sense of urgency. The forthcoming international conference on the Indian Ocean should facilitate the modalities of an international arrangement to implement the Declaration.

63. Since 1978 there has been a rapid accumulation of conventional weapons in the armouries of States. If this question has not so far been accorded the emphasis that it perhaps deserves, it is because it has not been considered as pressing as the case of nuclear weapons, with their immense destructive capability. My delegation none the less realizes the great danger that the conventional arms race poses to international security, especially when more States are becoming involved in such a race. The danger arising from the continuous production of new and sophisticated conventional armaments has taken on an ominous dimension for commercial and political reasons, especially in the context of super-Power rivalry, and ensuing tensions have forced some States to acquire these weapons. Many of the developing countries, particularly in regions where tensions prevail, have been obliged to increase their military expenditures on conventional weapons, and some have done so at the expense of their development efforts, which confirms the close and positive relationship that exists between disarmament and development. The world can either continue to pursue the arms race or move towards stable social and economic development. It cannot do both. My delegation, therefore, does not lose sight of the importance of reversing the conventional arms race, particularly since the largest part of military expenditures goes for conventional armaments. We expect the arms-producing countries, the biggest sellers of conventional arms, to co-operate fully in spite of the consequences this may have for their national economies.

64. For the non-aligned countries the Committee on Disarmament is an important forum for multilateral

negotiations on disarmament issues, which fundamentally affect their security interests, giving these countries the right and duty to participate and to be heard, if only as potential victims of an eventual nuclear war. Experience has shown, however, that the Committee has been prevented from fulfilling its responsibility as the sole multilateral negotiating body. Thus it has been effectively thwarted in its efforts to initiate multilateral negotiations on the priority question of nuclear disarmament because of the opposition of some nuclear States which claim this issue to be their exclusive domain and beyond the ambit of decision-making by the international community. On other critical issues the Committee has continued to flounder. Indeed, my delegation views with dismay the inability of the Committee to reach even one modest agreement or to complete even one minor task set by the tenth special session. The posturing of certain nuclear States in frustrating the Committee's efforts is clearly contrary to both the spirit and the letter of the Final Document. The value of multilateral negotiations must be acknowledged, especially now, at a time of confrontation, mutual distrust and suspicion. The Committee, therefore, should forthwith initiate negotiations on substantive issues of vital interest to nuclear and non-nuclear States alike. My delegation believes that a genuine will to negotiate and reach agreements, especially among the nuclear and major military Powers, remains the key to the effective functioning of the Committee.

65. Before concluding, allow me to underline briefly what has already been stressed by many other speakers—the relationship between disarmament and development. If we managed to stop and reverse the arms race and initiate the process of disarmament, a substantial part of the manpower and resources now swallowed up by the arms race could be channelled towards development efforts, especially in the poor countries of the world. A reallocation for development purposes of even a small part of the \$600 billion spent last year on the arms race would mean a significant alleviation of suffering for the poorest of mankind.

66. The road to disarmament is without doubt a long and arduous one. The obstacles are formidable, but they are not of such magnitude that they should defeat our purpose, given the understanding that there is really no alternative for the continued existence of civilization and the survival of mankind. It is encouraging to note that, after continuing deterioration of the international situation during the last few years, the super-Powers have recently expressed a desire to resume negotiations on strategic arms, which we hope will reverse the current negative trends and thereby establish an atmosphere more conducive to disarmament. Indeed, the present rapidly deteriorating international situation must strengthen our resolve to attain concrete results. In these endeavours we expect greater consideration to be accorded to the serious concerns expressed by the international community as a whole, which, apart from Governments, has in recent days included increasing numbers from among the general public.

67. It is for these reasons that my delegation looks forward to meaningful initiatives during this session. Although the basic difficulty continues to be the lack of

political will and determination on the part of some States, we none the less hope that at this session the Assembly will find itself able to review the situation fully and achieve a more authentic consensus on implementing the decisions and recommendations of the Final Document. My Government believes that the issues are simply too important not to command the solemn commitment and involvement of all of us, particularly those among us who have the greatest power and therefore the greatest responsibility to advance the common cause of disarmament.

68. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Assembly that three organizations having observer status with the General Assembly—namely, the League of Arab States, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the Palestine Liberation Organization—have asked to be allowed to speak on the subject before this special session. May I take it that the Assembly agrees to these requests?

It was so decided.

69. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now hear a statement by the Prime Minister of the Republic of Finland. I have great pleasure in welcoming Mr. Kalevi Sorsa and inviting him to address the General Assembly.

70. Mr. SORSA (Finland): While we speak to this special session on disarmament as representatives of Governments, we also speak in the name of our peoples. The interests of peoples must be paramount to Governments if they claim the right to govern. Governments should do whatever they can to dispel the danger of nuclear war. More than ever the survival of man is threatened.

71. Those of us who have dedicated time and effort to disarmament, who have seen noble intentions collapse, who have witnessed time and again the triumph of the arms race over all efforts to contain it may ask: is there no way to stop this trend, which will ultimately lead to catastrophe? Statesmen of dedication and sincerity, many of them in this Hall, have done their utmost to arrest this development. Yet the arms race goes on. It is as if the arms race had escaped rational human control. It almost seems to contain a built-in element of self-destruction.

72. Nuclear war poses a challenge to the survival of the whole of mankind. Nuclear weapons have made man the captive of his own ingenuity. The fear of nuclear war is real. Today more than ever before, the danger of nuclear war haunts people's minds. In my country, as in others, anxiety about that danger has given rise to an increasingly active expression of public opinion. The Finnish delegation contains a number of representatives of civic organizations active in this field in Finland. People engaged in this activity have made it a real, potent force. We need not agree with every proposal made or every method used. Still, it would be a grave mistake to ignore or belittle this sentiment; this is a genuine, growing public concern. We must be responsive to it. In this respect, the World Disarmament Campaign launched at this special session deserves our support.

73. There is but one course: recognition of realities and resolve for action. Cynicism and despair are a false response; so is singling out culprits for the arms

race. Issues are far more complex than that. States continue to view the arms buildup in terms of their national security, yet national security should not be sought in arms, but in disarmament.

74. Reason impels us to act rationally and collectively. In words we agree to do so. Why, then, should practice be so difficult? One reason lies in obsolete notions of national security. They strengthen the arguments of those who seek security in arms. The tragic conflicts of today are sad evidence of this. So far, we have failed to remedy the situation by giving sufficient power and authority to collective security arrangements, primarily to the United Nations.

75. Foundations for an effective international arms control and disarmament process obviously start with the policies of national Governments: they have to practise what they preach to others.

76. It is to state the obvious to say that disarmament cannot be viewed in isolation. It is an integral part of international politics, and as such is subject to the same forces and influences as international politics in general. Progress or lack of progress in disarmament negotiations is dictated by political realities. Periods of relaxed international tension have been congenial to disarmament efforts. At times of confrontation, such as the present, disarmament negotiations come to a halt. Yet at such times disarmament negotiations are particularly urgent, both politically and militarily. The presence at this session of many world leaders is a recognition of that.

77. The history of arms limitation is not a mere record of failures. The limited but significant agreements achieved in the past two decades show that at least some aspects of the arms race can be contained by a political process. That process has produced, *inter alia*, a partial prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing, an agreement on nuclear offensive weapons, and a treaty on anti-ballistic missiles. It also produced the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, a major achievement which remains the single most significant arms limitation measure so far.

78. Nuclear weapons have not been used since the Second World War, but nuclear arsenals have grown in size, sophistication and destructiveness beyond any conceivable purpose. The possessors of nuclear weapons justify the existence of those weapons by the doctrine of deterrence. For the majority of the peoples of the world, the elimination of nuclear weapons would be a much more convincing assurance.

79. The so-called nuclear balance is not a static concept. The achievement of a certain level of assured destruction, however awesome, has not been enough. In fact, the development and refinement of nuclear weapons has proved to be the most dynamic field of advancing arms technology.

80. Advances in military technology may prove upsetting to global strategic stability, which would be an outcome of incalculable consequences. Nuclear weapons and weapon systems of increased sophistication and accuracy, both tactical and strategic, are being developed, produced and deployed. It is therefore necessary to oppose the development and deployment of all new nuclear weapons, their spread to new owners and their deployment on new territories.

81. Recently the possibility of first use of nuclear weapons in specific situations has given rise to debate. Military doctrines are adjusted to suit new arms technology. Doctrines of counter-force, limited nuclear exchange, extended deterrence, and so on, are examples of this. Such doctrines, whatever their name, stand in contrast with the widely shared view that nuclear war cannot in fact be limited. It is obvious that stability can be achieved only by taking into account all aspects of security.

82. While nuclear weapons are a threat to the security of all, the main responsibility for containing the nuclear-arms race is in the hands of the two Powers with preponderant nuclear might—the Soviet Union and the United States. They have recognized that responsibility by engaging since the early 1970s in the negotiating process of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks [SALT]. While no reductions in nuclear arsenals have been achieved through those agreements, they do constitute a significant first effort towards restraint in the nuclear-arms race. They have thus achieved some limitation of the threat posed by nuclear weapons. Furthermore, in the view of the Government of Finland, the strategic dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States constitutes in itself an arms control measure of vital importance. In addition to their intrinsic political value, SALT should be viewed as a crucial factor in efforts towards creating a more stable strategic environment in the nuclear field and towards strengthening the hope for the preservation of peace. Success in negotiations demands restraint in the field of nuclear weaponry.

83. We regret that there has been an interruption in this dialogue. We also regret that its last product, the SALT II treaty, achieved after seven years of painstaking negotiations, has not formally entered into force because of extraneous circumstances. It should not be forgotten that the SALT process represents a major political achievement in the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States and, as such, has a profound impact on political developments in general.

84. An indication of the value of the SALT II treaty as an intermediate stage in the process of nuclear arms control is the fact that the two parties have both implicitly and explicitly observed its provisions in practice. The Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems concluded in 1972 will, in accordance with its provisions, come under review at the end of this year. Nothing should be done to erode the restrictions the treaty imposes. The rapid advances in technology related to ballistic missile defence serve to underline the potential risks that anti-ballistic missile systems would entail for the nuclear strategic balance.

85. I have already spoken of the danger of nuclear war, which haunts people's minds. The shift from negotiation and dialogue to the accelerated buildup of the nuclear arsenals of the major nuclear Powers causes widespread alarm. It is therefore high time that the negotiating channels be opened once more. Against this background, the world has welcomed the resumption of a strategic dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States, which is to begin at Geneva on 29 June. The initial negotiating positions will obviously reflect the differing strategic postures and perceptions of the parties. It is equally obvious

that the negotiating process will prove long and arduous at best. Yet there seems to be a willingness to tackle the issues seriously and in a manner that should lead to significant quantitative and qualitative limitations and reductions in nuclear arsenals.

86. The approach taken to date in strategic-arms negotiations has emphasized quantitative limits. The field has been left open for the qualitative development of nuclear weapons. As a result of this, new types of weapons—ever more sophisticated and deadly—enter the arsenals of both major nuclear Powers. This undermines confidence and increases the perception of hostile intentions. Dangerous advances in military technology will make all arms-limitation efforts more complex in the future. It will be increasingly difficult to agree as to what weapons should be limited and how to limit them. Verification may prove increasingly complex. New approaches, new ways of thinking and entirely new mechanisms may be necessary. A comprehensive cessation of nuclear-weapons testing, which has been a top priority in disarmament negotiations for almost 20 years, would at least be a partial remedy to the problem of qualitative development of nuclear-weapon technology.

87. Besides negotiating on the entire range of nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapon States should take measures to lessen the danger of nuclear weapons and therefore make the use of such weapons less probable. The Final Document calls upon all States, in particular nuclear-weapon States, to consider means to prevent the use of nuclear weapons, through international agreement, where possible. In 1973, the Soviet Union and the United States committed themselves through an agreement to acting in such a manner as to avoid military confrontation and to exclude the outbreak of nuclear war between them or between either party and other countries. While the parties should fully honour those commitments, a multilateral approach—an international agreement on the prevention of nuclear war—could be envisaged as a confidence-building measure in the nuclear age.

88. Nuclear weapons and the possibility of nuclear war are a concern to all continents, all States and all peoples. Europe is the continent with the deadliest concentration of weapons, both conventional and nuclear. It is a continent where the threat of nuclear war is felt particularly acutely. Concrete and comprehensive results in the Geneva talks on nuclear weapons are therefore an urgent necessity for Europe. The goal should be to eliminate the danger posed by nuclear arms which have been deployed or are scheduled to be deployed. The Geneva talks and the forthcoming talks on strategic weapons have obvious links with one another.

89. Ever since 1971, States responsible for European security have deployed common efforts to enhance security and co-operation within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. That work culminated in the adoption of the Final Act of that Conference, signed at Helsinki on 1 August 1975. During the follow-up to the Conference, the need for a comprehensive approach to European disarmament became obvious. An effort has been made to reach agreement on a conference on disarmament in Europe. We in Finland look forward to the com-

pletion of a mandate for such a conference when the follow-up meeting reconvenes at Madrid in November.

90. Nuclear weapons are a threat to all—to the strong as well as to the weak, to the allied as well as to the neutral and the non-aligned, to the developing countries and the developed alike. Nuclear weapons have so transformed the very nature of security, both political and military, that war and the threat of war are no longer available to States as a rational means of policy, however powerful those States may be. The reduction of the danger of nuclear war and nuclear disarmament are in the first instance the responsibility of those States that possess nuclear weapons. But by their very character, their destructive power, nuclear weapons also threaten non-nuclear-weapon States, whether they are parties to conflict or innocent bystanders. It is in their own security interest, therefore, for non-nuclear-weapon States jointly to consider measures to protect themselves against the dangers of nuclear war.

91. One such measure concerns security assurances. Countries such as mine have given up the option of acquiring nuclear weapons or permitting them to be stationed in their territories. In turn they have the right to expect that nuclear-weapon States will give up the possibility of using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against them. Such assurances by nuclear-weapon States should be binding and comprehensive. As a collateral measure, such security assurances would go some way towards assuaging the justified security concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon States. They should be accomplished through effective international arrangements. This could be achieved without delay.

92. Another risk for non-nuclear-weapon States is the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The threat of their acquisition or the capacity to make them by additional States is a threat to all States, nuclear and non-nuclear alike. That threat is particularly serious in regions in which international peace and security are already in jeopardy. The Non-Proliferation Treaty remains the best instrument to combat that threat. Some nations have chosen to remain aloof from the Treaty and refuse to accept international safeguards on all their nuclear activities. As long as they do so, suspicion about their intentions is justified. It hampers international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the benefits of which all nations should share equally.

93. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is yet another measure by which non-nuclear-weapon States could safeguard their interests against the nuclear danger. It is well known that my country has been particularly interested in this concept.

94. We are here to discuss problems in a global context. Yet for every country its immediate political and security environment is of prime importance. Finland is no exception. My country has the advantage of living in a region of political stability and enjoying harmonious relations with all its neighbours. Our security environment is marked by stability. This situation reflects the wishes of the Nordic peoples and Governments and is deeply rooted in history. In the post-war era the Nordic region has been largely untouched by international tension. The absence of

nuclear weapons in the region is one feature of this situation. Finland's former President, Mr. Urho Kekkonen, has presented the idea of establishing a Nordic nuclear-weapon-free zone, a measure which would be a confirmation of the established policy of those countries. The intention is to remove the Nordic countries from the sphere of speculation caused by the development of nuclear strategy and to ensure that the area will remain outside international tension. Finland will continue to pursue this idea. As has been emphasized by Mr. Mauno Koivisto, the President of Finland, such a measure by the Nordic countries would consolidate regional security. The Nordic Foreign Ministers have exchanged views on the question and have agreed to maintain contact on the issue.

95. In view of our interest in nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is natural that eight years ago at the United Nations Finland took the initiative in the undertaking of a comprehensive study on the questions of nuclear-weapon-free zones. In this useful study consensus was reached on several principles, but this did not prove possible on a number of questions. Since the study, progress has been achieved in arrangements for nuclear-weapon-free zones. New concrete ideas envisaging the establishment of such zones in various regions suggest the need to update the comprehensive study to reflect new realities. It could facilitate the creation of such zones and thus advance the limitation of nuclear arms. Finland intends to make a proposal for such an updated study.

96. While nuclear weapons represent the most awesome threat, this should not overshadow the problem of conventional weapons. The conventional weapon is not only a threat but an instrument of war and destruction that is used daily. Efforts towards conventional disarmament and the control of arms transfers should therefore be intensified.

97. Finland is a neutral country which has sought and found security not through reliance on military alliances but through a foreign policy designed to keep it outside international conflict and controversy. It has a vital interest in promoting the development of the peaceful and rational world order provided by the Charter of the United Nations. We consider that activity which promotes international disarmament efforts is activity in the interest of our own security. On that basis Finland has made proposals concerning arms limitation in the Nordic area. We have worked for the strengthening of the existing arms limitation agreements, particularly the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We devote considerable resources to scientific research to facilitate agreement on verification of arms-limitation measures under consideration. Finland pledges to intensify these activities. It has taken a particularly active part in the work of the Committee on Disarmament in every form possible for a non-member country. Full membership in the Committee, which Finland continues to seek, would enable us to make an even more useful contribution.

98. The purpose of this session, as we see it, is to provide a new impetus to arms-limitation negotiations, which are now virtually at a standstill. Despite the deeply disappointing record of disarmament efforts, the session should look to the future constructively and resolutely. A foundation of an international disar-

mament agenda was laid down at the tenth special session. Now it is our task to strengthen that foundation and give it more specific content.

99. Arms limitation and disarmament are not ends in themselves. The pursuit of disarmament should be viewed as the pursuit of greater security for all nations. For Finland, this is an indispensable part of the quest for a more peaceful, rational world order. Such a world order is not possible without economic and social justice. Disarmament therefore remains an imperative not only for the security of nations, but also for economic progress and social justice in the world. Hundreds of millions of people live in conditions of abject poverty and hunger, deprived of the most elementary necessities for dignified human existence. A fraction of the resources spent on military purposes could radically improve their situation.

100. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Prime Minister of Finland for the important statement he has just made.

101. Mr. JORGE (Angola) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it is extremely pleasant for us to express our heartiest congratulations on your election as President of this second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and we would express our best wishes for success in the exercise of your mandate. Your qualities as an experienced diplomat guarantee that this session will take place in a constructive atmosphere.

102. We should like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for the significant and considerable efforts that he has already made in the search for solutions to the delicate problems that he has faced since his election and we also wish to express our best wishes to him for complete success in the performance of his other responsibilities.

103. Four years ago, on the initiative of the non-aligned countries, the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was held. In the Final Document of that session, which was adopted by consensus, the conviction was expressed that "disarmament and arms limitation, particularly in the nuclear field, are essential for the prevention of the danger of nuclear war and the strengthening of international peace and security and for the economic and social advancement of all peoples" [*resolution S-10/2, second preambular paragraph*]. At the same time a Programme of Action [*ibid., sect. III*] was adopted enumerating specific disarmament measures which needed to be implemented in the years following. To achieve these objectives, all Governments were to intensify their concerted and concentrated efforts to adopt effective measures to halt the unbridled arms race, for nuclear disarmament and for the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction, as well as the conclusion of conventions or treaties providing for general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

104. Regrettably, it must be recognized that the efforts made by a number of countries, particularly the socialist and non-aligned countries and countries which love peace and justice, have remained fruitless. In addition, no important progress has been made in using for economic and social development the

enormous resources that are being wasted on the arms race.

105. The process launched then, which had seemed so promising and reassuring for all humanity, has over the years become a cause of disturbing frustration because of the lack of interest or of political will shown by the imperialist Powers in serious disarmament negotiations.

106. Thus, international peace and security have been placed in jeopardy by the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, national independence and territorial integrity of States; by the accelerated increase in military budgets and expenditures which have stimulated the escalation in the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race; by military intervention and occupation, interference in the internal affairs of States and their destabilization and the refusal of the right to self-determination of peoples and nations under foreign and colonial domination; by the strengthening of certain military alliances and the creation of rapid deployment forces; by the imposition of economic reprisals against countries which adopt independent positions; by vast military manoeuvres clearly aimed at intimidating peoples; and by flagrant lack of respect for the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly such principles as non-use of force and settlement of disputes by peaceful means.

107. Who, then, bears the grave responsibility for this deterioration of the international situation? In our opinion it is the present American Administration, its allies and its privileged agents or instruments, namely, the régimes of Pretoria and Tel Aviv.

Mr. Thunborg (Sweden), Vice-President, took the Chair.

108. That opinion is based on the firm conviction of the Government of the People's Republic of Angola that no socialist or progressive country, no country that cherishes peace and justice, would start a nuclear war or use other weapons of mass destruction, because the survival of mankind, international peace and security and the independence of peoples are, for such countries, principles and objectives of prime importance.

109. The world problems which affect peace, security, freedom, independence and economic and social development demand a global response and efforts by the international community as a whole.

110. Thus the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament must give priority attention to the final preparation and adoption as soon as possible of the comprehensive programme of disarmament, as anticipated at the first special session on disarmament. This means that the Committee on Disarmament, as the multilateral negotiating body, must make and continue to make every effort along these lines to achieve the objectives set for it, namely, the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe and the implementation of urgent measures to halt the arms race, thereby paving the way to a stable peace and, consequently, the achievement of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

111. Within this framework negotiations must aim first at the limitation and cessation of the quantitative and qualitative increase in armaments, in particular weapons of mass destruction, and at the gradual reduction of conventional and strategic weapons, with strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security. At the same time, and to complement this, a certain number of conventions or treaties must be adopted concerning, *inter alia*: a comprehensive ban on nuclear-weapon tests and on the manufacture and stockpiling of all chemical, bacteriological and radiological weapons; the destruction of such weapons; the limitation of offensive strategic weapons—SALT II and SALT III; the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe and other areas; the significant reduction of military budgets and expenditures.

112. Everyone knows that peace and economic and social development are inextricably linked. As disarmament progresses, military expenditures will be considerably reduced; therefore the funds thus becoming available can and should be devoted to economic and social development, in particular for the benefit of the underdeveloped countries. It is necessary that the prodigious sums—this year the total is \$600 billion—spent annually throughout the world for military purposes be invested in agriculture—there are at least 570 million starving human beings; in education—there are 800 million illiterates; and in health—there are 1.5 billion people without access to the most elementary health services. Instead of getting fighter aircraft, tanks or any other type of weapon at stiff prices, the independent underdeveloped peoples would surely prefer to get and even pay for tools and agricultural products, medicine, clothing, school or university materials, building materials and so on.

113. According to certain statistics, 50 million to 100 million people work directly or indirectly in the production of military equipment and more than 500,000 qualified professionals are engaged in research and development on new weapons technologies, which represents an annual expenditure of \$35 billion.

114. Furthermore—to give an example supplied by United Nations experts—if it were possible to recover the materials or products used to build 200 intercontinental missiles these would amount to approximately 10,000 tonnes of aluminium, 2,500 tonnes of chrome, 150 tonnes of titanium, 24 tonnes of beryllium, 890,000 tonnes of steel and 2.4 million tonnes of cement.

115. However, whenever any attempt is made to consider or even demand the conversion of the weapons industry, the false argument is invariably raised that it is impossible to dismantle such an industry, which currently absorbs \$500 billion to \$600 billion, without at the same time causing great disruption of the world economy. Of course, such a conversion process could not take place overnight. It would have to be gradual, and the post-war period has already shown that such a transition can take place successfully. Where there is a will, there is a way.

116. Is it not paradoxical that at the very time when high-ranking representatives of all States Members

of the United Nations have gathered here at Headquarters to take part in the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, at a date agreed in advance by everyone, the Tel Aviv régime should dare once again with insolent arrogance to defy the international community by carrying out an armed invasion deep into Lebanon on the flimsiest pretext?

117. This event of exceptional gravity deserves severe condemnation and a suitable response from the appropriate organs of the United Nations and all peoples which stand in solidarity with the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples.

118. At the same time, in the southern region of Africa another like-minded régime also dares to commit aggression against several countries, including the People's Republic of Angola, and even to occupy certain parts of the territory of this sovereign and independent State. How much longer will United Nations bodies remain powerless in the face of such flagrant and inadmissible violations? To whom, then, should these peoples, the victims of aggression, turn when peace and security are so gravely threatened by those régimes, which enjoy the connivance and support of certain imperialist Powers, in particular the United States of America? For there are effective measures at the disposal of the appropriate organs of the United Nations.

119. Considering the fact that all the co-ordinates of the problem of détente and general and complete disarmament have been duly specified in the recommendations and decisions of the first special session devoted to disarmament, contained in the Final Document and its Programme of Action, there is no need to recapitulate them here and now.

120. The recent arrangements made by the Soviet Union and the United States to reopen, in the near future, disarmament negotiations hold out the hope of a better future for all peoples. We hope that those negotiations, if they proceed as they ought to, will create an atmosphere which is even more propitious for the convening as soon as possible of a world disarmament conference which would adopt the necessary agreements and concrete measures.

121. Notwithstanding the complexity of the issue, we hope that this second special session devoted to disarmament will be able to adopt urgent measures to avert the possibility of a nuclear war, in which there could be no winners or losers, to put an end to the arms race, to reduce or even eliminate sources of tension and armed conflicts, and in this way to ensure the survival of mankind and international peace and security.

122. The struggle continues. Victory is certain.

123. Mr. KASIM (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It gives me great pleasure to extend to Mr. Kittani our warmest congratulations on his unanimous election as President of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I am fully confident that with his experience and ability he will be able to contribute effectively to the success of this important session. I wish also to pay tribute to the Secretary-General for the efforts he has exerted and to the Preparatory Committee for the preparations they have made for this session.

124. We meet today at an important juncture in the history of mankind to consider ways and means that will enable us to achieve general and complete disarmament. That is the objective which has been sought by the international community ever since it became aware of the huge dimensions of the problem created by the dangerous weapons that have been developed and produced. After two world wars and the tragic sufferings of the human race it was not possible to achieve disarmament in spite of the grave consequences of using nuclear weapons which would destroy human civilization and annihilate the entire human race.

125. The creation of the United Nations was a natural and logical consequence of the Second World War, when the peoples of the world called for the establishment of an international organization as a forum in which conflicts would be solved peacefully. We are now witnessing the use or threat of use of force in contravention of the provisions of the Charter, provisions which should be used in such a way as to make it possible to achieve justice and equity and to foster the spirit of co-operation among States.

126. It was assumed that the major Powers, which under the Charter were given the major responsibility for maintaining world peace and security, would co-operate in order to implement its provisions and find just solutions to the problems arising between States. However, that has not been possible because of the rivalry and confrontation among those major Powers, which have resorted to military force in order to confront their rivals. This has led to a further intensification of the arms race and impaired the ability of the United Nations to implement the provisions of the Charter for solving conflicts in a peaceful manner. This rivalry, which used military superiority as the basis for dealings between States and the maintenance of the balance between States, has led to the intensification of the arms race and the development of more sophisticated nuclear weapons, particularly since man has realized from the beginning their unlimited destructive potential.

127. The danger created by the continuing arms race and the development of totally destructive methods of war, whether with conventional or nuclear weapons, has led the United Nations to give close attention to this question. I need not enumerate here all the efforts that have been exerted to bring about complete and effective disarmament. I need refer only to the first special session devoted to disarmament, held four years ago, which adopted a Programme of Action as well as a number of measures that should eventually enable us to achieve our objective, that of averting the danger which faces the entire world. However, after this lapse of time we are meeting again today to find that the situation has further deteriorated and is indeed now more dangerous than ever, thanks to the development and production of weapons of mass destruction, and the fact is that certain countries have devoted a large part of their resources to such purposes, rather than to meeting the requirements of economic and social development. This is most evident in the experts' reports, which indicate that military expenditure actually totalled almost \$600 billion in 1981. One can only wonder whether it would not have been better to devote such an enormous sum,

or perhaps part of it, to economic and social development in our present world, where it would be more useful and indeed would enhance world peace and security, rather than to allocate such enormous amounts for military purposes, a fact which has not brought any kind of security or tranquility.

128. There is no doubt that the two super-Powers bear the major responsibility for this grave deterioration, because of the intensified arms race between them, the tendency to equate security with the possession of more sophisticated weapons and the lack of political will necessary to achieve real disarmament and avert the disaster facing the world. There is no doubt that the argument in justification of a limited nuclear war is inconsistent with the simplest facts, because the use of any kind of nuclear weapon by one side would be countered in the same manner by the other side and would consequently lead to an all-out nuclear conflagration.

129. The arms race has been attended by increasing recourse to force in order to solve problems between countries, which is inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations and the provisions of its Charter. The international Organization has been prevented from carrying out its duties in maintaining world peace and security. The two super-Powers have failed to set an example in the field of real disarmament or by supporting firmly the implementation of the provisions of the Charter, thus enhancing the role of the United Nations. Those two countries have disregarded the conduct of certain allegedly friendly countries which are carrying out actions that endanger peace and security and are inconsistent with the provisions of the Charter.

130. All this has caused frustration among countries and a lack of confidence in existing international institutions. Small countries have had to follow a military approach to preserve their stability and security, particularly since some of them are subjected to constant threats and attacks by certain other countries which have opted for aggression and hegemony and the imposition of *faits accomplis*. This has been made possible by the state of indifference which prevails in international relations, which is facilitated by the fact that the two major Powers have not fulfilled their responsibility for maintaining world peace and security. The aggressive conduct of certain countries has caused a state of insecurity in other countries, which have thus had to allocate a major part of their limited resources to purposes of self-defence at the expense of economic and social development priorities and the welfare of their peoples.

131. I will only mention here that my country, Jordan, is obliged to allocate more than a quarter of its national income for the maintenance of its own peace and security in view of Israel's constant aggressive practices.

132. It is only right to state that, had there been a truly effective international security system which could protect the legitimate rights and interests of the peoples and ensure that justice and equity prevailed as the basis for solving problems, this would have created confidence among all countries that they could rely on that system to prevent aggression. Thus those countries would not have had to follow the

present trend and we would not have witnessed this growth in military expenditures and destructive weapons.

133. The proof of this resort to aggression and the imposition of hegemony and *faits accomplis* is the aggressive conduct of Israel in the Middle East. In fact, 15 years ago Israel forcibly occupied Arab territories, from which it has refused to withdraw, pleading its so-called security interests. When the international community demanded withdrawal in return for peace, Israel refined its security concept to make it synonymous with its occupation of the Arab territories. This is evident in the annexation of Arab Jerusalem and the establishment of new settlements under the pretext of security requirements. When the international community rejected such claims, Israel revealed its aggressive and expansionist schemes and intention to annex the occupied Arab territories. It annexed the Golan Heights, taking advantage of the tension prevailing in certain areas of the world. It intensified its illegal practices in the West Bank and in Gaza aimed at annexing them. In fact the Prime Minister of Israel declared this intention, saying that those territories are part of the territory of Israel and therefore it is not a matter of annexation.

134. Those who follow the Israeli security concept will note its steady expansion to include buffer zones at the expense of neighbouring Arab States on the pretext of protecting its security in the occupied territories which it has expanded into or annexed. As evidence of this, Israel is threatening the security and stability of Lebanon by carrying out operations of murder and devastation with a view to splitting it up and destroying its territorial integrity. In pursuit of its security concept, Israel has gone so far as to carry out air raids against the Iraqi nuclear plant, because it believes that in order to impose a *fait accompli* and maintain its absolute military dominance it must weaken the other Arab countries in the region, thus impeding their development, and commit all kinds of aggression and attacks against the rights of those countries.

135. Here I wish to refer to the project that Israel has embarked upon to link up the Mediterranean Sea with the Dead Sea, in gross violation of international conventions and agreements, thus jeopardizing the vital economic interests of Jordan. Israel possesses enormous military potential, which enables it to penetrate Arab air space. It is doing this all the time in order to expand its sphere of influence. It is threatening Arab countries and trying to impose a *fait accompli* on them. The Israeli Minister of Defence declared last December that Israeli military interests extend to all the territory from Pakistan in the east to North Africa in the west. This Israeli security concept is a reincarnation of the policy of hegemony and force at the expense of the rights of others. Israel has taken advantage of United States support to maintain its security. Indeed, Israel has benefited from United States military, political and economic support.

136. In view of Israel's untenable concept of security, we call upon the Western countries, including the United States of America, to restrain Israel and to confirm that genuine security resides in recognition of the legitimate rights of all parties and the attainment of a just and honourable peace based on the

inadmissibility of the occupation of the territories of other States, withdrawal by Israel and recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people rather than to accept blindly and absolutely Israel's security concept.

137. We wish to recall that the countries of the world that cherish freedom and justice worked together to take action to eliminate a similar security concept that existed 40 years ago.

138. Israel believes that in order to maintain its occupation of the Arab territories it must impose its aggressive policy on the Arab world through its absolute military superiority or by creating instability and insecurity in those countries. In order to maintain its military superiority, Israel has added nuclear weapons to its arsenal with which to threaten the Arab world and to make it accept *faits accomplis*. Here I refer to the report of the Group of Experts appointed by the Secretary-General entitled *Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament*.⁴

139. That United Nations report stated clearly that there are significant indications that Israel reached the threshold of becoming a nuclear-weapon State at least a decade ago. Taking into account its nuclear facilities, the availability of nuclear material required for their operation, the existence of scientific and technical knowledge and the presence of an adequate number of trained and experienced staff, the Group of Experts which prepared the United Nations report wished to emphasize that they did not doubt that Israel, if it had not already crossed that threshold, had the capability to manufacture nuclear weapons within a very short time. Israel also possesses the means of delivery of such weapons to targets in the area.

140. The international community has realized the grave consequences of the Israeli nuclear programme. The General Assembly since 1974 adopted several resolutions, confirmed by the first special session devoted to disarmament, concerning the importance of declaring a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. It called upon the countries of the area to refrain on a mutual basis from producing, testing, obtaining, acquiring or in any other way possessing nuclear weapons and not to allow any party to place nuclear weapons in their territories and to accept placing their nuclear facilities under the safeguards and control of IAEA.

141. In spite of all this Israel has refused to heed these calls. It has refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty, it has not allowed the competent international organizations to investigate its nuclear facilities and has not been reprimanded for doing so. This means that countries which refuse to sign this Treaty would benefit in a way that would encourage other countries to follow suit. Thus the Treaty has, in fact, rather than putting an end to the proliferation of nuclear weapons, contributed to their proliferation.

142. The report of the Group of Experts has been confirmed by what was said by the former Israeli head of State, Ephraim Katzir, in an interview published in the *Washington Post* of 3 December 1974, that Israel has the power to produce nuclear weapons and that it can do so over a reasonable period of time.

143. The book *Two Minutes over Baghdad*, written by two Israeli authors and approved by the Israeli

military censors and published only a few days ago, confirmed Israel's military nuclear capabilities and possibilities of development in collaboration with the Government of South Africa. Nuclear co-operation between Israel and South Africa implicitly or explicitly constitutes a most dangerous threat to the Arab and African peoples, indeed to the security and peace of the entire world.

144. We believe that the whole world should be seriously concerned about the mentality and logic of the Israelis who do not stop carrying out acts of aggression against Lebanon and wreaking havoc in that country on the pretext of revenge for the attempted assassination of the Israeli Ambassador in London. In fact we are sure that Israel will not hesitate for one moment to use its nuclear weapons if it thinks that some other event constitutes a threat to its security. We call upon the world immediately to consider the possibility of Israel's taking such a step. It is necessary for the world to take adequate measures to prevent and avert such a disaster.

145. Jordan looks to the Charter of the United Nations as the proper framework for effective measures to be drawn up in order to turn the Middle East into a nuclear-weapon-free zone. This would put an end to the Israeli nuclear programme and eliminate its nuclear weapons, thus warding off the danger which faces the world.

146. Jordan seeks genuine peace based on justice that recognizes the rights of all and ensures stability throughout the area. Jordan has direct experience of the true tragedy of Palestine and its people. Jordan, through its Arab affiliation, has shouldered the responsibility for and has suffered the consequences of the problem and has supported, together with its Arab brethren, all the efforts made to uphold the Palestinian cause and solve the Middle East issue on the basis of international unanimity concerning a just peace and the withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied Arab territories including the Arab city of Jerusalem, as well as recognition of the legitimate national rights of the Arab Palestinian people, including their rights to exercise self-determination and to set up their own independent State on their own territory, and the safeguarding of the security of the countries of the area.

147. The international consensus reflected in General Assembly and Security Council decisions has also been confirmed in certain European, African, Islamic and non-aligned forums. The Arab participants, in the resolutions adopted at the Ninth Arab Summit Conference at Baghdad from 2 to 5 November 1978 and in the Saudi eight-point peace plan, have confirmed their positive contribution to those international efforts. The latest Arab contribution was made by the head of the external relations committee of the Palestine National Council and through the suggestions made at the international seminar on the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, held recently in Paris, and they, in fact, reflect the international consensus on this problem.

148. Jordan is always faced with the threat of Israeli aggression. In the absence of serious international action to bring about a just peace, and in view of the fact that the expansionist policy of Israel is disregarded and of the support given it especially through the use

of the veto in the Security Council in order to prevent the adoption of sanctions, which Israel interprets as support for its aggressive policy, Jordan has to allocate a great part of its limited resources to legitimate self-defence. This is also the case of other small countries which find their security and stability threatened. This, in other words, accounts for the continuing state of tension and for the spiralling arms race which threatens the security not just of our region but of the whole world because of a possible confrontation between the two super-Powers caused by Israel's military nuclear option.

149. In view of the absence of effective international action, small countries will have to subject themselves to the will and hegemony of strong countries, and this means that they will have to join the arms race in order to maintain their self-defence, stability and security.

150. Thus we believe that disarmament is not feasible so long as all these problems and differences persist in the international arena. All effective measures must be taken in a spirit of justice and equity, and the two super-Powers must fulfil their responsibilities; they must set an example by starting negotiations on genuine disarmament in order to enhance the role and effectiveness of the United Nations and respect for its Charter, so as to deter aggressive countries and create peace and confidence among the countries of the world.

151. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): My delegation is happy to see Mr. Kittani of Iraq presiding over another special session of the General Assembly. It is of major historical significance that, during his presidency, he has been called upon to direct the proceedings of one regular and three special sessions of the Assembly. Such frequency obviously reflects the gravity of the overall international situation and emphasizes the particular urgency and seriousness of purpose with which the world's problems ought to be tackled. His past performance convinces us beyond the shadow of a doubt that, despite the complexity of the issues which will be discussed from various viewpoints, he will be able to guide this difficult session to a fruitful conclusion.

152. Permit me, at this juncture, to convey through him to the members of the Preparatory Committee my delegation's appreciation for their painstaking work in making all the necessary arrangements and preparations for this session. We are particularly appreciative of the invaluable role played by the Chairman of that Committee, Mr. Oluyemi Adeniji of Nigeria, in making this session possible. Our thanks go also to the Secretary-General and his staff for extending to the Preparatory Committee all the required assistance and support.

153. General and complete disarmament has been a sorely felt need and a world-wide aspiration of the highest order, even if the level of international public awareness varies from country to country and from region to region. My country has been one of those which have sorely felt this need and is proud to have played a humble but significant role in the world's search for international peace and security through disarmament. In the early 1960s, the young Republic of Ghana made a major effort to contribute towards promoting greater awareness in the world of the true

nature of the dangers posed to the entire human family by the atomic bomb. The initiative, as many will recall, took the form of the convening of the Accra Assembly on the world without the bomb. That Assembly was a body of eminent scientists and thinkers from all four corners of the earth whose common denominator was their irreversible resolve that a speedy answer be found to the problem of disarmament.

154. Twenty years have since elapsed, but the record shows that disarmament negotiations have done comparatively little, by way of concrete results, to allay our fears. We have cause for neither hope nor rejoicing. On the contrary, our world has been drawn inexorably closer to the day when the extermination of the human race by man's own hand may appear to be the logical, perhaps even natural, consequence of the interaction of uncontrollable events.

155. One terrible effect of the arms race is the false sense of power which it induces, leading to an all-too-easy and often unnecessary recourse to military solutions to international misunderstanding. This unfortunate attitude, more often than not, explains why the international community readily expends no less than \$500 billion each year on arms and armaments, while the basic needs of the poor of the earth remain unsatisfied. There is a global obsession with militarism which more than anything else underlines our generation's insatiable preference for matter over mind. Thus human beings have practically become the most easily expendable commodity. No wonder, then, that the many General Assembly resolutions calling for general and complete disarmament remain on the books almost like dead letters. As the Ghana delegation emphasized during the first special session on disarmament, held four years ago, the lack of real achievement in the field of disarmament is due principally to the fact that, in spite of our best intentions, we concentrate on attacking the peripheral rather than the central issues of the problem. The truth of this assertion is apparent even from a cursory glance at the catalogue of the disarmament efforts made at the level of the international community over the last 20 years or so.

156. In 1959, the Antarctic Treaty, prohibiting military activity in Antarctica, was signed. The year 1963 saw the birth of the Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water. In 1967, a significant step was taken when the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) was concluded. This Treaty was the first example of the creation of a nuclear-free-zone in a populated region of the world. Then in 1968 the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons came into being, obliging nuclear Powers not to transfer nuclear weapons to non-nuclear-weapon States, while the non-nuclear-weapon States undertook not to receive them. This initiative was followed in 1972 by the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof. In 1972, there was also the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction. This Convention

was the first international instrument formulated in modern times to include actual disarmament measures. Although these agreements are significant achievements by the international community on paper, their collective impact, in terms of general and complete disarmament, has been marginal. International peace and security are perhaps even more endangered today than when those serious initiatives were begun a little over two decades ago.

157. It is pertinent to recall that, on 20 September 1961, the United States and the Soviet Union issued a statement in which they confirmed that the goal of multilateral disarmament negotiations was to ensure general and complete disarmament, entailing the disbanding of armed forces, the elimination of nuclear-weapon stockpiles and the discontinuance of heavy military expenditures. In 1976 the two super-Powers presented to the General Assembly the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques, and commended the Convention to other States for signature and ratification. That process led up to the agreements on the limitation of strategic arms, which are now to be followed by the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks.

158. There is no denying that all those efforts constituted positive elements in the quest for general and complete disarmament, but the effect has been slight compared with the sheer enormity of the problem. Except for the treaty on bacteriological weapons, the agreements so far reached do not amount to substantive measures of disarmament, while, in the meantime, the arms race proceeds at top speed.

159. As my delegation observed four years ago, at the tenth special session of the General Assembly:

“it would be naive to feel satisfied. No general and complete disarmament has been achieved and no procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes or effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations have been laid down. On the question of disarmament, no measures for reductions in armed forces, the dismantling of military establishments, including bases, or for the cessation of production of arms, their liquidation or conversion to peaceful uses, have been agreed upon; no elimination of stockpiles of nuclear weapons, or of chemical or other weapons of mass destruction has been possible; we have not secured the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems, neither have we settled the fate of organizations and institutions in charge of the military efforts of States. Furthermore, we have not reached agreement on how best to reduce military expenditures.” [15th meeting, para. 43.]

Those words are as true today as they were four years ago.

160. We are faced with a terribly serious crisis which has not in any way been alleviated by the recent and erroneous suggestions that nuclear war is winnable, or even possible. Since war has always been possible, we must proceed from the basis that nuclear war is just another war, except that it would be terminal. That basis must include, as its principal element, the recognition by all concerned—Governments and individuals alike—that the unprecedented technical

and scientific advances which the world has made since the Second World War have not produced a commensurate amelioration in human nature. My delegation believes that, given the right conditions, nuclear war is just as possible as conventional wars which occur today almost with abandon and impunity.

161. This point of departure should also definitely include the horror we also feel at the fact that nuclear war cannot be limited or won. Even if it can be geographically localized, its destruction of life and property will sooner or later be global. The consequent biological problems would be so extensive and complicated that they would completely defy any organized medical response that human society could devise on the basis of present-day scientific knowledge. No one has any right to exterminate peoples. The most important truth, therefore, is that the question of nuclear disarmament is one directly affecting the interests of peoples, not only those of Governments and States.

162. Accordingly, if the nuclear Powers, which would be directly responsible for the extermination of the human species, fail to understand that no headway whatsoever can be made if they continue to approach disarmament negotiations as mutual enemies and not as spokesmen for all humanity, nothing will be gained.

163. Bearing this fact in mind, my delegation is participating in this current special session in the very strong hope that the nuclear Powers will not consider the session as another opportunity for explaining to the rest of us the reasonableness of their policies or positions regarding the issue of arms control. In other words, we are not here to applaud statements in justification of the current nuclear policies of each nuclear Power or of each ideological bloc of nuclear Powers. Such an attitude would obviously be misguided. Our expectation is that all concerned will fully acknowledge the value of the United Nations as the only forum in which meaningful negotiations can take place on this huge world problem. In other words, since the United Nations is the last hope of mankind, it follows that the Organization is the appropriate forum in which every disarmament negotiation should be conducted.

164. We must move away from the situation in which the nuclear Powers themselves are the only ones involved in the search for answers. It should be remembered that the nuclear Frankenstein's monster created by them is the unwanted heritage of mankind. Its elimination must therefore be the responsibility, equally shared, of all peoples which are its victims. It is my delegation's sincere expectation that one positive result of this particular session will be the discovery of ways and means whereby all will have a say in nuclear arms negotiations. This means that we will all approach the problem from the standpoint of a common desire to arrive at an acceptable solution. The very visible and vocal interest shown by ordinary people, particularly in the Western world, in the question of disarmament indicates quite clearly that bloc interests in the matter can no longer be considered paramount.

165. Our preoccupation with the nuclear dilemma cannot be overemphasized, since nuclear weapons

represent an immediate threat to the continuing existence of the human race. We are in the presence of a force with which all must be constantly concerned. But that preoccupation should not in any way close our eyes to the other aspect of the arms race in which most States of the world are engulfed. I refer to the arms race in conventional weapons, which, unfortunately, involves the third world, at tremendous cost to economic progress, to the preservation of life and to the fulfilment of the just aspirations of the vast majority of mankind. This facet of the arms race constitutes a real threat to the human race as a whole, since it is through the exercise of the power unleashed by this phenomenon that so many lives are lost and that even the existence of some nations and peoples is in very serious jeopardy.

166. How sad it is that this race seems to have become one of the cheapest means for the manufacturing States to make billions of dollars at the expense of poor, developing countries; how disquieting that, in order to maintain the fruitfulness and viability of this cheap market, strife and disagreement are fanned among sister countries so as to keep the arms industry churning in the developed economies; how much more disappointing that the third world countries themselves give the impression of being powerless to arrest this evil trend; and how fearsome that it might very well be the use of these conventional weapons that would make it impossible for nuclear arms not to be employed.

167. Our world is in grave danger of extinction at a time when it possesses more than adequate technological and scientific means to wipe out poverty completely and to make our temporary sojourn on this planet one of joy and peace. Let us all have confidence in ourselves as members of one human family and take those charitable steps which must be taken to rid ourselves and posterity of this scourge.

168. The PRESIDENT: Under a decision [*decision S-12/22*] taken by the Assembly at its first plenary meeting, I call on the Director-General of UNESCO, Mr. Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow.

169. Mr. M'BOW (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) (*interpretation from French*): It is a great honour for me to participate in this second special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament, and I am grateful to the Preparatory Committee for giving me this opportunity to speak before the Assembly. I greet the representatives of Member States who are trying to give form to that hope—disarmament—cherished by mankind as a dream, but which henceforth is inextricably linked with its chances for survival.

170. It is now four years since, in this very Hall, I described the broad outline of the work done by UNESCO in this area, in accordance with the provisions of its Constitution, which assign to it the purpose of "advancing, through the educational and scientific and cultural relations of the people of the world, the objectives of international peace and of the common welfare of mankind for which the United Nations Organization was established and which its Charter proclaims."

171. In the Final Document adopted at the end of its work, the General Assembly at its tenth special session charged UNESCO, directly or indirectly, with certain tasks in four main areas: information, study and research, co-operation with non-governmental organizations and, finally, education on disarmament. The report which I have submitted to this special session will enable the Assembly to form some idea of the way in which UNESCO has discharged those tasks in accordance with instructions from its Executive Board and its General Conference.

172. UNESCO has constantly been concerned with the matters that are the subject of the Assembly's deliberations, and its member States have therefore accorded great importance to the Assembly's work. Thus, at its twenty-first session, held at Belgrade in 1980, the General Conference called upon me to make an appropriate contribution in UNESCO's areas of competence to preparations for the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament in 1982. The Executive Board, in turn, at its 114th session, which has just concluded, called upon me to make the necessary arrangements, within the context of the current programme and budget and the second medium-term plan for 1984 to 1989, to discharge the special responsibilities which the General Assembly might wish to entrust to the organization by the terms of the one or several documents which it may adopt at its second special session devoted to disarmament.

173. Indeed, UNESCO believes that it is its primary responsibility to do all it can, within its areas of competence, to help ease international tension and to encourage the maintenance of peace and disarmament. Standing at the crossroad of all the activities of the human mind, open to all the works through which peoples express their feelings, UNESCO constantly is alert, striving fully to capture the pulse of the world. It is therefore well aware that we are living in a world that is increasingly dominated by anxiety: among the rich, it is anxiety over growing unemployment which can lead to serious social tension, fear, egoism and, alas, even chauvinism; among the poor, it is anxiety at seeing ever more doors closed to them and at seeing relationships of inequality being maintained in situations for which there seems to be no way out; finally, among many countries, it is anxiety at the aggravation of tension, the increase in conflicts and the rise in perils which could lead to nuclear war.

174. The echoes of those anxieties and the dangers which could arise from the situation they engender reach us from ever more varied sources—from individuals of every background, from non-governmental organizations and institutions co-operating with UNESCO and from the highest authorities of the contemporary world. His Holiness Pope John Paul II last January at the Vatican solemnly handed me the declaration of a group of distinguished scholars convened by the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, in which those scientists confessed how powerless the medical community would be to provide the necessary care to the survivors of a nuclear attack. They concluded, "prevention is our only recourse".

175. And so all the scenarios constructed in the comfort of studies, according to which the effects of a

nuclear war on man could be limited, are thereby contradicted. The International Council of Scientific Unions, consisting of scientists throughout the world—whether they belong to the East, the West or the countries of the third world—have called upon me through their governing body to be their spokesman at this session, since they cannot directly speak to the Assembly themselves. Those scholars, researchers, professors, who know better than anyone the dangers that mankind now faces, urge the Assembly and urge all Member States to take measures immediately to put an end to the arms race.

176. The academies of sciences of the socialist countries for their part have called for the establishment of an international committee of scientists on the danger of nuclear war.

177. Recently, the Secretary of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America gave me a text expressing the anxieties of American scientists and authorized me to convey them to the Assembly.

178. The concern and anxiety felt by intellectuals and scientists are without any doubt a reflection of the broader movement which is now building up or gathering momentum in other circles, in many countries and, in particular, among young people. That movement expresses a single desire: to see an end to the process which is threatening humanity with irreparable disaster. It is self-evident that the nature of war today has completely changed. The destructive power of modern nuclear weapons is such that a conflict in which such weapons were used could lead to the destruction of the human race. That, I believe, is what basically distinguishes our age from all preceding ages: the ability mankind now has to destroy itself.

179. Once the nuclear fire has been lit, surely nothing can stop it. It is at the least illusory and dangerous to think that those who are mad enough to launch a nuclear war would then be wise enough to limit it. And the existing stockpiles are already sufficient to eliminate all human life on earth several times over.

180. Chemical and biological weapons, although less spectacular in their effects, are nevertheless a real danger, and that is something of which the general public is not fully aware. These weapons are prohibited, and yet we know that they are still being produced, tested, refined and stockpiled, undoubtedly for future use.

181. Immense resources are thus completely wasted, because they do not enhance the security even of those who expend them, since military balances simply tend to establish themselves at ever higher levels. The arms race, born of the desire to dominate or of a feeling of insecurity, thus contains within it the germ of its own acceleration. Because of the growing interdependence of the destinies of the various nations and the contradictory clash of their interests, there is an increasingly closer link between international tensions and internal conflicts, between national oppositions and ideological differences, between regional interests and what is at stake at the planetary level. Thus war can not only escape the control of those that unleash it; it can escape all control and sweep the whole world towards irreparable destruction.

182. War must therefore no longer be considered a way of settling disputes between nations. It must be faced as a common scourge that threatens to backfire indiscriminately against everybody, even those who think they can control it for a certain time. It is time we all unite against it.

183. A peace movement unprecedented in history must now flourish everywhere, a movement that will claim collective responsibility for the fate of humanity, a responsibility that must go beyond the frontiers of selfish interests and narrow calculations and rise to the level of the solidarity of the human race.

184. Of course, many efforts have been made within the United Nations system to eliminate war. Activities have been undertaken by UNESCO and are reflected in the document that I have submitted to the Assembly. I shall mention just a few recent ones concerning certain important meetings such as the World Congress on Disarmament Education which was held in June 1980; the training seminar for university students on disarmament in Latin America and the Caribbean, held at Caracas in October 1981; the colloquium organized with the co-operation of the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs and held at Ajaccio in February of this year on the subject of "Scientists, Arms Race and Disarmament", which adopted various recommendations, some of which were addressed to this session; and lastly, the intergovernmental conference to be held next December on the implementation of the recommendation on education for international understanding, co-operation and peace and education on human rights and fundamental freedoms.

185. It must be said, however, looking at the situation that prevails today, that the efforts undertaken so far throughout the world by one and all have led to meagre results.

186. This session has opened against an extremely grim background. At this very moment aircraft and tanks in their hundreds are spitting fire in the Middle East, Africa, Latin America. At this very moment, children, women, men—in particular, innocent civilians—are dying in Lebanon and elsewhere. And those who could stop this carnage, those who alone can do that, confine themselves to verbal declarations, often very ambiguous.

187. Have the words President Harry Truman spoke on 25 April 1945, when the Charter of the United Nations was adopted at San Francisco, been forgotten? He said, "We can no longer permit any nation or group of nations to attempt to settle their arguments with bombs and bayonets." And he added, "If we do not want to die together in war, we must learn to live together in peace."

188. But if since 1945, when the United Nations system was established, bloodshed has continued throughout the world, this has not happened everywhere. The industrialized countries as a whole have enjoyed peace, and meanwhile they have been providing the rest of the world with the weapons with which countries continue to destroy one another. The industrial Powers have avoided confrontation among themselves, but they have aggravated, if not created, conflicts elsewhere, where the weapons they have manufactured have been tested by and on third-

world peoples, as though their blood mattered less. The developing countries themselves often use resources that could better be used to improve the well-being of their peoples. I may be overstepping the bounds imposed upon me, but I cannot still the voice of my conscience at such a tragic moment in history.

189. The world situation has deteriorated to this point, and the main factors of conflict are becoming more rather than less acute. The threats are increasing instead of being reduced, and that is not because we do not have the material means or adequate institutional mechanisms; it is because at a time when we finally do have those things we do not have a faith in the unity of our future, a philosophy that unites our diversity around values we all share.

190. It is already late, but there is still time together to forge this common philosophy, because beyond all their differences the peoples suffer the same kind of anguish, face the same kind of dilemma, have the same hopes which, expressed in a million ways, unite at one point: the ethical foundations of our existence.

191. Our age can be, because it has the intellectual and technical means, and it must be, because our survival is at stake, the age in which for the first time our common hopes are formulated in a language that is the language of the entire human race. Only then will the voice of collective wisdom prevail over the voice of ambition and the desire for individual power; only then will the same rights and duties, the same values and standards, be respected. This session is an outstanding opportunity for that voice to make itself heard. May it clearly express the anguish of our age.

192. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Afghanistan, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

193. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): I am speaking only to set the record straight in connexion with an assertion made in the statement by the head of the delegation of Pakistan this morning.

194. He asserted that the process of détente had broken down as a result of the presence of foreign troops in Afghanistan.

195. The process of détente did not break down as a result of the presence of the Soviet contingent in Afghanistan. The NATO countries had long before decided to reverse that process—through the creation of rapid deployment forces, the expansion and strengthening of their military presence in the Indian Ocean area and some countries adjacent to it and substantial increases in their military expenditures in the 1980s.

196. That all took place before the Soviet troops were requested to come into Afghanistan.

197. I have made this clarification simply to erase any doubts that might have existed in the minds of delegations.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 124, document A/31/243.*

² *United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 480, No. 6964, p. 43.*

³ *Ibid.*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326.

⁴ *United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.2.*