

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

TWELFTH SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records

18th  
PLENARY MEETINGFriday, 18 June 1982,  
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

## AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: This morning the Assembly will hear a statement by the Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Menachem Begin. I have great pleasure in welcoming him and inviting him to address the General Assembly.

2. Mr. BEGIN (Israel): Two ancient, universal prophets in Israel, Yeshayahu Ben-Amotz and Micha Hamorashti, brought forth a similar, although not identical, vision of complete disarmament and eternal peace. The vision of Isaiah is older. I shall, therefore, quote from Chapter 2 of his book.

"And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.

"And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

"And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore."

3. All this shall come to pass "in the last days". If such be the case, what solace does this great vision bring to suffering mankind? For soon after those "last days" ice is to cover the earth, volcanic lava will engulf the continents or, as may happen in our own times, a nuclear explosion under water or over land may destroy all we have built during the ages, and the world will return to *tohu-vavohu*. Only in the last—and may we add, few—days will humanity enjoy the blessings of peace, the tranquillity of disarmament. So where is the cure for mankind's afflictions?

4. The accepted translation provides the answer to these questions. "In the last days" in the original language of the Bible is written: "*Vehaya B'acharit Hayamim*". Anyone familiar with the richness of Hebrew synonyms, the fullness of Hebraic homonyms, does perceive that between "*Acharon*"—last—and "*Acharit*" there is no more than a similarity of sound; they are a far cry from being identical in meaning. "*Acharit*" is a synonym of "*Hatikva*"—hope—as we

find in Jeremiah, Chapter 29, Verse 11: "*Latet lachem acharit v'tikva*", which in proper translation reads: "to give to you a future and a hope". "*Acharit*" also means progeny, as we find in Ezekiel, and in progeny there is future. And so "*B'acharit Hayamim*", as it is written in the original language, does not mean the last days but the days of bright future, the days of redemption—only then shall man enjoy the full blessing of eternal peace for many, perhaps for all, generations to come.

5. Such is the true vision. But nearly three millenia have passed since it was revealed and written. Thousands of wars have devastated lands and destroyed millions of people, sometimes exterminating whole nations. Plowshares were beaten into swords, pruning-hooks into spears. What then of the prophet's vision? Should we despair? Certainly not. A vision is like a lodestar. It is high, far, bright. It shows you the way. One day, in the bright future, "*B'acharit Hayamim*", it will become reality. Let us strive on. Let us have faith.

6. Steps must be taken to bring the realization nearer. Perhaps the vision cannot be reached but in stages. So let us consider them.

7. The first stage must be, despite all failures and disappointments, to ban aggressive war. The mistake made by the well-intentioned authors of the Paris Pact of 27 August 1928, better known as the Kellogg-Briand Pact,<sup>1</sup> was in omitting the adjective "aggressive" in article I, which reads:

"The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another."

8. This text turned the Kellogg-Briand Pact into a *pium desiderium* and, indeed, it was glossed over by the known events of the 1930s and 1940s. Experience requires that this definition be corrected. Perhaps, instead of the words "they condemn recourse to war", it should be written "they give up recourse to war", but what is more important is to add to the categorical statement at the end of article 1 the words: "except in self-defence". The most precise definitions of the Lucarno Pact of 1925 should serve as a basis for the new formulation.

9. Self-defence is a most sacred right and duty of man. Our world is divided into different planes: there is the North and the South, the West and the East; the developed and the developing countries; the poor and the rich lands. But in our time there is also still the division between tyranny and liberty. As long as tyranny is armed, liberty must have and develop weapons for its defence. Otherwise, slavery will engulf

the whole of mankind and all the pacts and the visions will be in vain. Pacifism is a beautiful idea, but if it confronts aggressive totalitarianism it is the greatest provocation, inviting attack, subjugation and destruction. This bitter truth we all learned in the thirties and the forties of our century.

10. In the 1970s and in the 1980s, the disastrous unilateral pacifism found its expression in a famous—perhaps infamous—slogan: “Better red than dead”. Foolish words. The true command is neither dead, nor red, but alive and free. Hence, the noblest concept of the human mind, in all circumstances: the inherent right of self-defence. What should be banned, denounced and renounced is aggressive war, whether by conventional or by nuclear weapons.

11. When the Kellogg-Briand Pact was signed there were in the world 70 sovereign countries; 63 of them signed and adhered to it. Nowadays there are 169 sovereign States, out of which 157 are Members of the United Nations. It is therefore desirable, even necessary, that 106 new countries should sign a corrected version of the Paris Pact, an international all-embracing treaty of renunciation of aggressive war.

12. The second step should be made by the nuclear Powers. They should negotiate a nuclear non-aggression pact—again, except in self-defence. They should undertake not to attack each other, or any other country, with those deadly weapons, the only exception being if they or their allies are attacked with such weapons.

13. The third stage should be the successive establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, patterned on the Treaty of Tlatelolco<sup>2</sup> concerning Latin America. Israel is prepared to negotiate and sign such a treaty with all its neighbours in the Middle East. With more and more denuclearized zones and with the proposed nuclear non-aggression treaty and with the progressive strategic arms reduction talks, we can steadily and practically diminish the danger looming over mankind ever since man discovered the ability to destroy himself and everything he built from civilization to civilization. Ultimately, perhaps in the bright future of our progeny, many offensive weapons will be disposed of and the process of disarmament will begin.

14. The question arises whether we can meet, whether we can talk to each other, despite the animosities, the prejudices, the recriminations, the states of war which still exist between nations.

15. Israel's answer is an unequivocal “Yes”. We have the experience. When I invited President Sadat of Egypt to come to Jerusalem to negotiate the conclusion of a peace treaty between our two countries, and when President Sadat of blessed memory declared in his Parliament: “I am ready to go to the end of the world and to Jerusalem to speak in the Knesset in order to save the life of one of my sons”—his soldiers—Egypt and Israel were still in a state of war, having waged five wars during 31 years with all the casualties and bitterness they involved. Yet President Sadat came to Jerusalem in November 1977. We met. We spoke about peace. Then I went to Ismailiya, and again we talked peace. We met for 12 days and nights at Camp David, under the faithful chairmanship and devoted leadership of President Carter—and we talked peace. We signed the Camp David accords, the Presi-

dent of the United States signing as a witness, and after six months of arduous negotiations we signed the Treaty of Peace between Egypt and Israel. President Sadat and I pledged: No more war, no more bloodshed, peace, *salaam*, *shalom*. Subsequently President Mubarak and I, on the eve of the funeral of President Sadat, stretched out our hands to each other, saying spontaneously—almost simultaneously—“Peace forever”. Egyptian and Israeli war invalids met at El-Arish, embraced each other, men—fighting men—with tears in their eyes, and called out to us—to President Sadat and to me: “No more war, no more fighting”.

16. So we can do it. All of us can do it. Even faced with animosity, even with a state of war, we can do it. Let us meet, let us shake hands, let us talk peace to each other, make agreements, and all of us will change the course of history of our nations.

17. One day, in the bright future, our children, or our children's children, will beat the swords into ploughshares and spears into pruning hooks, and the vision of Isaiah will become a living reality. Men shall not teach war; nations shall not learn war anymore.

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

19. Mr. HARALAMBOPOULOS (Greece): Since this is the first time I have had the opportunity to address the Assembly, I should like to express to Mr. Kittani the warm congratulations of my delegation on the exemplary way in which he has so far carried out his duties as President both of the thirty-sixth session and of this twelfth special session.

20. I should like also to express to the Secretary-General, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, my deep appreciation for his valuable contribution to the noble task of preserving world peace; he has my best wishes for his future endeavours.

21. I wish to express my Government's satisfaction that this special session has been convened, because we consider it to be of particular importance in the present circumstances of rising tensions and the increasing escalation of armaments in the world.

22. This is the second time that the nations of the world have gathered under the auspices of the United Nations to discuss disarmament. It is natural that this session is taking place within the framework of the United Nations, because the promotion of peace, disarmament and international co-operation constitutes the very essence of this international Organization.

23. In view of what is going on around the world, unfortunately, the prospects for disarmament do not seem particularly promising. But that is the very reason why we must redouble our efforts and assume our responsibilities to the present and future generations of all the peoples of the world. It is obvious that disarmament is not only a lofty ideal; today it is above all an urgent necessity. As tragic and horrible as past wars have been, they could not have led to the total annihilation of mankind. Today, however, nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction can threaten history, civilization and life itself on our planet.

24. Faced with this reality, and taking full account of the emerging dangers, it is urgent that those steps be taken which can promote détente and co-operation and open the way for the adoption of concrete measures for arms control and disarmament.

25. Those measures must be adopted in the shortest possible time, as dangerous concepts about nuclear war and nuclear weapons are being put forth. The technological breakthroughs that have come about in the last few years, especially the improvements in the effectiveness and accuracy of nuclear weapons, are liable to make us abandon traditional theories of deterrence and tend to consider limited nuclear war as possible and winnable. Such thinking is particularly dangerous because it encourages the illusion that limited nuclear war can be contained within a specific geographical area. What is more than certain is that any seemingly limited nuclear war will rapidly escalate into a general nuclear war. Such concepts and theories promote even more the escalation of armament.

26. It should also be emphasized here that the speed of technological advances in this field is much greater than that of diplomacy. Thus, the gap between nuclear weapons technology and the progress towards effective measures of international control of nuclear weapons is widening dramatically.

27. We must emphasize at this point that the problem of disarmament is intimately related to the conditions prevailing in the world today.

28. In the first place, it is evident that the present international situation is decisively determined by the state of relations between the super-Powers and the political and military blocs.

29. For our part, we are opposed as a matter of principle to the division of the world into antagonistic blocs. Overcoming this division is an integral part of our long-term policy. We are convinced that this vision of ours is shared by most of the Governments represented here today.

30. However, facing today's realities, we are compelled to observe that until very recently there have been increasing tensions between the super-Powers which affect the process of détente and which have led the negotiations on disarmament into near deadlock.

31. It is encouraging, nevertheless, that there exist on the horizon some hopeful signs. In this connexion we consider the negotiations going on at Geneva and Vienna and the last proposal by President Reagan to be positive developments.

32. I should stress, however, that it is imperative not only to have goodwill in the negotiations, but above all to have a real will to obtain results so that the cause of peace is advanced.

33. We firmly believe that in all these negotiations the balance of force should be moved downwards and not upwards. For it makes no difference if one Power can destroy the world 10 times over and the other 11 times over. So long as any Power is able to destroy the world once, that is once too many.

34. Another hopeful sign is the emergence of a new consciousness among the citizens of many countries, including those in Europe and in North America,

concerning the real dangers of nuclear weapons. These citizens, having realized that decisions on nuclear arms affect the most elemental of their rights, namely, their right to live, increasingly demand that their voice be heard on these fundamental issues. As leaders of the world, we must assure them that we too are extremely moved by their concerns and are working to create conditions of peace that will eliminate the fear of nuclear holocaust.

35. Secondly, with regard to the prevailing international conditions, we should note the increase of local conflicts and wars that contain the seeds of wider conflagration because of their unpredictable nature.

36. Moreover, the ever-increasing recourse to force for the settlement of disputes creates a climate of international instability, feeding at the same time dangerous arms races.

37. No progress is possible without a previous stabilization of the climate of international relations. The international community must support the basic principles of international coexistence and co-operation and must oppose aggression of any kind and occupation by force and support the demand for self-determination and human rights.

38. The failure actively to oppose aggression and occupation and to enforce repeated United Nations resolutions has led to situations such as the present tragic one in Lebanon and the deplorable continuation of military occupation in Cyprus.

39. Parallel to the Security Council resolutions on Lebanon, which Greece fully supports, my Government took the initiative in the European Community countries which led to a declaration condemning the Israeli aggression. The territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon should be fully respected and the national rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including the right to form a State of their own, should be recognized so that peace and security can be firmly established for all peoples in that sensitive region.

40. In so far as Cyprus is concerned, Greece has proposed that occupation forces be withdrawn and that an expanded United Nations peace-keeping force be assigned to Cyprus to serve as a guarantee of a just and permanent solution. Greece is ready to assume the additional expenses that such an expanded force would require and is also ready to withdraw its very small contingent stationed on the island by virtue of the 1960 independence agreements.

41. Thirdly, we must not lose sight of the positive role played by the non-aligned movement in international relations, and we must not fail to take advantage of the enormous contributions it has already made and can continue to make in the future for the cause of peace, disarmament and international co-operation.

42. In this respect my Government wants to underline that there can be no real peace and stability, despite all the disarmament efforts, without economic and social development. We are deeply convinced that the day is approaching when the problems existing in the relations between North and South will become far more important and acute than the relations between East and West.

43. It is imperative that we devote the best part of our efforts to confronting in a decisive and effective way the problems that exist because of the gap between rich and poor countries. We must do everything possible to move towards the progressive closing of this gap because any success in this direction will at the same time be a most important contribution to the efforts for disarmament.

44. The economic and social development of all countries, and particularly that of the poor countries, is gravely affected by the burden of armaments. Though international statistics do not give the complete picture, it is estimated that more than \$600 billion is spent each year on weapons and weapon development. It is clear that even if part of these resources were devoted to social and economic projects the living conditions of most people in the world, especially in the developing countries, would be improved drastically, and at the same time the possibilities for conflict would be lessened. In this respect the United Nations has already played a very constructive role, and we believe that it should continue to devote its efforts towards this end.

45. More generally, we favour initiatives which will enable the United Nations to fulfil its role concerning disarmament and to accomplish the additional tasks which the present session will assign to it. Greece considers the comprehensive programme of disarmament a very important instrument in the disarmament process.

46. As far as the United Nations Centre for Disarmament is concerned, it should be upgraded and its information activities should be extended. We are willing to contribute within our means to the World Disarmament Campaign proclaimed by the General Assembly.

47. In addition, we believe that various non-governmental organizations and other bodies dealing with disarmament issues, such as the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, headed by the former Swedish Premier Olof Palme, can make a valuable contribution to the disarmament process.

48. In our opinion, any pragmatic approach to the question of disarmament should take local circumstances into account. Thus, as a first step, we should look towards the conclusion of regional agreements. In this respect, the Greek Government supports the idea of creating a nuclear-free-zone in the Balkans, a concept that is analogous to the one that has been discussed with regard to the Scandinavian area. We are, of course, aware that the realization of that idea in our region can only come after consultations and negotiations. The attitude of the two super-Powers on this issue is of critical importance, since the attempt to create such zones in Europe depends on their political will to maintain the balance of forces at a lower level, ensuring at the same time increased security for the European continent.

49. We should recall here that the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, held at Helsinki, recognized the principle of indivisible security and made a specific reference to the Mediterranean area. However, the appendix to the Final Act concerning the Mediterranean still remains at the level of good intentions. It is for this reason that future follow-up

meetings of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe should also examine more closely the disarmament aspects of the Mediterranean dimension of European security.

50. Greece, as a European, Balkan and Mediterranean country, supports the idea that the Mediterranean should be transformed into a lake of peace and co-operation, with the gradual reduction and the ultimate withdrawal of foreign military forces, to the benefit of the peoples living in the Mediterranean basin.

51. Appropriate mechanisms that can make this possible should be found in consultation with all parties concerned. Such a development would not be incompatible with disarmament efforts but, on the contrary, would constitute a direct contribution to those efforts and to peace in general.

52. Furthermore, we wish that the Madrid meeting of representatives of States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe would adopt the text of a specific mandate to convene a conference on disarmament in Europe with the participation of all the signatories to the Final Act of Helsinki. Such a conference should aim at adopting practical confidence-building and security measures so that we may arrive at an effective process of disarmament in Europe.

53. Equal security must be guaranteed for all European countries. In this connexion, Greece has supported the zero-level option as a starting point for the Geneva negotiations on nuclear weapons so that the equilibrium of forces can be brought down to the lowest possible level.

54. Needless to say, we are aware of the fact that nuclear disarmament cannot be approached, nor can it be achieved, in isolation. On the contrary, it must be coupled with disarmament in conventional weapons as well as other weapons of mass destruction.

55. My country is a nation that has always supported the peaceful settlement of all international problems, including those of direct concern to it. It is for this reason that Greece strongly supports the idea of disarmament and all efforts that contribute towards its attainment.

56. We are a small country that, like so many others, yearns to live in peace both with its neighbours and with all other countries. We want to devote our efforts and our limited resources to our social and economic development, instead of spending, contrary to our desire, 6.7 per cent of our gross national product for defence.

57. We therefore wish every success to this special session from which so many peoples expect the first concrete results in the efforts for disarmament and peace. This is particularly significant at this moment of international tension and open conflicts.

58. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now hear a statement by the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Pierre Elliot Trudeau. I have great pleasure in welcoming him and in inviting him to address the General Assembly.

59. Mr. TRUDEAU (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): Canada does not intend to employ the



language of force or military power in the Assembly. In the prevailing international situation, all countries, the powerful and the weak, the rich and the poor, have an obligation to use the language of peace.

60. One would have to be deaf to remain indifferent to the clamour that has arisen from the four corners of the world against the arms race. In some countries, anxiety and anger are freely expressed. From others, voices muted by repression have managed to reach us. In both cases, however, the message is clear. The men and women of the entire world have addressed to their leaders the most urgent appeal. They beseech us to use the present session to embark on an endeavour that will put a brake on the suicidal competition in which we are engaged.

61. Looking at the work of this twelfth special session, we must remember that disarmament is not simply a technical problem. It is also a political problem, and it is impossible to deal with it while disregarding the world context. To understand how little progress has been made since the tenth special session four years ago, it is sufficient to recall some of the events that have marked the world scene in the interim, particularly recently.

62. One is obliged to ask what has happened to the Charter of the United Nations. As Chancellor Schmidt recalled earlier this week [10th meeting], the Charter is an international law. By adopting it, each of our countries has made it an integral part of its national legislation. The Charter, in Article 2, paragraph 4, lays down as the first condition indispensable for the establishment of a world order that "All Members" of the Organization "shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force" in a manner inconsistent with the objectives of the United Nations.

63. Periodically, some people call for a commitment from us not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. I understand rather well those who make such a request, because they are concerned about the horrible consequences of a nuclear war.

64. I would simply point out here that the Charter already prohibits the first use of force—any use of force. That is the law that binds us. I therefore see no usefulness in repromulgating the Charter. On the contrary, I believe it would be very dangerous to weaken one of its fundamental principles by creating the impression that there is an order of priority among the various uses of force.

65. In any case, to renounce the first use of force would not fundamentally resolve the disarmament question. Our real problem is to break the vicious circle of the arms race. We shall never do that if either camp has the impression that its security is not assured. We arm ourselves because of a feeling of insecurity, and we shall disarm only when we are convinced that we are not threatened. To be viable, the limitation of weapons must therefore strengthen the security of peoples and not diminish it.

66. Unfortunately, security is an elusive concept. It is more than a mere matter of weapons; it is also a matter of perception. When each camp makes gestures which the other side perceives as threatening, distrust between the East and the West is increased.

67. The difficulty here comes above all from the fact that we are dealing with a vast array of weapons systems which are very different one from another, and that technological progress tends to outpace current negotiations.

68. I believe that we must accept the fact that total security has become for all countries an unattainable objective in today's world. The mere fact that we are working on it creates a feeling of insecurity among others. In a world where nations have become interdependent in practically all areas, security can no longer be a purely national matter.

69. A wise precept of diplomatic negotiations states that the results obtained should take into account the interests of the two parties involved. Negotiations on the limitation of armaments are no exception. Any attempt to secure strategic advantages at the expense of the other side is, sooner or later, doomed to failure. Only initiatives which can enhance mutual security can end the present paralysis. The two super-Powers must, in particular, recognize from the outset that they each have strategic interests and the necessary force to protect those interests.

*[The speaker continued in English.]*

70. Those, then, are the premises from which my discourse on disarmament will flow. I am going to use the time available to talk primarily about nuclear issues, not because Canada does not attach great importance to the negotiation of agreements on chemical weapons and conventional armaments—it does—but because the preoccupation of our publics today justifiably centres on nuclear weapons.

71. The nuclear-arms buildup is causing anguish to many people in many parts of the world. They are disturbed by the rehearsal of nuclear scenarios in a deteriorating political climate. They are posing their own questions about reasonable definitions of security. They are reminding political leaders that what is at stake is the crucial matter of the life or death of mankind.

72. As Prime Minister of a country that from the outset renounced a nuclear-weapons capability of its own, I understand full well the people's anguish and confusion. The nuclear debate is difficult and seems to pursue an inverse logic. It deals with power that, by common consent, is unusable. It argues for more nuclear weapons in order that, in the end, there may be fewer. It perceives the vulnerability of cities and of human beings as an element of stability in the nuclear balance. And worst of all, the debate goes on without much evidence of any light at the end of the tunnel.

73. When we met in 1978, a dialogue on strategic arms limitations had been going on between the major nuclear Powers for several years. A comprehensive nuclear-test ban seemed on the verge of conclusion; it never was concluded. Subsequently, other negotiations—SALT II—were concluded; that Treaty has not been ratified.

74. I do not believe it would be productive at this time for the Assembly to try to apportion blame for those failures. I remain convinced that both the major nuclear Powers are intent on dissipating the threat of nuclear confrontation.

75. In this regard there are some positive developments. Negotiations to reduce intermediate-range nuclear forces began, as we know, late last year and, following President Reagan's Eureka initiative, the long-awaited talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms will resume in a few days. All of us have an enormous stake in those negotiations; failure to reach an early satisfactory conclusion could have dramatic consequences. Let me illustrate this assertion.

76. Since the tenth special session, a new generation of intermediate-range missiles has been deployed by the Soviet Union. Three hundred SS-20s now pose a threat to Western Europe. The alliance to which Canada belongs has decided to counter the Soviet threat by deploying new Pershing II and ground-launched cruise missiles and, at the same time, to engage the Soviet Union in negotiations aimed at setting limits on the systems of both sides at the lowest possible level.

77. It follows that, unless those negotiations accomplish their objective by late next year, new weapons of terror will be added to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] arsenal. Having attended the NATO summit meeting last week at Bonn, I can testify that we passionately want those negotiations to succeed in removing the current threat and thereby obviating the need to deploy new missiles of our own. But what will be the position of the Warsaw Pact countries? I must assume that they too will negotiate in good faith. I would add, however, that they would be ill-advised to assume that public demonstrations in the West will weaken our negotiating position.

78. True, hundreds of thousands of demonstrators in Western Europe, in Canada and here in New York last week have taken pains to express the extent to which a renewed arms race is fundamentally repugnant to their values. In many ways, I suppose most of us in the Assembly agree with them. That similar demonstrations have not taken place in Eastern Europe does not, I think, suggest that the people of the countries members of the Warsaw Pact are any more comfortable with the prospect of mutual incineration; rather, it may be due to the fact that they are denied not only the right to express publicly their views but, indeed, to acquire the knowledge and understanding on which such views may be founded. It would be a grave miscalculation were the Soviets to misinterpret the very strength of our democratic system as a demonstration of weakness of our resolve.

79. It is with considerable conviction, therefore, that I call on the intermediate-range nuclear forces negotiators to achieve real progress within the limited time remaining so that in this instance the armaments spiral will not be allowed to proceed apace.

80. In seeking to arrest the arms race, the problem that continues to preoccupy me is the technological momentum that lies at its root. We must come to grips with that problem, which was the central point of my presentation to the tenth special session [our meeting]. Let me return to it briefly.

81. I start with the proposition that all new weapons systems are potentially destabilizing. That is because such systems will heighten concerns about a disarming first-strike capability, or will tend to blur the difference between nuclear and conventional warfare, or will

increase the problems of verification. Instability is the fuel that feeds the nuclear-arms race. That is why four years ago I put before the Assembly a "strategy of suffocation" designed to deprive the nuclear-arms race of the oxygen on which it feeds, from the laboratories to the testing sites.

82. The main elements of the strategy had long been familiar features of the arms control dialogue: a comprehensive test ban; a halt to the flight testing of all new strategic delivery vehicles; a cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes; a limitation, and eventual reduction, of military spending for new strategic weapons systems. It was in the combination of these elements that I saw a more coherent, a more efficient and a more promising instrument for curbing the nuclear-arms race.

83. But the strategy was never meant to be applied unilaterally. It always envisaged negotiated agreements between the nuclear Powers. All elements of the strategy would probably not fall into place at once, but all would be essential if the strategy was to have its full effect: halting the technological momentum of the arms race by freezing at the initial or testing stage the development of new weapons systems.

84. While I continue to believe that such a technological freeze is fundamental to controlling the arms race, I would now propose, however, that it be incorporated into a more general policy of stabilization. I do not consider the strategy of suffocation to be in competition with current negotiations or with negotiations shortly to commence. Indeed, I believe that the more successful these negotiations are, the more likely will they need to be entrenched in agreements along the lines I have proposed.

85. The impact of the current and proposed negotiations, if they succeed, will be to produce a stable balance at a much lower level of armament. It will involve not only important quantitative reductions but a qualitative change, in that destabilizing systems will have been reduced. We will be dealing not only with a balance at lower levels but also with a different kind of balance, in that it will be more stable.

86. Thus a policy of stabilization has two complementary components: the suffocation strategy, which seeks to inhibit the development of new weapons systems, and our current negotiation approach, aimed at qualitative and quantitative reductions in nuclear arsenals designed to achieve a stable nuclear balance at lower levels.

87. Before I leave the subject of suffocation I must stress the urgency of coming to grips with the development of new weaponry for use in outer space. Twenty-five years ago the first man-made satellite was launched. That event marked a leap in man's mastery of the earth's environment. Fifteen years ago it did not seem premature to exclude the possibility that space might be used for other than peaceful purposes. But today the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies [*resolution 2222 (XXI), annex*], is patently inadequate. That is how quickly, in today's world, science fiction becomes reality.

88. The Treaty lays down that nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction are not to be placed in

orbit around the earth or stationed in space. In retrospect, that leaves loopholes which risk being highly destabilizing. I am thinking particularly of anti-satellite weapons or anti-missile laser systems. I believe that we cannot wait much longer if we are to be successful in foreclosing the prospect of space wars. I propose, therefore, that an early start be made on a treaty to prohibit the development, testing and deployment of all weapons for use in outer space.

89. Of course, the whole edifice rests on key assumptions about verification, and it is to the theory and practice of verification that we must increasingly give attention.

90. Openness is central to the process of verification, but here, too, technology has taken us far beyond the notions about openness that were prevalent only 25 years ago. When we speak of verification by "national technical means", we have in mind the vast range of activity that is detectable by the magic eye of highly sophisticated satellites plying their intrusive orbits around the globe. I sometimes wonder whether we realize the immensity of the leap that we have made and whether a certain reluctance in accepting the rigours of verification is not an insufferable anachronism.

91. Verification is not only a matter of access. Verification entails a technology of its own that differs from weapons systems to weapons system. Therefore, ideally, the work on verification should prepare the way for arms control agreements that still lie ahead; otherwise problems of verification will inevitably prevent the conclusion of even well-advanced arms control negotiations. In this context I am encouraged by the positive approach to verification procedures contained in the remarks of the Soviet Foreign Minister on 15 June [12th meeting].

92. However, given the complexity and characteristics of many modern weapons systems, so-called national technical means may not be adequate for verifying arms control or disarmament agreements; consequently, the international community should address itself to verification as one of the most significant factors in disarmament negotiations in the 1980s.

93. In Canada we are allocating increased funds for arms control and disarmament initiatives. This decision will allow us to take two important steps. First, we are committing resources to enable Canada to become a full participant in the international seismic data exchange, the international verification mechanism which will form part of the provisions of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We believe that the exchange should be fully operational at an early date and in advance of the treaty. Secondly, we will substantially increase research in verification. To develop effective verification procedures, Canada will be devoting more attention to utilizing expertise available inside and outside government.

[The speaker continued in French (interpretation from French).]

94. In the course of the present session many valuable proposals will be submitted to us, including those contained in the Palme Commission's report, entitled "Common Security: a programme for disarmament",<sup>3</sup>

which has greatly contributed to informing the public and alerting it to the problems of disarmament. I have tried, by taking the Canadian point of view, to make a number of proposals of my own within the framework of a global stabilization policy. They are aimed at bringing about a balance in armaments at the lowest possible level by eliminating destabilizing systems, by reducing systems already in place and by preventing new destabilizing systems from being developed.

95. As the various proposals before the Assembly are sorted out I hope that in the course of this special session preference will be given to those which require the least amount of goodwill in order to be implemented. The Assembly is entitled to expect from all participants sincere intentions and a willingness to take action. The two super-Powers have particularly heavy responsibilities in this respect. They must devote all their energies to negotiating a reduction in their nuclear arsenals and must not deviate from this fundamental objective by imposing prior political conditions on negotiations. This presupposes that the super-Powers will agree to communicate, to talk to each other and to recognize that they have undeniable common interests which unite them on the substance of the matter, namely, on the need to avoid a catastrophe which would destroy both of them.

96. When the security of the world and the fate of mankind are at stake, all Governments must speak out on behalf of the human communities they represent. But above all they have the duty to end our collective impotence in the face of the nuclear peril. Bernanos said, "The highest form of hope is despair overcome". It is that form of hope which is demanded of us by millions of men and women who feel anguish at the arms race and the prospect of a nuclear holocaust.

97. The most unpardonable sin that the Assembly could commit would be to kill by inaction the hopes nourished by mankind today. For in view of the madness inherent in the use of atomic weapons, to kill the hopes for disarmament would truly be to risk killing life on earth.

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

99. Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): I wish at the outset to congratulate the President and the members of the General Committee on their assumption of the high offices of this crucial special session devoted to disarmament. I wish also to take this opportunity to renew the commitment of my Government to the efforts of the United Nations in this field and thus to undertakings of the Secretary-General and his staff in assisting Member States.

100. The Preparatory Committee of this special session, under the able leadership of Mr. Oluyemi Adeniji, has made it clear that the general hope and purpose of this session is the initiation of new negotiations and the intensification of ongoing negotiations on urgent measures of disarmament in bilateral, regional and multilateral forums. The Bahamas sees this hope and intent as a most valid and urgent one, given developments since the first special session devoted to disarmament. I refer, of course, to the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session [*reso-*

lution S-10/2] and to the degree of its implementation, particularly of its Programme of Action [*ibid.*, sect. III].

101. The Bahamas shares the assessment that while the international disarmament strategy and machinery elaborated in the Final Document have proved sound and therefore not been fundamentally challenged, there has been virtually no corresponding reflection of the strategy through concrete measures in the policies and conduct of individual Member States, particularly those possessing the largest arsenals. In the face of such an impasse, the challenge to this special session is how to move from awareness, machinery and procedures to disarmament. In meeting that challenge we must not allow the plethora of past and present disarmament efforts on comprehensive and specific issues to cloud our perspectives and goals towards general and complete disarmament. To guard against unwitting or deliberate failure to see the forest for the trees in this urgent matter of disarmament and the adequacy of measures to achieve it, we must not lose sight of the time-tested formula for exposing contradictions and real intentions, that is, the interaction of motivations, words and actions.

102. It is in this context that the Bahamas, as a small developing State the major part of whose defence budget is geared towards the policing of its extensive, fragmented and isolated coastline against drug traffickers—a signatory of both regional and multilateral disarmament agreements whose territory is nevertheless criss-crossed by the military-strategic communications and naval networks of several militarily significant States—wishes to offer a few observations which it feels can contribute to concrete and effective disarmament undertakings.

103. These observations may be summarized in the following way.

104. First, the logical conclusion must be drawn from the contradictions between the words and the deeds of those States possessing significant arsenals of arms, whether nuclear or conventional, given the recognized necessity for a disarmed world. Those States that feel least secure and most handicapped by the burden of arms expenditure and the threat to their survival posed by the arms policies of other States must themselves act decisively and even independently of nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States which feel secure in their existing or potential deterrence, in their retaliatory and self-defence capabilities, or in the economic returns of their arms. How can such decisive action be taken? The Bahamas challenges those apparently most helpless victims of the arms race and military production establishments, whether developed or developing, honestly and courageously to assess the implications of interdependence and its dynamics.

105. Secondly, such an evaluation will obviate the apparent contradiction between security necessities and disarmament and should promote consensus regarding a definition of security which excludes protection predicated on power, prestige, influence and foreign domination, whether political or economic. The definition should also allow for security dictates to be tempered by respect at all times for human rights.

106. And thirdly, disarmament deliberations and negotiations should at every level, from bilateral to multilateral, distinguish between issues and measures which are causal and those which are consequential, thereby keeping in perspective the degree of contribution of any idea or concrete measure towards effective disarmament.

107. To illustrate briefly, these three points have some of the following implications, which, in our view, are crucial for overcoming the impasse in the majority of areas of present disarmament endeavours.

108. Generally, with respect to both nuclear and conventional disarmament, while in no way negating the special responsibility of the super-Powers and other militarily significant States—for example, as set out in General Assembly resolutions 36/95, 36/96 B, 36/97 E and I and 36/100—non-militarily significant States must actively as well as verbally contribute to disarmament by recognizing that interdependence implies all actors, not pawns and actors. In this context, there is the potential for real bargaining power in every link of mutuality.

109. The truism that if one is not part of the solution one is part of the problem should also generate initiatives to resolve, among neighbours and nationals, historical conflict-producing situations of an external and internal nature. It is in this context that the Bahamas regards as having great merit the conclusions and recommendations of the studies on the relationship between disarmament and international security, on confidence-building measures and on the relationship between disarmament and development.

110. Such initiatives of non-militarily significant States are also prerequisites for effective nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace which have full territorial application.

111. Additionally, such initiatives, while complementary to those already requested of nuclear and militarily significant States, may also be regarded as causal—as opposed to consequential—in relationship to genuine disarmament, for they then become the catalysts for consequential measures such as agreements to limit the buildup and transfer of nuclear and conventional armaments, security guarantees, the reduction of military budgets and the “starving” of military research and development, which in turn would affect negatively the production of new weapons of mass destruction.

112. Finally, the distinction between causal and consequential disarmament measures has far-reaching long-term implications for the question of international co-operation in peaceful uses of nuclear energy and technology and the related issues of non-proliferation, verification and research and development for social and economic progress.

113. In the light of the clarifications already made regarding this distinction, the Bahamas regards the peaceful use of nuclear energy and technology as an inherently consequential issue. The effective implementation of paragraph 66 of the Final Document, which pertains to this question, will depend in great measure on the negotiating strength acquired by those States which have demonstrated their commitment to disarmament through the initiation and



promotion of effective measures at the bilateral and regional levels. The multiplier effect of such measures, because they will have been predicated on the complexity of international relations in all their varied aspects, would then facilitate at the international level the implementation of the related politically sensitive issues of international regulation, with universal non-discriminatory application, of all aspects of the operation of the nuclear plant cycle—that is, supplies, monitoring and verification on the basis of full-scope safeguards.

114. In conclusion, I wish to state that the Bahamas has attempted to bring into focus those fundamental aspects of the disarmament question which we feel must be honestly addressed if naked force, as epitomized in armaments and the strategic military technological network which supports them, is to cease to be the final arbiter in human affairs and the major contributory factor to the imbalanced development of the planet, and if Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter, which prohibits the threat or use of force, is finally to be implemented.

115. Mr. MASHINGAIDZE (Zimbabwe): Mr. Witness Mangwende, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Zimbabwe, had very much wished to participate in this important session of the General Assembly. Unfortunately, however, other pressing matters intervened and prevented him from making the trip to New York. Consequently, he has authorized me to deliver his statement to the twelfth special session of the General Assembly, which is the second special session devoted to disarmament.

116. Before I turn to the statement, however, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Kittani of Iraq on his well-deserved unanimous election to guide the deliberations of the Assembly. His diplomatic experience and skills, which have already been amply demonstrated by the way he presided over the thirty-sixth session, assure us in advance of a very successful conclusion to the programme before this special session.

117. May I also, on behalf of the delegation of Zimbabwe, pay a special and richly deserved tribute to the Secretary-General and his colleagues in the Secretariat for their excellent work in preparing for this special session.

118. Finally, I wish to express the sincere condolences of my delegation to the delegation and people of Saudi Arabia on the passing of their leader, the late King Khalid.

119. It is now my honour and privilege to deliver my Minister's statement to the Assembly.

“It is with great pleasure that I welcome this opportunity to address you on the important topic of disarmament. The urgency of achieving progress in comprehensive disarmament has necessitated the calling of this special session.

“Mr. President, please allow me, first of all, to convey to this Assembly of distinguished representatives warm greetings from my President and my Prime Minister and from the entire people of Zimbabwe. I wish to convey to you the seriousness with which Zimbabwe views this special session devoted to disarmament.

“While the General Assembly was searching for new measures and approaches to the problem of disarmament during the first special session on disarmament, in 1978, Zimbabwe was still engaged in an arduous struggle for national independence. My delegation wishes, however, to congratulate you all on taking important steps towards the solution of this most important question of our times.

“The disarmament problem cannot be divorced from political stability and mutual trust in the world. In a cold-war situation, where insecurity and distrust prevail, we cannot talk of disarmament. Unfortunately, the period after the Second World War has been characterized by international tension and local wars. These have contributed significantly to the proliferation of armaments among States.

“The most urgent task in the field of disarmament involves the nuclear-arms race. The disarmament process in this area should focus directly on the nuclear-weapon States, especially the two super-Powers, which possess the largest arsenals of nuclear weapons. It is the opinion of my Government that, if negotiations on nuclear disarmament are to be meaningful, the super-Powers should set the ball in motion.

“A comprehensive approach to disarmament should contain a phased programme. First of all, special attention has to be given to effective control of the arms race. This first phase must be characterized by an immediate cessation of the nuclear-arms race and the threat of nuclear war which accompanies it.

“The conclusion of a multilateral comprehensive test-ban treaty would constitute an important instrument in arms control. An early conclusion of such a treaty would slow down further qualitative improvement of existing nuclear capabilities, the possible increasing of nuclear explosive capabilities by more States and the development of new weapons systems.

“The 1963 partial nuclear test-ban Treaty<sup>4</sup> was the first major international agreement intended to limit nuclear weapons. We are, however, aware that the partial test-ban Treaty has had little effect in arresting the nuclear-arms race among the major nuclear Powers. It should be noted that the Treaty has had limited impact in terms of restricting the underground testing of large thermonuclear weapons. My Government therefore calls for an early start of negotiations for a multilateral comprehensive test-ban treaty.

“Whereas we recognize and welcome the conclusion and signing of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII)*, *annex*], we note with concern the many problems that Treaty faces in the process of implementation. We would like to see the non-proliferation régime strengthened. To this end, the non-nuclear-weapon States need not only guarantees against nuclear blackmail but also a strong commitment from the nuclear-weapon States that they will not resort to nuclear war as a means of resolving conflicts. It is therefore necessary to conclude an international legal agreement to protect non-nuclear-

weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

“It is also important to reach an international agreement on the non-emplacement of nuclear weapons on territories of other States, thus violating their territorial integrity and independence. Negotiations should also start on a progressive and balanced reduction of nuclear stockpiles and their means of delivery, ultimately leading to the total elimination and destruction of such nuclear arsenals. Adequate measures also need to be taken to ensure the cessation of all production of nuclear-weapons systems and their means of delivery, as well as the production of fissionable materials for weapon production purposes.

“We welcome the negotiations on theatre nuclear forces commenced last November. Those negotiations should be widened to cover other categories of strategic nuclear weapons. The production and the perfecting of tactical nuclear weapons always pose uncertainties for humanity because, if used, they represent a clear danger of nuclear escalation.

“Zimbabwe calls for an early ratification of the SALT II Treaty and the commencement of negotiations on a strategic arms reduction treaty among the super-Powers. We believe that action on both fronts will lead to a significant reduction in the production of nuclear weapons, thus contributing to the ultimate goal of a world devoid of nuclear weapons.

“I should like now to turn briefly to the question of a convention on bacteriological and chemical weapons. We are concerned about the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological weapons. In our struggle for national independence we were victims of the use of these weapons. It is no secret that South Africa, in its quest to destabilize the southern African subregion and to maintain its white supremacist policies, has resorted to the use of such weapons, especially in Angola. It is therefore necessary to initiate negotiations on an international treaty prohibiting their possession, as well as the stationing of bacteriological and other weapons of mass destruction on the territories of other States. The conclusion of an agreement on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological and chemical weapons is an urgent disarmament issue. Similarly, we feel that there should also be a treaty on radiological weapons.

“As to the military use of the sea-bed, rapid technological developments in recent years have enabled the major military Powers to use the deep sea-bed for military purposes. In order to curb this development, the sea-bed Treaty was signed in 1971 [*resolution 2660 (XXV), annex*], which Treaty prohibits the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof. Despite the conclusion of that Treaty and the holding of the first Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof, in 1977, the sea-bed

is still being used for hiding armaments. We therefore continue to be concerned by the use of advanced ocean technology for military ends and feel that such technology must be used for peaceful purposes, for the advancement and welfare of mankind.

“With regard to the prevention of arms proliferation in outer space, a comprehensive programme of disarmament must take into account the use of outer space for military purposes. The advantages of the peaceful use of outer space in such fields as meteorology, remote sensing, communications, navigation and so on are well known to the world community.

“It is a pity that those same Powers which have acquired advanced space technology seem bent on polluting outer space, to the detriment of mankind. We should therefore investigate to what extent the 1966 outer space Treaty and the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems take cognizance of the necessary prohibitions on outer space warfare, in the light of the development of new weapon technologies. It is our desire that measures be taken to negotiate international agreements which prohibit the use of outer space for military purposes.

“In regard to particularly inhumane weapons, we appreciate the progress made by the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. The Conference signed three Protocols, which cover non-detectable fragments, land mines and booby-traps, and incendiary weapons.

“We are well aware of the destruction caused by these weapons, especially to civilian populations. It is our hope that the United Nations will establish appropriate machinery to help the victims of wars in which such weaponry might be employed.

“I now turn to regional efforts on disarmament. The effecting of strong measures on a regional level is an important component of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. In 1977, a proposal for an agenda item on a nuclear-free zone in Africa was submitted to the General Assembly.<sup>5</sup> A resolution requesting all States Members of the United Nations to respect the continent of Africa as a nuclear-free zone was subsequently adopted [*resolution 33/63*]. It is still our feeling that nuclear testing or stationing nuclear weapons in any State on the continent presents a threat to the peace and security of all our peoples.

“We are also gravely concerned at the acquisition by the racist South African régime of the capability to manufacture nuclear weapons. We have no doubt that the adventurist and desperate *apartheid* régime would use them to unleash a nuclear holocaust. It should therefore be the duty of all States Members of this body to desist from all military co-operation with the racist régime, including in the nuclear field. Failure to do so would be a great blow to all efforts aimed at the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to general and complete disarmament.

"We similarly support the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. The introduction of nuclear weapons from any source would, indeed, jeopardize the attainment of a peaceful settlement in this volatile region. The apparent acquisition of nuclear weapons by Israel does pose a threat to all the States in that region. We also vehemently condemn the nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa and urge the States Members of the United Nations to discourage these two pariah States from conducting secret nuclear-weapon research and development, activities which seriously threaten world peace and security.

"The Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace [resolution 2832 (XXVI)] is very important to Zimbabwe and to other African States. Indeed, the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, meeting at Lusaka in 1970, first proposed the idea that the Indian Ocean should be declared a zone of peace from which great-Power rivalries, military bases and nuclear weapons should be excluded. This idea was endorsed by the General Assembly in 1971 when it adopted resolution 2832 (XXVI). However, we are disappointed that, despite a great deal of activity on this subject in the United Nations and at summit meetings of non-aligned countries, the two super-Powers have continued to violate the sanctity of the Indian Ocean. We also condemn the undertaking of efforts to establish military bases in the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean.

"We wish to make some comments on the subject of disarmament and development. The vast world resources spent on armaments and militarization have been a subject of discussion in this forum for many years. It is most unfortunate that the vagaries of the arms race, especially on the part of the super-Powers, have led to the squandering of vital resources on the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction. Since the Second World War none of the great Powers has been at war with another, but military expenditures have continued to grow. In 1980 alone world military expenditures totalled some \$500 billion, which approximately equals the total investment made in the third world. Despite this enormous outlay of resources, no State, large or small, feels secure.

"Our greatest concern is that these resources used for military purposes could be better used in development assistance for the third world. It is estimated that 20 per cent of all scientists in the world are involved in military research, when in fact they could be used in the field of development for the good of mankind as a whole. Hundreds of millions of people in the world are plagued by hunger, illiteracy and disease, when mankind still has an abundance of resources. There is definitely a functional relationship between disarmament and development. Disarmament must contribute to the democratic restructuring of international economic relations and the establishment of a new international economic order. We cannot acquiesce in the maldistribution of wealth in the world, whereby the rich countries of the North live in affluence and the third world countries languish in deprivation

and squalor. It is exactly this gross inequality in the international economic system which is a source of international tension and which exacerbates the arms race. We therefore call for a reallocation of resources in favour of the developing countries.

"I wish to express the conviction of my Government that it is necessary for a World Disarmament Campaign to disseminate information on the armaments race, to institute education programmes for disarmament and peace and to mobilize world-wide support for the disarmament process. We are encouraged by the growth of the peace movement in Europe, a movement which has played an important role in disarmament debate in recent times. We feel that it is the duty of the States Members of the United Nations and non-governmental organizations to step up the campaign for disarmament.

"Beyond the Campaign itself, my Government concurs in the recommendation of the Group of Governmental Experts to Study the Institutional Arrangements relating to the Process of Disarmament, appearing in its study annexed to the Secretary-General's report<sup>6</sup> submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, that a United Nations disarmament agency should be established. Such an agency would help in the many areas affecting the disarmament process, such as the areas of deliberations, negotiations, verification and so forth. The importance that disarmament has assumed in today's world justifies the establishment of such an agency.

"We also support the convening of a world conference on disarmament, and we hope that this special session will put forward concrete suggestions which will contribute to peace in the world."

120. That concludes my Minister's statement.

121. Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I am happy to join with those who preceded me in extending our heartfelt congratulations to Mr. Kittani on his election to the presidency of the Assembly at this special session. The experience and prudence he has demonstrated, both during the thirty-sixth session and during subsequent sessions, prove that he is most qualified to preside over our work. We are convinced that, thanks to his experience and wisdom, the Assembly's debates will be serious and useful.

122. The General Assembly is holding this special session devoted to disarmament in an international atmosphere charged with problems: wars, injustice, persecution and racist oppression. We are witnessing the war between Iran and Iraq and we want to see our brothers find a solution to that conflict as soon as possible. We hope, too, that the United Nations efforts to find a solution to the problem of Afghanistan will be crowned with success. At the same time, an aggressive invasion has been launched by the Zionists against Lebanon and the Palestinian people. Racist practices continue in occupied Palestine and southern Africa. The people of Namibia is fighting for its right of self-determination. There are other problems in Africa, South-East Asia and the South Atlantic, and the big Powers have intervened and threatened the use of force against the smaller Powers in Africa and Central America.

123. The convening of this session demonstrates the determination of our peoples to survive in a world in which peace and security prevail. The fear of war expressed here and in recent popular demonstrations will surely have an effect on the results of this session so as to bring mankind nearer to the fulfilment of its hopes for life in a world of peace and security.

124. Disarmament and the consolidation of international security are among the most complicated problems facing our present-day world. The international community is concerned about those problems, and has been for many years. That concern has been shown both within this Organization and in other international organizations. It has been shown by the holding of various international disarmament conferences and meetings since 1932 and is reflected in hundreds of resolutions adopted, *inter alia*, at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in 1978. The adoption by consensus of the Final Document of that session was an important event in the history of disarmament negotiations. On that occasion the world community was able to formulate a Programme of Action aimed at achieving the goal of general and complete disarmament.

125. Although the principles and objectives contained in the Final Document are valid and important, and although the circumstances in which we live are difficult, those principles and objectives have not been reflected in the policies of the big Powers, which, for the protection of their own security and interests, are based on the principle of the use of force and on their indifference to the interests of other States.

126. A brief review of what has occurred since the first special session on disarmament shows clearly that the events of the last four years have occurred in a manner totally at variance with the purposes and principles of the Final Document and with the hopes placed by peoples in the results attained at that special session. Some of these events are: the intensification of the arms race among the great Powers and the quantitative and qualitative growth of nuclear arsenals; continued nuclear-weapons testing; the refinement of new systems of weapons of mass destruction such as the neutron bomb and the persistence of theories of nuclear deterrence, strategic balance and localized, winnable nuclear wars and of there being survivors of such wars; the halting of talks by the major nuclear Powers on strategic weapons and the lack of any progress in that field and the fact that the SALT II Treaty has not been ratified because of the United States of America; the lack of any progress in disarmament negotiations on the priorities established, because of the attitude of the big Powers; and the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons.

127. With regard to this last-mentioned, there are signs that the racist régimes of the Zionist entity and Pretoria possess nuclear weapons, thanks to their mutual co-operation and the assistance of certain Western Powers, in particular the United States. The possession by those régimes of nuclear weapons has added a new dimension to the nuclear threat because of the aggressive, racist nature of those régimes and because of their not having acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or other international agreements in that field. They persist in their refusal to accede to

that Treaty or to submit their nuclear installations to international monitoring.

128. In addition to these negative developments in the field of disarmament, in recent years we have seen a deterioration in international relations because of the extension of wars and pockets of tension and because of the persistence of imperialist and racist policies of aggression, occupation, annexation, pressure and economic blockades against the non-aligned countries in order to subjugate them, establish hegemony over them and exploit their national resources by use of terror and military bases.

129. The use of force and the threat of force by American imperialism and the racist colonialist forces, as well as the violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and United Nations resolutions, in particular the principles relating to sovereignty, independence and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, has persisted in recent years. The sovereignty and territory of many non-aligned States have been exposed to aggression. I am thinking particularly of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which in the summer of 1981 was the victim of American imperialist aggression. The aggression we are seeing now is eloquent proof of the fact that the international situation is deteriorating and that international peace and security are in peril.

130. In the Middle East, for example, the racist Zionist entity, the main agent of imperialism in the region, continues its racist aggressive policies based on occupation, annexation and on repeated acts of aggression against the Palestinian people and the peoples of the Arab countries bordering on occupied Palestine. Barbaric Zionist aggression unleashed on 6 June 1982 against the people of Lebanon and the Syrian and Palestinian peoples continues. It has left more than 10,000 dead, 17,000 wounded and 600,000 homeless. Most of those wounded are innocent civilians. This act of aggression has flagrantly violated international law and the most elementary human rights, as well as the principles of the Charter. It has infringed the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. That act of aggression could never have taken place without the all-out aid and support given by the American Government to the Zionist entity in all fields—economic, political and military. American aid, in fact, has exceeded \$25 billion in the last 20 years, and the figure is still rising. To that must be added the supplying of military information and data and the co-ordination of the intelligence services of the two countries. The American Administration also provided the Zionist forces of aggression with ultra-modern military material, which was used by Israel even before it had been used by the American forces.

131. All peace-loving forces throughout the world deplore this aggression. The United States Government, which prepared the way and co-ordinated that aggression with Israel, alone does not. In fact, the Israeli deputy chief of staff planned this act of aggression in the United States two weeks before it was unleashed. The United States Secretary of State made a series of statements on the Middle East, and I refer particularly to his statement of 26 May 1982 concerning the problem of Lebanon, in which he said that the United States was pledged to intervene in any trouble-spot in any region of the world. That was



not mere chance. It was to prepare American opinion for this Israeli act of aggression. The American Administration felt that that was the proper way to resolve the problem of Lebanon.

132. Now the American Administration is encouraging the Zionist entity to persist in its act of aggression and its occupation of Lebanon and not to withdraw until there is a political solution which is in keeping with American and Zionist interests.

133. In the continent of Africa the situation is no less dangerous. The racist régime of Pretoria, assisted by the colonialist countries, continues its acts of aggression against Namibia and neighbouring African States. In the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean regions the fleets and military bases of the colonialist countries continue to be a serious threat and a source of disturbance to the security and independence of the littoral States of those two regions, representing a sort of military, political and economic domination and hegemony there. My country calls for the removal of those fleets and bases so that the Mediterranean may be a sea of peace. We ask also that the Indian Ocean region become a zone of peace and that nuclear-weapon-free zones can be created in Africa, the Middle East, South Asia, Latin America and northern Europe.

134. In the Caribbean and Latin American region certain States are exposed to interference in their internal affairs and to economic blockades and sieges by American imperialism. Furthermore, the events in the South Atlantic are the result of a colonialist situation which must be resolved by peaceful negotiations.

135. The question of armaments and disarmament is not only a military problem, but also an economic, social and political problem which affects everybody. The world arms race, apart from offering a very gloomy picture of international relations based on injustice, persecution, the threat to the weak by the strong, the struggle for spheres of influence and the use of force, as well as the emergence of traits of egoism and exploitation, as is a heavy burden on the economies of many States, draining the potential of mankind everywhere and wasting the resources which are needed for economic and social development, in particular for the developing countries, whose peoples suffer from lack of food, education and medical care. The United Nations study entitled *The Relationship between Disarmament and Development*<sup>7</sup> shows that 1.5 billion people do not have the necessary medical care, 570 million people suffer from serious malnutrition, nearly 800 million people are illiterate and 200 million children do not attend school because there are not enough schools, whereas, in 1981 \$600 billion were spent on weapons.

136. The negative effects of the arms race are not limited to diverting resources from civilian sectors to military purposes, for economic and social development programmes, especially in developing countries, are also being held up because those countries, to safeguard their security and independence, have to divert a large part of their resources from development efforts to military ends. Similarly, the arms race has prevented the establishment of the new international economic order and has widened the economic gap

between the developed and the developing countries. Furthermore, the arms race is one of the primary factors in creating the economic difficulties which affect certain States, such as inflation, unemployment, balance of payments deficits and other political and social problems.

137. The relationship between disarmament and world security is a close one. The arms race, in addition to impeding international efforts to reduce tension, is contrary to the principles of the Charter. Safeguarding world peace and security is the first of the purposes embodied in the Charter. The Charter also provides for strengthening the role of the United Nations in reducing international tensions and establishing the climate necessary for creating a just and permanent peace. Its foremost principles are those concerning the non-use of force or the threat of force in international relations, the settlement of disputes by peaceful means and guaranteeing the equality of peoples and their right of self-determination. The world community has frequently reaffirmed the importance of those principles.

138. Nevertheless, many principles continue to be violated and disregarded. There is an increasing lack of security because of dangerous concepts to which the big Powers and their allies adhere—concepts such as deterrence and the maintenance of international security through a balance of terror. International events have proved such concepts to be erroneous. The arms buildup, in particular the buildup of nuclear weapons, has not brought the hoped-for security. If international peace and security are to be preserved, there must be—in addition to efforts to halt the arms race and achieve disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament—a commitment to the principles of the Charter, respect for the laws governing international relations, the building up of confidence, respect for the sovereignty of States, non-intervention, recognition of the rights of peoples that are still not independent to self-determination and independence, the elimination of hotbeds of tension in the world, a ban on establishing new foreign military bases, as well as the dismantling of those that already exist, and the withdrawal of foreign fleets from areas not under the sovereignty of the nations to which those fleets belong—the areas of the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean and other seas. The United Nations, which under the Charter has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and for disarmament, must participate in all negotiations and agreements affecting the future of peoples.

139. The role of the Security Council in maintaining world peace must be strengthened, and negative factors preventing that important body from playing its proper role must be eliminated. My country supports all bilateral or multilateral international efforts to strengthen world peace and security and achieve disarmament.

140. In my delegation's view, the priorities set in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session still constitute the most solid basis for any disarmament process. One of the tasks facing the present special session is the adoption of practical measures to implement those priorities. Another important task is the adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. If it is not to have the same fate as previous

documents, it must oblige States to engage in negotiations for disarmament, in accordance with the priorities established in the Final Document.

141. We must establish precise time-tables for the various measures to be taken. Highest priority in the programme should be accorded to the prohibition of nuclear war and the elimination of nuclear weapons, which threaten mankind. We should eliminate weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons. We must pledge not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons, particularly against non-nuclear-weapon States. An important step towards removing the spectre of nuclear war would be the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. All States should adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the provisions of which must be respected. In this regard I should like to reaffirm that my country, which desires to see peace achieved and the risk of the use of nuclear weapons avoided, has signed the Treaty, together with an agreement with IAEA on safeguards in the country.

142. We advocate the peaceful use of the atom at the service of mankind and for the improvement of the economic and social standards of the peoples. We appeal for co-operation between the States that have nuclear technology and those that do not. In that connexion, we repeat our condemnation of the Zionist entity, which committed an act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor, which had been built for peaceful purposes. Iraq is a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, to which the Zionist entity continues to refuse to accede.

143. The peoples of the world desire total disarmament under effective international control as the final objective. All States, and in particular the nuclear-weapon States, must strive to achieve that objective, through this Organization, the most appropriate instrument for maintaining international peace and security and for achieving disarmament.

144. The destruction and havoc wrought by war is still fresh in the memories of many peoples, who continue to suffer from the consequences of war. My own country, Libya, suffered from colonialism and military operations. For some 20 years

—from 1911 to 1932—we fought a war of liberation against the fascist Italian invasion. Libya was a theatre of action during both world wars. Its cities, roads and public services suffered severe damage. Almost half the population of the country became victims of the military operations. The effects of the Second World War are still being felt. In Libya there still are booby-trapped minefields set by the fighting forces of the Allies. There are from time to time explosions causing loss of life and property, and agricultural development programmes and mining are impeded in some areas, thus burdening the budget for peaceful programmes.

145. Consequently, my country requests the United Nations to intervene to find a solution to this problem and to take a decision rewarding compensation for the losses caused by such mines.

146. In conclusion, we express the hope that the political will and determination of all States, in particular the large nuclear-weapon Powers, will be strengthened and that mutual respect will prevail among peoples and States in international relations, as well as balanced economic and social relations among all States and among the individuals of each State so that we may reach the desired goal: disarmament.

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> General Treaty for Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2137, p. 57).

<sup>2</sup> Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326).

<sup>3</sup> A/CN.10/38. See also A/CN.

<sup>4</sup> Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964, p. 43).

<sup>5</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 105, document A/5975.

<sup>6</sup> A/36/392.

<sup>7</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.1.