

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TENTH SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



15th
PLENARY MEETING

*Friday, 2 June 1978,
at 3.35 p.m.*

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker in the general debate this afternoon is the Prime Minister of the Republic of Turkey. I have great pleasure in welcoming His Excellency Mr. Bülent Ecevit, and in inviting him to address the General Assembly.

2. Mr. ECEVIT (Turkey): Sir, I should like first to congratulate you warmly on the able way in which you are presiding over the special session of the General Assembly. I know to what extent your outstanding diplomatic skills and dedication to the ideals of our Organization have contributed to harmonious discussions and constructive conclusions during the thirty-second session. We are confident that under your wise and inspiring guidance our deliberations will enhance the cause of disarmament, which is today the most urgent concern of mankind.

3. I should like also to express our satisfaction at seeing as President a representative of a country with which Turkey has traditionally maintained friendly and fruitful relations. I had, a few months ago, the opportunity of paying an official visit to your country and was extremely gratified to find a convergence of views between Turkey and Yugoslavia on several issues, and particularly on the need to develop understanding, harmony and co-operation in the Balkan region. May I finally add that we greatly appreciate in Turkey the important role played by Yugoslavia in the promotion of peace and international co-operation, as well as in the efforts for disarmament.

4. May I on this occasion reiterate our profound gratitude to the Secretary-General for his tireless and dedicated efforts in the service of the world community. We realize the complexities of his task and we stand ready to support him in the fulfilment of his responsibilities.

5. A special tribute is due to the non-aligned countries, which took the initiative regarding the convening of this special session of the General Assembly. This initiative has had the support of the Turkish Government from the outset. Turkey was one of the sponsors of resolution 31/189B adopted at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly and has participated in the preparations for this special session as a member of the Preparatory Committee.

6. Some years ago the General Assembly departed from its previous practice of meeting in special sessions only in

times of crisis, when an issue had to be urgently debated by our Organization. I am referring to the special session which assembled in 1974, when the vital problem of the new world economic order was discussed in all its aspects in this forum. It is certainly not a matter of chance that we should be meeting again now for another special session to deliberate a question of equally vital importance to the international community, the problem of disarmament—and I mean disarmament on a world scale. Both questions—the need to establish a more equitable, more just and more balanced economic order in the world, and the necessity of initiating an effective disarmament process—constitute, in the present state of international relations, two closely-related problems, on the solution of which depend the future and indeed the fate of human civilization and its chances of survival.

7. They are indeed closely related because disarmament would greatly enhance the possibility of using large amounts of resources for the construction of a fair order of that kind, rather than in a way that may result in the destruction of mankind and civilization. The United Nations special session on disarmament is being held at a crucial time, when consciousness of the necessity of stopping the arms race and of initiating and promoting more efficient methods in the field of disarmament is acutely felt throughout the world.

8. The degree of progress we can achieve in agreed measures for the reduction of arms will depend to a large extent on whether we can take bold and imaginative steps to improve economic and political relations throughout the world. A breakthrough in disarmament negotiations cannot be achieved if we do not have more trust in each other and a better awareness of the common aims and interests of all mankind. We are assembled here to express the will of the nations to achieve disarmament and permanent peace and to search for new ways and means for a quicker pace in the disarmament process.

9. We ought to devise methods that will have to be implemented within the pattern of international relations and, to be successful, we must try to solve all our problems in their correlation. We should not, however, regard the existing pattern of international relations as immune to alterations and improvements and we should not lose sight of the fact that the disarmament process cannot progress independently of efforts successfully to tackle the issues of the world economic order and to further and consolidate détente in the world. An equitable world economic order, détente and disarmament are the three pillars on which will rest a better and healthier system of international relations.

10. *Détente*, at present, is based largely on a balance of deterrence. This is a precarious balance that does not ensure substantial progress in the way of disarmament. We should all try to evolve a new concept and pattern of *détente* that would be based on a more positive balance—a balance of interests in maintaining peace and mutual confidence among nations.

11. The emergence of an atmosphere in which nuclear balance—that is, balance based on mutual annihilation power—will no longer be the unique impediment to a world war seems to be prerequisite for real advance in the limitation and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons. And this can only be achieved through closer dialogue and through increased mutual confidence among the nuclear Powers with the active support of the world community.

12. I am of the opinion that such developments as have taken place in Europe in the last years and as have created improved political conditions and a better climate in relations between States on this continent must be considered at this session with particular interest, not only because we have in Europe a huge accumulation of arms, nuclear and conventional, but also because the experience that was gained there may greatly help us to ascertain what are the realistic and practical methods of promoting a process of relaxation of tensions in other parts of the world. I would, in this connexion, stress that mutual and balanced force reduction efforts should be global rather than local, with the aim of reducing the threat universally.

13. We are still at the stage when a take-off in disarmament negotiations is hampered, among other reasons, by the lack of sufficiently reliable and agreed upon methods and means of control. But a start has been made, and we should try to assess realistically the factors which made some progress in disarmament negotiations possible and opened vistas for further advances. These factors are, as we see them, a state of rough parity in defence, a growing consciousness of increased economic interdependence and the benefits which accrue from it for the welfare of mankind, better mutual understanding and a stronger feeling of friendship between nations. The necessary feeling of relative trust originates in such positive developments in international relations.

14. Success in the first stages in the disarmament process will depend on the implementation of a sequence of balanced reductions, subject to adequate control. Measures and international rules for increasing the adequacy of such control could best be adopted and applied under United Nations responsibility and supervision with the contribution of all nations. The United Nations should be better equipped for such a function. We are of the opinion that that would greatly contribute to strengthen and promote the mutual trust on which rest ultimately agreed disarmament measures.

15. We should not be discouraged by the difficulties of the start. The dynamics of *détente* and disarmament have a logic of their own, and with goodwill and effective organization and control mechanisms, they may follow their course once set in motion.

16. Promoting mutual understanding, trust and friendship would provide the soundest basis for disarmament efforts. The United Nations, therefore, should require all Member nations to adopt and implement educational programmes that should breed a culture of peace and international friendship. Terrorism and violence have reached alarming dimensions in our age, indicating the insufficiency of educational efforts to cultivate feelings of love and tolerance in the hearts and minds from an early age. Today, I have had sad news demonstrating this regrettable fact: the wife and a close relative of the Turkish Ambassador in Madrid, as well as his driver, have been killed in a terrorist attack. It is obvious that it is difficult to mobilize the will of mankind for disarmament and peace in a psychological atmosphere that breeds hate, hostility and violence.

17. Questions relating to disarmament constitute a major preoccupation of the foreign policy of Turkey. As a developing country, Turkey has no doubt felt more than many others the harmful effects of the burden of armaments in times of the cold war, as its particular geographical and geo-political position did not allow it to remain outside the grave tensions of that period. But when conditions slowly improved, Turkey made consistent efforts to facilitate and promote the process of *détente*. Since the signing at Helsinki of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe on 1 August 1975, it has substantially increased, in its own region, its contribution to the consolidation of *détente*, following an active policy of friendly co-operation with all its neighbours and the countries of the region. In parallel to its efforts for improved political relations and enlarged economic collaboration, Turkey has supported all initiatives aimed at arms reductions. Because of its particular location, at the crossroads of East and West, and North and South, Turkey realizes that the only firm foundation of its own national security—and indeed of the security of all nations—rests on the successful outcome of such collective endeavours as bring us together here today.

18. The first round of negotiations on strategic arms limitations were concluded because both sides could rely on the means of control at their disposal for verification of the particular dispositions of the agreement. Where effective verification measures could be agreed upon, arms control arrangements have come into being. If we are sincere in arms control and disarmament measures, I believe that there should then be a sharing of information by those who have the means. National verification methods should be gradually developed and internationalized. As I have already indicated, this could best be done under United Nations supervision.

19. The present terrifying arsenals are the product of advanced technology. Advanced technology should also provide the means for more effective control and verification of existing armaments. Under the circumstances, we consider that it would be highly advisable for the world Organization to set up a scientific body which could be entrusted with the task of studying and evolving arms control methods with a view to providing reliable technical means of verification to be used in the disarmament process. The work of such a scientific body would prove useful to disarmament negotiations, and the reliable techniques that in-

dependent scientists might evolve could ultimately form the scientific basis of an international system of arms verification and control.

20. With respect to the other important initiative which was taken in convening the Vienna talks on mutual force reductions, we observe the differences between the views of the negotiating parties are in the process of being narrowed, thanks to the constructive proposals which have recently been put forward. We expect that the mutual and balanced force reduction talks will now achieve substantial progress. We think that an initial agreement on force reductions in central Europe can and should pave the way for new initiatives for negotiations on balanced force reductions ultimately covering the whole of Europe. My Government intends to contribute constructively to all initiatives aiming at reducing the military threat in all parts of that continent as well as all around the world.

21. We are fast moving towards an integrated world and we have to consider our problems on a global scale. As I pointed out earlier, we are faced with similar and sometimes interrelated political problems and issues of defence and military balance in various regions of the world. I think that the dynamics of détente and disarmament, of which I have spoken, would apply to all regions of the world where more stability and enlarged co-operation is needed for the interests of the nations situated in those regions. Regional efforts aimed at improving political relations, the intensification of economic exchanges, stability and gradual reduction of forces that countries attempt to make in their own regions should be strongly supported and assisted by the world community. The question of regional balance is acquiring increased significance for world peace. Tensions and the over-arming which results from them exist in several important regions of our globe. Defusing existing tensions and achieving equitable political compromises on differences and conflicts would result in greater security for all concerned and enhance disarmament efforts both regionally and globally. In order to create an atmosphere of confidence as well as to focus the attention of the world's opinion on regional balance and stability, proposals for the registration of weapons transfers and sales should be seriously considered. Turkey would support proposals for the enforcement of a system of registration of arms sales, with the expectation and hope that mandatory publicity about arms deals would enable the international community to preserve and bolster regional balance in the field of détente.

22. We must not overlook the fact that, together with State-to-State or commercially open arms deals, illicit arms sales and smuggling have reached dangerous proportions in our world. Arms-producing and arms-exporting countries have the particularly grave responsibility of strictly enforcing in good faith adequate measures which would prevent illegal sales and contraband of arms; this sordid trade which thrives on human lives must be stopped. Our countries should agree on a set of procedures and restrictions regulating the sales of arms, forbidding and preventing all illicit arms deals and deliveries for purposes inconsistent with the common interests of the world community and the aims of our Organization. As a first

step, my country suggests that the Secretary-General request Governments to provide our Organization with all needed information regarding legislation and law-enforcing measures regulating arms sales and purchases in Member countries, including measures enacted and implemented to prohibit and impose penalties for contraband and the smuggling of arms.

23. Substantive progress in disarmament negotiations depends to a large extent on the availability of effective machinery for negotiations. In this respect also we strongly believe that the role of the United Nations should be strengthened.

24. My Government is of the opinion that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should continue its work under the aegis of the United Nations, provided that some adjustments are made in its composition in line with present needs and provided as well that a closer link is established with the United Nations. However, my Government supports appropriate steps that would encourage all nuclear-weapon States to participate in the work of the disarmament negotiating body. If all nations—big or small—are not identified with this work, the success of the negotiations conducted in that Conference is bound to remain limited. As in most bodies, the importance of rotation should be kept in view. It is normal that all nuclear Powers, as well as some countries well advanced in arms technology, should be permanent members of that body; but I believe that countries with heavy and important responsibilities in maintaining stability and balance should also take part in its work. The participation of such States which have a big stake in the reduction of armaments would stimulate new and bolder initiatives in this important forum of disarmament negotiations.

25. An end to nuclear tests has for more than 20 years been considered a crucial step towards the achievement of nuclear disarmament. A total ban on all nuclear tests would limit substantially the competition among nuclear-weapon States in the qualitative field and would at the same time help to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries. We earnestly hope that the discussion on this subject between the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States will result in an agreement to which other nuclear and non-nuclear countries will adhere.

26. The risks inherent in an unchecked competition in strategic armaments between the two main nuclear Powers are becoming greater every day. Rapid technological advances and the introduction of new weapons systems are escalating the strategic arms levels, increasing the likelihood of the use of such arms and raising the possibility of fatal errors of judgement.

27. The danger of the present nuclear arms race can only be aggravated by nuclear proliferation. My Government fully shares the concern felt over the spreading of nuclear weapons. It considers that an increase in the number of nuclear Powers would be a destabilizing factor in the present balance of nuclear deterrence and would undermine disarmament efforts. Therefore, we believe in the necessity of taking urgent measures in order to strengthen the present non-proliferation régime. In this regard due attention must

be given to the balance between responsibilities and obligations established within the framework of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*]. Until the super-Powers begin to diminish their massive nuclear arsenals, they will not be seen to be fulfilling their own share of the contract with the non-nuclear countries as defined in the non-proliferation Treaty.

28. For this reason the state of the strategic arms limitation talks has an important impact on the climate of international opinion with respect to proliferation. The conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty would have a profound effect in enhancing a non-proliferation climate. Appropriate arrangements based on a consensus with a view to providing adequate security guarantees to non-nuclear States would also be helpful in reducing the incentives to go nuclear. In this connexion I should like to state my Government's support for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world under certain conditions. Such arms-control arrangements designed to maintain stability within specific geographical regions have considerable value as barriers to proliferation.

29. A workable strategy for restricting the spread of nuclear weapons must be broadly based. It must take into account the legitimate interests of both the developing and the developed countries. Energy at affordable costs is a prerequisite for development. The non-proliferation of nuclear weapons must not entail the prevention of the dissemination of nuclear technology for peaceful and development purposes. Under adequate safeguards, nuclear technology for peaceful purposes should be available, without any restrictions or discrimination, to all developing countries.

30. Turkey is a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and my Government, while conscious of the imperfections of the Treaty, will nevertheless promptly request approval from Parliament of its ratification. We shall do this in the hope of doing our part in encouraging all countries to accede to it and thereby to give more vigour to the appeal directed to nuclear-weapon States for quick and effective progress in the field of nuclear disarmament.

31. These are, in broad outline, some of the views which my delegation may further elaborate in the deliberations at the special session. The Turkish Government is fully aware of the fact that arming cannot of itself guarantee a country's security. Improvement of international relations, as well as disarmament and arms-control activities, forms a vital part of security. It is in this belief that my Government, in its programme, has defined the following line of action in international relations:

"We will follow a foreign policy which binds the national interests of Turkey not to international tensions but to détente in international relations and to the consolidation of world peace. We will strive to ensure that world peace is based upon human love and the principle of the non-violability of each nation's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, and not on the bal-

ance of terror. Our Government is determined to contribute to the termination of the armaments race and to preventing war technology from reaching dimensions dangerous to humanity."

It is in this spirit, as expressed in my Government's programme, that Turkey will try to contribute to all activities in the field of disarmament.

32. The aims and endeavours of the foreign policy of Turkey will be threefold: Turkey will support all efforts aiming at the betterment of economic relations on a global scale and the establishment of a just and equitable international economic order; it will continue to contribute to the strengthening and consolidation of détente; and, in parallel with these pursuits, it will participate actively and with determination in actions and undertakings which will ensure steady progress towards world disarmament and lasting peace.

33. Allow me to end my statement with the wish that mankind may progress through concerted efforts towards a fairer, freer and more peaceful world, a world in which feelings of hate and fear will be replaced by feelings of love and confidence.

34. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly I wish to thank the Prime Minister of the Republic of Turkey for the important statement he has just made.

35. Mr. FELLI (Ghana): Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to see you presiding over the deliberations of the important tenth special session of the General Assembly barely a few weeks after you successfully supervised the work of the special session on Namibia. I recall also that about eight months ago you were elected President of the thirty-second session of the General Assembly. At those sessions your tact and diplomatic acumen contributed in no small measure to the success of the Assembly. I have no doubt that this special session also will have the benefit of your wide diplomatic experience.

36. I also wish, Mr. President, to convey through you to Mr. Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina our sincere thanks for the painstaking efforts he and his Committee made in preparing for this session. My thanks go also to the Secretary-General and his staff for giving the Committee every possible assistance.

37. Mr. President, that you should be presiding over the special session is significant. It is significant because you come from a country, Yugoslavia, where the First Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries was held in 1961. The importance of that Conference cannot be overemphasized. For the first time in mankind's history it was brought home to all of us that disarmament was not the prerogative of the big Powers alone; it had become the concern of every person. From that time, disarmament has remained the central issue of concern to all non-aligned nations.

38. I recall that it was almost directly after the Belgrade Conference that Kwame Nkrumah, the then President of

Ghana, convened the Accra Assembly on the world without the bomb. That Conference was attended by individuals of repute in their own right in their respective countries. In a statement sent to the Accra Assembly, Kwame Nkrumah said:

"You have assembled here, not as representatives of countries or political parties or organizations, but as individuals who are determined to save the human race from those who would condemn it to destruction. The fact that you have come here as individuals will, I believe, allow you to do that new thinking and make that fresh approach which is today so essential to the survival of mankind.

"A new approach to these problems, new thinking on the issue of man's preservation, is demanded. Out of this body of eminent thinkers, who have actively concerned themselves with the welfare and progress of mankind, must come a positive answer to that demand."

The secretariat of the Accra Assembly was kept going mainly through grants made to it by the Government of Ghana and by other Governments and individuals.

39. The Accra Assembly demonstrated Ghana's justifiable concern for the preservation of the world and our common civilization in this nuclear age as well as our hope that our modest effort in convening the conference would provide the urge that would eventually lead to general and complete disarmament.

40. But our record of 17 years of disarmament negotiations does not give us cause to rejoice. What we have achieved is so little compared with the goals that we have set for ourselves. Sadly, the record indicates that we have been working only at the periphery of disarmament. We have deluded ourselves into believing that once we settle the peripheral issues, disarmament will automatically follow. That has not been the case, and 17 years is just too long to wait. Instead of making steady progress towards disarmament, the issues have become more and more complex, as an examination of our record would show.

41. In 1959, the Antarctic Treaty forbidding military activity in Antarctica was signed. In 1963 the Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water¹ came into being. In 1967 a significant step was taken to ban nuclear weapons in Latin America. It was the first example of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in a populated region of the world. Protocols I and II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America² have since been signed. Then in 1968 the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex] came into being. That committed nuclear Powers not to transfer nuclear weapons to States not possessing them, while the non-nuclear nations undertook not to receive them. In 1972 the sea-bed treaty [resolution 2660 (XXV), annex] came into

force, prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in that environment. In 1975 the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction [resolution 2826 (XXVI), annex] came into force. This Convention is the first international instrument in modern times to include actual disarmament measures. On 20 September 1961 the United States and the Soviet Union put out a statement confirming that the goal of multilateral negotiations on disarmament was to ensure general and complete disarmament, which would entail the disbanding of armed forces, the elimination of nuclear-weapon stockpiles and the discontinuance of heavy military expenditures.³ In 1976 the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques [resolution 31/72, annex] was presented to the General Assembly by the United States and the Soviet Union with a recommendation for signature and ratification by other States.

42. These, together with the agreements on strategic arms limitation, represent the positive side of the nuclear disarmament programme. But the truth is that except for the Convention on bacteriological weapons none of the agreements reached constitutes a substantive measure of disarmament.

43. Looking at the record of our disarmament efforts, therefore, 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.

44. On the contrary, what do we find? The world's expenditure on armaments has soared to the unprecedented and unacceptable figure of over \$400 thousand million. As against that figure, the World Health Organization spent \$83 million over a period of 10 years to eradicate smallpox in the world. At the same time, its programme for the eradication of malaria in the world is estimated to cost about \$450 million, which the agency is having difficulty in raising. It is indeed an irony of circumstance that whilst it is plagued by hunger, poverty and deprivation, the world is ready to spend fantastic sums of money on armaments rather than on health, education or agriculture.

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964, p. 43.

² *Ibid.*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326.

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session Annexes*, agenda item 19, document A/4879.

45. It is the reality of the danger posed to human society by the nuclear weapons arms race, as well as its common failure to make meaningful progress in disarmament, that have moved Ghana to lend its full support to this special session of the General Assembly. We appreciate the complex and sensitive nature of the task in the face of ideological differences. We know that disarmament will not be achieved overnight, but we are convinced that faster progress could be made if we were to strengthen our mutual understanding and trust, for it is better to hold the world together by a balance of trust and hope than to maintain it by a balance of fear.

46. Having said that, I should now like to turn to conventional weapons, which also deserve serious attention in the disarmament effort. Whilst it is true that the billions of dollars that make up the military expenditure of the world are spent on research into the manufacture of nuclear weapons, it is also a fact that a sizeable proportion of this expenditure is devoted to sophisticated conventional arms. Perhaps the only difference is that whereas the nuclear arms enrich the arsenals of only a few nuclear Powers, the deadly conventional weapons find universal use, particularly in the third world.

47. A survey of the world's recent history reveals that whereas the territories of the leading manufacturers of conventional weapons have enjoyed relative peace and stability since the Second World War, deadly conventional weapons have been used frequently to heighten tension and conflict in Asia, Africa and Latin America. At present, the international hotbeds of conflict are concentrated in Africa more than on any other continent, and Africa and Africans continue to be the tragic victims of arms supplied from outside the continent. In Africa, therefore, the arms race is being conducted through numerous conflicts over territorial claims.

48. But there is yet another source of tension in Africa which is even more frightening. I am referring to the Pretoria régime, which by its actions has occasioned the arms race in southern Africa. The Pretoria régime of South Africa, in pursuit and in support of its *apartheid* policy, continues to build up a huge arsenal of arms. The purpose of this accumulation of arms is none other than to intimidate its immediate neighbours and also the rest of Africa. But as long as the Pretoria régime pursues this policy Africa will remain a continent of unrest and a source of potential danger to the peace of the world.

49. Today, it is no longer a secret that the South African régime, through the acquisition of nuclear technology imparted to it by some Member States of this Organization, is on the threshold of gaining a nuclear-weapon capability. Such an event is bound, of course, to alter substantially the power structure in southern Africa and almost certainly frustrate the liquidation of racism and of subjugation in that part of our continent. Since the rest of Africa cannot be expected to accept the entrenchment of colonialism and *apartheid*, we have the moral obligation to sound a warning that in the event of a threat to our individual and collective security the fate of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which we have all fought very hard for, may very well be placed in jeopardy.

50. In face of this threat to the peace and security of Africa, we are compelled to renew our appeal to the international community to prevent South Africa at all costs from introducing nuclear weapons into the continent. The Ghana Government believes that, to achieve this, the international community, especially through the efforts of member States of the Security Council must intensify its economic and military sanctions against the Pretoria régime under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. It is only if they do so that the overwhelming wish of African States to preserve their continent as a nuclear-weapon-free zone can be guaranteed against frustration by the stubborn régime of Pretoria.

51. There is a socio-economic aspect of disarmament which the Assembly at this special session must not fail to examine very closely. Our struggle for international peace and security through a progressive reduction in our respective military establishments would do only half the job, unless we turned released resources to the betterment of the quality of life of our peoples. The yawning gap between the industrialized and developing worlds constitutes a source of friction which must be removed to ensure global harmony.

52. It will be recalled that in 1961 the Secretary-General appointed a group of experts to consider the social and economic aspects of disarmament. In 1971, another group of 14 experts was established to bring the 1961 report⁴ up to date. In the introduction to the 1971 report, the group of experts stated: "In 1961, when the report of the Secretary-General entitled *Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament* was being prepared . . . the world was . . . spending . . . \$120 thousand million annually for military purposes."⁵ That was equal to \$US 150 thousand million at 1970 prices. By 1970, annual military expenditures exceeded \$200 thousand million. The experts also estimated that if annual military expenditure continued to absorb the same percentage of world output, it could well reach the level of \$300 to \$350 thousand million—at 1970 prices—by 1980, with a total outlay for the current decade of about \$2,650 thousand million, \$750 thousand million more than was spent from 1961 to 1970. It is not yet 1980, and yet expenditure on arms has soared to \$400 thousand million. At the current rate of expenditure, one can forecast that by 1980 it will have hit the level of \$450 thousand million.

53. The constant process of the qualitative refinement of weapons has brought mankind to the point where it now stands, a victim threatened by his own technological progress. It is against this background that the Supreme Military Council of Ghana welcomes this special session as affording a rare opportunity to reappraise the respective positions of our countries on the question of disarmament.

54. We are spending large sums of money on armaments while our development is suspended or at best considerably slowed down. Ghana naturally is concerned about what

⁴ United Nations publication, Sales No. 62.IX.1.

⁵ *Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.72.IX.16), para. 2.

we consider to be a waste of resources. Those who have spoken before me have outlined the universal concern over this aspect of disarmament. Even so, my delegation wishes to join in underscoring the urgency with which we feel this matter must be handled.

55. The Ghana delegation recalls, in this connexion, that in this very Assembly, about four years ago, representatives endorsed the taking of important steps aimed at restructuring economic relations by identifying specific goals in the Declaration and Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order [*resolution 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI)*] and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States [*resolution 3281 (XXIX)*]. That Declaration reflects the awareness of the international community that the present state of our relations in the economic field, characterized by a polarization between the rich and poor, can no longer be tolerated. It is also a recognition of the fact that the growing disparities between the levels of development of the rich and the poor nations are not only morally unacceptable but also pose a serious threat to harmonious relations and the development of meaningful co-operation between the rich and the poor, thus creating a potential danger to the peace of the world. We all know that our hopes for the new international economic order and meaningful co-operation among all States require patient negotiations in an atmosphere devoid of tension and conflict. The arms race and all that it implies constitute a serious obstacle to the attainment of such a goal.

56. The Ghana delegation welcomes the recommendation and proposals contained in the report of the Preparatory Committee [A/S-10/1]. We are particularly happy to note that the Committee has set out clear priorities and measures which should guide future disarmament negotiations. My delegation hopes that the sincerity and the political will of countries represented here will be brought to bear on international efforts to implement those recommendations and proposals.

57. We have had occasion to state here, and in other international forums, that the Supreme Military Council of Ghana supports the ultimate aim of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. My Government, however, recognizes that before that goal can be achieved we should establish conditions within which all nations, great and small, can feel secure. This means that confidence and security ought to be strengthened if States are to beat their arms into ploughshares. The Ghana delegation therefore believes that for the success of any disarmament negotiations there should be a constant and sustained effort to remove sources of tension and injustice. In other words, international détente must be deepened and consolidated.

58. This is why my delegation welcomes proposals contained in the report. We would like to see the institution of more confidence-building measures as an important part of the disarmament programme. We are happy that this aspect of the programme has received some attention in the Preparatory Committee's report.

59. Another part of the document which my delegation would like to refer to is the one concerning the machinery for future disarmament deliberations. Whatever the objectives of the programme of action that is finally agreed upon by this Assembly, the success of future work will depend upon the provision of appropriate and adequate machinery to deal with problems which hamper the effective control of the arms build-up. My delegation does not deny that the political will of Member States is essential for any disarmament negotiations. We believe, however, that the creation of appropriate and effective machinery is vital for the implementation of the proposals.

60. My delegation has in mind the strengthening of the central role of this Organization as a first step towards the successful implementation of any proposals we may adopt.

61. We invite Member States represented here, therefore, to reaffirm their full commitment to the United Nations to enable the Organization to live up to the noble mission for which it was created. In particular we would urge Member States to support the Secretary-General in his efforts to strengthen further the expertise and capability of this Organization to play the central role in the disarmament process and to accept the obligation to place at the disposal of the United Nations the agreed manpower necessary for an international peace force, to be equipped with agreed types of armaments. The deployment of that force would ensure that this Organization could effectively deter or suppress any use or threat of use of arms in violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter.

62. It is essential for this Organization to be encouraged to exercise its leadership role. It should be encouraged to guide decisions with regard to all disarmament problems.

63. In the last few days the Assembly has received proposals from delegations which have participated in the general debate so far. Diverse as the suggestions have been, it is the view of my delegation that they have articulated a measure of consensus with which my delegation would be happy to be associated. If we want to make quick and timely progress on the issue of disarmament, then it is in our common interest that we identify the areas of agreement and initiate effective action to translate them into advantageous reality.

64. It is the view of my delegation that most delegations share the desire that steps towards general and complete disarmament be taken under the auspices of the United Nations. The Ghana delegation wishes to propose, therefore, that a supreme United Nations body, accessible to all Member States, be immediately created to co-ordinate all activities in this direction. The *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Special Session could perhaps be entrusted with the task of working out the structure and terms of reference of that supreme United Nations body, for subsequent approval by the General Assembly.

65. One pertinent reason for the slow progress made in the past has been the lack of agreement on verification procedures. While Ghana sympathizes with the parochial sentiments of those countries that have taken issue with verifi-

cation proposals in the past, we none the less agree with those other countries that have demonstrated that there can be advantage to all in using the technological facilities at man's disposal to make a modest beginning in the collection and collation of information on all forms of nuclear activity. The Ghana delegation is therefore inclined to support the creation, in the near future, of an international satellite monitoring agency. It is our hope that the nuclear Powers will give material support to the creation of this agency. Similarly, advantage should be taken of the facilities offered by some Member States for the establishment of a seismological monitoring agency, to ensure that the information accruing to the international community on nuclear activities can be as complete as is humanly possible.

66. But disarmament will not be achieved only through the use of sophisticated technological gadgets. Progress in this important endeavour will substantially depend on the willingness of Governments and peoples to see disarmament become a reality. Our problem here is attitudinal, and we all have a grave responsibility to adapt our respective national policies to meet the challenge. In this regard, the nuclear Powers shoulder primary responsibility. We call on them, in the name of humanity, to respond to our common appeal for a solemn undertaking not to use their weapons, on however limited a scale, against any non-nuclear country, and to adhere scrupulously to the desire of certain geographical areas to remain nuclear-weapon-free zones.

67. Much has already been said about the link between disarmament and development, with which we are in complete agreement. We wish to emphasize the importance of this link and the expectation of the developing world that through the progressive saving of resources in the field of military expenditure the quality of life of the world's poor may be significantly bettered. To that end, we would go along with the provision to the new Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation of parameters on how to utilize resources released through a cut-back in the military budgets of the militarily powerful States for developmental purposes.

68. Furthermore, we are all aware that the lofty objectives that we pursue will not be achieved unless they enjoy funding by all States. We recommend, therefore, to the special session the immediate establishment of a disarmament fund, into which all States can contribute in accordance with a scale of contributions to be agreed upon, for the purpose of advancing the important decisions to be taken here.

69. Finally, the level of representation at this special session gives us hope that success is a possibility—indeed a probability. It indicates that we have all accepted our responsibility. We also accept the obligation to ensure that the conclusions reached at this special session will be implemented. It has become almost a cliché to say that this Organization performs as well as its Members permit it to perform. It is none the less true to say also that the Organization can and will do as much as its Members allow it to do.

70. The world has gone a full turn since the end of the first world war. We can and we must end the distrust which gives rise to conflict. We can and we must give confidence and trust, without which there cannot be real détente. The world is now at a crossroads. We can elect to take the road that leads to destruction or that which leads to the prosperity and well-being of all mankind. Our choice, I am sure, is clearly for the latter.

71. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, on behalf of the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic I should like to congratulate you, the representative of socialist Yugoslavia, on your election to the presidency of this special session of the General Assembly and to wish you successful and fruitful work in your post.

72. The cessation of the arms race and disarmament are the central issues today in world politics. The most important, the most urgent task today, as was stated by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Mr. Brezhnev, at the eighteenth Congress of the Leninist Young Communist League of the Soviet Union, is to achieve a further easing of the danger of war and to halt the arms race. This is felt by all peoples and is acknowledged by the majority of Governments.

73. The course of the general debate at this special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament confirms that irrefutable fact. Mankind is becoming ever more profoundly aware of the fact that in the nuclear age military conflict is fraught with the danger of the most terrible consequences for our planet. But it is not enough to recognize the absurdity and perniciousness of the arms race. One must go further and actually adopt concrete measures to call a halt to it. That, of course, requires considerable efforts. Nevertheless we still categorically reject pessimism regarding this problem. The arms race is not an endless labyrinth. Today, new political and material conditions have come into being which are propitious for further and more decisive progress towards the cessation of the arms race and towards disarmament.

74. The States of the socialist community have been pursuing a firm and consistent policy in favour of the cessation of the arms race and for a world without weapons. Such a policy flows from the very nature of socialism, as a social system, the highest goal of which is the well-being and happiness of the working people.

75. In socialist States, unlike capitalist countries, there are no such things as classes or groups; there are no military-industrial complexes which have a vested interest in earning profits from the arms race. Therefore, from the very first decree under Soviet power—the Leninist Decree on Peace—right up to the new Constitution of the USSR, the whole 60-year-old history of the Soviet State has cogently demonstrated—to use the words of Mr. Brezhnev—that “the first State of victorious socialism has emblazoned indelibly upon its banner the word ‘peace’ as

the highest principle of its foreign policy in keeping with the interests of its own people and of all other peoples on the planet''.

76. In their approach to the problem of disarmament, the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist States have always proceeded from the premise that the most effective and rational means of attaining peace is general and complete disarmament. As far back as 1922 at the Genoa Conference, convened on the initiative of Lenin, the Soviet delegation proposed a programme of general disarmament. From that time on the constructive approach of the USSR to talks on general and complete disarmament has been preserved intact.

77. The achievement of general and complete disarmament has been defined in the Constitution of the USSR as one of the aims of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community have unfailingly put forward a genuinely comprehensive programme in that area.

78. The movement of the non-aligned countries has supported disarmament, and that was once again demonstrated by the final communiqué adopted by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned States last May at Havana.⁶

79. The struggle for peace and disarmament is not confined to the efforts undertaken at State and inter-State levels; it has become the business of the peoples of the world themselves. On all continents the voice of public opinion is making itself heard ever more loudly, with ever greater confidence, calling for the adoption of speedy and effective measures in this area. That is shown by the documents from so many international and national public organizations that have been submitted to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the reports about the unprecedentedly broad movement of the peoples of the world advocating peace, cessation of the arms race, prohibition of barbarous means of destruction and annihilation, and in favour of disarmament. Those are the legitimate demands made by the peoples, and they are finding their broadest and fullest reflection in the numerous peaceful initiatives of the USSR and other States of the socialist community.

80. The documents submitted for consideration at this session reveal the consistent policy of the Soviet Union in matters of disarmament. The first proposal of the USSR in the United Nations was the draft international convention on the prohibition of the manufacture and use of weapons based on the use of atomic energy for the purposes of mass destruction, which was submitted in 1946. In subsequent years the Soviet Union has put forward more than 70 specific proposals; they were all designed to strengthen peace and security and to solve urgent problems of disarmament. They provided for prohibiting and eliminating nuclear weapons and other types of weapons of mass destruction, blocking or narrowing the avenues for further expansion of

the arms race in this area; they provided for the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces, as well as military budgets, and for the use of the funds so released for peaceful purposes. Those proposals also contain a programme of general and complete disarmament and partial measures for halting the arms race and bringing about disarmament in the most varied fields, both in terms of existing forms of weaponry and of new forms and systems of weapons. They contain measures of a general international nature, including the proposal for the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations and measures at the regional and bilateral levels. Those proposals provide for the prohibition or limitation of military activities on land, at sea, in the atmosphere and in outer space.

81. Most of them have been approved by the General Assembly; some have become international treaties and conventions; talks are still going on with regard to a number of them, and others still await solution.

82. Now our Party and the Soviet State are implementing the Programme of the Further Struggle for Peace and International Co-operation, for the Freedom and Independence of the Peoples, adumbrated at the Twenty-fifth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. States Members of the United Nations are very familiar with the concrete measures contained in the decisions of the Twenty-fifth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on questions of disarmament. The constructive position of the Soviet Union on the cessation of the arms race and disarmament as applicable to the tasks facing the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament were put forward in the statement of a member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. A. A. Gromyko [5th meeting], and in the proposals submitted for the consideration of this session by the Soviet Union on "Practical means for halting the arms race" [A/S-10/AC.1/4].

83. The Byelorussian people, like the other people of the USSR, know very well the price of war and the price of peace. During the years of the Great Patriotic War our Republic lost more than 2,200,000 of its citizens, or every fourth inhabitant, and more than half of its national resources. At the present time, the industrial output of Byelorussia is almost 25 times greater than before the war. In order to implement plans for the further economic and social development of our country we need lasting peace.

84. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR at sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations has repeatedly stated the devotion of its people to the cause of peace, détente, security and co-operation of peoples, our hope for the cessation of the arms race and disarmament. The Byelorussian SSR has set forth its position in answer to the questionnaires sent by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and in the United Nations has joined in sponsoring very important proposals on those questions. It is a party to international agreements that have been concluded to date on the limitation of the arms race and disarmament. On the opening day of this special session of the General

⁶ See document A/33/118 of 7 June 1978.

Assembly, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian SSR ratified the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques.

85. We believe that this session, on the basis of the positive experience of the past and the results achieved, using its rights and prerogatives, is in a position to make a real contribution to the attainment of agreement leading to a cessation of the arms race. The successful solution of practically all the organizational problems with regard to preparing for and holding it, working out and formulating the final documents—and that is still far from being complete—all testify to existing opportunities for indicating new kinds of concerted action leading to the cessation of the arms race.

86. Up to the present time there have been concluded and there are in operation specific, binding international agreements and treaties on such questions as the cessation of a high proportion of nuclear-weapon tests, adoption of measures to prevent their further proliferation in the world, prohibition on the emplacement of such weapons in outer space, on the sea-bed and the ocean floor, prohibition and elimination of bacteriological weapons, and prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques.

87. Unfortunately, not all States Members of the United Nations are parties to those treaties. But it is quite clear that universal accession to those treaties and agreements would significantly enhance their effectiveness. We note with satisfaction that, in the course of this special session of the General Assembly, a number of States have announced their accession to those agreements or their intention to become parties to them. In our view, this special session and its decisions should aim at ensuring that all States without exception become parties to those treaties and conventions; and that, in turn, would demonstrate the desire of every country to halt the arms race and to join actively in the search for new agreements on disarmament. Of course, neither national interests, nor a desire to achieve more far-reaching measures in the field of disarmament, nor the argument that certain States do not possess those kinds of weapons that are limited or prohibited under those agreements can be allowed to become obstacles to their becoming parties to those treaties.

88. We also consider it to be the duty of every State, regardless of its social system, size, economic and military potential, geographical situation or any other characteristic, to promote the speediest and most successful completion of the negotiations which are already under way at bilateral regional and international levels, directed towards the cessation of the arms race and disarmament. And of course no one has the right to take steps which could complicate the achievement of understandings on the problems under discussion. After all, these are vital questions and their solution concerns not only the direct participants in the negotiations but also all the peoples of the world. The mere enumeration of the problems now being discussed shows this. There are the Soviet-American talks on limiting strategic offensive armaments; the negotiations be-

tween the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests; the work carried out by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on the agreements concerning the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and the destruction of stocks of those weapons, and concerning the prohibition of the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction; the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe; the Soviet-American talks on the prohibition of radiological weapons, on the limitation and subsequent reduction of military activities in the Indian Ocean, and on the limitation of international trade in and transfer of conventional weapons.

89. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, in common with the other States of the socialist community, has a vital interest in the successful completion of all the negotiations now under way on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security for all the parties. The success of those talks would ensure that political détente comes to be supplemented by military détente. These purposes would also be served by the adoption by all States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe of the proposals by the States parties to the Warsaw Pact, on the conclusion of a treaty binding the parties not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against one another and not to increase the membership of the military-political groupings and alliances confronting each other in Europe.

90. The general debate now going on shows world support for the new initiative of the Soviet Union presented for the consideration of this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. This is quite natural, because those proposals are in keeping with the interests of all peoples, serve the cause of strengthening peace, and take into account the position of other countries. Those initiatives provide, first of all, for specific measures to ensure the total cessation of the further quantitative and qualitative buildup of arms and armed forces of States possessing a large military potential, and to create conditions for their subsequent reduction. They also provide for such steps as the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons in all forms, the cessation of the manufacture of all other weapons of mass destruction and their prohibition, the cessation of the creation of new types of conventional weapons of great destructive capability, the renunciation of the expansion of armies and the building-up of conventional weapons on the part of the permanent members of the Security Council and also of those countries which have military agreements with them.

91. One of the most topical issues of the day is the limitation of the nuclear arms race. Last November the Soviet Union proposed an agreement on the simultaneous cessation by all States of the manufacture of nuclear weapons in all their forms, whether atomic, hydrogen or neutron bombs or missiles.⁷ At the same time, the nuclear Powers would undertake to proceed with the gradual reduction of

⁷ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, First Committee, 26th meeting.*

the existing stockpiles of those weapons until the complete elimination of nuclear-weapon stocks was achieved. The start of negotiations on the implementation of those measures would make it possible for atomic energy to be used exclusively for peaceful creative purposes. We should like to hope that all the other nuclear Powers will respond favourably to this initiative and, together with a group of countries not possessing nuclear weapons, will begin, within the time-limits established by the session, negotiations on nuclear disarmament and on the question of the non-use of force in international relations.

92. It is essential that measures should be taken to prevent the danger of nuclear war towards which mankind may be drifting as a result of the nuclear arms race. We know that if the existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons were to be used, mankind might be totally obliterated. Specific steps should be taken to adopt and implement the provisions contained in the draft resolution of the USSR on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war, submitted last September at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly.⁸

93. Of great importance is the problem of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Their proliferation or acquisition by States in regions of conflict and tension will not strengthen security; on the contrary, it will increase the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict, if only by accident. And in that case no "nuclear umbrella" would protect anyone from the deadly storm. That is why further efforts are needed to achieve an effective and universal solution to this problem, in order, too, to prevent the implementation of the plans for the development of nuclear weapons in South Africa and in Israel, because this is something which is fraught with the most serious consequences for the cause of peace and security, not only for Africa and the Middle East, but for the whole of mankind.

94. The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic is convinced that the readiness of the USSR to conclude appropriate bilateral agreements with any non-nuclear State on the basis of the declaration by the Soviet Union that it will never use nuclear weapons against those States which renounce the production and acquisition of nuclear weapons and which have none on their territories, as well as the Soviet proposal on the need to solve the problem of preventing emplacement of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where they do not exist at present, will receive a favourable response on the part of both non-nuclear and nuclear States. This will strengthen the régime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and diminish the danger of the outbreak of nuclear conflict.

95. Recently the question of the prohibition of the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction has become very urgent. As far back as 1975, the Soviet Union put forward a proposal to conclude an agreement on this problem.⁹ Unfortunately, the Western Powers have on various pretexts evaded the practical implementa-

tion of that proposal. Furthermore, the United States in practice has been preparing for the development of the neutron weapon, this new, particularly inhumane means of mass destruction of people. True, the United States Government took a decision two months ago to postpone the production of those weapons. Taking into account this decision, the Soviet Union has declared that it too will refrain from producing neutron weapons if the United States does not do so.

96. But we must go further, and completely prohibit that barbarous weapon before it is too late to preclude its emergence. This purpose would be served by the draft convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear neutron weapons, put forward by the socialist States early last March at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva.¹⁰

97. In supporting the prohibition of the neutron weapon, we should like to stress that this is favoured by the peoples of the whole world, including those countries where it is proposed to deploy this weapon. As is shown by the recent Harris Poll, even the majority of the population of the United States is against the neutron bomb.

98. The General Assembly should finally take an authoritative stand in favour of practical measures to reduce the military budgets of States having a significant military potential. As far back as 1973, at the initiative of the Soviet Union, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and the allocation of part of the funds so saved for rendering assistance to the "developing countries [resolution 3093 (XXVIII)]. It was then proposed that agreement be reached on a higher or a lower percentage for the reduction of military budgets. However, because of the positions of certain countries, the practical implementation of that decision was, in effect, submerged in the endless and long drawn-out technical and methodological studies and research, and the developing countries were thus deprived of the opportunity to receive additional assistance. One can only express regret at this. The Soviet Union is now proposing that agreement be reached on specific figures for the reduction of the military budget of each State having a significant economic and military potential, including all permanent members of the Security Council—not in terms of percentage, but in absolute terms, with the allocation of part of the funds for increased assistance to developing countries. It is proposed that such an agreement should cover a three-year period, beginning with the budget for the next financial year.

99. The implementation of the aforementioned proposals of the USSR would be in keeping with the purposes of the United Nations, the demands of the peoples of the world, the cause of peace and the economic and social progress of all States; it would also contribute to the deepening and strengthening of international détente. The implementation

⁸ *Ibid.*, Annexes, agenda item 127, document A/32/242, annex II.

⁹ *Ibid.*, Thirtieth Session, Annexes, agenda items 31, 34-38, 120, 122 and 126; document A/10243.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Thirty-third Session, Supplement No. 27, vol. II, document CCD/559.

of these measures is entirely feasible, given the necessary political responsibility and goodwill on the part of all Member States of the United Nations. Some people might have to review their positions. The purposes of disarmament are incompatible with the whipping up of war hysteria, attempts to substitute arms control for disarmament, the increase of military expenditures, and trying to blame others for what is one's own fault. On one and the same day, *The New York Times*, for example, published the statement by the Vice-President of the United States at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and also a report that the United States Congress had earmarked an additional portion of military appropriations for the Pentagon, an amount which exceeded the request of the Administration—and even for certain kinds of weapons for which the Government had simply not requested appropriations at all. Can we reconcile the tasks facing this special session on disarmament with the decision of the NATO States on a further increase of military expenditures, which, in any case, are now nine times higher than at the time of the creation of that bloc?

100. Completely incompatible with the purposes and tasks of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament are the fostering of the myth of an alleged "Soviet military threat", the allegations about the inevitability of world war, and the playing down of its danger to the fate of mankind. We all know who, last year, was the only one not to support the idea of convening the present special session, who did not make any proposals to bring about disarmament but is in favour of the further accumulation of armaments, urges the stepping-up of military expenditures of the imperialist countries and is trying to prove the need for the involvement of developing countries in the arms race instead of in the solution of problems of economic and social development. Such a militaristic course is permeated with hegemonistic aspirations and is entirely at variance with the position of the socialist, non-aligned, developing, and virtually all other States that have gathered at this special session in order to try to find ways of calling a halt to the arms race and embarking on disarmament.

101. The Byelorussian SSR believes that this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should provide further impetus to the adoption, as early as possible, of specific measures in the field of disarmament and cessation of the arms race.

102. To these ends, we must adopt a final document in which, we hope, the positions of all groups of States will be taken into account in a balanced way. It is important that such a document should contain an objective appraisal of the results achieved in the field of measures for disarmament and the limitation of the arms race; it should lay down universal and far-reaching goals, as well as realistic and generally acceptable tasks, so as not to destroy the existing negotiating machinery but contribute to the efficiency of its work.

103. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR regards this special session as an important stage along the road to a world disarmament conference, convening of which is

favoured by the overwhelming majority of States. In our view, the current session should take a step forward and set the time for the holding of that world disarmament conference.

104. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to express the hope that in the course of this session a spirit of co-operation will prevail, and that universally acceptable decisions will be adopted aimed at achieving the most important and urgent goals of our day; curbing the arms race, embarking upon real measures of practical disarmament and making progress towards general and complete disarmament. In our view, the task of this session is to play a substantial role in mobilizing the efforts of all States for the realization of the goals of disarmament and for the stepping-up of the struggle for peace without weapons and for a world without war. It should also express the political will and desire of every State to enhance the effectiveness of negotiations in this sphere.

105. As Mr. P. M. Masharov, Alternate Member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Byelorussia, stressed in his speech at the Eighth Congress of the International Federation of Resistance Fighters which is now being held at Minsk, "the life of present and succeeding generations, the future of the whole of mankind, depends on whether the peace-loving forces will succeed in stopping the senseless arms race".

106. For its part, the Byelorussian SSR, together with other socialist States, is ready to make a constructive contribution to the work of the session and towards achieving specific positive results in this work.

107. Mr. SIMONET (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, let me first say that I am delighted to see you guiding the work of this special session of the General Assembly with the authority that you have always shown in this post. Your political skill and impartiality have helped to maintain the constructive atmosphere that we enjoyed at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly.

108. As early as October 1943, in the middle of the Second World War, representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, China and the Soviet Union assembled in Moscow and declared their countries to be in favour of seeking the limitation and general regulation of armaments.

109. Thus, looking beyond the gigantic defence effort which was then being undertaken by those countries, the leaders of those countries expressed the aspirations of the world for peace and for an international security founded on principles other than the law of weapons and the balance of power.

110. It is discouraging to note that the efforts undertaken since then by the international community have not been such as to prevent the development of military stockpiles to a degree never before known.

111. There is no subject more difficult than that of disarmament. Negotiations always get off to a hesitant start. Once they are under way progress is slow because of a fundamental distrust which the protagonists cannot overcome, regardless of the sincerity of their determination. But the difficulty of the task must not make us give up the struggle. Furthermore, certain favourable events have occurred since the early 1960s, and they should encourage the international community to redouble its efforts. Despite its limited nature, détente has fostered an improvement in the political climate, and that has produced a certain number of tangible results. While being aware of their partial nature, we must welcome those results.

Mr. Scheltema (Netherlands), Vice-President, took the Chair.

112. The representative of Denmark has had the opportunity to express the concerns and the hopes of the nine member countries of the European Community before this Assembly [7th meeting]. I shall therefore not repeat the various points which he made in that statement. However, I should like to thank the representative of Denmark for having so clearly set forth our common position.

113. I shall deal briefly with the conditions for general and complete disarmament.

114. Despite the practically continuous discussions and notwithstanding some partial successes to which I have referred, the goal of general and complete disarmament seems even further removed now than it was at the time when the Russians and the Americans signed the declaration paving the way for the negotiations which took place during the past decade.

115. However, the ever-increasing perception of danger is daily reflected in a growth of awareness on the part of peoples and Governments. During the last quarter of this century, political leaders will have to reverse a trend which otherwise might very well lead the world to an apocalypse. No conflict of interest could possibly justify that prospect.

116. The present session should provide the basis for concrete action, without any undue attachment to formalistic approaches and going beyond abstract goals which have long been used to disguise the lack of real progress.

117. At this session the Assembly should define a strategy for disarmament. But if we want it to be effective, we must avoid two pitfalls. The first is the danger of wanting to accomplish too much; general and complete disarmament is not, in fact, a reality within close reach. Inasmuch as the world continues to be dominated by the laws of the balance of power and relative force, the security of States will largely continue to remain founded on the maintenance of military might. Disarmament will depend not only on concrete measures but also on whatever progress is made in the establishment of a peaceful world order. The foundations of such an order are, as we are aware, non-interference and the non-use of force as well as justice and co-operation. The second danger is that of scepticism of the kind that considers the arms race as inevitable and im-

possible to control. Such scepticism could lead to destruction by arms or general exhaustion in the arms race. On the contrary, the security of everyone and of all mankind lies in a continuous but gradual process of disarmament.

118. More concretely, the question of disarmament must be considered in three dimensions which cut across each other but which do not merge. I refer to the East-West dimension, first of all, which dominated the debate until the 1960s and which continues to be an essential factor in that debate. Next is the North-South dimension, because of the interrelationship between disarmament and development. Finally, there is the more specifically regional dimension, because of the recent emergence of new military Powers.

119. We believe that if we wish to contribute to the strengthening of security, the process of disarmament will have to take into account a certain number of guiding principles. I shall limit my comments to the link between disarmament and security.

120. At each stage of disarmament a level of security, not diminished but perhaps even strengthened, will have to be maintained by all the parties and for all the parties.

121. Next, a proper balance between the respective rights and obligations of States will have to be maintained in the process of disarmament. If all States are concerned with disarmament, then each must contribute to it. Moreover, this notion of a balance of rights and obligations is particularly important in the relations between military and non-military nuclear States, if we really want to ensure an effective system of nuclear non-proliferation.

122. Finally, in order to generate confidence, without which there can be no lasting security, any disarmament agreement must be subject to adequate verification. More often than not, this will have to include measures of an international nature.

123. I shall now touch briefly upon the programme of action which this Assembly will have to formulate.

124. Here the difficulty is far greater. The security situation varies from one region to another and sometimes from one State to another.

125. The programme of action should essentially be based on immediate measures to be implemented within a few years, perhaps four or five. The purpose of this first stage should be to reverse the tendency of States to arm to excess, and to bring about reductions in the levels of armament and lay the foundations for longer-term measures.

126. While not underestimating the priority of nuclear questions as a whole, we think that parallel attention should be given to conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction, taking into account all possibilities on the global and regional levels.

127. I should like to comment first on the problems related to nuclear armaments. Nuclear armaments represent the most serious threat to the world. Mankind should be

haunted by the spectre of the use of nuclear armaments. To prevent such use it is necessary to reduce nuclear stockpiles with a view to their progressive elimination. The nuclear Powers have a special responsibility in this field because of their privileged position in possessing nuclear weapons. That is why the second round of strategic arms limitation talks should be followed by a third round leading to the conclusion of a third agreement, similar in nature, concerning substantial reductions in the capacity of the super-Powers. That is also why it is essential that in addition to those negotiations a dialogue should be entered into by all nuclear States.

128. Similarly, the goal of a complete ban on nuclear tests should receive priority. The trilateral agreement to which the present negotiations should lead will only be a first stage and should be strengthened by the accession of all nuclear Powers.

129. On the other hand, the nuclear military Powers must be willing to grant guarantees of security to States which have renounced nuclear weapons. These guarantees should be offered under conditions to be determined by the circumstances and aspects of security particular to each region.

130. However, modern times hold a challenge: besides the spectre of the use of nuclear energy for military purposes, its peaceful use has become essential. The energy crisis has divided the world into those that have energy sources and those that do not. For the latter—and they include my country—the peaceful uses of nuclear energy play an ever-increasing part in the economic development and social progress of their populations. We have therefore with a number of other countries made considerable efforts in specialized technologies such as reprocessing and enrichment.

131. But how can we reconcile the broadest possible access to peaceful uses of the atom with avoidance of the risks of nuclear military proliferation? Although Belgium was aware of the shortcomings of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, it acceded to it. We are convinced that it corresponded to the higher interests of nations. The non-proliferation régime must be strengthened by accession to the Treaty of those that have not already done so or by a binding commitment on their part to conform to its provisions and to the controls associated with it. But the system of guarantees of the International Atomic Energy Agency must be enlarged on the basis of international and non-discriminatory agreements. On the other hand, parallel to the Treaty the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones—circumstances permitting and at the initiative of the States concerned—might make an effective contribution to the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime.

132. In another but equally important area, we also consider that, as I said a moment ago, there is a regional dimension to this question. This regional dimension of security has led Belgium at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly to propose a study on the regional pos-

sibilities of disarmament.¹¹ We have already given the Secretary-General a report which has been submitted to the special session as an official document [see A/S-10/8]. Other countries have done the same, and we welcome the growing interest of the international community in this idea. The regional approach has asserted itself during the preparatory work of the special session. We shall have to take into account the possibilities that it offers for a plan of action on the short and longer term, both in the nuclear and the conventional fields.

133. The vertical approach, which has been on our agenda for many years, must be combined with a horizontal approach which action on a regional level constitutes.

134. Europe is undoubtedly a region where nuclear and conventional components are indissolubly linked to the point where a reduction, if not the total elimination of nuclear weapons, can be conceived only in the framework of an over-all balance which would include conventional weapons. That is why any proposal to ban the non-use or the first use of nuclear weapons is contrary to the requirements of our defence at the present time and it cannot therefore be considered as a possible immediate action.

135. The present situation is marked by a considerable lack of balance in conventional forces. Therefore, the Vienna negotiations on the reduction of forces and armaments in Europe are of the utmost importance not only on the regional but also on the world level, if only because of the level of accumulated armaments and the size of the armies present. I should like to think that the most recent Western proposals will finally make it possible to establish the foundation for a balanced agreement.

136. Belgium feels that the debate on conventional weapons should, as I just indicated, be concurrent with the nuclear debate. Both questions are very closely linked. The conventional arms race is developing not only in Europe but also on a world scale, and it involves regions which until recently had been relatively spared. Consequently, the conventional problem also becomes a matter of priority, all the more so since conventional weapons today represent more than four-fifths of world military expenditure.

137. In the area of short-term measures, the programme of action should contain a commitment to seek a limitation and a reduction of forces and conventional weapons in the world. The volume of transfers of arms has constantly grown during the past few years. This question is of course one of the most delicate, inasmuch as it touches directly upon the security of importing States, or especially on their approach to their security needs. There also the regional approach which we advocate could bring about the beginning of a solution to the problem. The States of a particular region might, we believe, agree on the level of armaments which would result in the limitation of transfers to a particular area. My country will encourage all efforts at consultation aiming at the control of the transfer of weapons throughout the world.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Thirty-second session, Plenary Meetings, 7th meeting, para. 124.

138. Finally, the reduction of military budgets in keeping with harmonized and verifiable procedures could be an efficient way to proceed with effective disarmament measures. Moreover, it would free resources which could in each country be spent to satisfy other needs, notably in the economic and social fields.

139. Still on the question of immediate measures, the programme of action should as a matter of priority comprise the conclusion of agreements which have already been under negotiation for many years concerning other weapons of mass destruction. Thus it is high time that we rapidly complete what has already been undertaken with the aim of banning chemical and radiological weapons. As for new weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles, we have together with our Western partners suggested that the matter be kept under consideration. The development of those weapons must be prevented by specific agreements on each weapon which can and should be identified.

140. Those are a few priority actions which should be undertaken in the nuclear field and in the field of weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons. If we succeed in these areas, a first important and perhaps decisive hurdle will have been surmounted.

141. It is essential to establish a precise, realistic programme acceptable to the whole of the international community. Then and only then can more ambitious measures be considered.

142. The search for new verification procedures might lead to further progress on the road to general and complete disarmament. Proposals have been made from all sides aimed at strengthening and internationalizing verification systems and procedures. Belgium fully shares the reasons on which these proposals are based.

143. I also have in mind everything relating to the maintenance of peace, especially the peaceful settlement of disputes, and, generally, measures which can contribute to the strengthening of confidence between States, particularly on the regional level.

144. Finally, the question of the link between disarmament and development will also have to be the subject of a thorough study. This link is not automatic. But one must admit that efforts directed towards defence limit available resources, often to the detriment of development policies.

145. I should like to conclude by stressing the central role of the United Nations in disarmament. It will be necessary in future to strengthen this role in order to make it possible for the United Nations to take effective action and provide the necessary momentum. The First Committee of the General Assembly should be the world deliberative body where the community of nations can discuss the problem of disarmament. On this level, guidelines must be laid down and assessments made. On this level too the application of the programme of action, on which we should agree, must be checked regularly.

146. We may wish to consider the possibility of convening another session at a later date to assess the progress made and to define a new programme for a subsequent period. In this way the United Nations, and in particular the General Assembly, would play an effective role.

147. But the problem of disarmament is also that of negotiating machinery. The international community must have a negotiating body attended by all the nuclear Powers and, generally speaking, by all those that can make a contribution to progress in the field of disarmament. It does not appear to us that in its present form the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament meets all those criteria. Its membership is neither complete nor balanced. Its present structure, and more particularly the system of co-chairmanship, no longer correspond to the present political facts of life and in fact appear as obstacles to participation. Belgium, which is not a member of the Committee on Disarmament, is primarily thinking of efficiency. It cannot be accused of ulterior motives, and it will support every measure aimed at contributing effectively to the strengthening of the machinery in terms of structure or participation.

148. The special sessions of the Assembly in 1974 and 1975 on a new international economic order originated in the stream of ideas and aspirations developed during the previous decade. Should not the General Assembly at the present session consider a general idea of that kind?

149. Imagination, coupled with restraint on the part of all and the will to succeed, might lead to a more productive stage in the efforts to achieve disarmament. If that did not happen, if new prospects were not apparent at the conclusion of our work, not only would an important opportunity for the international community have been missed, but that failure would vindicate those who practise pessimism and discourage those who still believe that disarmament can be usefully and effectively attempted. However, one must not give way to such gloomy predictions. I am convinced that our Assembly will seize the opportunity which is offered to it today to respond to the aspirations, confused, but nevertheless becoming increasingly precise, of billions of human beings awaiting reassurance and comfort from us. Belgium, for its part, can assure the Assembly of its assistance and its absolute readiness to co-operate in this venture.

150. Mr. MATANE (Papua New Guinea): The tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament marks another chapter in the United Nations efforts in the search for international peace and security. We note with admiration the keenness of all States and their desire to solve the disarmament problem, which is shown by the participation of high-level representatives of various Governments.

151. My delegation salutes the President of the General Assembly and congratulates him on his unanimous election to preside over this session devoted to disarmament, which is not only a tribute to his ability to preside but also a mark of respect for his country, where the heads of State or

Government of the non-aligned countries first proposed, in 1961, the convening of a world disarmament conference.

152. My delegation also expresses its gratitude to Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina and the members of the Preparatory Committee for their excellent presentation of the many documents and reports which are relevant to the purpose of this particular session of the General Assembly. It is our earnest hope that at the tenth special session the General Assembly will make every possible attempt to reach a practical and workable agreement which will give effect to the ideals enunciated in the 1961 Belgrade resolution and other significant resolutions pertaining to disarmament.

153. In the past 17 years or so it has been pointed out that disarmament would not only reduce the fear and misery of war and the threat of nuclear horror, but also give the entire international community more resources which could be used for economic purposes. While the nations of the world yearn for peace, security and economic and social improvements, the ever-increasing problem of the arms race continues. It is now apparent that the arms race is a complex and menacing problem, and it seems that the main criterion governing the thinking is the achievement not of the ultimate in welfare for mankind, but of the ultimate in mass destruction.

154. Would it not be better if the expenditure on arsenals were used instead to fund action to deal with the following problems facing mankind? About 1,500 million people—nearly 40 per cent of the world population—have no effective medical service; nearly 3,000 million people live in countries which have one physician per 1,000 people; nearly 3,000 million people lack access to safe water; about 750,000 people die every month from water-borne diseases; nearly 570 million people are seriously undernourished; nearly 2,000 million people have a life expectancy of less than 60 years—most of them of less than 50 years; about 800 million people are illiterate; nearly 250 million children under 14 years of age do not attend school, and the number is growing. My delegation views these as real social problems experienced principally by developing countries.

155. My delegation is amazed by the frightening trends in the arms trade within the third world, instead of economic, health and social programmes. It is a sad, hard fact that the third-world countries are committed to armaments, and we foolishly believe that we are increasing our security by strengthening our military defence capacities. I should like to point out also that arms imports by third-world countries have increased quite substantially and that the figures show that 75 per cent of the current arms trade is with them. It is also disheartening to note that, while negotiations are projected on nuclear weapons, all the wars fought since the Second World War have been and are being fought in the third-world nations with conventional weapons. My delegation urges that a programme of action on disarmament and disarmament machinery be established at this session in order to ensure the eventual cessation of the mad arms race.

156. May I point out that in contrast to the general situation concerning arms import figures the situation in the Oceania region—and Papua New Guinea is part of that region—tells a different story. Oceanic arms imports for the period 1970-1976 added up to 0.01 per cent of the total arms imports of the third-world countries.

157. We must look to the United Nations and its first resolution, adopted on 24 January 1946, in which the General Assembly envisaged the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction, including biological and chemical weapons. The Soviet Union and the United States, in their joint statement of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations of 1961, agreed that any programme of general and complete disarmament should contain provisions on the elimination of chemical and bacteriological weapons.

158. Nevertheless, the mad destructive arms race continues. Is it not ridiculous that since 1946 the General Assembly has adopted numerous resolutions dealing with the problems of disarmament, but no solution or significant breakthrough has been achieved in disarmament efforts to secure peace and channel those monies resulting from disarmament to promote world peace and economic development without the power of weapons?

159. Since its accession to independence in 1975, Papua New Guinea, in various international forums, time and time again has expressed its opposition to the continuing development and testing of nuclear weapons. That opposition was again reiterated by our Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Michael Somare, in his statement at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly in 1977. He said:

“Another area of grave concern to us is the continuing development ... of new types of nuclear weapons. In the past we have strongly opposed the testing of such weapons, particularly in the Pacific region, and we will continue to do so. That the testing of nuclear weapons has not been totally banned is a matter to be regretted, and I urge all nations to co-operate in the search for an effective means of controlling those weapons of mass destruction.”¹²

160. Papua New Guinea considers that the \$350 thousand million spent on arms should be diverted to the following uses: the education of the international community on the dangers of nuclear weapons; the financing of proposals contained in the new international economic order; and an increase in bilateral and multilateral assistance in the fields of economic and social development.

161. We should like to see to it that the sale of armaments is not employed as a means of mediation or as a tool for compensation. We feel that the United Nations should play the primary role in the settlement of international disputes, which would mean that arms would not be employed. In comparison with the question of prestige, man

¹² *Ibid.*, 28th meeting, para. 22.

and his environment are paramount, and we strongly urge that nuclear weapons should under no circumstances be used.

162. Papua New Guinea is a non-nuclear-weapon State and has supported and will continue to support the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and any endeavours that will put a stop to the arms race.

163. It is clear that military budgets should be reduced. Some of the resources left over as the result of military budget reduction could be used to provide assistance to the developing nations. In this respect, on gaining independence, my country did not see fit to maintain an expensive defence force inherited from the colonial Power. We therefore cut most of the previous military expenditure and kept only the basic necessities. In our national budget, the defence force is not a priority. Our national aim is to improve the lives of our citizens. We spend major portions of our funds on education, health and agriculture, as being what we consider will be most beneficial for our people.

164. Papua New Guinea is watching with great interest the course of the Soviet-American dialogue. The conclusion of the second strategic arms limitation agreement, which will set concrete limits on strategic offensive weapons systems, holds out hope for my delegation, for it sees in that a real possibility of stopping the nuclear arms race.

165. We are also concerned that while negotiations on the limitation of present armaments are taking place, new weapons are being developed. Therefore, in effect, if we were to have an agreement on the present armaments, it would serve no purpose because we would then have to negotiate again on yet more advanced weapons, and so the cycle would continue. That, to my delegation, is absolutely unsatisfactory. We would prefer a complete halt to the development of new weapons while negotiations are going on about the present weapons.

166. Another area of concern is the proliferation of nuclear weapons, both vertically in nuclear weapon States and horizontally to non-nuclear-weapon States. We would prefer to see specific steps taken to prevent the occurrence of such a phenomenon. There should be strict international safeguards regarding the use of plutonium and highly enriched uranium, because they present a special danger in the continued development of nuclear power.

167. My delegation wishes to state strongly that it is opposed to any form of nuclear testing in any environment, not only because nobody is able to determine whether the explosions are for the testing of weapons or for peaceful purposes, but also because man is not yet able to understand to the fullest extent the effects of atomic radiation on himself and his environment.

168. Papua New Guinea is in the South Pacific, where nuclear tests are conducted. Naturally, we are concerned about the effects of these nuclear-weapon tests. The Pacific nations, realizing the effects of nuclear weapons, have expressed their total opposition to nuclear testing in

the Pacific in recent meetings in South Pacific forums. My delegation once again voices that opposition here. Over the years, the Pacific countries have persisted in their request for the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests. That persistence is in keeping with the numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly calling for an end to nuclear-weapon tests both above and below ground. The Pacific nations have no desire to be armed with nuclear weapons, despite their limited need for practical and conventional weapons to protect and safeguard their territorial waters which contain the resources to supplement their economies.

169. The process of decolonization in the Pacific has been slow but peaceful. Emerging nations there have attained independence without bloodshed partly because of the limited supply of arms issued to the indigenous inhabitants of the island populations. During the South Pacific discussions the desire has always been emphasized for the Pacific Ocean to be declared a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Our aspirations for peace and security are based on that premise. The South Pacific region—and I speak for Papua New Guinea—must have this assurance, for without it its future will become complex and retrogressive.

170. Development is a matter of progress, and that applies to every country wanting peace; the interdependent world should have its poverty eliminated and at the same time there should be disarmament. Would it not be a simple solution to spend these "prestige" monies designated for armaments on economic and social welfare? Why should this just be an idea that is talked about at these meetings without result while the arms race continues? It may be rather idealistic to speak of disarmament in terms of moral principles, but is it not more unrealistic and illogical to seek so-called arms advantages to form a precarious pinnacle which, whether by accident or design, could tumble down and destroy civilization in a cloud of dust?

171. Progressing rapidly from atomic bombs to missiles and nuclear warheads, the race goes on for maximum destructive capacity. No nation or community can have a guarantee of immunity. Let us remember that the clouds in the sky do not recognize national borders, nor do they discriminate when they discharge their cargoes of death on innocent people. Papua New Guinea is not considering or seeking its own national interests because it is a nation committed to peace, but because it is a nation in the South Pacific that has gained independence and wants to spend its money on helping its people to make progress. Nevertheless, we realize that in this interdependent, international community we must speak out against the horrors and financial ruin caused by the armaments race.

172. Why, since 1946, with those who are acknowledged to be the best statemen and stateswomen of the international world, have we not been able to stop the armaments race? My delegation maintains that we have a vital stake in achieving the reversal of the arms race.

173. My delegation recognizes, of course, that the primary responsibility for that rests with the big Powers, and I could refer to previous eloquent speeches and suggestions made by the leaders of the various delegations. But the

countries that do not possess vast nuclear and missile arsenals have the advantage and it is their obligation to bring about controlled disarmament. In fact, we have the distinct advantage of being in a position to suggest solutions, and the promotion of world peace and security for all of our people without incurring the suspicion that we are furthering our own interests. It is necessary to dismantle rather than to clean up the atomic and nuclear arsenals.

174. Disarmament under a system of effective control could always involve problems caused by fear and distrust. The answer, in my delegation's opinion, is the crux of the disarmament problem and indeed man's survival on this planet.

175. My country must be heard, because we want our South Pacific to remain free from war pollution. May I quote the late Dr. Albert Schweitzer when he was accepting the 1952 Nobel Peace Prize. He said:

"Our present situation is summed up in one fact: that the Second World War has not been followed by any treaty of peace. The agreement which brought it to an end had the character of merely a truce, and it is because we are not able to reach a satisfactory formula for reorganization that we have to content ourselves with uncertain truces which arise from needs of the moment and cannot be regarded as in any way permanent."

He went on:

"May those who have in their hands the fate of nations take care to avoid whatever may worsen our situation and make it more dangerous."

176. Papua New Guinea will take care to do all in its power to support positive moves towards complete disarmament. Again my delegation pleads: do not let this special session be just sweet words, speeches and records. We wish to be judged by our efforts to stop the destruction of mankind and instead to give energy, wisdom, wealth, prosperity and security to all nations.

177. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): The delegation of Kuwait is very happy that the deliberations of the tenth special session of the General Assembly are conducted under the presidency of the Deputy Foreign Minister of Yugoslavia, Mr. Lazar Mojsov. I draw personal happiness from this fact.

178. My delegation would like to pay a special tribute to the Secretary-General for his unflagging efforts in the service of the cause of peace and disarmament. My delegation would also like to express its sincere appreciation of the work done by the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament under the wise and able leadership of Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina.

179. This session is historic. The documents so far prepared and the speeches delivered are full of constructive ideas, proposals and background material. There are no signs of intellectual drought or famine in the United Na-

tions. If the political will of States were to match their inventiveness, the success of the special session would be assured.

180. This special session should be a watershed in the history of the work of the family of nations on disarmament, and not another disappointment, though the major military Powers still hold the key to this issue.

181. The issue of disarmament is a complex one which is inextricably linked with security. In the conditions of today's world, in which the dictates of military might prevail, a special session on disarmament may look to some people quite anomalous. In certain regions, anarchy is about to supersede international law and order. Some Member States have been successful in reaping the fruits of their aggression. The victims are expected and called upon to give in to the demands of the aggressors. If they do not concede we label them unrealistic. So force has been creating facts which, even if not recognized by the United Nations, are considered by some Member States of the United Nations as irreversible.

182. Arms have become a part of power politics. They are offered as a reward in certain instances, in some to maintain the balance of power in a certain region, while in others they are given to States that follow policies identical to those of the donors. Arms are also given to countries in order to tame restive local public opinion and silence opposition within these countries for the purpose of maintaining unpopular régimes in power. On the other hand, arms are also supplied to Governments to secure their agreement to certain arrangements which they are reluctant to accept without the inducement of arms. Weapons have also become a major factor in creating military alliances. So stability is sought not through respect for the United Nations Charter or international law but through the introduction of arms. This process creates arms races instead of stability. Arms are dangerous if they are coupled with territorial ambitions. No doubt arms sharpen the appetite of aggressors for territorial expansion, as witnessed this decade in the region from which I come.

183. What is the purpose of this special session? Is disarmament addressed to those who are victims of aggression or to those who supply arms to the aggressors?

184. This special session in our view must articulate the agony of the people of the world that the alternative to disarmament is the continuation of the arms race, with its concomitant unpredictable consequences. We must be firm in conveying our message that if the arms race is not halted the world will be saturated with lethal weapons at the disposal of individuals who could wilfully put an end to human civilization.

185. We should also be firm in our opposition to those who rely on force in the expectation that it pays in the end. This leads us to the danger of the arms race in conventional weapons. In the last three decades, wars have been fought with conventional weapons supplied by those countries that believe that their security is ensured by nuclear weapons. This is the nature of the world we live in. Hu-

man genius is used more for its own destruction than for its promotion. Brilliant brains are recruited to work in laboratories on lethal projects instead of being utilized for the enhancement of human excellence and values. The world spends more than \$1 million a minute on armaments. The arms race continues unabated while over 500 million people are suffering from malnutrition. The late President Eisenhower, a brilliant soldier of great distinction, summed up the matter very neatly when he said in a speech in 1953:

"Every gun that is made, every ship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its labourers, the genius of its scientists, the hope of its children."

186. World military expenditures have reached the astronomical figure of \$400 thousand million a year. The increase in the tax burden in the industrialized countries during the past 50 years has been largely caused by the increase in military expenditures. Heavy military spending generates a stream of buying power without producing an equivalent supply of goods for the civilian market. The outcome is double-digit inflation, and a waste of valuable and badly-needed human and natural resources. Millions of people are in desperate need to be saved from hunger and malnutrition and countless millions of children in the developing countries live in conditions which are an affront to human dignity. A grim prospect is ahead of them in their adult life.

187. There must be a release of at least a certain percentage of funds earmarked for armaments to meet the direct needs of the unfortunate people in the developing countries. The soaring expenditures on arms are unforgivable whilst the majority of the earth's inhabitants are living in unsatisfactory conditions. Economic development has been slow by comparison with the rapid expansion of military power. Any economic progress so far achieved has bypassed the poorest of the world's population. The social consequences of the arms race are no less serious. The world community suffers not only in lost economic opportunities but also from the social tensions, the crime and the violence that are the result of neglecting basic human needs. It is thus ironical that, while armed power does not guarantee national security, extravagant military expenditure is at the root of the social problems that make domestic security illusory. Advances on the path towards general and complete disarmament not only create a better international climate but also make régimes which accept drastic reductions in their military expenditures domestically more stable and secure. Basic human needs for food, shelter and education of the majority of the world's population have not yet been satisfied. Human welfare, particularly in the developing countries, suffers from the diversion of resources to armaments.

188. That trend must be reversed if the gap between rich and poor is to be narrowed. The world must heed to the cry of the poor and the needy for a reduction in arms expenditures and the use of the resources thus released for

purposes of social and economic development. We expect this special session to emphasize that the present state of affairs is intolerable. Armament is not a substitute for security. Security must be ensured by mutual and collective respect for the Charter of the United Nations.

189. If the outcome of this session is a repetition of the usual platitudes on arms control, the credibility of the United Nations will be undermined. The hopes of innumerable millions have been raised regarding the results of this special session. If such hopes are dashed, no future endeavour on disarmament will be taken seriously.

190. Disarmament touches upon the basic fibre of the family of nations; but, strangely enough, even the poor countries are sacrificing their economic and social priorities for the sake of armaments.

191. Some States have been occupying the territories of other Member States for a decade with impunity and at their ease. Others have committed numerous aggressions without a serious check from the United Nations. Thus, those who violate the Charter of the United Nations enjoy the fruits of their aggression without any curb or punishment. There is an undeniable erosion of legality in the world. Defiance of United Nations resolutions, the violation of international law and the flouting of the Charter have become quite commonplace. No one should expect the victims of such violations to submit meekly to the demands of the aggressors. The issue here therefore is how to make disarmament compatible with security. We live in an era in which the power of force dominates the power of law. Only starry-eyed idealists would agree to live at the mercy of international goodwill. We should not expect nations to halt the arms race simply because a declaration is adopted by the United Nations General Assembly. The crux of the whole matter is that, in a world armed to the teeth, weapons have become synonymous with survival.

192. Many nations are here because of their ability to forestall aggression. On the other hand, many nations are here seeking to redress the injustices inflicted upon them. We have discovered that intoxication with military power is another factor in reviving old theories. Mr. Begin, the Prime Minister of Israel, because of his military power, makes the Bible the platform of his foreign policy, instead of the Charter of the United Nations. He knows better than anybody else how much military power can achieve.

193. The world cannot afford to be crippled by the staggering expenditures on the arms race. Furthermore, the fate of world civilization cannot be left to the caprices or whims of a few major nuclear Powers. So what can the United Nations do in the face of impossible odds? Is it true that we are verging on the impossible?

194. Some think that we are indulging in a tragic farce. We may be engaging in a wild goose chase, but we cannot afford to leave things as they are today. One thing this session is certain to achieve is to bring the subject of disarmament before world public opinion. People all over the world must feel that they have a stake in our deliberations. This special session must send its message to the world

that disarmament is reconcilable with security only if Member States observe scrupulously the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

195. The Charter has not been eroded by time, but Member States have departed from the provisions of the Charter, and in this respect Member States should not be blamed if they seek protection in an arms buildup when they see the Charter being violated by other Member States without the application of the provisions that call for sanctions. So, without a sense of security, the arms race will continue, and a sense of security will not be brought about unless all Member States renounce force as a means of solving international problems. That may sound like a dream, but that is what this special session is about. A dream of today may become a reality in the future. What is important is that we should not scoff at that dream but should seriously think about its realization.

196. Many speakers have already upheld the principle that weapons which cause unnecessary suffering must be avoided. The inhumanity of that type of warfare is clearly shown when those weapons are directed against defenceless civilian populations. The question of the prohibition of the use of napalm and certain other specific conventional weapons has been referred to by the General Assembly in the past, but little has been achieved so far to prohibit those weapons or restrict their use. There is a clear distinction between the use of weapons against military targets and the indiscriminate use of those weapons against civilian populations. Israel has used napalm and other incendiary weapons against the civilian populations in neighbouring Arab countries, particularly against the Palestinian refugee camps. During its recent invasion of Lebanon, Israel even used cluster bombs against the Lebanese civilian population and against the Palestinian Arab refugee camps. Those weapons cause widespread and largely uncontrollable conflagrations in civilian areas and present insurmountable obstacles to the protection of civilians and of the environment. They also cause pain, disfigurement and disabilities through burn injuries among survivors. While our long-term aim should be to take measures for the prohibition of the production, use, development and stockpiling of napalm and other specific conventional weapons, the least the Assembly can do during the present session is to call for the prevention of the use of those weapons against civilian populations.

Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) resumed the Chair.

197. One of the healthiest developments in recent years has been the emergence of the idea of nuclear-weapon-free zones as a means of ensuring the complete absence of nuclear weapons from various areas of the world. Small countries in many regions of the world are seriously concerned about the threat of nuclear attack and the danger of being involved in nuclear war. From the very start Kuwait joined in sponsoring the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Since adherence by all countries of the region to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons could achieve that aim, the role of the Treaty in the promotion of the establishment of the zone was one of paramount importance. It

is a cause of great regret that Israel—which already possesses nuclear weapons—has frustrated the establishment of the zone so as to maintain its military superiority and its military presence in occupied Arab territories.

198. From the very beginning also, Kuwait rallied to the call to declare the Indian Ocean a zone of peace from which great civilian and military bases and nuclear weapons would be excluded. We are looking forward to a conference which will serve as a negotiating forum between the great Powers and the littoral States of the Indian Ocean with a view to halting the further escalation and expansion of great-Power military presence in the Indian Ocean, and eliminating from the Ocean all bases, military installations, logistical supply facilities, nuclear weapons, weapons of mass destruction and any manifestation of great-Power military presence conceived in the context of great-Power rivalry.

199. 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 prohibits the stationing of strategic weapons in perhaps the only places in the ocean environment that were declared not feasible for their policies of nuclear deterrence by the two super-Powers. The real threat from under-water missiles comes from highly mobile submarines, not from stationary emplacements.

200. Similarly the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction backed away from a ban on chemical weapons and prohibited only those bacteriological agents and toxins which are so dangerous and noxious that even the countries which produced them had come to doubt their value and wanted them destroyed. We are not attempting to disparage the biological weapons agreement which has just been described as the only disarmament agreement in the true and meaningful sense of prohibiting some system of weapons and destroying their stockpiles. However, the aim of that agreement could be reinforced with a ban on chemical weapons.

201. World public opinion rightly feels that arms control constitutes a wrong approach, since it aims at curing some of the symptoms instead of treating the causes. Participation in time-consuming arms control negotiations is merely a palliative which does not diminish to any significant degree the continuing gigantic arms effort. Most arms control agreements are nothing better than agreements to arm to a certain level—a fact that does not reduce the power of one side to destroy the other many times over. Of what value are arms control agreements if the combined effects of the nuclear blasts, fall-out and fire-storms resulting from a full nuclear exchange could destroy all life, not only in the warring nations but in the rest of the world as well?

202. The arms race is irrational and counter-productive. It is certain that in a war fought with atomic weapons there will be no victory. An atomic war could end, not in victory and defeat, but in mutual annihilation. The invention

of the atomic weapon and its aftermath should have made it evident that war could no longer be used effectively as an instrument of policy. It would thus seem paradoxical that the two super-Powers are accumulating even more overwhelming destructive power for the declared purpose of preventing its use. The irrationality of the situation has been described as an uncertain and unsatisfactory balance of terror which an accident, miscalculation or recklessness could change into all terror and no balance.

203. The question is often raised whether real disarmament agreements can be reached before political conflicts are resolved. It is true that arms races are the outcome of political conflicts, are kept alive by them and subside with them. However, the gruesome prospect of mutual annihilation has created a new situation which requires the use of disarmament as a vehicle for progress towards greater international understanding. Disarmament need not be the result of the political situation; it can also be partly instrumental in creating a political situation.

204. Kuwait has always taken the view that the General Assembly should be the main disarmament forum and the main framework for disarmament negotiations. If the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is to remain an organic link must be established between it and the General Assembly. All Member States must be allowed to submit directly proposals on measures of disarmament that are the subject of negotiations in the Conference and attend meetings of its working bodies whenever such proposals are examined.

205. Disarmament multilateral conventions should be subjected to the same procedures applicable to treaties in general. It is true that in their early stages those conventions may be negotiated among a limited number of militarily significant States; however, the scope of those conventions should be widened so as to protect the interests of all countries, big and small. Draft disarmament conventions emanating from the super-Powers or militarily significant States should not be treated as sacrosanct, but must be open to substantial amendments by all Member States. The treaty has become the main instrument of international legislation. Exclusion of small countries from the treaty-

making process is tantamount to denying those countries their right to engage in the law-making process and subjecting them to norms which may be unacceptable to them and inimical to their interests.

206. The world has watched and waited for too long in frustration without being able to see any truly meaningful progress towards genuine disarmament. The key to success or failure is in the hands of the major military Powers. It has been said that war is too important a matter to be left to the generals. That remark may well be amended by adding that disarmament is too serious a matter to be left to the unfettered discretion of the major military Powers. The issue at stake is whether we can agree on a programme of action which will make it possible for world civilization to survive. The key to war prevention is disarmament, general and complete. All nations have an interest in finding mutually acceptable ways to reduce the danger of war, to improve their standards of living, and to lift the heavy burden of arms from the backs of their peoples. That collective responsibility must be reflected in the decision-making process. The decisions of the present session must reflect the willingness of the major military Powers to relinquish the monopoly they have exercised over the disarmament process for too long.

207. The 1970s have been proclaimed as the Disarmament Decade. During the past eight years the arms race has not only become more dangerous; it is also becoming more complex and more firmly entrenched. Little has been done to turn or even to stem the tide of the arms race. Every year that passes is a living testimony to the dangers of the continuation of the arms race, and a blow to the illusion that lasting peace and security can coexist with huge accumulation of means of destruction. Notwithstanding those discouraging antecedents, it is too early to call the Decade a complete failure. Many voice the hope that the present session will shatter the existing inaction and impart a new momentum to efforts towards general and complete disarmament, which is a prerequisite for establishing a new international economic, political and social order. We hope that will prove true.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.