



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 5TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. YANGO (Philippines)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

DOCUMENTATION OF THE COMMITTEE

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 56, 128 AND 135 (continued)

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Petrovsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Mrs. Thorsson (Sweden)
Mr. Marinescu (Romania)
Mr. Hepburn (Bahamas)

UN LIBRARY

OCT 26 1981

UN/SA COLLECTION

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/36/PV.5
22 October 1981
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

DOCUMENTATION OF THE COMMITTEE

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the first speaker inscribed on the list, I should like to state the following: the report on the relationship between disarmament and development has been distributed to members of the Committee today in two languages, namely, English and French. As a usual practice, documents should be distributed simultaneously in all official languages of the United Nations, although exceptions have been made on certain occasions. This afternoon the representative of Sweden is scheduled to speak in order to introduce the above-mentioned report which is the outcome of a year's preparation. For technical reasons, the report will not be available today in the other languages, but will be available next Friday.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to inform the Committee on the status of the documentation.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): With regard to the status of the documentation related to our agenda items, I wish to inform the Committee that the Journal lists, next to each item, its relevant documents.

However, a small number of reports are still to be issued. They include the following:

Report of the Preparatory Committee of the second special session, under item 39. That Committee concluded its work last Friday and its report will be ready in early November.

Report of the Secretary-General on Chemical Weapons, under agenda item 42. The Group of Experts have started meeting in order to finalize the report, which will be ready also early in November.

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, under agenda item 49. The Ad Hoc Committee is scheduled to meet for two days this week to approve its report, which will be issued early in November.

(Mr. Rathore)

Report of the Secretary-General on the programme of research and studies on disarmament, under agenda item 51 (c). This report, which was submitted last week, will be ready late in October.

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament, under agenda item 51 (e). The programme is still under way, but the report is expected to be issued by the end of October.

With regard to agenda item 51 (g) on the non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war, I wish to state that, by resolution 35/152 D, the General Assembly requested all States that have so far not submitted their proposals concerning the non-use of nuclear weapons, avoidance of nuclear war and related matters, to do so, in order that the question of an international convention or some other agreement on the subject may be further considered at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. No proposals were submitted by any State under the above request and, consequently, no report will be submitted under this item.

Report of the Secretary-General on confidence-building measures, under agenda item 55 (c). The report is expected to be issued in the course of this week.

Report of the Secretary-General on the relationship between disarmament and international security, under agenda item 55 (f). The Group of Experts is expected to meet early in November to conclude the report which will then be issued in about mid-November.

Lastly, the report of the Secretary-General on disarmament and international security, under agenda item 55 (i). This report is expected to be issued this week.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 56, 128 AND 135 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The task of preventing war is today of the utmost urgency and immediacy. It is not limited simply to the confines of continents, the seas or the oceans. The important thing is to establish a reliable barrier to the placing of weapons in such new expanses and spheres as have recently been mastered by man, such as outer space.

The Soviet Union, which was the first to blaze the trail for mankind into outer space, has from the very beginning of the space age tirelessly striven to confine that sphere within the framework of exclusively peaceful co-operation.

As far back as 1958, the Soviet Union proposed to exclude the possibility of any military use of outer space on the basis of strict observance of the principle of equal security and not permitting any military advantages to either side. Reference to that task was included as an integral element in the draft treaty on complete and general disarmament submitted by the Soviet Union to the Committee of Eighteen on 15 March 1962.

We can note with satisfaction that, so far, with regard to outer space, the international community has more than once succeeded in finding answers worthy of human reason to the challenges of Mars, the god of war. These are in the form of agreements, based on the balance of interest of all parties and achieved by means of honest and equitable negotiations.

One of the first of such challenges was the danger of turning outer space into a proving ground for nuclear weapons. A convincing answer to that challenge was the Treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water of 1963. more than 100 States became parties to that Treaty, including three nuclear States: the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The next major action was the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies of 1967, which lays down an important international legal obligation to refrain from placing in orbit around the Earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction or from installing such weapons on celestial bodies or to place such weapons in space in any other way.

In 1979, the General Assembly approved the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, which provided for the demilitarization and neutralization of this natural satellite of the Earth and other planets of the solar system. A useful measure in the matter of limiting the military use of outer space was the conclusion in 1976 of the proposal of the Soviet Union in the form of the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques. In article II of that document, it is stated that the term "environmental modification techniques" refers to any technique for changing .. through the deliberate manipulation of natural processes .. the dynamics, composition or structure of the Earth, including its biota, lithosphere, hydrosphere and atmosphere, or of outer space.

Thus, over the past two decades, we have noticed a favourable trend for joint multilateral efforts to erect a barrier to bringing outer space into the arms race. The important provisions which have materially decreased the possibility of using outer space for military purposes are contained also in the bilateral Soviet-American agreements concluded in the 1970's. The treaty on limiting the system of anti-missile defense of 1972, supplemented by the protocol of 1974, binds the parties not to create or to test or develop systems or components of anti-satellite defense which are based in outer space. A provisional agreement on certain measures in the field of limiting strategic offensive weapons - SALT I of 1972 - laid down definite limits for the quantity of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The SALT II treaty signed in Vienna on 18 June 1979 now came to provide not only for quantitative but also qualitative limitations with regard to the weapons in question. It contains provisions which place limits on the possibilities for creating means of placing nuclear weapons in earth orbit and partial orbital devices.

As a result of the struggle of peace-loving States for peaceful uses of outer space, a great deal has been accomplished. The treaties and agreements that I have mentioned have laid down a good basis for further co-operation between States on outer space for peaceful purposes and have established a system of international guarantees which exclude the possibility of stationing in outer space any nuclear or other form of weapons of mass destruction.

However, today this is no longer adequate. We cannot fail to see that in the matter of conquering space, we find ourselves faced with two opposing developments. On the one hand, we have use of outer space for practical, peaceful needs, and it is to this subject that the second special United Nations conference on the use of outer space for peaceful purposes will be devoted. It is to be held in Vienna from 9-22 August 1982. In the same year, mankind will mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the beginning of the conquest of space when, on 4 October 1957, the Soviet Union for the first time in history placed an artificial object into outer space orbit.

Since that time, the Russian work sputnik has become a symbol of man's transcending the limits of Earth's atmosphere. Prospects were opened up for the conquest by man of outer space. Now, the peaceful conquest of outer space is among the most important global problems. Our country is doing a great deal to ensure that a broad range of States can take part in peaceful activities in outer space. I should like to stress in that regard that the Soviet Union views the success of Soviet astronauts as the common heritage of mankind.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

We consider it normal that after the first man to have carried out a flight in space - and he was Yuri Gagarin, a Soviet citizen - citizens of other countries should also take part, along with Soviet citizens, in flights in Soviet spacecraft. Flights in outer space have already been carried out by people from other countries in the socialist community. In the near future, this international roster will, we hope, be supplemented by the names of persons representing India and France. The use of outer space is already bringing great benefits to mankind in such areas as communications, the study of the earth's natural resources, meteorology and navigation, as well as many other areas. We would recall with satisfaction our co-operation with the United States in the peaceful conquest of space clearly manifested, inter alia, in the joint Soyuz-Apollo flight. There is thus every ground for asserting that people are beginning to "feel at home" in outer space.

At the same time, however, there is another and dangerous trend, one that is also fraught with consequences of a planetary scale. Recently there has emerged the real threat of the creation and stationing in outer space of the most advanced forms of weaponry, forms which do not come under any existing limitations and which, in particular, do not come under the definition of weapons of mass destruction. The danger of the spread of the arms race to outer space is once again increasing sharply. It is not a question of preparations for some imaginary, science-fiction "Star Wars". The United States, which is pursuing an arms race that is unprecedented in scale, has the intention of using outer space for military preparations which are, incidentally, very extensive and substantial, and which have a clearly earth-ward orientation. This, of course, poses a threat to the vital interests of all States without exception. It is no secret, after all, that none will be immune should a war involving the use of weapons based in space break out. According to the estimates of many scientists and specialists, the arms race in space may become a reality in the course of this very decade, if we do not close off the avenues for its development in good time.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Judging from Press reports, the Pentagon is drawing up battle plans for dominating outer space, which, on the analogy of mastery of the air, is viewed as a key to military victories on earth. Plans are being made for creating systems of anti-satellite weapons, including the stationing in outer space of military bases equipped with such systems as well as the laying of anti-satellite mines. For some years now, work has been proceeding on the creation of laser weapons or of weapons based on the use of particle beams to be based in outer space to destroy targets both on earth and in space. It has been repeatedly reported that certain military aspects have been provided for by the programmes for launching reusable manned spacecraft. Of particular danger are projects for stationing anti-rocket weapons systems in outer space.

Referring to this danger, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), in its annual publication "World Armaments and Disarmament" for 1981, stressed that adding such anti-rocket systems to strategic offensive arms is connected with nuclear first-strike strategy. United States attempts to turn outer space into a new arms-race arena are linked to its ambition to achieve supremacy in military power and are primarily designed to establish its hegemony on earth.

Of course, in today's world, ideas of achieving a position of military supremacy by means of space weapons or by any other weapons are unrealistic and illusory. The spreading of the arms race to outer space would not only bring additional destabilizing factors into the strategic situation, and further increase tension but also have a most negative effect on the prospects for the peaceful conquest of outer space.

The stationing of weapons in outer space would sharply reduce and ultimately lead to the total curtailment of international programmes of co-operation in research in, and the use of, outer space in the interests of the accelerated development of all countries.

In so far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it has consistently stood for a peaceful outer space. The Head of the Soviet State, L. I. Brezhnev, recently stressed:

"The Soviet Union has been and remains a staunch champion of the development of business-like international co-operation in outer space. Let us hope that the boundless ocean of outer space will remain free

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

and clear of weapons of every kind. We are for reaching, by joint efforts, a great humanitarian goal - the exclusion of the militarization of outer space."

In accordance with this position of principle, the Soviet Union has put forward for consideration at this session a proposal to conclude a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. The goals and content of that proposal are familiar to members. They were set forth in a letter from the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and in the draft treaty annexed to that letter (A/36/192).

In short, the essence of the proposal is to prevent the further militarization of outer space and to exclude the possibility of outer space becoming an arena for the arms race and a source of heightened tension in relations between States. The Soviet draft treaty provides that States Parties undertake not to place in orbit around the earth objects carrying weapons of any kind, install such weapons on celestial bodies, or station such weapons in outer space in any other manner, including on reusable manned space vehicles of an existing type or of other types which States Parties may develop in the future. The draft treaty provides that each State party undertakes not to assist, encourage or induce any State, group of States or international organization to carry out activities contrary to the goal of not stationing weapons of any kind in outer space.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The Soviet draft treaty clearly and distinctly indicates the need for States to use space objects in strict accordance with international law, including the Charter of the United Nations, in the interests of maintaining international peace and security and promoting international co-operation and mutual understanding.

Thus, the treaty proposed by the USSR creates no advantages for any of the parties. At the same time it ensures the interests both of those States which already possess the means for placing objects in space and of those States which do not have this capacity.

The draft treaty, as applicable to outer space, gives concrete expression to principle of the non-use of force enshrined in the United Nations Charter. The conclusion of the treaty would once and for all exclude the possibility of the use of space as a theatre for military activities.

Article 3 of the draft makes a special provision for ensuring the security of flights of peaceful space craft. In accordance with this article, every State would undertake "not to destroy, damage or disturb the normal functioning, or change the flight trajectory of space objects of other States Parties if such objects in their turn were placed in orbit in strict accordance" with the goals of the proposed treaty. This is in keeping with the interests of many States which have their own space objects in space or which are using them collectively for communications, meteorology, navigation, the study of the natural resources of the earth and other useful purposes. The security of peaceful functional satellites, according to the Soviet draft, would have to be guaranteed.

The draft treaty would not provide any possibility for the violation of its provisions on the part of anyone. Article 4 especially defines the need and an adequate system for ensuring security in observing the provisions of the treaty. This system is in keeping both with the contemporary level of scientific and technological possibilities and with existing practice.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

It provides that "each State Party should use the national technical monitoring facilities available to it, in a manner consistent with generally recognized principles of international law" and should not "place obstacles in the way of the national technical monitoring facilities of other States Parties". Furthermore, it is provided that "in order to promote the implementation of the purposes and provisions of the treaty, the States Parties shall, when necessary, consult each other, make enquiries and provide information in connexion with such enquiries."

We quite often hear people say that someone or other is working out a programme of space armaments out of fear that this kind of programme, so it is alleged, has been launched in the Soviet Union. This is all the same kind of propagandist myth as that of the Soviet military threat. The reality is that governments of all countries of the planet have on their tables a very clear and definite document reflecting the intention of the USSR seriously and in a business-like fashion to resolve the problem of preventing the placing in outer space of weapons of any description and to work along with other countries for the conclusion of a binding international agreement on this subject. The readiness of States to get down to the work of producing such a treaty, not just in words but in actual fact, will reveal the true intentions of every power with regard to outer space.

The position of the Soviet Union in questions of limiting the arms race is well known. We are ready to go as far as other States agree to go, right up to and including general and complete disarmament. This, we believe, is the way in which we will also resolve the question of the full and final demilitarization of outer space.

The measure we propose is pursuing a goal which can be achieved even today. The treaty is meant to erect a reliable barrier to the conversion of outer space into a new theatre of the arms race. We believe that the General Assembly will make a valuable contribution to solving this problem, which is truly of unsurpassed global significance, if it approves the idea of concluding a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space and proposes to States that they produce without delay the text of such an agreement.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Since the essence of the matter lies in preventing the emergence of yet a further source of the danger of war and yet another area of the arms race and since on a number of substantive aspects this problem is linked with other questions of limiting armaments and bringing about disarmament and affects the security interests of States, the most appropriate organ for working on such a treaty is, in our view, the Committee on Disarmament.

I think this is in harmony with the view expressed at the spring session of the Committee on Disarmament by the representative of Sweden, Mrs. Thorsson, when she said that the Committee should very soon consider the urgency of preserving outer space, another common heritage of mankind -- for peaceful activities. (CD/PV.127, p. 6). We consider it appropriate for the General Assembly to recommend to the Committee on Disarmament that it go to work on producing a treaty on the prevention of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space as one of its most urgent measures.

The task of preventing the development of the arms race in outer space is an urgent matter and all members of the international community without exception have an interest, we believe, in seeing it resolved positively. However, we must not waste time. Experience shows beyond any doubt that the arms race in any area is much easier to prevent than to reverse once it has already begun to develop. The Soviet Union wishes to issue to the international community a clear and distinct appeal to take action in good time to make outer space forever unsullied and free from any weapons and to prevent it from becoming a theatre of confrontation and a source of the exacerbation of the relations between States.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the Under-Secretary of State of Sweden, Mrs. Thorsson, who will, during the course of her statement, introduce the report on the study on the relationship between disarmament and development (A/35/356).

Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden): As the Chairman has just stated, I am speaking this afternoon not as a Swedish representative to this Committee - that will come later - but as Chairman of the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. In that capacity, I want now to introduce document A/36/356, containing the final report of the Group.

Representatives might recall that the Group was appointed by the Secretary-General in August 1978, following a request contained in paragraph 94 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, which also, in paragraph 95, approved the draft mandate and terms of reference submitted to it and contained in document A/S-10/9.

In accordance with its mandate and terms of reference, the Group's study has taken into account the current situation in the field of disarmament and the importance of disarmament for détente, international peace and security, economic and social development, as well as the promotion of international co-operation and their reciprocal relationships. The study has been made in the context of how disarmament, when achieved, can contribute to the establishment of a New International Economic Order. Furthermore, the study was required to be forward-looking and policy-oriented, enabling it to serve as a basis for decisions on concrete action to reallocate real resources released through disarmament measures to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries.

Common sense alone tells us that military preparations are an economic burden. This was expressed by General Eisenhower during an early part of his Presidency, as follows:

Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies, in a final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, from those who are cold and are not clothed".

Obviously, a study conducted some 30 years later must pursue this issue further. In fact, a basic finding of our Group, unanimously expressed, is that the world can either continue to pursue the arms race with characteristic vigour or it can move consciously and with deliberate speed towards a more sustainable

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

international economic and political order. It cannot do both. The arms race and development are thus to be viewed in a competitive relationship, particularly in terms of resources. Or, to put it another way, the arms race and underdevelopment are not two problems; they are one. They must be solved together, or neither will ever be solved.

Few have grasped the scale and the intensity of this contradiction. But listen to the low-key words of a man of clear vision, Philip Noel-Baker, who said at a conference in London in January 1977:

"There are more than a thousand million men and women in the world who cannot read or write or do the simplest sum. Their illiteracy helps all too powerfully to keep them poor. It prevents the rural proletariat from learning and applying the known agricultural techniques which would double their crops and change their lives. Illiteracy bars their path to social, cultural and political progress.

"Yet if UNESCO were given a fund of \$200 million for a worldwide literacy campaign, it could free every nation from this evil handicap. Two hundred million dollars is approximately the price of two strategic bombers of the latest type.

"The nations of the third world suffer grievously from diseases which have disappeared from the developed West. Malaria still kills great numbers and weakens millions more, so that their productive output is reduced. Trachoma is very simple to cure, but if untreated, it makes the victim blind, his life a burden to himself, and him a burden to society. Leprosy makes its victims segregated social outcasts. Yaws, a diet deficiency disease, covers the body with running sores, makes a man unfit for work or play and allows him no real rest.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

"These four diseases impose a heavy annual load of economic loss and human suffering in the third world. Yet all of them are easily preventable. The World Health Organization (WHO) could eliminate them -- wipe them out now and for the future -- for an expenditure of \$500 million -- about the cost of one aircraft carrier".

And this is not all, for the world hungers. One thousand two hundred million individuals who have to live on incomes of less than \$150 a year remain hungry from the cradle to the grave. They never know what it is to have a solid meal. But, as Willy Brandt said in 1980 in introducing his report, 'North - South -- A Programme for Survival':

'One-half of one per cent of one year's world military expenditure would pay for all the farm equipment to increase food production and approach self-sufficiency in food-deficit, low-income countries by 1990 .

This is sometimes called a conventional juxtaposition. But it is not. Rather, it focuses our attention on the historical fact that governments have, over the past 30 years, spent vast resources on armaments, resources which -- on grounds of morality, on grounds of equal human justice, on grounds of enlightened self-interest -- ought to have been directed to ending world poverty and building for human and material development. This can never be called conventional. Because this is how world armaments are the cause of poverty and underdevelopment. This is the theft that President Eisenhower realized, recognized and expressed.

It is inevitable that varying views and interests find their way into any multilateral group. This was also true of the Governmental Expert Group on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. Experts found it necessary to make reservations on a few points in the substantive chapters. But in the final analysis, in summarizing our three years of study and its findings, and in formulating our recommendations in the study's concluding chapter, we stand united.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

The Group was eager to understand the relationship itself. The 1972 United Nations Group of Experts on the same topic stated in its report:

"Disarmament and development are of the greatest importance to the world community. But fundamentally they stand apart. The United Nations has agreed to seek each vigorously in its own right, regardless of the pace of progress in approaching the other. Specifically, nations have agreed that national and international efforts to promote development should be neither postponed nor allowed to lag merely because progress in disarmament is slow". (ST/ECA/174, United Nations, 1972)

Taking the point of departure of the 1972 study, this statement is still true. Ten years ago, and as duties of the industrialized countries then went, development was simply equated with development assistance. Hence the conclusion reached at that time, which I have just quoted. But since then the development debate has been broadened to involve the basic structural changes in all societies, within States and among States, including more equitable distribution of income, access to the means of production and greater participation by all groups in decision-making, and progress towards the establishment of a New International Economic Order.

In the present study we have introduced a new conceptual framework, defined in a dynamic triangular interrelation among disarmament, development and security. In this framework we have taken a broader approach to the problem of security. In our era, national security can no longer be equated with military might. Even less can international security - that is, security for all - be so defined. Also, we demonstrate that threats to security may be aggravated in many ways, including those that go far beyond purely military threats. In fact, it was recognized by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in the very first paragraph of its Final Document, that the arms race itself has become a threat to the security of nations. Thus, disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, would directly enhance security.

National security is not a goal in itself. Its ultimate purpose must be to secure the independence and sovereignty of the national State, the freedom of its citizens, freedom and the means to develop economically, socially and culturally - which defines exactly what we mean by development. This can never be achieved by any one State at the expense of others. In a world of interdependence, only through global, or international, security will it be possible to reach the objective of national security for the ultimate goal of freedom, well-being and human dignity for people throughout the world.

Today there is an array of intensifying non-military threats which aggravate the security problems of States. Such non-military threats can be described as: widespread reductions in prospects for economic growth; existing or impending ecological stresses, resource scarcities - notably in the field of energy and certain non-renewable raw materials - and a growing world population, for today's stresses and constraints may translate into tomorrow's economic stresses and political conflicts; and the morally unacceptable and politically hazardous polarization of wealth and poverty.

The appalling dimensions of poverty, the destruction of the environment, the accelerating race for arms, and the resulting global economic malaise are largely problems of our own making. The Group states that it is well within our collective capabilities and within the earth's carrying capacity to provide for basic needs for the world's entire population and to make progress towards a more equitable economic order at a pace politically acceptable to all. In this respect, the Group reaffirms that the arms race is incompatible with the objectives of a New

International Economic Order. Of course, also in the future, economic growth is possible even with a continuing arms race, but it would be relatively slow, and very unevenly distributed both among and within regions of the world. We show, on the other hand, that a co-operative management of interdependence can be in the economic and security interests of all States. But the adoption, or rather the evolution, of such an outlook is quite improbable if the arms race continues.

It is imperative that non-military challenges to security be treated as non-military. If this is not recognized, if States fail to accept and persevere in tackling these challenges through voluntary measures and co-operation, there is a grave risk that the situation will deteriorate to the point of crisis, where, even with a low probability of success, the use of military force could be seen as a way to produce results sufficiently quickly. This is far from being a remote possibility. In recent times there has been a marked and increasing tendency in international relations actually to use or to threaten to use military force in response to non-military challenges, not only to "security", but also to the secure supply of goods and to the well-being of the nations facing those challenges.

One task defined in the Group's mandate and terms of reference was the establishment of a reliable data-base on the present-day utilization of material and human resources for military purposes. That proved impossible, since reliable data are not available for a majority of countries. Most countries, among them some major participants in the arms race, provide very little information or analyses of resources devoted to their military effort. As a result, the estimates provided in the study are largely based on data available in Western countries. In 1978, in its resolution 33/71 M, the General Assembly appealed to Governments to make available data and information relevant to a meaningful completion of the study. Four countries - Denmark, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom - responded to that request.

Nevertheless, the study has documented the fact that at least 50 million people are directly or indirectly engaged in military activities world-wide. That figure includes about 25 million in the world's armed forces, some 10 million world-wide in paramilitary forces, approximately 4 million civilians employed in defence departments, an estimated 500,000 qualified scientists and engineers engaged in research and development for military purposes, and at least 5 million

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

workers directly engaged in the production of weapons and other specialized military equipment.

There are even some indications that the actual number of persons around the world - soldiers, sailors, airmen, bureaucrats, scientists, engineers and general workers - directly or indirectly affected by the more than \$500 billion now devoted to military preparations is greater, perhaps considerably greater, than 50 million.

Conservative estimates suggest that global industrial production for military purposes in 1980 amounted to more than \$127 billion, 95 per cent of which took place in the industrialized countries. We have also calculated, although statistics are sketchy, that anything from 3 to 11 per cent of world output of a selected group of important non-energy minerals is used for military purposes, and that 5 to 6 per cent of the world's petrol is consumed by the military.

Military research and development remains by far the largest single objective of scientific enquiry and technological development. Approximately 20 per cent of the world's qualified scientists and engineers were engaged in military work, at a cost of around \$35 billion in 1980, or approximately one quarter of all expenditure on research and development. Military research and development has increased to around 10 to 15 per cent of world military spending compared with only 1 per cent before the Second World War. Here the crucial fact is that virtually all this research and development takes place in the industrialized countries, 85 per cent in the United States and the USSR alone. Adding France and Britain would push this share above 90 per cent. In 1977, the United Nations Study on the Economic and Social Consequences of the Armaments Race and of military expenditure stressed that

"military technology is moving further and further away from any conceivable civilian use, and is anyway focusing on fields which are mostly irrelevant for the solution of the more important present and future problems of the world". (A/32/88, para. 100)

That study also states that the truly remarkable fact is

"how little, not how much new has come to the civilian sector from military R and D efforts". (Ibid., para. 99)

Those conclusions are highlighted in our study. However, it stands to reason that even a modest reallocation to development objectives of the current capacity for military research and development could be expected to produce dramatic results

in fields like resource conservation and the promotion of new patterns of development better adapted to meeting the basic needs of ordinary people. This is evident, inter alia, from the fact, which is also among our findings, that, on average, a military product requires 20 times as much research and development resources as a civilian product.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

In purely financial terms, world-wide military expenditures by 1981 will exceed, as we all well know, the astounding level of \$520 billion, representing 6 per cent of world output, Member States certainly realize that this amount is roughly equivalent to the value of all investment capital in all developing countries combined.

The international trade in arms is rarely officially recorded. In spite of the lack of comprehensive data, the Group confidently estimates that more than \$35 billion is annually traded in the international arms traffic. Of this figure 75 per cent represents imports by developing countries. In itself, this is hardly surprising. The capacity of the developing countries to manufacture modern weapons is extremely limited. Weapons import is heavily concentrated in particular regions. For example, five Middle East countries alone accounted for over one third of all major weapons imported by developing countries over the period 1977-1980. On the supplier side, there is a similar concentration. Four countries - the United States, the Soviet Union, France and the United Kingdom - dominate the international traffic in arms, accounting for 80 per cent of the cumulative value of arms export in 1974-1978. Another four countries - the Federal Republic of Germany, Czechoslovakia, Italy and Poland - accounted for over 10 per cent, so that just eight countries supply over 90 per cent of the international arms trade.

The relatively uneven and limited access to data that I have indicated earlier naturally hampers analysis. Furthermore, the Group concludes that a steady reduction of secrecy, together with a gradual elimination of the arms competition, would contribute to breaking the vicious circle in which the arms race in different countries unreasonably and excessively reinforce each other. Therefore, the Group unanimously recommends a fuller and more systematic compilation and dissemination, taking into account the needs of the United Nations in terms of resolution A/35/142 B, by governments of data on the military use of human and material resources and military transfers.

The effect of the arms race on the economic and social spheres in our societies extends far beyond the fact that 5 to 6 per cent of the world's resources are not available to help satisfy socially productive needs. The very fact that these resources are spent on armaments accentuates the

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

inefficient allocation of the remaining 94 to 95 per cent, within and between nations. Three fundamental characteristics of the arms race reinforce this disallocation: first, the sheer magnitude of the volume of resources; secondly, the composition of expenditure, most particularly the stress on research and development, affecting investment and productivity in the civilian sector; thirdly, the fact that this massive effort has now been sustained for over thirty years.

If we look ahead and assume a future rate of real increase of military expenditure by, say, 2 or 3 per cent annually, which is a modest hypothesis by historical standards, the value of the additional resources that will be denied the civilian sector over the next 20 years - that is, resources over and above the present annual amount of about \$500 billion - would be equivalent to one quarter and one half respectively of current world production.

We can make similar calculations for the past. For instance, if half the funds spent on armaments throughout the world from 1970 to 1975 had instead been invested in the civilian sector, it has been calculated (United Nations Disarmament Fact Sheet No. 9, "Cost of the Arms Race", 1979) that annual output at the end of that period would have been \$200 billion higher than it actually was - a figure in excess of the aggregate gross national product of southern Asia and the mid-African regions. And mark well, this growth would most likely have been achieved without any extra demand for investment resources.

In the past many have argued that military spending is beneficial to a country because it accomplishes three things simultaneously: it increases national security, it creates jobs, and it has a generally stimulating effect on the civilian economy.

The general public believes this because it seemed to be so in the past. People saw that the war economy during 1939-1945 produced more guns and more butter simultaneously. Yet, it has been pointed out that such an inference is incorrect because we must consider the short-term and the long-term effects. Governments also generally shy away from informing the public on the real economic and social costs, particularly in longer terms, of military expenditure.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

Military outlays fall by definition into the category of consumption and not investment. As a consequence, steadily high or increasing military outlays tend to depress economic growth. This effect may be direct through displacement of investment, and indirect through constraints on productivity. The historical coexistence in the United States of America and other industrialized countries of high levels of military spending and high growth rates during the 1939-1945 war and during the 1950s and 1960s were unique phenomena which cannot be repeated and which cannot be taken as evidence of a causal relationship between military outlays and growth.

A study conducted in the late 1960s by Emile Benoit is much cited as showing that military outlays do not have negative effects on economic growth for developing countries. In reality, Benoit's own conclusion, as stated on page 4 of his book "Defence and Economic Growth in Developing Countries", was more modest. He said:

"Thus we have been unable to establish whether the net growth effects of defence expenditures have been positive or not. On the basis of all the evidence we suspect that it has been positive for the countries in our sample, and at past levels of defence burden, but we have not been able to prove this."

This suspected positive relationship has been contested as spurious, since it was simultaneously correlated with other important socio-economic factors in the economies of those developing countries. Based on today's level of research, it can now be confidently refuted. In our study we do recognize that the availability of unutilized and underutilized resources in developing countries may produce short-term results, suggesting a parallelism between high rates of growth and significant military spending, a situation which is, by the way, frequently associated with foreign dependence. In the long run, the totality of the socio-economic consequences of sizeable military outlays in these countries outweigh any short-term economic spin-offs into the civilian sector.

On the basis of the present report, and the research commissioned for it, we can confidently conclude that military budgets are dead-end expenditures in all kinds of economies, be they market, centrally planned, or mixed. Military expenditures do not foster growth. Through their inflationary

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

effects - thoroughly analysed in the study - and the general economic and political malaise to which they contribute, military spending inhibits the capital investment required for development. Through the drain on the most valuable research talents and funds, it restrains productivity gains and distorts growth in science and technology. The military sector is not a great provider of jobs. On the contrary it is shown that military outlays are among the least efficient kinds of public spending. It drains away funds that could relieve poverty and distress. The very nature of military spending heightens tensions, reduces security and underpins the system which makes even more arms necessary.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

It is widely acknowledged that the true foundation of national security is a strong and healthy economy. The present study presents overwhelming evidence that the contemporary military establishments significantly distort and undermine the very basis of sustained economic and social development in all countries. Accordingly, the Group unanimously recommends that all Governments, but particularly those of the major political and military Powers, should prepare assessments of the nature and magnitude of short- and long-term economic and social costs attributable to their military preparations so that the general public be informed of them.

The structural changes implied by the movement towards a New International Economic Order require a strong and sustained political commitment. Costs and benefits are difficult to compare in conventional ways. The costs tend to be felt sooner than the benefits. But there is little doubt that all societies would reap major benefits from a reduction in the economic burden of military activities and that there is a strong mutuality of interest between industrialized and developing countries in this respect. Therefore, the Group unanimously recommends that Governments urgently undertake studies to identify and to publicize the benefits that would be derived from the reallocation of military resources in a balanced and verifiable manner to address economic and social problems at the national level and to contribute towards reducing the gap in income that currently divides the industrialized nations from the developing world and establishing a New International Economic Order.

The Group also unanimously recommends that the United Nations Department of Public Information and other relevant United Nations organs and agencies, while continuing to emphasize the dangers of war - particularly nuclear war - should give increased emphasis in their disarmament-related public information and education activities to the social and economic consequences of the arms race and to the corresponding benefits of disarmament.

The need to view disarmament in a dynamic economic environment is elaborated in the study by examining the technological feasibility and economic potential of a process of conversion of resources from military to civilian purposes. The main object, in economic terms, is to devise short- and long-term policies designed to

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

consolidate the goal of disarmament with economic goals of growth, monetary stability, full employment and foreign trade balance. While, as a matter of course, conversion itself will have to await some measure of disarmament, preparation and research for an economic conversion policy cannot be deferred until such a time.

The defence industry everywhere is characterized, inter alia, by a high degree of geographical concentration. It also involves a considerable degree of specialization of its workforce. This apparent exclusiveness should not prove to be an unsurmountable problem, because, first, conversion and redeployment are not phenomena uniquely associated with disarmament. Any form of economic and social change represents a continuous process of conversion. Particularly in modern industrial economies, the factors of production must respond continuously to the development of new products and the phasing out of old ones and to the introduction of new production techniques; secondly, because conversion is feasible, as a significant part of military demand relates to goods and services essentially identical to civilian ones.

Primary responsibility for conversion, in an over-all sense, inevitably falls on the central Government, particularly as regards planning and initiation of preparations for such a process. The nature and extent of government involvement, following disarmament measures, in the process of conversion itself will vary from country to country, depending largely on the prevailing type of economic system. If transition is to be as smooth as possible and involve the minimum waste of finite resources, it is vital that every effort be made to anticipate the extent and the character of the conversion problems that will arise. It is therefore obvious to the Group that preparations for conversion should be among the first steps on the road to disarmament. Hence, the Group unanimously recommends that Governments create the necessary prerequisites, including preparations and, where appropriate, planning, to facilitate the conversion of resources freed by disarmament measures to civilian purposes, especially to meet urgent economic and social needs, in particular in the developing countries. This would include the creation within each country with a significant military establishment of a core of

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

people with knowledge and expertise on conversion issues; the development of contingency conversion plans by plants engaged in specialized military production; the broad involvement of all affected parties in conversion planning, including management, trade unions and national defence research institutes.

Preparing for conversion would also enhance confidence in the national as well as the multilateral disarmament climate. A society that is prepared for conversion is naturally a more credible proponent of disarmament measures. The Group therefore unanimously recommends that Governments consider making findings of experience and preparations in their respective countries available by submitting reports from time to time to the General Assembly on possible solutions to conversion problems.

As a potential asset for alternative socially productive uses, the research and development component of military outlays is of utmost significance. The 1972 report on the subject identified more than 70 possible alternative uses. Our present investigations suggest, in more elaborated and detailed ways, for instance, that production workers in the military sector could quite easily transfer their skills to the development, production and installation of solar energy devices. Environment, housing and urban renewal are other areas likely to gain from the possible rechanneling of military research and development. New transport systems, particularly in urban areas, are sorely needed and have long been regarded as a major civilian alternative for the high technology industries in the military sector.

The General Assembly required the study to indicate concrete actions to reallocate real resources released through disarmament measures to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries. In doing so, and in accordance with the additional task given to us by the General Assembly in its resolution 33/71 I, the Group has considered a French proposal presented at the tenth special session on the establishment of an international disarmament fund for development.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

Obviously, the achievement of disarmament measures which will release real resources will in the first instance most directly benefit those States which are affected by these measures. Practical ways by which disarmament may redound to the benefit of development in the developing countries may take many forms. Beside changes in economic relations to the benefit of developing countries, it is widely recognized that increasing the magnitude and predictability of flows of capital to developing countries, as grants or on concessional terms, is of vital importance. One proposed way of fostering these flows would be to establish a special fund for development to be financed from budgetary savings through the implementation of disarmament measures, as well as a levy on armaments, or voluntary contributions. The Group is unanimous in its opinion that the disarmament dividend approach to financing a fund - by which savings won by concrete disarmament measures or a portion thereof would be allocated to development needs - is most in accord with the United Nations conception of disarmament and development, as well as being the most feasible. The Group unanimously recommends that further consideration be given to establishing an international disarmament fund for development and that the administrative and technical modalities of such a fund be further investigated by the United Nations with due regard to the capabilities of the agencies and institutions presently responsible for the international transfer of resources.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

The Group has also addressed the question of increased involvement by the United Nations system in the theme of its study and the related matter of effective co-ordination. The issues that it tackles regarding resource utilization, the impact of the arms race, conversion problems and possible measures for reallocating resources could be appropriate points of reference for United Nations research, planning and educational programmes. The Group unanimously recommends that the disarmament-development relationship be incorporated in a concrete and practical way in the ongoing activities of the United Nations, its organs and specialized agencies.

An increased volume of activities, research and information related to disarmament and development, both at the national level and within the United Nations, requires increased co-ordination. The disarmament and development perspective is both interdisciplinary and interdepartmental, there being no special centre of expertise in the international dimension of the relationship nor any part of the United Nations system with this particular focus. The two bodies having lead functions in the fields of disarmament and development are the United Nations Centre for Disarmament and the Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, respectively. Bearing that in mind, the Group unanimously recommends that the Secretary-General take appropriate action, through the existing interagency consultative mechanism of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, to foster and co-ordinate the incorporation of the disarmament and development perspective in the programmes and activities of the United Nations system.

The present study represents what may prove to be the most comprehensive research effort of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. At the beginning of its work, the Group compiled a list of possible institutions and researchers which were then invited to present suggestions for research within our main areas of interest. Some 75 research proposals were received, 43 of which were commissioned, involving more than a hundred researchers throughout the world. The Group thoroughly discussed the 40 reports eventually received and would like to express its sincere appreciation of the contribution that they have made to its work.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

Ten countries contributed a total of around \$600,000 to the Disarmament Project Fund. In addition, 10 other countries have financed nationally executed research for the study. One non-governmental organization -- the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical, Professional and Technical Employees -- gave a symbolic but heartily appreciated grant.

I should like to take this opportunity to express the Group's deep feelings of gratitude towards those Governments which, by either or both of the two financing methods, have enabled the Group to initiate such a comprehensive research programme. Throughout the three years of its work, the Group has benefited from the services of competent observers from United Nations institutions as well as from a number of non-governmental organizations which, at our invitation, came to our sessions in Geneva and New York to exchange views with us on the subject of our study. In giving this presentation, I wish to pay tribute to those institutions and organizations for their valuable contributions. I also want to thank most sincerely the members of the Group and its secretariat for stimulating co-operation in carrying out the task given to us.

As instructed by the General Assembly, the Group has also had the pleasant task of making arrangements for the preparation of a short report based on the study and intended for a mass audience. With the financial assistance of the Canadian Government, the Group has arranged for an independent and well-known Canadian author and journalist to write this popular version of our study. It is hoped that it will appear in English by the end of this year. In this context, I should like to appeal to Governments to respond to the Assembly's call for the mobilization of world opinion in behalf of disarmament by facilitating the translation of the popular version into their national languages and ensuring its widespread dissemination.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

This study has in my view strengthened the economic and social case for the disarmament-development relationship by identifying military spending as an impediment to economic growth and social development and the arms race as an obstacle to the establishment of a new international economic order.

We have pointed out strategic considerations pertinent to a realistic assessment of the potentials of reversing the arms race and reducing national military outlays. We have done that by projecting the arms race as a threat to international security and by outlining the dimensions of non-military threats to national security.

The Group has indicated the political and economic potentials of rationally imperative alternatives in suggesting that policies aimed at implementing the disarmament-development relationship are likely to broaden the base of East-West détente and put the North-South dialogue into a mutually advantageous frame of reference.

The study should not be considered a completed project. It must represent the start of a process. That process must be pursued through effective implementation and follow-up measures. The study relates to the real world, to its human conditions and human prospects. It is the duty of the member States of the international community to deliberately design the process fostering world détente and world development, to the benefit of the thousands of millions of human beings inhabiting this world of ours.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): It is a special pleasure for me to extend to you, Sir, and to the other members of the Bureau my warmest congratulations upon your respective elections, and I would ask you to convey those congratulations to the Chairman of our Committee.

The particularly active role played in international relations by Yugoslavia, with which Romania maintains fraternal ties in the struggle for disarmament and international security, the widely recognized qualities as a diplomat and negotiator of our Chairman, and his rich experience in the field of multilateral diplomacy are the best guarantees that under his chairmanship the work of the Committee will be fruitful.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

Our Committee has just begun its work at a time when tension in international life continues and arouses the legitimate concern of all peoples. The deterioration of the world political climate, the continued existence added to the emergence of new hotbeds of conflict clearly show with each passing day the extremely serious consequences for peace and security and the threat to the independence of peoples represented by the continued accumulation of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, on a gigantic scale, which is in no way justified by reasons of security and which offers at all times a stimulus to recourse to force in international relations.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

Disarmament talks and negotiations have failed to influence the course of such events in any manner whatsoever and have led to virtually no concrete results insofar as the substance of such questions is concerned.

The international community is rightly disappointed at the sterility of many of the negotiations held in recent years, negotiations that have produced resolutions, reports and recommendations relating to disarmament while the arms race, instead of being slowed down in any way, has been given new and powerful impetus. Military budgets have reached unprecedented dimensions and are continuing to show a rising trend. New types and systems of weapons are being developed while existing weapons are constantly being improved, thus providing fuel for the infernal machine of action and reaction. All those developments serve merely to introduce new destabilizing elements and to enhance the danger of a destructive thermonuclear war.

As the Romanian delegation stated in the general debate in the General Assembly, it is quite obvious that the aberrant escalation of weapons has brought mankind to an impasse that requires a responsible assessment of the situation and the necessary political will to take a new and bold approach that will be capable of leading to military balance, not through an increase in weaponry but, rather, through the continued and systematic reduction of military expenditures on armed forces and weapons and through resolute disarmament measures under, first and foremost, effective control of nuclear weapons.

The President of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, stressed that if we truly want peace, if we truly want stability and confidence to prevail throughout the world, the efforts of all must constantly be subordinated to the imperative need to proceed without delay to effective negotiations for the cessation of the arms race and disarmament, first and foremost nuclear disarmament. It is high time for the peoples of the world to understand that we have reached such a level of armaments that life itself, civilization and the existence of peoples are in danger.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

Thus, Romania feels that there is no more urgent task for the United Nations than to act vigorously to achieve the adoption of concrete measures aimed at halting and reversing the arms race and at eliminating once and for all the policy of force and the threat of force.

In that connexion, the coming year could prove to be decisive in laying the foundations for a new stage in United Nations efforts to mobilize States in the cause of disarmament. There can be no doubt that the major event of that year will be the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which should provide a clear perspective on efforts aimed at halting the arms race and disarmament. In the opinion of the Romanian Government, given the present international circumstances, the special session can and should restore confidence in the fact that disarmament is truly possible and that measures designed to promote practical actions aimed at triggering an authentic disarmament process can be adopted. Aside from the conclusions to be formulated with respect to the existing situation with regard to armaments and disarmament negotiations, the goal of the special session should be to crystallize guidelines for the course and modalities of action to be followed in order to change radically the situation that prevails in this field.

The special session, in our opinion, offers from every point of view an opportunity we must not let slip. It is therefore incumbent upon all of us to prepare for its success. As we see it, it should proceed on three planes. First, the necessary conditions for the success of the session imply above all that States - and the militarily most powerful States in particular - should undertake no new measures to increase their armaments or, in other fields, any measure of such a nature as to aggravate the international situation further.

Secondly, the deliberative and negotiating bodies of the United Nations system, and first and foremost the Committee on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission, should intensify their work in order to achieve concrete results and to produce substantive reports for consideration and adoption at the special session.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

From this point of view, it is obvious that special tasks devolve on the Committee in Geneva. The elaboration of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, which we conceive as an instrument for action designed to mobilize the political will of States to implement, at agreed intervals, specific disarmament measures, first and foremost in the nuclear field, occupies a special place. Nor should it be forgotten that the mandate entrusted to the Committee cannot be regarded as having been fulfilled solely with the elaboration of the Comprehensive Programme. Its activities must be judged on the basis of progress achieved in the negotiations on the matters before it which relate, for the most part, to the nuclear field and that of weapons of mass destruction.

It is also incumbent on the Disarmament Commission, which is charged with the task of presenting a report to the special session in accordance with the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly, to carry out a number of very important tasks in the course of the coming year. We are convinced that the substantive report submitted by that plenary body, which has proved its worth in the over-all United Nations machinery for disarmament, can represent a valuable contribution to the success of next year's special session.

We also consider that the special session must take a resolute step towards the consolidation of a new and more complex approach to disarmament questions, in keeping with their interdependence vis-à-vis other major problems that face mankind.

The examination of the relationship between disarmament and development that will be put forward for consideration by the special session, as well as other proposals and initiatives by States that also encompass the reduction of military expenditures, should make it possible to associate the disarmament process with satisfaction of the economic and social needs of all countries, and in particular the developing countries, and with the elimination of under-development.

Lastly, the sound and thorough preparation of the special session implies that its Preparatory Committee, which has adopted a provisional agenda and reached agreement on the majority of the organizational questions, should at its forthcoming meeting focus its activities on a number of substantive questions.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

In the opinion of the Romanian Government, any decisive action in the field of disarmament should constantly keep in view the absolute priority to be given the nuclear field in the context of efforts aimed at halting the arms race.

The urgency of such measures has been recognized by the United Nations in more than 100 resolutions, beginning with the first decision adopted by the General Assembly, resolution 1 (I) of 24 January 1946, which provided for the elimination of atomic weapons from the arsenals of all States. The dangers nuclear weapons engender today are all the greater, both for those countries possessing them and for mankind as a whole, owing to the quantitative and qualitative development of arsenals as well as the emergence of strategic theories that tend to give credence to the inconceivable, namely, that a limited nuclear war is possible.

I would not wish to repeat here the arguments adduced by non-nuclear-weapon States in support of their repeated demands that negotiations concerning such weapons should begin without delay. The dangers for those States that result from the existence of nuclear weapon stockpiles, manipulated by others, the sharp division they create in an already divided world seeking equality, their role as a means of threat and pressure, the negative influence on the peaceful uses of the atom needed by all, these are but a few of those arguments. The Romanian delegation considers that there can be no valid argument against the initiation and completion of nuclear disarmament negotiations, while there is still time.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

That is why, and we must say this frankly, the activities of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva appear to us to be totally unsatisfactory from that point of view. The Committee's inability since its inception to begin concrete negotiations within certain working groups on the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and the reduction of existing stockpiles up to their total elimination, as well as on the prohibition of nuclear tests, gives us reason not only for displeasure, but also for growing concern. A similar situation obtains with respect to negotiations on the elaboration of security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States. Although a working group, which has been functioning for three years, was established within the Committee, the progress achieved is certainly unsatisfactory. We are compelled to state unequivocally that in our view the true test of the activities of the Committee on Disarmament will be the manner in which it will achieve concrete results in the nuclear field. Therefore, in the course of next year, while also taking into account the prospect of the special session, it is necessary to create from the very outset special working groups on nuclear disarmament which should initiate effective negotiations, and act resolutely to work out international arrangements in order to arrive at a system of real guarantees covering all non-nuclear-weapon States.

Our delegation appreciates as well-founded and just the proposal put forward by the Soviet delegation asking that anyone who uses atomic weapons first be declared a criminal. We must consider that whoever prepares to use atomic weapons against other States is in fact pursuing a policy against mankind which should be combatted by all peoples, who must act now to stop the trends towards the use of such weapons, because after their use it will be too late. That is why we believe that everything must be done to halt the production of nuclear weapons and prohibit their use, for they represent the gravest danger for peace and mankind.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

A number of the items on our agenda dealing with the creation of denuclearized zones in various parts of the world forcefully bear witness to the desire of the large majority of States to be left outside the dangerous nuclear sphere and to be shielded from the peril represented by such weapons. My country's delegation which, over the years, has advanced on more than one occasion proposals aimed at transforming the Balkans into a non-nuclear zone, a zone of friendship, peace and good-neighbourliness, supports those initiatives and believes that their implementation would constitute concrete steps towards a world where atomic weapons would be excluded for good.

Stressing the absolute priority of nuclear disarmament, Romania also supports the adoption of measures aimed at the prohibition of chemical and radiological weapons, new weapons and weapons systems of mass destruction - questions which also appear on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva. In this connexion we support the proposal of the neutral and non-aligned countries members of the Group of 21 in the Committee to review the mandate of the working group on chemical weapons in order to provide expressly that the objective of its activities is the negotiation of a treaty prohibiting chemical weapons. We are also of the opinion that special attention should be given to the question of new weapons and weapons systems of mass destruction, in the light of existing priorities - an area in which the Geneva Committee should work actively.

Romania believes that a task of the highest importance and urgency is the freezing and reduction of military expenditures, the only rational alternative to the culpable and dangerous squandering of material and human resources for destructive purposes. In our view this is the only approach that is consistent with the responsibilities of States and, first and foremost, the most powerfully armed States, to the cause of peace and international security, and it is in keeping with this position of principle that my country has requested the inclusion of an item relating to the reduction of military budgets in the agenda of the last few sessions of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

The present dimensions of military expenditures represent an unbearable burden for all peoples, a major obstacle on the path to economic and social progress and to the solution of fundamental problems for the present and future of mankind. The more than \$550 billion swallowed up by weaponry intensifies the economic and financial crisis, nurtures instability and contributes to the perpetuation and aggravation of underdevelopment. The conclusion of the report on the disarmament development relationship, which was introduced today by the representative of Sweden, Mrs. Inga Thorsson, Chairman of the Group of Experts, shows clearly these nefarious consequences.

The first special session devoted to disarmament decided that Member States should consider new ways and means of reducing military budgets. During the last few sessions of the General Assembly, it was decided by consensus to give new impetus to efforts to conclude agreements on the freezing, reduction or any other balanced limitation of military budgets.

Effective support along these lines, as has just been pointed out by the head of the Romanian delegation in the general debate, would be the conclusion, at this session, of an agreement on freezing military budgets at the 1981 level.

Such a decision is imperatively demanded in view of the urgency of the moment we live in which cannot be ignored. We must all become conscious of our responsibility, and our obligations to the international community must prevail over differences of opinion concerning technical questions relating to the approach to the problem.

At this year's session of the Disarmament Commission, in accordance with the mandate entrusted to it, work was begun on the identification and elaboration of principles to govern the reduction of military budgets, on the basis of a working paper submitted by the delegations of Romania and Sweden (A/CN.10/26).

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

The elaboration of principles seeks to record the agreement of States Members on the objectives they pursue and on the political and security co-ordinates which define the ways and practical means of achieving such objectives.

The consideration of the document and the proposals put forward on this subject which has just begun in the Disarmament Commission was marked by a decision to continue, at its forthcoming substantive session, negotiations with a view to identifying and elaborating principles governing new actions by States to halt and reduce military expenditures, with the possibility of codifying such principles in an appropriate document when the occasion arises.

The Romanian delegation wishes to reaffirm its conviction that their adoption in the form of a declaration by the second special session devoted to disarmament would be a major contribution by the United Nations to the cessation of the dangerous escalation of military expenditures.

We reserve the right to make a special statement on the problems of military budgets in the subsequent discussions of this Committee.

As a European country, Romania, quite naturally attaches the highest importance to the strengthening of security, peace and co-operation in Europe which, without a doubt, would have constructive effects on the general climate world-wide. Like other European States, Romania notes with special concern the accumulation on our continent of the most powerful military arsenals, both conventional and nuclear, including the stationing and development of new nuclear medium-range missiles.

The Romanian delegation believes it would be especially important for the General Assembly to speak out resolutely against the stationing and development in Europe of new nuclear medium-range missiles and in favour of starting as early as possible concrete negotiations to eliminate such missiles and nuclear weapons in general, from the continent.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

We believe that all European States, which have a vital interest in this question, should participate in such negotiations. We also speak out against the production of the neutron bomb, which is still planned for Europe. Bearing in mind the existing situation in Europe and the fact that 80 per cent of world arms expenditures are made by States signatories of the Helsinki Final Act, we believe that it is exceptionally important that the Madrid meeting should lead to positive results, and first of all to the convening of a conference devoted to the strengthening of confidence and to disarmament in Europe, which conference would become an essential component of an effective process of disarmament.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

In attaching such high importance to a successful conclusion for the Madrid meeting, we believe that we must do everything in our power to ensure that that meeting gives a new, powerful impetus for the policy of détente and for the comprehensive implementation of the documents signed at Helsinki.

Among the vigorous actions to be undertaken in order to bring the disarmament negotiations out of the deadlock in which they find themselves, the United Nations should continue to intensify its activities aimed at mobilizing world public opinion, the masses of the people and all progressive circles while informing the peoples of the world of the development of the arms race and the dangers involved.

We must openly tell our peoples the whole truth, and must prevent the creation of the illusion that they can live calmly and securely while ever more enormous means of destruction continue to accumulate. It is for the United Nations to assume special responsibilities for facilitating the widest possible dissemination of information concerning the existing situation in the field of weapons and armaments and the development and results of disarmament negotiations. It is more necessary than ever for all world political forces to act vigorously to improve the international political climate, to reduce and eliminate the risk of war and to take real steps along the path of reducing military arsenals. As was emphasized at the international scientific meeting, entitled "Scientists and Peace", held recently at Bucharest, we must ensure that man's genius, and science and technology are used not for making weapons, nor for destructive purposes, but exclusively for peaceful ends, to speed up the development of the least-developed countries, to solve the problems of energy and food and to ensure the economic and social progress of all peoples. The adoption of measures likely to stimulate the interest of world public opinion in disarmament will create the basis for broad international support for the disarmament actions agreed upon next year.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

Among the many items relating to disarmament included in the agenda of the Committee, the Romanian delegation in this statement has concentrated its attention on the ones I have singled out. I should like to assure the Committee of our desire to make a constructive contribution, in the spirit of the opening statement made by the Chairman, to its deliberations during both the general debate and the discussion of submitted proposals.

Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): Sir, please convey my delegation's congratulations to the Chairman on being elected to lead the First Committee in its deliberations. His country, Yugoslavia, is well known for its contributions to the field of disarmament. Similarly, his personal skills as an effective negotiator are unquestionable. My delegation also extends sincere congratulations to you, Sir, and other members of the bureau and would wish to assure you that the Bahamas stands ready to assist you in finding ways to enhance a fruitful conclusion to our work at this session.

I spent a number of days pondering over the approach my delegation's intervention should take in the general debate. Quite frankly, I had adopted the attitude that there were no appeals left that would summon the immediate co-operation of those States that were convinced that arms build-up would best serve as a deterrent to war rather than as a threat to international security.

However, after listening to the deliberations during the last session of the Preparatory Committee for the second special session on disarmament, I realized that it is human folly, fear, distrust and, yes, perhaps even selfish interest that are retarding positive growth in disarmament. Jay Cantor, in the issue of 4 September last of The New York Times, put my thoughts in another perspective. He said:

"The mobilization for war puts everything and everyone in their places, provides the rigidity that society prefers instead of change". (The New York Times, 4 September 1981, p. A23)

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

It seems that despite our awareness of the physical destruction and human tragedy that have resulted from wars or conflicts, whether by primitive, conventional or atomic weapons, mankind is still unwilling to seek another plan of action. Of course, disarmament is still a household word, but it is losing its savour. It is becoming a misnomer. My delegation feels that one of the reasons for this is that, except for media data highlighting pockets of regional conflicts, to many in this ivory tower the world is calm and nations sit with fingers crossed that nothing major would happen to trigger a large-scale, global confrontation that may prompt deployment of new and sophisticated nuclear weapons.

Another difficulty is that my delegation accepts the view that disarmament is synonymous with peace. Both words are passive, nondescript, intangible expressions which oftentimes elicit nothing more than intellectual or philosophical posturings on the part of negotiators. Concerned with this assumption, I tried to find substitutes for these terms, but so far nothing seems as comprehensive, or as applicable. In my search for new signals, I ran across John Burton's Theory of Peace, from which I extracted two of his suggestions.

The first of these is as follows:

"The call for disarmament has been made in past ages in the interests of economy, as a means of avoiding war, and on the basis of pure reason. In the nuclear age it is a call with urgency; it is a plea for surviving".

The second is more pertinent, in that it strikes the nerve of the problem:

"Yet in all the discussion of disarmament there was little talk of a disarmed world. No examination seems to have been made of how to resolve conflict in a disarmed world, of how spheres of influence would be controlled without leading to further political conflict, of how smaller and independent nations would be protected, or of other obvious related problems of disarmament".

Coupled with these is another thought-provoking comment:

"The problem is to determine the nature of a disarmed world, for without it there can be no disarmament. This means determining a condition of peace."

Given those evaluations, my delegation has no alternative but to think that the nuclear-weapon and near-nuclear-weapon States are not willing to accept the theory that a world without arms is a world without war. It is evident that, in their struggle for supremacy or for recognition, they may well be preparing unwittingly for war rather than searching for peace-cum-disarmament.

After this soul-searching, my frustrations increased because I had no magic formula to present that would cure mankind of the fear to which I referred earlier. In this regard, I trust that representatives will overlook my lack of reference to statistics, even though they have served as good guidelines for making decisions. Furthermore, I did not want to dwell on that factor, as there are numerous reports on the size of the arsenals maintained by many States as well as expenditures under military budgets as compared with those for economic and social development. It seems also that the current statistical trend is to show the disasters that could result from the employment of nuclear weapons, whether by accident or by a malfunction of the machinery.

Yet my delegation is aware that a blasé attitude to this very important question is just as detrimental. For example, we cannot rest on the belief that the super-Powers are too knowledgeable and too rational about the dangers of war to do anything drastic. A posture of silence can be likened to the anecdote "The arms race is like a horse with a broken leg: you may shoot the horse, but that will not cure the leg".

Consequently, I have decided to participate in the debate on selected agenda items allocated to this Committee and to supplement my views with critical comments from experts in the field of disarmament.

First, we must ask ourselves what is meant by general and complete disarmament. I indicated earlier that in order to understand that concept we must come to grips with man's aggressive nature and the consequences of a disarmed world. Committees charged with the question of disarmament have made several proposals, and one step in that direction is support for the establishment of regional weapon-free zones. While Member States seem to have accepted the Treaty of Tlatelolco, making Latin America a nuclear-weapon-free zone, the call for similar developments in Africa, the Indian Ocean, the Middle East and South Asia is buried in a plethora of political warfare. Even some of the agreements that have been reached on this subject are now threatened by re-negotiation.

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

Bertrand Russell, in his article Has Man a Future?, rightly expresses ambivalence regarding the viability of complete disarmament when he states that

"General disarmament, though immensely important and desirable, would not, if achieved, be enough in itself to secure a stable peace. So long as scientific technique continues to be understood, any major war that might break out would lead to the manufacture of nuclear weapons by both sides, and whatever even more deadly weapons had been foreseen during the previous years of peace. But although disarmament, for this reason, is not alone sufficient, it is a very essential step without which no other can lead to much of value."

I think that what needs greater evaluation here is that the improbability of the terminology should not be used as an excuse for not trying to achieve it.

Secondly, at the last session, representatives expressed disappointment that ratification of SALT II had not come about; it seems unlikely that much progress will be made in that vein during the current session. The delegation of the Bahamas is heartened, none the less, that the United States and the Soviet Union have agreed to reopen talks later this year. The United States Secretary of State and the Soviet Union's Foreign Minister both stated that although their Governments' objective was not a competition for supremacy, they would meet the challenge in maintaining the balance of power and not permit anyone to become superior to them. Given the nuances, and the paradox of such a philosophy, I trust that the super-Powers will become more flexible and less preoccupied with which country is more powerful in terms of the accumulation of strategic weapons.

Thirdly, each year, all committees are allocated items that - like television programmes - are spin-offs of unresolved items. In both cases, this is a form of exploitation. Whereas the television programme often produces profit, the repetitious committee items create greater confusion. My delegation feels that there are a number of items on the question of disarmament that could be combined and that in this way the task of implementation could be less complicated.

Another view is that the substance of some of the items, because of their titles' uncontroversial nature or their obvious relevance to the promotion of disarmament, gets lost in the maze of the different interpretations of consensus. I know that the following is a harsh indictment, but it seems that the more we agree the more we disagree, which makes any implementation of consensus texts accidental at best. Otherwise, how do we account for such a dearth of similar texts?

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

There ought to be a concerted effort to shorten the agenda and devote more time to the construction of consensus texts on a comprehensive test ban, nuclear non-proliferation, and the use of chemical, nuclear and conventional weapons, to name a few areas. If only three of those polarized subjects could achieve genuine political endorsement, mankind would feel less threatened by references to the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

We talk about confidence-building measures and political will to effect such things as arms control, arms limitation and total disarmament, but unless words are translated into action all our efforts will be vain.

Fourthly, in June and July 1982 the international community will gather for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The first special session devoted to disarmament in 1978 produced a Final Document which is considered to be sacred, but certain statements made during our deliberations at the last preparatory session cause my delegation to wonder if that reverence is still applicable. My delegation concurs wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed by the Ambassador of Brazil who, last Friday, pinpointed some of the barriers we face in finding effective solutions to our dilemma. It is evident that we need a set of agreed guidelines, imperfect though they may seem to us at first light. But we must remember that the fault is not in the written word but rather in our own changing natures. I am convinced that if we are serious about our work and are desirous of producing those measures that would promote and strengthen international peace and security, we have the will to do so.

If nothing else, my delegation would wish to see a change in the approach to the issues before us as outlined in the adopted agenda for the second special Assembly session devoted to disarmament. It seems to me that we have narrowed the options for peace and disarmament by qualifying our terms and singling out those areas we consider to be of greatest danger to human survival. What we are doing through that method, however, is concentrating on the parts, and not on the whole. That is not all bad, but unless we keep the whole picture before us we could continue to make slight progress in some areas, such as the limitation of nuclear and chemical weapons, while there would be a build-up in the area of conventional and other kinds of supposedly less harmful weapons.

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

It is imperative, then, that we agree on our priorities and insist that they be given urgent and conscientious attention if we are to show any semblance of progress on this delicate, sensitive, yet volatile question of disarmament.

I regret to say that if the developments at the 1982 session do not exceed the stage of accomplishment achieved at the 1978 session, the international community would be wasting precious time, thereby plunging the cause for disarmament into an even deeper abyss of uncertainty and frustration. Member States should not be satisfied with a mere rehashing of the text of the Final Document from unilateral positions. We should have passed that stage. We must recognize the power of interdependence. All talks during this era termed a Disarmament Decade ought to be translated into positive action and nations should support all measures, especially those of a regional nature, geared toward positive and concrete solutions to arms control.

As at the 1978 session, my delegation is pleased to see the recognition given to non-governmental organizations who have been catalysts in this struggle for peace and disarmament. Their participation will, no doubt, bring new impetus to the cause for peace. Another positive element is that the church is beginning to take a more active role in promoting the idea of disarmament. Young people throughout North America and parts of Europe form model United Nations for the purpose of grappling with solutions to the arms race and other international issues.

The Centre for Disarmament in conjunction with the Department of Public Information, should be congratulated for their efforts in disseminating data on disarmament. They should be encouraged to seek as many new and practical techniques as possible to awaken the public, governments, specialized agencies and private organizations to service they can render, not only for this special session but throughout the decade. My delegation welcomed the suggestions contained in the working paper by the Secretariat in document A/AC.206/18 of 14 October 1981.

Fifthly, my delegation is pleased to see the interest that small developing countries are showing toward the study of disarmament. They are realizing that active participation is a very effective weapon for change. I am doubly delighted that they are not only speaking out against the evils of proliferation of weapons

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

of mass destruction, proposing measures to enhance the establishment of regional weapon-free-zones, the reduction of military budgets, confidence-building measures and comprehensive programmes of disarmament, but also presenting programmes to promote the link between disarmament and economic and social development.

My delegation will read with interest the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Development and International Co-operation", by a group of experts chaired by Mrs. Thorsson of Sweden.

The correlation here is unmistakable, and in debates on economic issues at the Organization of African Unity, the Commonwealth Heads of Government Conference, the Ottawa Summit and our own Global Round, nations are urged to bring pressure on those systems which disregard the collective responsibility for protecting mankind against hunger, poverty and economic disaster, while upgrading military defence. My delegation hopes that a similar spirit would prevail at Cancun.

Mr. J. K. Galbraith, a well-known economist, author and political adviser, referred to the worthwhileness of United Nations studies on disarmament and development, and stated poignantly:

"The arms race as it now proceeds does not strengthen free institutions or free enterprise or however we denote our economic and social system. On the contrary, it is gravely weakening that system. And if or when in some moment of error, anger, or panic, this rage goes out of control - if there is a nuclear exchange, large or as some now imagine limited - what is called free enterprise or capitalism will not survive. Nor will free institutions. All will be shattered beyond recovery. So, equally, of course, will be what is now called communism. Capitalism, socialism, and communism are all sophisticated social forms relevant only to the advanced world as it has now developed."

Sixthly, the Foreign Minister of the Bahamas, Mr. Paul Adderley, in his address to the General Assembly on 6 October 1981 said:

"Our age is at present consumed in a contest between the major Powers and their allies for the allegiance of the world, either through friendship or through fear. At the core of the contest are the competing ideologies of the major Powers, which they see as representing the sources of their cultures and civilizations." (A/36/PV.27, p. 43)

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

It would be unrealistic of this Committee to deny or ignore what is commonly referred to as East-West tensions, but we ought to try to promote communication instead of confrontation when difficulties arise in those areas. For, as Flora Lewis rightly states in her editorial in the 11 September issue of The New York Times,

"East and West do have an overriding mutual interest in preventing nuclear war. But they haven't done much to figure out how. It is ever more urgent, as weapons improve, to open broad talks on both sides' concepts of security. Without such a context, rival missile counting isn't likely to bring essential agreements." (The New York Times, 11 September 1981, p. A27)

Despite the tenor of gloom that may have seeped into my statement, my delegation sees a purpose in this yearly exercise. It is convinced that something good comes from constant contact, even if only through osmosis. It is fair to say, then, that 36 years of effort have produced some positive results, however small.

Let me sum up my comments by quoting once more an appropriate paragraph from a report from the Foreign Office of the United Kingdom:

"In the world today disarmament cannot be regarded in isolation as a purely technical problem (and the technical difficulties alone are immense. There can be progress on disarmament only if the deep-rooted mistrust between the two Power blocs can be lessened; and this can be only a gradual, slow process. The key to disarmament is to build up confidence between the two sides and for this international inspection is needed."

Using the United Nations as a base, large and small nations must agree on ways to implement peace. In this and other Committees we may tend to blame the powerful nations for the stalemate in the disarmament process; but while such a general view would be an imbalanced one, to say the least, in the field of disarmament the greater blame rests squarely on the shoulders of the nuclear States and, in particular, the super-Powers. The less intransigent they are in adopting positive measures, the greater the chances for universal acceptance of a disarmed world.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of the United States, Mr. Adelman, has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. Before calling on him, I should like to remind Members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements made in exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): This morning I spoke to set a positive and constructive tone for the First Committee throughout its deliberations. I asked the Soviet representative, as all others in this hall, to focus on facts and evidence and truth, both historical and evidential in nature, and to refrain from empty polemics and rhetoric. Unfortunately, some two hours after a call for serious deliberation, the Soviet representative gave a litany of charges without substantiation. In particular, he indicted the United States for turning outer space into a new theatre of the "arms race". This again is just not true. I regret that such rhetorical claims continue to be made, particularly by the only country to engage in such practices.

As pointed out at some length this morning, there has been no super-Power "arms race" at all over the last decade. The Soviets have been building steadily and determinedly at 4 to 5 per cent real growth each and every year, while the United States is devoting 25 per cent fewer resources to defence than 12 years ago. By no definition can that be deemed a "race" in any serious vein.

Secondly, the Soviet representative spoke as if his country has not engaged and is not engaging in any military activities in outer space. Again, the contrary is true. The Soviet Union is the only country in the world continually to test the only operational anti-satellite system which exists. The demonstrated Soviet non-nuclear low altitude orbital anti-satellite interceptor poses a known, if at present limited, threat to some United States satellites. It is anticipated that the Soviets will continue work in this area with the goal of negating satellites in high orbit, as well as developing more effective "kill" mechanisms, perhaps using a laser or some other type of directed energy weapons.

The evidence indicates that the Soviet space programme as a whole is almost purely military in direction and in orientation. The USSR has been launching satellites at four to five times the United States rate,

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

and with as much as 10 times the payload. Their research and development effort in the military uses of outer space has been and is today nothing short of staggering.

Thirdly, let me refer to the Soviet representative's mention of what he called this afternoon the 'myth of the Soviet military threat'. Noble freedom fighters in Afghanistan realize that this is no myth. People in Western Europe, Africa and Asia have long realized that this is no myth. Rather it is a serious problem for supporters of freedom, of non-aggression and of true self-determination around the world.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.