

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION
*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE
10th meeting
held on
Friday, 23 October 1981
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 10TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

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

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Ulrichsen (Denmark)
Mr. Dashtseren (Mongolia)
Mr. Mweu (Kenya)
Mr. Martini Urdaneta (Venezuela)
Mr. Rossides (Cyprus)
Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan)

UN LIBRARY

OCT 28 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.

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

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

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ULRICHSEN (Denmark): Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to congratulate you and the other officers of the Committee on your election. We are looking forward to working under your wise guidance and, if I may add, I have very personal reasons for being happy to work under the guidance of a Chairman from Yugoslavia. Your vast experience and skills will undoubtedly contribute to a successful outcome of our work.

Last Tuesday, 20 October, the representative of the United Kingdom made a statement in this Committee on behalf of the ten member States of the European Community. While fully adhering to that statement, I should like to express some additional considerations of the Danish Government.

Arms control and disarmament negotiations do not take place in a vacuum. We must face the realities of today's world. International tension has not diminished since the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. On the contrary, we are witnessing the flaring up and continuation of conflicts in various parts of the world which contain a serious risk of escalation.

In this situation, it is more than ever necessary to try to maintain a dialogue and to continue the disarmament negotiations at all levels and in good faith. It is not only a moral obligation for all nations, but also a necessity for obtaining the stability and security from which we would all prosper. A reversal of the arms race would also increase the possibilities for reallocating resources to solve the social and economic problems that are faced by so many countries, and particularly the poorest ones. To obtain undiminished security at a lower level of armaments is an obligation for all nations on the long road to general and complete disarmament.

Arms control and disarmament measures in the nuclear field must be given the highest priority. We must halt and reverse the present nuclear arms race and at the same time convince more States to refrain from seeking nuclear explosive capability.

(Mr. Ulrichsen, Denmark)

That goal will not be achieved by augmenting nuclear stockpiles or creating new sophisticated variations of nuclear arms. The goal can only be reached by strengthening present treaties and by negotiating additional agreements. The Non-Proliferation Treaty should be adhered to by all States. The full-scope safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) should be applied to all nuclear activities in non-nuclear-weapon States and be made a requirement by exporting countries in this field.

Likewise, the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty adhered to by all States would have a positive influence on the endeavours to curb the nuclear arms race, and at the same time effectively prevent both horizontal and vertical proliferation. We would welcome an early resumption of the trilateral talks on a comprehensive test ban and we express the hope that it will be possible soon to finalize a comprehensive test ban in the international negotiating forum, the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Ulrichsen, Denmark)

A decisive factor in halting the tremendous build-up of nuclear arms by the super-Powers would be new SALT negotiations. Through the years we have witnessed a heavy arms build-up by one side and with a new programme for intercontinental nuclear arms by the other side the nuclear arsenals will be further increased. We therefore urge the Soviet Union and the United States to resume the SALT negotiation process without delay with a view to obtaining substantial reductions of nuclear weapons as part of a new SALT agreement.

I now turn briefly to the situation in Europe. We look with particular concern at the considerable build-up of theatre nuclear forces in Europe. It is of the greatest importance that the most serious efforts now be undertaken in order to bring about essential reductions of nuclear arms in Europe, thereby reversing the trend of an increasing nuclear-build-up with new and terrible weapons systems. We therefore welcome the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union will initiate formal negotiations in Geneva on 30 November and we hope that those negotiations will soon lead to results.

The Danish Government regards the follow-up meeting in Madrid of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe as an important component of the ongoing dialogue between East and West. Denmark will continue to work for a balanced and substantial outcome in Madrid. We want significant progress as to the human dimension of détente, and we will spare no effort to secure a precise mandate for a conference on disarmament in Europe in accordance with the proposal submitted by France. In our view, this constitutes a reasonable text which pays due regard to the legitimate interests of all parties.

From the Danish point of view we attach great importance to the negotiations in Vienna on mutual and balanced force reductions. During the negotiations, which have now entered their eighth year, considerable progress has been made, even if concrete results in the form of agreed reductions have not yet emerged.

(Mr. Ulrichsen, Denmark)

On the international scene it has been promising that the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament during its two substantive sessions has been able to fulfil by consensus the goals set for those sessions. During the session just completed the Committee fixed the dates and the agenda for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. All States will now have the opportunity to make thorough preparations for this important special session of the General Assembly. The second special session will provide the world community with an opportunity to reflect on what has been achieved since 1978 in the field of disarmament and on the reasons why certain measures have not yet been achieved, to analyse the causes of the arms race and to consider further ways to facilitate the implementation of the recommendations adopted at the first special session on disarmament. We all have an obligation to contribute to a realistic and meaningful outcome of the session.

Another promising development was the opening for signature of the United Nations Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects. Subject to ratification, Denmark signed the Convention on the opening date, 10 April 1981. The ratification procedure is now in progress and it is the hope of my Government that as many States as possible will be able to accede to the Convention so as to make it universally applicable. Through its provisions on review and follow-up, the Convention will, we hope, set in motion a process which will lead to further advances in international efforts towards alleviating the sufferings of civilians and combatants alike during armed conflicts.

Pursuing the objective of ensuring observation of the substantive provisions of the Convention and its annexed Protocols, we call upon States to give further study to the question of an appropriate and effective mechanism to facilitate implementation of the Convention and to recommend that this question be further examined in future considerations and negotiations concerning the follow-up of the Convention.

(Mr. Ulrichsen, Denmark)

We are grateful for the comprehensive annual report from the Committee on Disarmament. The report shows how intensively the formal and informal deliberations in Geneva were carried out this year. Although no concrete results were obtained, a solid basis for further discussions was created, not least in the Working Group on Chemical Weapons under the energetic chairmanship of Sweden. For the time being Denmark is not a member of the Committee on Disarmament, but, having enjoyed official observer status in 1981, we have had the opportunity of following the work of the Committee and of contributing to it. We intend to apply for the same status at next year's session.

The United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) held its third substantive session in May-June this year. The Commission adopted its final report to the General Assembly by consensus but, as will be seen, spectacular results were lacking. In view of the shortened period of time and the heavy workload placed upon the UNDC this is hardly a surprising although still a disappointing result. Anyway, it is our opinion that the deliberations of the UNDC provide concrete ground for further progress in our work.

Denmark attaches great importance to the work done by the Secretary-General, with the assistance of experts, in carrying out studies on various items related to disarmament. We welcome the new studies presented to this session of the General Assembly, notably on disarmament and development and on confidence-building measures. These and other studies will create a valuable background for the deliberations at the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

In resolution 35/156 A, proposed by Denmark, the General Assembly approved in principle the carrying out of a study on all aspects of the conventional arms race. It was left to the UNDC at its 1981 session to work out the modalities for the study. A very useful and profound discussion took place in the UNDC, but the necessary consensus was not reached. Because of the urgency of the matter, not least with regard to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and because we feel that the world community cannot just ignore this huge category of weapons, even if they go under the name "conventional", Denmark intends to submit a draft resolution at this session of the United Nations General Assembly on the immediate convening of the group of experts and the beginning of its work on the basis of the deliberations in the UNDC. We are at present conducting consultations with members of that Committee to this effect. My delegation will revert to this subject in due course.

Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, the Mongolian delegation would like to congratulate you on your election to your responsible post and at the same time to express its conviction that under your skilful and experienced guidance the Committee will be able successfully to tackle the items on the agenda before it and take important decisions on them. We should like also to congratulate the Vice-Chairmen, Ambassador Yango of the Philippines and Ambassador Carias of Honduras, and the Rapporteur, Mr. Makonnen of Ethiopia.

In our statement today the Mongolian delegation would like to dwell particularly on the new proposal made by the Soviet Union with regard to the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe and the adoption of a declaration on this subject by the General Assembly, the draft of which is before the present session of the General Assembly. The head of my delegation, the Foreign Minister of the Mongolian People's Republic, Mr. Dugersuren, in his statement in the general debate on 29 September of this year, expressed the full support of the Mongolian People's Republic for that proposal, which it regards as an extremely urgent and timely one and the best response to the requirements of the present international situation.

The entire course of current events on the international scene has placed the question of removing the threat of a nuclear war in the forefront of the efforts of the world community to curb the arms race and to reduce tension throughout the world. It is no accident that this was echoed as a leitmotiv in the statements of the overwhelming majority of the delegations that spoke in the general debate concluded recently.

An ever-growing impetus is being given to the world movement demanding the ending of the threat of nuclear war, and it now encompasses broader schools of the population in various parts of the world. No sensible and unprejudiced person today, I believe, could fail to regard nuclear war as being fraught with fatal consequences for the very existence of life and civilization on earth. Nuclear weapons have, since their first appearance, undergone a tremendous evolution - it might even be called a revolution. They have proliferated both quantitatively and qualitatively. Scientific and technological progress engendered the so-called technological arms race, wherein the main thrust is related to the qualitative aspect of armaments. The present state of the nuclear arsenals in itself makes the very idea of nuclear war, however it may be conceived by the

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

authors of the various projects, something that is both senseless and suicidal. For that reason the mindless adventurism of the militaristic circles of the West is thrown into sharp relief - particularly those of the United States, which, having set itself the task of attaining military superiority, is gradually pushing the world into the abyss of a new phase of the arms race, which is fraught with the danger of a possible further exacerbation of the world situation and increases the threat of the outbreak of war. It is precisely the purpose of the sharp increase in the military budget of the United States to devise new and even more dangerous systems of nuclear and ballistic weapons and of its decision to go ahead with full-scale production of neutron weapons, its increased activity in connexion with plans to station American medium-range missiles in Europe and its plans to militarize outer space.

As is well known, in order to justify the present new spiral of the arms race, use is being made of the battery of old familiar arguments as well as various new theses and doctrines which are designed to mislead not only the people of that country but the world public as a whole. Behind the smoke-screen of the threadbare myth of the so-called growing Soviet threat, a strategy is being devised for a so-called restricted nuclear war, as attested to by the notorious Directive No. 59 of President Carter, which has been adopted as part of the arsenal of the present Administration of the United States.

Once again the concept of a preventive strike has been aired. We believe that the most dangerous aspect of this is to be found in the attempts in those circles to make world public opinion accept the idea of the permissibility, the acceptability and even the inevitability of nuclear war. Attempts are being made to instil the monstrous idea that it would be possible to survive such a war. Any nuclear clash, however limited it might be at the outset, would in the final analysis lead to catastrophe for all mankind.

Such a situation makes necessary urgent and active efforts by all States to prevent nuclear war. Therefore the Mongolian delegation believes that the United Nations, whose main purpose it is to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, can and indeed should unambiguously condemn the idea of being the first to use nuclear weapons. The adoption of a solemn declaration that States and statesmen that were the first to resort to the use of nuclear weapons

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

would thereby be committing a heinous crime against mankind would be a step of immense political importance, and would indeed help to create an atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding among States. The particular merit of such a declaration, as we see it, would be that it would draw the attention of statesmen directly involved in the decision-making process with regard to State problems including the question of the use of nuclear weapons, to the fact that they bear tremendous responsibility and that there can never be any justification or forgiveness for any statesman who decides that his country will be the first to use nuclear weapons. If such a provision were to be included in the declaration, it would place a universal obligation upon statesmen to act in such a way as to prevent and remove the threat of the outbreak of war. Naturally, if all countries, and primarily the nuclear-weapon Powers, were to undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and if they strictly abided by that, the problem of the use of nuclear weapons would in itself quite simply disappear from the agenda, and also there would be no further need to produce, develop and accumulate nuclear weapons.

My delegation considers the provision in the draft declaration that would condemn any doctrine permitting the first to use nuclear weapons or any action which pushes the world towards catastrophe as being incompatible with the laws of human morality and the high ideals of the United Nations.

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

We believe that such a condemnation would serve as a serious warning to those circles who cannot see their way to giving up the times of the cold war and the doctrines of a pre-emptive strike, brinkmanship, and so on. Equally important is that provision which would make it a direct responsibility of the leaders of States possessing nuclear weapons to act in such a way as to do away with the very possibility and danger of the outbreak of nuclear war. This logically stems from that particular responsibility which the nuclear States bear towards the peoples of the world in preserving and strengthening universal peace and security.

The Mongolian delegation holds the well-considered view that all countries, both great and small, both nuclear and non-nuclear, can and should play a substantial part in efforts to prevent war and in carrying out the vital task of restricting and putting an end to the arms race and bringing about disarmament. This would be served by including in the declaration a provision to the effect that the nuclear arms race should be halted and reversed by joint efforts, through honest and equitable negotiations. In present conditions, there is no other possible option than to bring about a situation whereby nuclear energy can only be used for peaceful purposes and only to serve the well being of mankind.

In the light of what I have said, my delegation expresses the hope that the draft declaration on the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe which has been presented by the delegation of the Soviet Union will win general support and will be adopted by the General Assembly.

These, then, were the points we wished to make in connexion with the new item which has been proposed by the Soviet Union for this session of the General Assembly. We should like to reserve our right to speak on other aspects of disarmament at a somewhat later stage in the work of the Committee.

Mr. MWEU (Kenya): Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to congratulate you on your unanimous election as Chairman of this Committee, together with the other officers of the Committee. I am confident that, under your able leadership, our deliberations in this Committee will be fruitful.

(Mr. Mweu, Kenya)

Once again, we have a chance to look at the urgent issues that appear on the list of items of the agenda of this Committee during the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. The majority of the items have appeared again and again before this Committee without a satisfactory or conclusive result being attained. In some cases we have been forced to retreat. The item of the agenda calling reduction of military budgets has been before the General Assembly for over eight years now, and there is no evidence to show that that call has been heeded. On the contrary, there has been a massive increase in military expenditure that has thrown the economies of many countries out of joint. These increases are at the heart of nagging and persistent inflation. A United Nations study of 1978, which examined the relationship between military expenditure and current economic problems of high unemployment, inflation, recession and low growth, regards high military expenditure as a contributory factor to the depletion of natural resources which, once absorbed by a missile or a submarine, are not available to the economy to generate employment. The Wall Street Journal recently reported that:

"military spending is particularly inflation-producing, because it puts money into the hands of defence plant workers, but does not expand the supply of goods available for consumption in the market place. Defence spending in this case is the worse kind of government outlay since it eats up materials and other resources that otherwise could be used to produce consumer goods".

The Secretary-General of the Commonwealth, Shridath Ramphal, addressing the group of non-governmental organizations in this very room, last year said:

"Unemployment in the industrialized countries in 1980 is twice what it was at the end of the 1960s with 20 million jobless, according to figures supplied by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), while 450 million unemployed is the figure supplied by the International Labour Organisation (ILO) for the developing countries, excluding China".

The arms race which is the outcome of the failure to heed the call for reduction in military budgets does not provide more jobs. In fact, there is

(Mr. Mweu, Kenya)

ample evidence to show that it prevents more jobs from being provided. Inflation, like unemployment, is a by-product of militarization which over-heats the economy. In one of the most telling statements made by a former President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower - himself a military man - said:

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

The capacity to continue with the arms race is not limitless. In fact, most nations involved in this race unto death are fully aware now that economic and budgetary constraint is perhaps the single most important disarmament measure facing them. They are faced with enormous burdens of choice. We call on those faced with this dilemma to come out in the open and reason together; we ask them in the name of all humanity to re-examine their options while there is still time to do so.

(Mr. Mweu, Kenya)

My delegation was encouraged to know that soon the United States of America will ratify Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. This is a move in the right direction -- the direction, it is hoped, of a nuclear-weapon-free world. It is not good enough to declare part of the planet a nuclear-free zone: as long as there are huge stocks of nuclear weapons, which are still being added to in several countries, planet Earth remains in great peril. That is why it is imperative and urgent that the Committee on Disarmament start at the earliest possible opportunity to negotiate a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty and nuclear disarmament. We fully endorse the remarks made by one of the leaders of the Group of non-governmental organizations, Mr. Homer Jack, when he said:

"Many NGOs feel the priority is nuclear disarmament; to prevent nuclear holocaust is an overriding concern. To make any use by States or by statesmen...of nuclear weapons a legal crime against humanity, is a step which the world community should take now, and should have taken even before August 6, 1945."

Another NGO leader, Rear Admiral G. R. LaRocque, added:

"Informed statesmen are fully aware that the greatest threat to mankind is the growing threat of nuclear war. This problem must be faced squarely at the special session. Prevention of nuclear war should be the dominant theme."

Kenya is aware of the serious dilemma that nations are faced with in terms of protecting their own security and that of their friends against external threats and of how effective and of what size any national defence against such threats must be maintained by them. It is our view that the insecurity that drives nations into the arms race ought to be identified and dealt with by the entire human race through the machinery of the United Nations and in accordance with the United Nations

(Mr. Mweu, Kenya)

Charter, that is why we have been pressing for the establishment of an ad hoc working group within the Committee on Disarmament to negotiate a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty and nuclear disarmament. We were disappointed to learn that even at this late hour one delegation is still reluctant to support that step. The Committee on Disarmament is an important negotiating forum for all disarmament issues. We cannot afford to have it spending its time on issues of a peripheral nature and leaving unattended the major disarmament issues. It could become redundant, and we must not allow that to happen.

We all recognize the obvious fact that, apart from nuclear weapons, chemical weapons are the next most destructive weapons in existence today. We are very encouraged by the way negotiations are proceeding within the Committee on Disarmament under the able chairmanship of Ambassador Lidgard of Sweden. The main objective should be a comprehensive convention that would prohibit the development, production, stockpiling, acquisition, retention, transfer and use of chemical weapons. We are aware of the complications involved regarding the question of verification of compliance. There is no way in which mutual confidence in the convention can be upheld and cherished if verification is not carried out by a mutually acceptable international verification mechanism. We hope this point of view will prevail and that verification under international care will be upheld as part of the convention.

The conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons has so far not materialized. We are hoping that nuclear-weapon States will revise the unilateral position they have taken on that topic and that the Committee on Disarmament will come up with a comprehensive draft convention guaranteeing non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We believe that non-nuclear-weapon States

(Mr. Mweu, Kenya)

that have declared their region a nuclear-weapon-free zone and are a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) have clearly indicated their abhorrence of the possession of nuclear weapons and have in part made a sacrifice by surrendering a portion of their right to self-defence. Nuclear-weapon States are still imposing further conditions on those States which we find unnecessary and which clearly show a lack of sensitivity to their obviously disadvantageous position. For whatever they are worth, those assurances should be unequivocal and legally binding on all parties. The surest way to secure lasting security assurance must certainly be through verifiable nuclear disarmament to ensure compliance. Nations that have proved untrustworthy in the past cannot expect to be trusted in the future; however sincere their promises, their compliance with verification procedures would be a constant and non-variable prerequisite. Who in Africa would trust unverifiable security guarantees from the Republic of South Africa against nuclear attack or the threat of attack now that it is believed that South Africa has nuclear weapons? We are aware that South Africa was led by Jan Smuts, an ally of the forces fighting against the Nazi régime during the Second World War, but it must be pointed out that the South Africa which stood by the United States and Britain during both the first and second world wars no longer exists. South Africa is now under the total control of Afrikaner Nationalists, the creators of apartheid who during the first World War I stirred up the Afrikaaner Rebellion intended to stab the Allies in the back and during the Second World War went even further and openly supported the Nazis. It is important to record that former Prime Minister J. Vorster was detained for his support of Hitler. That is the party in power, that is the party that perpetuates the evil crime of apartheid; that is the party that threatens us with the proliferation of nuclear weapons on the African continent. We hope our friends abroad will re-examine their relations with that party, which has not denied the fact that Hitler was its ally in the Second World War.

Mr. MARTINI URDANETA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish):

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the delegation of Venezuela, I should like to express our special pleasure at seeing you preside over the work of the First Committee at this, the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. We are sure that your experience and your thorough knowledge of the subject we are addressing will redound to the benefit of the tasks that have been assigned to us. Our appreciation and best wishes also go to the other officers of the Committee.

The arms race is relentlessly moving forward, and there seems to be no turning back. It now involves not only the security of the States that promote and develop it, but the survival of the whole world as well. There now seems to be an utter failure to appreciate the real risks and dangers of the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race. Proof of that is the complete lack of results or of practical measures in that area and the obvious lack of political will on the part of those States that have the primary responsibility for genuine disarmament measures.

(Mr. Martini Urdaneta, Venezuela)

We find ourselves faced with a new military escalation and an increase in competition between the major Powers for strategic reasons. We are faced with a new cold war and an arms race greater than ever before in history.

The international community is particularly concerned over the casual manner in which the nuclear Powers have taken decisions to increase their nuclear arsenals and their military budgets in general, without taking into account that such decisions affect the security of all peoples and constitute a threat to the survival of mankind.

Consequently, it is exceedingly difficult to deal with the work of the First Committee in an international atmosphere in which with every passing day we seem to be getting ever farther from a genuine disarmament process, although we recognize the complex and multifaceted character of the disarmament problem and that that process must be gradual and effective while, at the same time, providing guarantees for the security and future of all peoples.

Nevertheless, we are convinced that the joint efforts of all States, and in particular the nuclear-weapon States, can make an effective contribution to overcoming the obstacles before us and can ease the way towards genuine and complete disarmament. That is why we must redouble and intensify our efforts so that the serious international situation confronting us can become a motivation and stimulus for the adoption of genuine disarmament measures.

It is in this context that we attribute importance to the efforts being made by the United Nations to promote disarmament. Since the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which revitalized the deliberative and negotiating bodies, the Committee on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission and the First Committee have been playing a positive role, one that should be stressed.

At the same time, let us have no illusions with regard to what has been accomplished, as can be clearly seen from the many resolutions adopted by the General Assembly year after year without any effective follow-up action being taken.

(Mr. Martini Urdaneta, Venezuela)

In this connexion the continuous appeals by the General Assembly for the conclusion of a treaty banning nuclear tests represent the most eloquent example. Many resolutions on nuclear disarmament have been adopted, and yet it has not thus far been possible even to initiate negotiations in the multilateral negotiating body on disarmament on such subjects as the establishment of ad hoc working groups to negotiate on such matters. The only things that have occurred in this regard have been deliberations and unofficial consultations that have reaffirmed the fact that, once again, negotiations should have begun a long time ago. These aspects of the nuclear arms race must be negotiated as a matter of urgency and cannot be put off until agreements are reached.

We believe that the Committee on Disarmament is well suited to its task, and we believe in the multilateral approach to disarmament negotiations and in working groups as representing the best machinery by measure of which substantive negotiations on disarmament can be held. We are concerned that in priority areas, where the Committee on Disarmament can accomplish useful work, its efforts have been obstructed by some Powers that are trying to divert the Committee's attention to non-priority subjects on its agenda.

We regret that the Committee on Disarmament has not made any significant progress in negotiations on some of the items before it, in particular on a nuclear test ban, the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, subjects to which the General Assembly has given top priority.

The Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons accomplished a task this year that deserves our praise. The Group identified those elements that could constitute a future convention on a complete and effective banning of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on the destruction of such weapons. The Working Group must now receive a new mandate to negotiate that convention, and this is a matter that becomes more urgent

(Mr. Martini Urdaneta, Venezuela)

with every passing day, for new factors could arise that would jeopardize the chances of achieving the desired results.

With regard to effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, the relevant Ad Hoc Working Group has been trying to reconcile the unilateral declarations of the world Powers with the just demands for security of the non-nuclear-weapon States. This is being done in an attempt to agree on a common formula or approach. If different viewpoints are to be reconciled, we must realize that today's world is interdependent, and that all States have the right to security and not just a few because of their military power.

In the Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons, my delegation has made certain concrete proposals designed to bring the draft convention into line with what today represents a real danger, whose solution requires negotiations.

Venezuela lends great importance to the activities of the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament. We believe that that programme should provide an effective framework for action aimed at enlisting all countries in a concrete, phased and well-defined negotiating process leading to the final goal desired by all States, namely, general and complete disarmament under effective international control. We hope that at the the spring session of the Committee on Disarmament the divergences of view that exist with regard to this programme can be reconciled and that the comprehensive programme of disarmament, which will without question be the most important document before the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, will be adopted by the international community and will finally initiate an irreversible process towards disarmament.

In view of the steady worsening of the international situation, one of the primary causes of which has been the continuing nuclear arms race, the second special session on disarmament scheduled for next year has taken on a very special significance.

(Mr. Martini Urdaneta, Venezuela)

Although the first special session on disarmament was an unprecedented event which established the basis for efforts to promote disarmament, the second special session must constitute an important step forward, maintaining the momentum towards the adoption and implementation of concrete and effective disarmament measures. In this connexion, we would like to mention the work of the Preparatory Committee for the second special session, whose third series of meetings was concluded last week. In this regard, we should like to pay a tribute to the Chairman of that Committee, Ambassador Adeniji of Nigeria, for his efforts.

(Mr. Martini Urdaneta, Venezuela)

The Preparatory Committee adopted the report that the General Assembly now has under consideration. This report includes the provisional agenda of the special session, which was adopted by consensus after lengthy, intense negotiations. Furthermore, it was also agreed that the Preparatory Committee should meet once again in the spring of next year to conclude work on some other relevant questions relating to the special session of the General Assembly.

We think the Preparatory Committee should undertake substantive work on questions relating to the special session of the General Assembly. If these matters are given proper consideration, then we will be more optimistic about the treatment that the Assembly will be giving to these subjects.

The draft agenda of the special session contains certain matters that the second special session devoted to disarmament should take up as a matter of priority. The comprehensive programme of disarmament, consideration of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session of the Assembly on disarmament and the role of the United Nations in disarmament are all priority issues.

We also attach special importance to the mobilization of world opinion in support of disarmament. The measures that the special session of the Assembly might agree on will be vital, and that is an element which has not been suitably used in the entire process.

In the crusade against the arms race, all peoples must participate, and their contribution will be all the greater if the present dangers are understood and if the crisis represented by the arms race is appreciated.

We also welcome document A/36/458, which contains the study of the Group of Experts on the Organization and Financing of a World Disarmament Campaign Under the Auspices of the United Nations.

The position of Venezuela on this subject is well known. If world opinion is fully aware of the many and diverse aspects of competition in the production of weapons, that could be of invaluable assistance in promoting the goals of disarmament and limiting the arms race.

(Mr. Martini Urdaneta, Venezuela)

We should also like to say that the Disarmament Commission has been functioning as a deliberative subsidiary body of the General Assembly, which was agreed on by the special session in 1978. We have taken part in the three sessions which that been held. In compliance with its mandate, consideration has been given to various aspects of disarmament and recommendations have been put forward.

The consensus rule, which has been beneficial in the work of the Commission, should not become a tool used to advance the interests of the major Powers.

Furthermore, it is our hope that the talks in Vienna on the mutual reduction of troops and arms in Europe will yield positive results and promote subsequent action to limit arms on the European continent. Any reduction of armed forces and armaments in that part of the world will certainly have a favourable impact at the world-wide level.

Finally, I do not wish to complete this statement without reference to a matter to which we have attributed great importance. I refer to the work being done by the Group of Governmental Experts which prepared the Study on the relationship between disarmament and development (A/36/356). These concepts have acquired special importance in recent years since they represent the most important objectives of the international community in the decade of the 1980s disarmament on the one hand and development on the other. Arms expenditure and the economic and social development of all peoples are inseparable.

It is not easy to find the right terms to define the present status of disarmament negotiations. In this entire process the political will of Member States, especially the nuclear-weapon States, which have a primary responsibility in the area, is a decisive factor.

In conclusion, I wish to say that it is our responsibility to participate in these debates because we are convinced that deliberations here can contribute to some extent to bringing about a less uncertain future for the generations to come.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Mr. Chairman, at the outset may I express the gratification of my delegation that a personality of your calibre. wisdom and experience is presiding over the deliberations of the First Committee at this critical juncture in world affairs. We also extend our congratulations to the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur. We are indeed in a period of crisis and the pressures are intensified in the pernicious arms race. In dealing with the problem of disarmament, in the first place we have to become fully conscious of the fact that there can be no agreed reduction or control of armaments while the arms race goes on. It is highly illogical to expect that on the one hand there can be a shedding of armaments while on the other hand new and more sophisticated weapons of destruction are produced. Therefore, the vital problem in respect of disarmament is, first, to halt the arms race.

May I mention that the Committee on Disarmament, which exerts such dedicated efforts towards reaching agreements on phased disarmament measures, might find it useful to give somewhat more attention to the need to halt the arms race in the first place. Because the arms race is constantly and rapidly escalating, and is brushing aside and neutralizing all disarmament endeavours, it has thus reached astronomical figures of expenditure, and in its course nuclear overkill capacity has been obtained many times. It still continues, however, to draining direly needed world resources to the point of exhaustion and exposing mankind to the danger of a nuclear holocaust.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

It is an undeniable reality that in a nuclear war there can be neither victor nor vanquished. All will perish, and more importantly the very environment of life on our planet will perish too.

The question arises, to what purpose then does this arms race aim if there can be no results from a war? What is the use of preparing for a war that can never be waged without total destruction for all? And it is illogical to speak of a limited nuclear war, for it is inevitably bound to expand, with vastly genuinely disastrous consequences. Nor is the concept of making a first nuclear strike without expecting a nuclear response at all realizable. The very concept of a first strike is an international crime.

Continuance of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, in "such circumstances" is wholly irrational and verges on insanity. But merely to brand it insane is not enough. That was done some years ago, by two great men, Albert Einstein and Bertrand Russell, yet hardly to any avail.

However, now we have reached a time when from all indications the dreaded danger of a nuclear war is ominously approaching. There must be a pragmatic sense of urgency in action towards halting this downward course of the arms race. But what can be done about it? How can the world community effectively deal with it? We can have repetitious statements over the years. I have been here for 20 years, and have repeatedly heard that the first priority is the comprehensive test-ban treaty. There was a time when for three years we were repeatedly unanimously adopting resolutions saying that it should have the first priority. But what happened? Nothing.

Therefore, if we are now in real danger, let us see what else we can do rather than repeating the same things we have said so many times. I hope I shall not find myself repeating them.

How can the world community effectively deal with the problem of the arms race? The only way is to go to the root of the problem and find its cause. There are many factors. What directly engenders and perpetuates the arms race, however, is the wrong concept of security through a so-called balance of power or balance of weapons with the apparent aim of attaining or maintaining a balance but with an eye to superiority all the time. Such a balance is, therefore, never recognized by both sides as having been reached. One or the other side always claims that it is

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

at a disadvantage and must increase its armaments. In consequence the escalating arms race is perpetuated.

Originally, what drove the Member States of the United Nations to resort to the arms race? In one sense, the conflict between the major Powers soon after the Second World War; in another, the two blocs that were created, splitting up the allies into two camps with the resulting polarization of the world community. But why did the rest of the Member States of the United Nations join in the arms race? Because they had been deprived of any kind of international security, of any kind of national security to protect their sovereignty and independence except armaments. So they had to rely only on armaments for their protection. The United Nations, on which so much hope had been placed, was wholly ineffective in the maintenance of international security and peace. Gradually they realized that the Security Council could not give effect to its decisions to protect them, as they had expected. Hence they fell back on the old world concept of "might is right". For there was no pragmatic protection of their rights through the United Nations. If the Security Council decisions - even unanimously adopted - remain unimplemented, wholly unimplemented, in a manner that had not been expected or even thought of by the drafters of the Charter. They prepared a Charter that was to be effective, with a system of international security fully provided for in order to give validity and effect to the decisions of the Security Council and meaning to the United Nations.

Therefore, in that situation, it was only natural for all States to concentrate on armaments. Developing States had to spend so much, and they still have to spend more and more for the defence of their independence and sovereignty because there is no protection from the United Nations.

Those are the problems that we must think of in this Committee, in an effort to restrain or halt the arms race. We believe that something can be done, even at this late hour, to promote world security through the United Nations parallel to the concept of the outdated and bankrupt policy of a balance-of-power resulting in the escalating arms race. To promote international security as required by the Charter, gradually providing trust in security through the United Nations for the smaller States, but eventually expanding and creating a broader climate of trust and confidence in the United Nations, within which there can be understanding and co-operation between the major Powers.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

But in order to improve the situation in the world, in order that the mandatory requirement of the Charter for a system of international security may be met, there must above all be co-operation among the major Powers, and particularly between the two major Powers. And I believe that there can be such co-operation. We have indications that that is the desire of both sides. The desire for such co-operation has been expressed in this Committee, and it is high time that we reached that stage.

We believe that co-operation between the two major Powers and the other Powers will have to take place in the United Nations and through the United Nations, not outside it. It could be done by creating a climate of confidence in the Organization.

Now, what has gone wrong with the United Nations? There has been the grave error of non-compliance with the Charter's fundamental purposes and principles concerning international security and peace. That must be remedied in order that the world community may find its feet through order and security, as required by the Charter.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

I should like to refer to the statements representing the views of two major Powers in order to show that there is a strong desire to move towards making the United Nations effective.

I refer first to the statement of Mr. Eugene Rostow, Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, when he said:

"The Charter embodies an agreed code of values which define the necessary terms of international co-operation - the rules which should guide and animate the behaviour of States and unite the Members of the United Nations, for all their differences, into a single society and polity." (A/C.1/36/PV.6, p. 16)

Mr. Rostow stated further:

"If the Charter rules, and especially its rules dealing with the international use of force, should finally disappear as an influence on the behaviour of States, world public order would collapse into anarchy and general war would inevitably ensue." (ibid.)

...

"The United States approaches the problems of arms control not" - and I emphasize that 'not' - "as isolated abstractions, but as components of the larger problems of international security and stability. After all, arms control initiatives are meaningless unless they are viewed as aspects of a comprehensive strategy to achieve and to maintain peace." (ibid., p. 17)

Furthermore - and this is very significant too - the representative of the United States stated that the central issue in the examination of the problem of peace is the declining influence of Article 2 (4) of the United Nations Charter on the behaviour of States. The Charter says - and the representative of the United States quoted this:

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Mr. Rostow went on:

"The last two decades have witnessed a rising tide of threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and aggressions, actions which involve the use or the threat of force against the territorial integrity or the political independence of States.

"Far too often in the United Nations and elsewhere we write and we talk as if peace could be secured through the adoption of an ascetic formula for limiting or abolishing nuclear tests" (ibid.) but we forget the important issue.

This is the attitude on this problem of the representative of the United States. I greatly appreciate it; I think it is a very wise approach and that it is helpful in bringing about the understanding and co-operation necessary to put an end to the arms race.

But I also note with great and equal satisfaction that Chairman Brezhnev, in his statement to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in February 1981, referred to the need for co-operation and said:

"It seems to us that it would be useful to call a special session of the Security Council, with the participation of the top leaders of its member States, in order to look for keys to improving the international situation and preventing war. If they so wished, leaders of other States could evidently also take part in this session".

This shows that the leader of the Soviet Union desires co-operation within the United Nations in order to solve the world problems of peace and war. This is a very encouraging statement.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

I should add that Chairman Brezhnev declared in that statement that he was ready to discuss also within the United Nations structure the Afghanistan question and the situation in the Persian Gulf.

There is thus readiness on both sides to discuss their problems within the United Nations, and to find a way of strengthening the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international security and peace. There is, therefore, room for understanding and co-operation between the two major Powers towards dealing with the arms race in order to avoid the dire consequences of its escalation.

I should like to refer in this respect to a resolution which was approved last year in this Committee and adopted by the General Assembly and which calls for precisely what Mr. Rostow found lacking in the observance of the principle of the prohibition of the use of force - that is, Article 2 (4) of the Charter - namely, a system of international security through the United Nations.

The resolution was submitted by twelve non-aligned countries, among them the leading non-aligned nations, and was not only adopted by consensus but also negotiated in advance with the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union and thus adopted with their consent. That resolution:

"1. Reaffirms its resolution 34/83 A of 11 December 1979, on disarmament and international security;

"2. Calls upon all States to proceed in a positive spirit towards measures under the Charter of the United Nations for a system of international security and order concurrently with efforts at effective disarmament measures;

"3. Recommends that the main organs of the United Nations responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security" - namely, the General Assembly and the Security Council - "should give early consideration to the requirements for halting the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and developing the modalities for the effective application of the system of international security provided for in the Charter;

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

"4. Requests the permanent members of the Security Council to facilitate the work of the Council towards carrying out this essential responsibility under the Charter;

"5. Requests the Secretary-General to submit a progress report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session." (resolution 35/156 J)

The Secretary-General submitted a progress report, but I believe that what is necessary is for the resolution to be implemented, because this will open the way to understanding and co-operation. Just as the two major Powers co-operated in the adoption of that resolution, so they can continue their co-operation in the implementation of the resolution to create the necessary climate in the United Nations.

The only rational way for disarmament is to move towards a gradual halt in the arms race by developing in a parallel way the measures and modalities for collective security as mandatorily required by the Charter and as provided for in the aforesaid General Assembly resolution 35/156 J.

Only through genuine co-operation between the two major Powers the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics within the framework of the United Nations and its Charter can there be a possible development in the field of disarmament. Whatever the extent of their socio-political differences is, they should not stand in the way of their co-operation to save the world from a global holocaust.

In the past, despite such differences they effectively co-operated against a common enemy to mankind in the Second World War. They could equally co-operate against a more deadly common enemy to humanity - the nuclear weapon of total destruction for all.

We express faith in the good spirit from both sides to move towards genuine co-operation in rendering the United Nations and its Security Council a meaningful instrument for international order, peace and security in compliance with the Charter.

By such a move and the ensuing trust in the United Nations a spirit of closer and more open co-operation will be generated between the major Powers on vital matters towards avoiding a nuclear cataclysm.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

We make this suggestion in all humility but with the complete faith that this is the only way to move out of the present vicious circle of the arms race. It is presented in the best spirit of non-alignment and bearing in mind the wider interest of mankind as a whole at a critical moment in its history.

Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan): Sir, at the commencement of our work, Ambassador Niaz Naik offered the felicitations of the Pakistan delegation on your assumption of the chairmanship of the First Committee. I take this opportunity to offer you my warm congratulations on your election to this high office which is a testimony to your rich experience and deep understanding of disarmament issues as well as a tribute to your great country for its outstanding contribution to the cause of disarmament and international peace and security.

We have listened with great attention to the statements made in this Committee during the course of the week. Each one of those statements has focused on the lamentable conditions obtaining in our world today which have virtually paralysed international efforts towards disarmament. Concern has been expressed in the gravest terms over the new spiral in the arms race which is reminiscent of the cold war days. The return to the logic of a balance of terror if allowed to persist could lead mankind to an accidental if not deliberate suicide. Three days ago, 20 October, the Under-Secretary of State for Disarmament in the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mrs. Thorsson, introduced the important study on the relationship between disarmament and development (A/36/356). That study brought into sharp focus the sombre reality of our time that while a vast majority of mankind lives in a state of poverty and deprivation, real resources to the tune of \$500 billion are being diverted annually to the manufacture and accumulation of the means of death and destruction. The fact that the two super-Powers already possess the capability of destroying our planet several times over is for some perverse reason, instead of bringing about a reversal of that trend, leading them on to still higher armaments expenditures.

It is obvious that an unbridled escalation in the arms race, especially in nuclear weapons, cannot be sustained indefinitely without increasing the risk of a global catastrophe. Our concern is aroused whether such escalation is quantitative or qualitative in nature and whether it involves the deployment of SS-20 mobile missiles or the production of the enhanced radiation weapon.

The arms race in all its aspects is not, however, a disembodied phenomenon; it is spawned in the existing global political and security climate. The

(Mr. Ahmad, Pakistan)

intensification of the arms race being witnessed today is directly related to the quantum increase in the level of international tensions caused by the growing resort to the use of force in the conduct of international relations that has unfortunately characterized the world situation since the beginning of the 1980s. A case in point is the military intervention in Afghanistan two years ago, whose impact on regional stability and, in global terms, on East-West relations needs no elaboration. The climate of insecurity and deepening confrontation between the two super-Powers is a matter of the utmost concern to the small and medium-sized States, which have a vital stake in an improved international security environment for the preservation of their own freedom and development.

It is therefore indispensable to revive mutual trust and confidence between the super-Powers and their military alliances as well as between them and the majority of the small and medium-sized States of the world.

A major element in the present atmosphere of international confrontation is the fact that the two super-Powers have much too large a conception of their own legitimate security interests. The present is not, however, the time for self-serving postures or initiatives. It is time, on the other hand, for serious negotiations on a broad spectrum of interrelated issues that would help in promoting a climate of international security and provide a new impetus to international disarmament efforts.

We welcome the announcement that the dialogue between the United States and the Soviet Union is to commence in the near future. We regard a dialogue between those two States, which bear the major responsibility for halting and reversing the arms race, as being complementary to the disarmament efforts undertaken within the framework of the United Nations. Equally, we believe that progress in the efforts undertaken in the United Nations which take into special account the security interests of the small and medium-sized States should not remain dependent on a dialogue outside the United Nations framework.

The discussions on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament during this year in the Committee on Disarmament have shown in sharp relief the divergent approaches of various States to the subject. It seems to us that all the nuclear-weapon States adhere, explicitly or implicitly,

(Mr. Ahmad, Pakistan)

to the doctrine of nuclear deterrence and accord an important place to nuclear weapons in the preservation of their security and that of their allies. It is also quite apparent that each of the two major nuclear Powers is afraid to fall even a fraction behind the other in their nuclear equation. These are, in simple terms, the impulses behind the nuclear-arms spiral and the main obstacles to nuclear disarmament. Common sense indicates that the first steps in the process of nuclear disarmament will have to be taken by the two nuclear Powers, whose arsenals are in size and sophistication immensely superior to those of the other nuclear-weapon States. Indeed, the SALT negotiations were a recognition of their special responsibility. We hope that the SALT agreements will continue to be observed and that the new negotiations to be undertaken by the two sides will be directed towards reducing rather than limiting their strategic and medium-range nuclear weapons. In the multilateral context, a beginning must also be made. The Committee on Disarmament can take up this subject, in the first place, by initiating discussions designed to clarify the concepts that are claimed to justify the nuclear-arms race.

Turning to specific issues, I should at the outset like to underline the widespread disappointment over our failure even to commence multilateral negotiations on the nuclear-test ban, the item that was accorded the highest priority on the world disarmament agenda by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We would have thought that the suspension of the trilateral negotiations in this regard would have been an additional reason to open multilateral talks on this important subject in the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva. Unfortunately this has not been possible. It is also apparent from the progress report submitted by the trilateral negotiators to the Committee on Disarmament last year that the perspective of those negotiations is flawed. Even if those restricted negotiations were to be resumed, it is unlikely that they would produce a treaty that could win general support and gain wide adherence. The major nuclear Powers need to realize that they cannot repeat the experience of the non-proliferation Treaty and seek imposition of an unequal arrangement on the non-nuclear-weapon States. We therefore share the general view in the Committee on Disarmament that multilateral negotiations should commence without further delay with a view to concluding an equitable and universally acceptable nuclear-test-ban treaty.

(Mr. Ahmad, Pakistan)

The deliberations in the Committee on Disarmament regarding the comprehensive programme for disarmament have been another source of frustration. This was made known by the Group of 21 in a formal statement in Geneva. Our disappointment is especially deep because we attach high expectations to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament scheduled for next year and regard the programme for disarmament as a principal accomplishment to be realized at that important session.

(Mr. Ahmad, Pakistan)

In accordance with the Final Document of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament, the comprehensive programme for disarmament has been envisaged as an international instrument which would create legal obligations on the part of all States to implement and achieve the measures included therein. These disarmament measures, in our view, should be set out in definite stages and lead to the ultimate goal of complete disarmament within an agreed time-frame. We consider that the concept of restricting the comprehensive programme to the framework of existing documents and decisions is incompatible with the fundamental purposes as laid down in the Final Document of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament. The Pakistan delegation hopes that negotiations on this important item during the spring session of the Committee on Disarmament will be fruitful, making possible the finalization of the programme for submission to the second special session on disarmament.

While the nuclear-weapon Powers remain totally preoccupied with the qualitative and quantitative build-up of their nuclear and conventional arsenals, justifying the resultant arms race on the basis of a variety of security doctrines, they remain entirely insensitive to the security concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon States. This evaluation is confirmed by the current status of negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament on the question of negative security guarantees to non-nuclear weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Despite the fact that serious efforts were made by some delegations to investigate the possible ways in which a common formula could be developed, the nuclear-weapon States, with the exception of China, did not demonstrate any readiness to contemplate even the slightest modification of their respective positions. They refused to look at proposals outside the perspective of their own narrowly-conceived nuclear doctrines. However, my delegation has listened with interest to the Soviet proposal relating to the non-first-use of nuclear weapons, which, in our view, has a positive content and deserves serious consideration. Pakistan has been engaged in efforts to promote an agreement on this question for over a decade.

(Mr. Ahmad, Pakistan)

In this search for effective guarantees, we cannot accept any proposition which provides the illusion rather than the substance of security assurances while attempting to secure additional obligations from the non-nuclear-weapon States.

The relentless attempts by the major nuclear Powers to enlarge and improve their own nuclear arsenals on the one hand while professing concern for nuclear non-proliferation on the other is self-contradictory. A further disturbing feature of this approach to non-proliferation is the apparent attempt to deny developing countries even access to nuclear technology for development. Peaceful nuclear programmes in several developing countries, including Pakistan, have become a target of false and politically motivated propaganda.

Pakistan's commitment to nuclear non-proliferation has been consistent and is a matter of record. We have taken several initiatives to promote the objective of non-proliferation in our region, including the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. In this initiative we are encouraged by developments in other regions, particularly the formalization of the Treaty of Tlatelolco in Latin America and the emerging consensus on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

It is, however, a matter of grave concern that the commitment of States to non-proliferation and even adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which has been so vociferously advocated by some nuclear-weapon States, cannot protect the peaceful nuclear programmes of developing States. The Israeli attack on the Tammuz nuclear research centre near Baghdad has exposed this stark reality. The entire international safeguards system structured by the International Atomic Energy Agency for peaceful nuclear programmes has been undermined.

My delegation believes that an attack on nuclear facilities, even when carried out by conventional weapons, is no less dangerous in its consequences than the use of radiological weapons. The negotiations for the convention banning radiological weapons must, therefore, take fully into account the question of prohibiting attacks against nuclear installations in any country.

(Mr. Ahmad, Pakistan)

Pakistan favours a comprehensive approach to disarmament. The priority accorded to the nuclear arms race and nuclear weapons should not dilute our concern to pursue simultaneously and vigorously efforts in other sectors. It is in this perspective that Pakistan emphasizes the regional and conventional aspects of disarmament. We attach great importance to progress in confidence-building measures and initiatives such as the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. Pakistan has consistently supported that important initiative by Sri Lanka, which aims at building an environment of peace and security in the Indian Ocean region. We hope that the permanent members of the Security Council, the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean and the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean will demonstrate a spirit of co-operation for the achievement of the objective of making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

The Pakistan delegation views with satisfaction the progress on multilateral negotiations on chemical weapons during the last year in the Committee on Disarmament. The draft elements, painstakingly formulated by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on this important subject, provide a solid basis to build on and to continue fruitful negotiations on the text of a treaty. We believe that whatever difficulties still remain can be overcome if the necessary political decisions are forthcoming, mainly from the United States and the Soviet Union. We fervently hope that the momentum for progress already achieved on this subject will continue to be maintained.

It is a matter of regret that the last session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission failed to bring about a consensus on any aspect of its mandate. Disagreement between the militarily significant Powers even blocked progress on the elaboration of elements for a study on conventional weapons and military expenditures. It would show a distorted perspective if our preoccupation with nuclear arms and nuclear weapons, which has already been the subject of extensive United Nations studies, should prevent us from addressing ourselves to the dangers of the conventional arms race, which is indeed responsible for the aggravation of conflicts and

(Mr. Ahmad, Pakistan)

tensions all over the world. We hope that the First Committee will take the necessary decisions to make possible the commissioning of these important studies at an early date.

I have indicated the general views of the Pakistan delegation on the agenda items pertaining to disarmament. We hope to make detailed observations on specific issues as and when they are taken up by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no other names on the list of speakers for this afternoon, I now call on the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

Mr. PHETSAVAN (Lao People's Democratic Republic): Mr. Chairman, we shall have occasion to express our warm and sincere congratulations to you when we take part in the general debate on disarmament questions within the next few days. My delegation has been compelled to ask to speak in order to counter the slanderous allegations made by the representative of China during the course of the general debate in this Committee yesterday afternoon, at its 8th meeting. In making those absurd allegations he referred in his statement to the so-called reports and information about the use of chemical weapons in my country, Laos, and other countries - namely, Cambodia and Afghanistan.

The slanderous allegations made by the representative of China show nothing but the intention of the expansionist big-Power hegemonist ruling circles in Peking, in connivance with the United States imperialists, to interfere in the internal affairs of the sovereign States of Indo-China, and are designed to discredit my country, which scrupulously respects the provisions of the international Convention which prohibits the use of such weapons.

The Lao People's Democratic Republic has been the victim of all kinds of sophisticated weapons used by its aggressors. That is why it attaches great importance to the question of the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons, acceded to the 1972 Convention on those weapons and strictly respects the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

(Mr. Phetsavan, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

As is well known, Laos is a small less-developed country. It is usually known for the degree of development of its feelings of humanity and tolerance. The attempt to accuse it of acts of cruelty such as the use of chemical weapons is a vain exercise which can only disturb the calm process of our debate.

My delegation is surprised that the Chinese delegation in its statement failed either to mention the iniquitous and intensive use of such inhumane weapons and other murderous weapons by its new friends, the United States imperialists, during the aggressive war against our country and our people and the peoples of Viet Nam and Kampuchea, or to refer to the fact that the United States was conducting bacteriological warfare against Cuba and supplying toxic chemicals to mercenaries to be used against the peoples of other countries, as is the case in Afghanistan.

Meanwhile my delegation categorically rejects the slanderous allegations against my country made by the representative of China, since they are merely based on a document published shamelessly by the United States in collaboration with a small group of Khmer refugees whom the United States is fostering, with the aim of making slanderous accusations against my country and omitting mention of its vile crimes against the Lao people and the two other peoples of Indo-China. Those slanderous and misleading allegations by China and the United States can deceive no one.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.