

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



FIRST COMMITTEE  
13th meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 27 October 1981  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

UN LIBRARY

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 13TH MEETING

OCT 30 1981

Chairman: Mr. CARIAS (Honduras)  
(Vice-President)

UN/SA COLLECTION

later: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)  
(Chairman)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

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

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. de la Fuente (Peru)  
Mr. Marinescu (Romania)  
Mr. Erdembileg (Mongolia)  
Mr. Moussa (Egypt)

\* 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.13  
28 October 1981

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

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

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. de la FUENTE (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Peru to the First Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations feels especially honoured that it is the representative of Yugoslavia who is presiding over our work, because of his well-known skill, experience and knowledge. His accomplishments unquestionably reflect Yugoslavia's record and constructive presence in today's world, and in particular in the area of disarmament.

It is not the intention of my delegation to indulge now in the same kind of pessimistic language, justified though it may be, so often heard in these debates and in negotiations, and in general in all disarmament bodies. Other delegations have already done so and they will surely do so in the future in specific, clear language. Moreover, there has been a conspicuous absence of any substantive, concrete changes for the better in the uncertain picture of the past few years, in particular since our last meeting during the thirty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly. Peru would now merely like to state that no one with common sense who is witnessing international events and the political changes which determine their course, and no one who understands the principal obstacles to the economic and social well-being of most of mankind, can honestly deny the fact that these are indeed parlous times.

Although the many forms of action on disarmament have not yet reached their full potential, it is undeniable that profound contradictions and a subsequent lack of credibility have an adverse effect on the institutional value of the process.

We should remember that the international community has become aware of the extremely diverse and complex nature of the disarmament problem and of the fact that it is linked at all times to vital sectors of the activities of nations and States, and to world development in general.

(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

Consequently, the United Nations has since then devoted a good deal of time and many resources to the sponsoring of multilateral negotiations and the carrying out of studies, covering the full range of possible subject matters directly or indirectly related to disarmament. In the meantime, those who have not alternative to promoting the integral development of their countries in peace and security have been disappointed that the balance sheet thus far seems to be negative. Even a superficial evaluation of the substance of our extensive agenda will lead us inevitably to these conclusions.

The reduction of military budgets is a long-standing and all-important objective the eventual realization of which, aside from affording many far-reaching effects, including psychological ones, could be observed and verified without much difficulty. It is thus ironic that this subject, which has been accepted as something that must be accomplished if the arms race is to be curbed, is one of the goals which has been least respected. Neither the many provisions of the resolutions adopted by our Organization nor the statements and exhortations made outside the United Nations represent even an intermediary step towards preventing a qualitatively and quantitatively significant number of States from expending resources for warlike purposes. Our Governments are well aware of the undue expenditures which are being made for military purposes. This is one of the items which has led to insoluble impasses, particularly among and with the major Powers, but it is equally undeniable that the international system as a whole shares the responsibility for this situation, because of the regrettable search for profits which exists as well as the proliferation of regional and local tensions, some of which are generated locally but most of which are produced by the very harmful polarity of views which seems to be emerging.

(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

Similarly, in the post-war period the highest priority has been accorded to the containment and reversal of the nuclear threat, which has been planned in steps which proceed from the cessation of the competitive manufacture of nuclear weapons to the goal of nuclear disarmament, including a total ban on the testing and improvement of nuclear weapons and the effective implementation of international instruments already agreed upon. It is, in our view, beyond question that in the discussions of atomic weapons, in the context of the disarmament process, what is being decided is whether or not mankind is to be assured a future. We nevertheless note with dismay that after years of valuable work, the struggle for nuclear supremacy is continuing with renewed vigour, as manifested in constant exchanges of accusations and recriminations which have a paralysing effect on the basic process of disarmament. This is occurring in the case of multilateral, global negotiations as well as that of parallel efforts, which are of decisive importance, constituting channels being used by those Powers possessing nuclear arsenals. I refer here to negotiations on strategic weapons possessed by the super-Powers and those that are deployed on the European continent.

The facts fully justify our concern. Nuclear non-proliferation still awaits achievement, since the implementation of the agreed body of norms has met with frequent and serious obstacles due to a widespread reluctance on the part of the nuclear Powers to honour the commitments which they entered into and the legal institutionalization of inequities in the possession and development of nuclear weapons. This is equally true in the case of nuclear explosions, where agreements arrived at with difficulty reflecting a desire to work towards higher objectives have been contradicted by the predominance of a very strong inclination to carry out nuclear tests for warlike purposes.

In connexion with the nuclear arms race and mankind's common goals, which are non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament, Peru wishes first and foremost to state that there is an overriding need to consolidate, with the help of

(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

the United Nations, regional initiatives, which, in addition to the role they play in the treatment of this subject within the international community, have the important function of alleviating tensions, providing reasonable amounts of security and establishing a climate of relative confidence in sensitive areas of chronic instability. We must not forget that important decisions have been reached by this Organization for precisely these purposes, but the path that seems to be agreed upon is contradicting those decisions, to the detriment of international peace and security. Latin America has made a pioneering effort in this connexion through the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

We would like at the same time to reaffirm our conviction that the only result that our peoples, both developed and underdeveloped, can expect from the achievements of science and technology in this area is their peaceful application in national development plans and programmes. There is no need to point out that the international community, and in particular those who receive and benefit the least from the world economy, must have access to these achievements through the international transfer of know-how, with appropriate guarantees and verifications of the purposes for which it is to be used by its recipients.

Recent events prove that the strenuous efforts of the United Nations have met with a rather cool reception, as have the sincere efforts of a fortunately large number of States Members of the Organization, whose perseverance has at least had the merit of sparing the world until now from worse upheavals.

(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

On that point, which is directly related to the application of the components of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the Foreign Minister of Peru, Mr. Javier Arias Stella, stated the following in the debate in the General Assembly:

The Government of Peru views with apprehension the close relationship between the tense international situation and the deadlock in the disarmament process. The deterioration of the latter has been dangerously aggravated by an escalation in the arms race on a world-wide level which involves primarily those nations that have the largest arsenals of nuclear and conventional weapons.

In this connexion, Peru is particularly concerned over the fact that an appreciation of the universal importance of peace tends to be diluted in theoretical and binding formulations, if not in misunderstandings which lead to failure, and that the institutionalized efforts of the United Nations run the risk of becoming bureaucratized when they are not legitimized by the political will of Governments.

(A/36/PV.6, p.67)

The reasons for this markedly negative characterization are to be found in the increase in regional and global tension, the lack of confidence and dialogue among States and the distorted and fanatical use of certain doctrines of security.

At this stage of our work, my delegation believes that certain pronouncements of a political nature take precedence over some other questions having to do with disarmament because, after all, the stagnation which we are now experiencing is eminently political in nature. Later, when we shall be considering draft resolutions and other initiatives, and then we can consider the various facets of the problem before us in this deliberative body.

(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

Although it is difficult to ascribe an order of priorities to the various items on our agenda, in the light of the foregoing comments, we believe that we can safely say that the major goal towards which we must be working is the second special session devoted to disarmament and its agenda, the comprehensive programme of disarmament. Distinguished speakers who have preceded me have put that subject into its proper context. We have received the report from the Ad Hoc Working Group in Geneva about the status of the comprehensive programme of disarmament in light of the 1982 objectives. We should also like to emphasize the sense of scepticism felt by those of us who had the opportunity of participating in the recently concluded session of the Preparatory Committee as a result of the obvious desire to submerge the formulation and adoption of an agenda for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in a sea of protracted and innocuous discussions. We sincerely hope that that does not foreshadow reality.

For the delegation of Peru, the feeling is that the horizons should be crystal clear. The speedy verification of the application of the recommendations made by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the adoption by the next special session of the comprehensive programme, as well as consensus on a final document which should be at least equivalent in scope and procedures to that which has legitimately been conceived by this Committee as the "Disarmament Charter" are prerequisites for the success of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and, as well, for our efforts to be truly effective.

I should like to conclude this first statement by the delegation of Peru in this Committee by reiterating our support for certain valuable initiatives such as the World Disarmament Campaign, the purpose of which has been to create an awareness in world public opinion of the dangers of

(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

the arms race, with special emphasis on the always latent and tragic possibility of a nuclear catastrophe. It is our firm conviction that, among other measures, it is especially important that the United Nations be endowed with an administrative apparatus in the area of disarmament which has enough standing and sufficient material means to carry out the extremely important task of providing information and guidance.

Peru would reiterate in this forum its unshakeable devotion to world peace and we turn to Governments and appeal to them to achieve one of the loftiest goals of the international community: namely, general and complete disarmament. We are certain that the major Powers responsible for the development of new and sophisticated forms and systems of massive destruction and for the discretionary trade in the greater part of this destructive capacity will conscientiously assume a political commitment to give a creative and conclusive momentum to this process, so that international peace and security will acquire a real and daily dimension in the community of nations.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): In our general statement, I had the opportunity to refer to some of the problems which are the subject of the present debate. At that time, I emphasized the importance and the extreme urgency which, in the opinion of my delegation, attach to measures aimed at the freezing and reduction of military expenditures. My statement today is dedicated precisely to that subject, the focus of particular and constant attention on the part of the Romanian Government, which during recent sessions of the General Assembly has put forward a number of proposals on that point.

The question of the freezing and reduction of military budgets is a matter of greater importance than ever. Its urgency is dictated by the fact that never before have so many resources been squandered



(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

for purposes of destruction and extermination. Never before have there been so many projects aimed at the production, emplacement and stockpiling of increasingly sophisticated new weapons whose manufacture requires even more considerable increases in military expenditures.

At the same time, mankind has never been faced with such a pressing need to ensure its economic and social development in order to resolve the very serious problems facing the international community, particularly in the case of the developing countries, stemming from the economic, energy and financial crises and the growing gap between rich and poor countries, the phenomenon of under-development in all its forms.

It would be superfluous to take up the Committee's time by giving statistical data to illustrate that dramatic and extremely dangerous situation. The figures are available to us, in abundance, provided by the United Nations, by governmental institutions, by eminent research institutes, all of which give us a complete picture regarding the amount of current military expenditures as well as their extremely harmful effects.

The absurd dimension of the increasingly great sums swallowed up each year by the arms race take on their full significance not only because military expenditures are at the present time in excess of \$550 billion dollars, the unbearable burden which those expenditures represent is particularly clear if we consider the growing share of world production they represent, particularly in relation to the absurdly low funds which are devoted to solving the fundamental problems of mankind, such as energy, food, health and the preservation of the environment.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

This situation is particularly unacceptable and paradoxical in the present circumstances, when the world economy is characterized by various kinds of structural crises that have not spared the most developed countries, by high rates of inflation, increasingly clear trends towards recession and growing unemployment. The tremendous resources expended for military purposes only add daily to those serious difficulties.

An analysis of the situation prevailing in the world reveals the extremely serious fact - and one the Romanian Government has emphasized on more than one occasion - that in recent years in many countries the growth rate in national income is less than the annual percentage increase in military expenditure.

At a time when even in the most developed countries there is talk of the need for action in order to succeed, at best, in keeping production at its previous level, the only area showing a continual increase is military expenditure.

One very disquieting factor in all this is the fact that the development of military budgets, and particularly those of the most heavily armed States, demonstrates that that constant increase is not engendered by wars or large-scale military conflicts, but represents a continually progressing phenomenon. This makes it even more difficult to halt the rising expenditure, which seems to be governed to an ever increasing degree by its own internal mechanics of action and reaction.

The conclusions reached in the study on the relationship between disarmament and development that was presented by Mrs. Inga Thorsson very appropriately show that mankind is confronted with a formidable choice: either to continue the arms race with exceptional energy or to move towards stable, balanced economic and social development, consciously and with all deliberate speed, within the framework of a more acceptable new international economic and political order. Both those goals cannot be pursued simultaneously.

The escalation in military expenditure is part and parcel of that choice.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

The work of the Group of Experts instructed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, at the initiative of my country, to update the study on "The Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race" will undoubtedly provide the next session of the General Assembly with new arguments and data on the profoundly harmful effects of the acceleration in military expenditures.

One hardly need emphasize that, in addition to its ruinous economic and social consequences, the escalation of military expenditures also entails the most serious threats for all mankind. The need to avert the ever-increasing risk of a conflict that would lead to the utilization of nuclear weapons has become particularly urgent. It is obvious that the increase in military arsenals, and the development of new weapons have their physical basis in the funds being expended upon them, which represent the concentrated embodiment of the military efforts of States, above all the most powerfully armed States.

The three-fold interaction of disarmament, development and security very clearly brings out the need for urgent steps designed to freeze and reduce military budgets.

Anyone willing to face reality must see quite clearly that the present rate of military expenditure can have no rational future. The statements made by a number of delegations, both in plenary meetings of the General Assembly and during discussion in our Committee, have expressed profound concern at the gigantic proportions military expenditures have assumed.

Far from imbuing us with a feeling of resignation, this serious phenomenon we are now facing only underscores the high priority and urgency of a freeze and reduction of military budgets within the over-all framework of measures designed to halt the arms race. This is an imperative task, whatever the difficulties involved in implementing it may be.

In this spirit, and together with other States, Romania has consistently spoken in favour of a reduction in military expenditure, both in percentages and in absolute figures. We should like to emphasize on this occasion as well, the proposal made by Romania with regard to a 10 to 15 per cent reduction of

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

military budgets and the rechanneling of the funds thus saved to the economic and social development of all countries, and primarily the developing countries. The Romanian delegation has also put forward the idea that at the present session the General Assembly should agree on freezing military expenditures at the 1981 level.

Consistent with its positions in this area, Romania has, for three successive years, unilaterally reduced its own military expenditures and the funds thus made available have been devoted to carrying out economic and social programmes.

The anxiety of peoples faced with the escalation in military budgets was reflected in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, as well as in the appeal addressed by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth regular sessions to all States, particularly the most heavily armed States, to display moderation in their military expenditures pending the conclusion of international agreements in that area. As everyone is aware, the General Assembly also requested the Disarmament Commission to define and spell out the principles that should govern the future action of States in the field of freezing and reducing military budgets.

The Government of Romania is most sincerely convinced that the drafting and adoption of such principles would be likely to help to initiate and bring to a successful conclusion negotiations on the reduction of military budgets.

During this year's session, the Disarmament Commission began to consider those principles on the basis of a working paper submitted by the delegations of Romania and Sweden (A/CN.10/26).

In the light of the foregoing, we felt it necessary to state very clearly in the working paper we submitted that the objectives of United Nations concerns in this area is the adoption of measures to freeze and reduce military expenditures under appropriate international control and embodied in international agreements. It is obvious that pending the conclusion of such agreements the political commitment of States to exercise self-restraint in determining such expenditures becomes a matter of extreme importance.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

The provision that budgetary reductions take the form of specific action and result in a genuine decrease in armaments has also been included to emphasize that efforts in this area are not an end in themselves, but rather a practical and effective means of halting and reversing the arms race.

Two fundamental ideas whose validity appears to us unquestionable, have guided us in the formulation of our proposals. The first is that the implementation of measures to freeze and reduce military budgets should in no way affect the right of States to equal security and a balance of forces at the regional or world level.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

The second principle is that this balance should be sought and established at ever lower levels of military expenditure and, consequently, lower levels of armed forces and armaments. This, essentially, is the purport of this new and bold approach which, my country believes, is the essential prerequisite for overcoming the deadlock in the disarmament talks, that is, bringing about military balance not by increasing arms but by continuously and systematically reducing military expenditure, armed forces and armaments by resolute disarmament measures under effective control.

We believe that among the principles to be adopted we must undoubtedly include the need for the most heavily armed States to be the first to embark on the process of limiting and reducing their military budgets. These States are at the top of the military-budget spiral. The important place they occupy in over-all military expenditure and the policies they pursue determine the rate of world military expenditure. It is perfectly obvious that the adoption of measures to freeze and to reduce the budgets of these States would result in more effective action in halting the arms race and in confidence-building.

Our delegation believes that it is particularly important that the principles to be drawn up reaffirm the relationship existing between the reduction of military expenditure and national and international development efforts. The funds that would be released through the reduction of military expenditures should be allocated to support the economic and social development efforts of the developing countries.

As in any disarmament agreement, the freezing and reduction of military budgets undoubtedly involves verification measures and the solution of a number of technical problems. Consequently, we consider that one of the principles which should guide the activity of all States in the field of reducing military budgets is the verification of such agreements by adequate measures, and also that the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, which established the principle of appropriate verification measures acceptable to all parties, should also apply to the agreements to reduce military expenditure.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

It is obvious that aspects of verification and comparability are integral parts of any future agreements to be negotiated and, consequently, cannot be regarded as preconditions to such agreements. The content of an international agreement and the ways and means of verifying it are a whole - the subject of negotiations which should be conducted in good faith with a desire to arrive at genuine measures which would result in the reduction of military expenditure. Without underestimating the difficulties deriving from present conditions, we are quite confident that the elaboration and adoption of these principles, which, furthermore, have been enshrined in other documents, is possible, and that if they were affirmed in a United Nations document they would be a substantial contribution by the Disarmament Commission. We are convinced that if these principles were to be agreed upon and included in a declaration to be adopted at the second special session devoted to disarmament, this would be of great significance for determining what concrete negotiations should be embarked upon. At the same time, we believe that their adoption would represent a political commitment on the part of all States to initiate such concrete negotiations on the freezing and reduction of military budgets.

The debates in our Committee offer us an opportunity to carry out a collective evaluation of the concrete possibilities for action on the part of the General Assembly to support efforts to reduce military expenditure and to allocate the funds thus released to purposes of economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries.

The Romanian delegation considers that these efforts could proceed, essentially, along three possible lines. First, in order to create a climate which would be propitious for negotiating agreements on the freezing and reduction of military budgets it is necessary that all States should evince moderation in determining the level of their military expenditure and should refrain from undertaking steps which by their very nature might undermine the very purpose of any future negotiations. A further argument in this particular field would be provided by the fact that the exercise of

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

such moderation would be a significant step towards helping to build confidence among States, and would have a very beneficial impact on the prospects for concluding agreements on the limitation and reduction of military budgets and for the international climate in general.

If the General Assembly, as at its two previous sessions, repeated its appeal to all States, particularly the most heavily-armed States, to display moderation when drawing up their military budgets until agreements had been reached on military budget reductions would be an initial contribution to the culmination of our discussion.

Secondly, the report of the Disarmament Commission which we have before us contains a consensus recommendation to the effect that the General Assembly should request the Commission at its next substantive session to continue its efforts to identify and elaborate the principles which should govern the actions of States in the field of freezing and reduction of military expenditures. I am referring to document A/36/42, page 13. We feel that the General Assembly should confirm this recommendation and should entrust the Disarmament Commission with the task of continuing at the 1982 session its consideration of the working paper annexed to the report of the Commission, as well as other proposals and ideas, in order to identify and elaborate the principles which should govern future actions of States in the freezing and reduction of military budgets, taking into consideration the possibility of including these principles in an appropriate document at the proper time.

Finally, we favour a consistent and close consideration of all technical aspects involved in the freezing and reduction of military budgets, including those relating to verification and comparability. At the same time, we believe that these matters cannot be considered from an exclusive point of view, nor can they be regarded as a prerequisite for any practical action to that effect.

We should like to emphasize once again that the Romanian delegation favours a constructive and flexible approach that would make it possible to identify elements which would help to reach common ground on the various ways States intend to act in order to reduce their military budgets.



(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

Our delegation, however, believes that these activities of the United Nations should be regarded as efforts to supplement the work of elaborating principles designed to govern the freezing and reduction of military budgets. All United Nations actions, whether in the Disarmament Commission or in other bodies created by the General Assembly, should be interlocking and, consequently, should be harmonized and subordinate to the over-all intention to promote international agreements on the reduction of military expenditure.

In conclusion, may I stress the hope that awareness of the responsibility we bear and the obligations we have to the international community will prevail over differences of view regarding the various approaches which can be taken to the problem of reducing military budgets.

Those were some of the thoughts our delegation wished to present on the question of the reduction of military budgets. On the basis of these positions, it is our intention to initiate consultations designed to result in the drafting of a resolution which might be widely acceptable, in order to keep the door open and to facilitate actions by States to limit and reduce military expenditure.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): One of the main bodies of the United Nations General Assembly, the First Committee, is now conducting its fourth session in succession since the adoption in New York of the well-known document which contains the goals and principles of disarmament and a comprehensive programme in the field of disarmament and also deals with the question of the effective functioning of international machinery for considering problems of disarmament in their various aspects.

This means that almost three years have elapsed since the holding of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the approval by consensus of its Final Document.

Today, at a time when the world community is preparing for the second special session, which is intended to be an important and responsible meeting, many are wondering what specific achievements in restraining the arms race and towards disarmament have been achieved? Have any real steps been taken towards nuclear disarmament? Naturally, it is not easy to give a simple answer to this.

The consistent efforts of the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations aimed at achieving genuine disarmament have met with a direct challenge from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which as early as May 1978, took the decision sharply to increase the military budgets of its member States and to elaborate a long-term programme to build up the military might of that bloc. Very soon thereafter, the United States of America hatched a series of plans one after the other, to station American medium-range missiles in Europe and to use outer space for military purposes. The decision has also been taken to undertake full-scale production of the neutron nuclear weapon and to locate on the territory of individual Western European countries that hideous means of the mass destruction of every living thing. We might add to this the recent announcement by the White House of a new programme for the further increase of American nuclear arsenals. This programme embraces missiles based both on land and on sea, including guided missiles and intercontinental MX missiles with a warhead 200 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb, and also strategic bombers of the new B-1 type and others. The American military presence is being strengthened in various parts of the world, the reliability of the so-called rapid deployment forces is being tested, and so on.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

All these activities have been accompanied by allegations about a mythical Soviet threat and statements that the Soviet Union is destroying the balance of forces.

In undertaking such dangerous steps, escalating the nuclear arms race, whipping up military hysteria and creating international tension, the authors of these military programmes have not concealed the fact that all this is directed against the Soviet Union and other socialist States in order to win military superiority over them. In order to justify these actions various doctrines have been advanced which proclaim the permissibility and acceptability of nuclear warfare, in particular the doctrine of two and a half wars, which is based on the idea that the United States should be prepared to intervene anywhere at any time in order to protect its vital interests. In the background of all this, statements are being made by officials in Washington on the need to establish a security reserve and to do away with areas of vulnerability.

On the whole, such policies and actions are quite obviously aimed at undermining the principles of equality and equal security and violating the existing parity in the military-strategic field. Essentially, this is the main reason for the exacerbation of the present international situation.

Those in certain circles in the United States and some other NATO countries are attempting to nullify everything constructive that has been done to preserve peace and international security, strengthen mutual understanding and trust among States, limit the arms race and bring about disarmament. The present leaders in Peking are condoning this action and even encouraging these circles to undertake further military activities.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

It is the fault of these forces that both bilateral and multilateral talks on the most important questions of limiting the arms race and disarmament have either been suspended or are not moving forward. This, we believe, is the explanation for the United States delay in ratifying the SALT II treaty and for the lack of effectiveness and universality of certain important international agreements and treaties on partial measures in the field of nuclear disarmament.

In these circumstances the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, on the basis of their fundamental policy in disarmament matters, have consistently put forward new initiatives and proposals and are firmly following the line of constructive dialogue and talks in order to achieve specific agreements on the curbing of the arms race while strictly observing the principles of equality and an equal degree of security. Agreed action on the part of the socialist States has been aimed at the successful implementation of the new peace initiatives which were worked out at the congresses of the fraternal communist and workers' parties of those countries, particularly the Peace Programme for the 1980s, put forward by the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

In this connexion, I refer to the timeliness and urgency of the new Soviet proposal regarding the conclusion of an international treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. The concrete consideration of this matter, for example, in the Committee on Disarmament and the drafting of an international treaty on this subject would be an important starting-point for efforts to prevent military confrontation in outer space.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

I should like also to draw attention to one of the most important points contained in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which emphasizes that nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization, and that it is essential to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race in all its aspects in order to avert the danger of war involving nuclear weapons.

These vital tasks are fully in consonance with the new initiative of the Soviet Union proposing the adoption by the General Assembly at its present, thirty-sixth, session of a declaration on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe. We are certain that that historically significant document will be widely supported in the General Assembly. In our opinion, its most important point is that the leaders of nuclear-weapon States should become aware of their supreme duty and direct obligation to act decisively in such a way as to eliminate the risk of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict.

The Head of the Soviet State, Mr. Brezhnev, in a recent interview, stressed that:

"Only he who has decided to commit suicide can start a nuclear war in the hope of emerging a victor from it. No matter what might the attacker possesses, no matter what method of unleashing nuclear war he chooses, he will not attain his aims ....

"If there is no first nuclear strike then consequently there will be no second or third nuclear strikes. Thereby all talk about the possibility or impossibility of victory in nuclear war become pointless - the question of nuclear war as such will be removed from the agenda of the day.

"And this is exactly what all peace-loving people on earth strive for, what the Soviet Union and its leadership are consistently working for. So now it is up to the United States and its leadership." (A/C.1/36/7, page 2)

In this connexion I should also like to say that it is the readiness of the United States that will, to a large extent, determine the commencement and any possible progress of the Geneva talks to take place at the end of November between the Soviet Union and the United States on medium-range nuclear devices in Europe.

I should now like to dwell on certain specific issues relating to the restriction of the arms race and to disarmament. Many have very rightly stated here that there is much to be desired in the results of the consideration of the most vital aspects of disarmament and in the achievement of practical steps in that field. It is to be noted with some regret that, as yet, we have been unable to achieve any substantial progress in our consideration of some of the most important items appearing on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament. As was shown by the outcome of the Committee on Disarmament's current work, that situation has been caused primarily by the position taken by the Western States and their followers, who are at present pursuing a policy of blocking substantive talks on these issues in that body. The last session of the Committee on Disarmament also convincingly showed that, in the present complicated international situation, it is of urgent necessity to demonstrate political will and determination in order to give a new impetus to talks on the restriction and curtailment of the arms race and on disarmament.

It is precisely to that end that delegations of the socialist countries have been pursuing businesslike talks in order to achieve concrete results within the framework of multilateral talks. The socialist countries have consistently favoured, and continue to favour, the earliest possible commencement of talks on the key issues of halting the arms race and nuclear disarmament. They have taken as the basis for their efforts the proposal made in 1978 by the Soviet Union for halting the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they are completely destroyed.

As representatives know, as far back as June 1946, the Soviet Union put forward in the United Nations a draft international convention banning forever the production and use of atomic weapons of mass destruction. The basic provision of that draft convention was that the parties to the convention would assume solemn obligations not to use atomic weapons, to prohibit their manufacture and storage, and to destroy all existing stockpiles of such weapons within a period of three months. It was proposed that violation of those obligations should be declared the gravest international crime against humanity.

That important proposal was rejected by the United States in the belief that it could maintain its monopoly over nuclear weapons.

At the last session of the Committee on Disarmament, a group of socialist countries proposed that consultations be held within that body to pave the way for concrete talks on matters of nuclear disarmament, and they continued in their efforts to create an ad hoc working group on that subject. But because of the negative reaction of certain nuclear-weapon States, it was impossible for that issue to be positively resolved.

The socialist countries, including the Mongolian People's Republic, have vigorously condemned the decision by the United States administration to begin full-scale production of the neutron weapon, considering that such a decision is an open challenge to peace and disarmament. Guided by our sincere desire to make it impossible for this hideous weapon of mass destruction to proliferate, the socialist countries have proposed the urgent establishment of a working group to hold talks on the drafting of an international convention prohibiting the manufacture, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear neutron weapons. A draft resolution to that effect was put forward by the socialist countries in 1978 in the Committee on Disarmament; but even at that time the Western Powers blocked any such proposal.

The absence of any readiness for serious talks, or, more precisely, the obstructionism and negativism of certain nuclear Powers and their allies is the main reason why the Committee on Disarmament has hitherto not been able to begin multilateral talks on the most urgent problem, which affects the interests of all mankind: the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests. The fact that China continues to explode nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, the further qualitative and quantitative improvement of nuclear weapons, the growth of the nuclear ambitions of Israel, South Africa and other potential nuclear-weapon States: all this makes it urgently necessary that a comprehensive decision on this question be taken as soon as possible.

We believe that the resumption of the tripartite talks between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union would greatly assist the work of the Committee on Disarmament in this field.

Along with the other socialist countries, the Mongolian People's Republic considers that an urgent task which brooks no delay is the strengthening of the security guarantees of non-nuclear-weapon States. We favour the speedy drafting and conclusion of an international convention on that subject, and regret the fact that the Committee on Disarmament has been unable to reach agreement on such a convention because of the negative position adopted by certain Western nuclear States.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

In this connexion, the Mongolian delegation would like to emphasize that the Committee on Disarmament should immediately undertake discussions in order to draw up an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present, the conclusion of which would lead to an increase in the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

The prohibition of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction is an important issue which we believe the Committee on Disarmament should take up in more specific terms, making use of the possibilities it already has available, including that of setting up a group of highly qualified experts.

We hold the view that the Committee on Disarmament, as it was unable to complete its work last session on a draft treaty prohibiting radiological weapons, should correct this situation so that it is enabled to complete its work on compiling the text of such a draft treaty as quickly as possible.

In the light of the fact that there will shortly be a second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, we believe it is extremely important successfully to conclude work on a comprehensive programme of disarmament. The Mongolian delegation believes that this programme should contain specific steps which will finally lead to general and complete disarmament, and should essentially focus on achieving practical agreements in connexion with restraining the arms race and with disarmament.

Turning now to the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons, we are pleased to note that a modicum of understanding exists among most of the member States of the Committee on Disarmament on a number of the substantive aspects of the forthcoming conference. We believe that further progress should be sought in order to achieve agreement in this very important area of real disarmament.

The Mongolian People's Republic, like other peace-loving States in Asia, is deeply concerned by the serious worsening of the atmosphere in this large continent and the fact that there are constant armed conflicts as a result of the active incursions of imperialist and hegemonist forces, that militarism has grown and that the decision has been made that a strategic partnership should be formed by supplying American offensive weapons and increasing the



(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

military presence in various parts of Asia. During the period which has elapsed since the end of the last world war, nowhere else in the world have there been so many wars and conflicts as there have been in Asia. The Mongolian People's Republic, which has done everything possible to participate in destroying and eliminating fascism and militarism and establishing international peace, categorically objected to the Korean War, during which the imperialist aggressors used bacteriological means of destruction. Mongolia has consistently supported the heroic struggles of the peoples of Indo-China, which won a resounding victory against foreign aggressors using chemical weapons such as napalm against them, as well as other means of devastation. In this way, the Mongolian People's Republic has always demonstrated its devotion to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

The sincere desire and aspiration of the Mongolian People's Republic to become a Member of the United Nations and to make its own contribution to the common cause of preserving peace and international security for many years encountered many obstacles created by those certain circles. However, we always believed that our just cause would triumph and 20 October marked the twentieth anniversary of the accession by the Mongolian People's Republic to membership of the United Nations. Throughout this time Mongolia has consistently supported and continues to support the efforts of peace-loving States to curb the arms race and take effective steps in the field of military détente and disarmament. In the United Nations and in other international organizations we have always endeavoured to assist and we continue to assist any efforts aimed at a positive solution of the urgent problems of the present day.

The Mongolian People's Republic has always firmly favoured the strengthening of peace and confidence and political dialogue between the States of Asia and has always given support to such constructive initiatives and proposals as those concerning making South-East Asia, the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf zones of peace and co-operation, the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Pacific, the adoption of confidence-building measures in the Far East, and so on.

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic, in its foreign policy activities, bears particularly in mind the tasks decided on by the twenty-eighth Congress of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, which was held at the

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

end of May this year, marking the sixtieth anniversary of the victory of the People's revolution in Mongolia. As the Committee knows, the Mongolian People's Republic, to prove its devotion to the cause of peace and détente, recently proposed that a convention be concluded on mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations between the States of Asia and the Pacific. It proposed the convening for this purpose of a conference among the countries of that area, to which all the permanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations should be invited. The fundamental approach of the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic to this matter and its view of the present situation in Asia and the Pacific area were discussed in some detail in the message sent by the Chairman of the Presidium of the Great People's Khural of the Mongolian People's Republic, Mr. Tsedenbal, to Heads of State and Government of the countries of those regions and to the permanent members of the Security Council, and also in the message of 21 September of this year to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, which was distributed as an official document of the United Nations General Assembly. In his message addressed to the Secretary-General, our Head of State, Mr. Tsedenbal, expressed his views on the fundamental provisions of such a convention and, in so doing, particularly emphasized the following point:

"An important place should be accorded to the provisions envisaging energetic actions by the participating States on such cardinal problems of strengthening peace and security as measures for reducing military confrontation, curbing the arms race, and disarmament."

(A/36/586, annex, p. 5)

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

This Mongolian proposal, which adds to and, we believe, strengthens the relevant initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist States has, together with the constructive proposals made by a number of Asian countries, been greeted with due understanding and support on the part of States Members of the United Nations.

The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic is prepared to co-operate closely with all States concerned in a broad exchange of views on this matter, so that through our joint efforts we shall be able to achieve fruitful results.

At the present time throughout the entire world, we are observing for the fourth time a week devoted to efforts to promote disarmament. We attach great importance to the activities which have been organized by governmental and non-governmental organizations as part of this week, all of which are playing an important part in mobilizing world public opinion in the struggle for the strengthening of peace and security, a curtailment of the arms race and genuine disarmament.

The voices of all peoples may be heard today raised in the demand for the prevention of nuclear catastrophe. The joint efforts of broad segments of the world population are now playing an important role in achieving practical steps in order to restrict and curb the arms race and to bring about nuclear disarmament.

In the opinion of the Mongolian delegation, it would be useful for the second special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament to consider the whole range of issues which stem from the points contained in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, so that it can subsequently help to mobilize world public opinion in favour of disarmament. In this connexion, we support the Mexican proposal for the organization of a world campaign on disarmament.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The Mongolian People's Republic, like other socialist countries, is profoundly convinced that putting an end to the arms race and achieving disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, are the indispensable prerequisites for tackling the most important tasks of development. As is well known, a special study was carried out on the interrelationship between disarmament and development. The First Committee recently had the Secretary-General's report on this matter before it. In our opinion, this is an excellent beginning for a very important piece of work. And we believe that what is most important is for such efforts to have a beneficial impact on the tackling of those tasks towards which they were originally directed.

The Mongolian delegation is ready to assist in the efforts of the members of the First Committee to enable the present session of the General Assembly to draw up specific recommendations for the resolution of some of the most urgent problems in the sphere of curbing the arms race and bringing about genuine disarmament.

Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt): Mr. Chairman, I hope you will allow my delegation, at the very outset, to congratulate you - in fact, to congratulate itself - at seeing you preside over the deliberations of the First Committee. Your brilliant performance over the years in matters of multilateral as well as bilateral diplomacy is a matter of record. Your work in the field of disarmament and other equally important fields bears witness to the efficiency, objectivity, commitment and sense of responsibility for which you are rightly known.

It is, of course, an added pleasure for my delegation to see you, a son of Yugoslavia, a country with which my own nation has strong historical ties of friendship and co-operation, guide the work of the First Committee.

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

We also wish to express our congratulations to the two Vice-Chairmen, Ambassador Yango of the Philippines and Ambassador Mario Carias of Honduras, as well as to the Rapporteur, Mr. Makonnen of Ethiopia.

We are confident that under such wise leadership the Committee will successfully discharge its duties, especially at a session which is both preceding and preparing for the second special session on disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, as you so rightly expressed it in your opening statement of 19 October, we are embarking on our work

...under the shadow of a continuous deterioration of the international situation. Bloc rivalries have brought the process of détente to a dismal state and have spread crises and conflicts all over the globe. Recourse to violence and use of force is being generally condemned but it is, nevertheless, becoming the practice of the day. Increasingly large numbers of countries rightfully consider themselves to be threatened. Regardless of their size, whether possessing the most complicated systems of arms or being poorly armed, all of them are apprehensive about their own security and their future."

(A/C.1/36/PV.3, p.2)

Indeed, the current international situation could be characterized by two parallel trends: first, the increasing recourse to the use of force in the conduct of international relations and, secondly, an increasingly precarious world economy. Caught between these two ominous trends, the countries of the third world, comprising the vast majority of the world's population, stand to suffer the most. On the one hand, their political independence is imperiled and, on the other, their economic viability is threatened.

More than 10 years have elapsed since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2734 (XXV) on the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, in an attempt to breathe some air into the Charter system for the maintenance of international peace and security. It is, indeed, ironic that the international situation at the time of the adoption of the Declaration was generally better than it is now, some 10 years later.

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

The crisis in the process of détente poses a serious threat to world peace and stability. The rivalry among the great Powers continues, and the competition for spheres of influence has intensified. The arms race, particularly in its nuclear aspect, has escalated to new levels of irrationality. Forces hostile to the emancipation of peoples continue to infringe the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of countries and the right of peoples under alien and colonial domination or foreign occupation to self-determination and independence.

The greatest peril, however, confronting the world today more than at any other time in the past decade is the threat of destruction as a result of nuclear war. The actions of nuclear-weapon States, which are continuously engaged in round after round of the nuclear arms race, have created a situation in which mankind seems to have been condemned to live in the shadow of nuclear annihilation.

As long as such a situation persists, the irrational allocation of resources will continue to move away from economic and social development and towards a more massive arms build-up, thereby further aggravating the precarious world economic and political situation and accentuating the threats to international peace and security.

In such a state of affairs, the arms race becomes both the cause and the consequence, as our Chairman has so rightly said. But, after all, that is why we are all here - to make a contribution towards disarmament - and this is precisely our mission, which we hope will not be one of those "missions impossible". I share in the Chairman's doubt as to whether it would really be impossible "to act reasonably before nuclear weapons are used again".

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

Since we are only a few months away from the second special session devoted to disarmament, our work should concentrate on the preparations for that session. Much has been said about disarmament, and hundreds of resolutions have been adopted on the matter. We are not against that, as we believe it contributes to a growing public awareness of the problem and thus plays a key role in a world disarmament campaign. In fact, we hoped that the Committee would have embarked on a kind of assessment of the disarmament process since the first special session devoted to disarmament. We are glad that both the Chairman, and many other speakers who preceded me have proceeded along those lines. I wish, in this connexion, to refer in particular to the statement by the representative of Mexico, Ambassador Garcia Robles.

An assessment of the kind we are calling for should not be shunned because achievements in the proper sense of the word have not been attained, nor should there be any tendency to pessimism or optimism. Disarmament is a very complex and multi-dimensional issue. It is only understandable, and in a certain meaning of the word even acceptable, that it meet with obstacles and set-backs. But the stakes are high and the magnitude of the danger is so huge that we should not accept defeat or permit failure.

Yes, there have been many negative elements in the work carried out in the field of disarmament since the first special session devoted to disarmament. They far outweigh the positive side. However, such positive elements do exist, and we have to build on them and do our utmost to arrest the negative trend, whether it is inherent in our way of working, results from developments in the international situation, or is brought in by some irresponsible action or policy by this or that State, either at the international or at the regional level.

The holding of the first special session devoted to disarmament was in itself a great achievement. The unqualified Final Document resulting

(Mr. Moussa Egypt)

therefrom and adopted by consensus was a milestone in the long and arduous process of disarmament. Ever since, the growing awareness of the necessity for disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, among all segments of active and effective circles in the international arena has been increasingly accentuated. This, and public awareness, indeed constitute the major groundswell for disarmament.

A consensus on the ultimate goal, that is, general and complete disarmament under effective international control, has been cemented. Another equally important world consensus has evolved centering on the essentiality of reaching a complete cessation of nuclear-weapon tests as a fundamental objective in the field of disarmament.

Consensus has also determined that nuclear disarmament is the focal point of disarmament efforts. Machinery for those efforts has been created, with three branches: negotiating, deliberating and study and research.

There have also been some limited concrete achievements, such as the conclusion and the opening for signature in New York on 10 April 1981 of the Convention on the Prohibition or Restriction of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. In addition, a number of cogent studies have been conducted, such as the study on the relationship between disarmament and development; the study on the implications of establishing an international satellite monitoring agency, the study on the institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament and the comprehensive study of nuclear weapons. All those positive elements notwithstanding, the negative ones are still enormous.

The insatiable quest for larger military arsenals embellished with armaments of increasing sophistication and destructive power has continued, even intensified. Billions of dollars and rubles are spent to increase the destructive power of military arsenals, to a point where it seems meaningless.



(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

Such an attitude, it is argued, is designed to maintain international peace and stability. The fact is, however, that one slight miscalculation and the world will witness havoc and untold sufferings.

As if the arms race on earth were not sufficient, we are faced with an increasing possibility that it will be extended to a new arena - outer space. Such a development would have serious implications for the nuclear arms race, particularly among the super-Powers.

Space technology will yield the undesired result of providing greater reliability and accuracy to strategic weapons, thereby entailing the replacement of the present strategic doctrines by more aggressive ones. Aware of the grave implications of the military uses of outer space Egypt, as far back as the General Assembly's endorsement of the outer space Treaty, had the following to say, on 17 December 1966. In the words of the Egyptian representative:

"What I would like to outline is what was not included in the treaty. In this regard, to our dissatisfaction, article IV prohibits only the placing in outer space of all objects carrying nuclear weapons and any other kind of weapons of mass destruction, and also the installation of such weapons on celestial bodies. We consider that this article contains a serious loophole since it does not explicitly provide for the use of outer space solely for peaceful purposes. The position of the United Arab Republic, together with other countries, on this matter is crystal-clear and has been stated and emphasized several times before in the Committee on Outer Space both in New York and in Geneva. We believe it is imperative that outer space be used solely for peaceful purposes, since mankind cannot afford to witness a new kind of arms race in space." (A/C.1/PV.1493)

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

Today, some 14 years later, the possibility has become a reality. Outer space is about to become another arena for the arms race. Consistent with our longstanding position, we support any genuine effort aimed at preserving outer space solely for peaceful purposes. We wish, however, to underscore the urgency of such an endeavour.

If we turn to the machinery of disarmament within the United Nations system, we can safely but regrettably conclude that neither the Disarmament Commission nor the Committee on Disarmament have been able to achieve the results desired of them. As for negotiations outside the United Nations framework, though clearly connected, be they negotiations in different forums between the two blocs or the two super-Powers, we cannot but express regret that no progress has been made.

This, in brief, is our assessment of the state of affairs in the field of disarmament since the first special session devoted to disarmament. We submit that it should in no way be a source of discouragement. On the contrary, it should be an incentive for us to redouble our efforts in the pursuit of a comprehensive programme for disarmament in the light of the guidelines set out in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament.

Only the week before last, the Preparatory Committee for the second special session painfully agreed on an agenda for the second special session, thus paving the way for substantive preparation at its next session. Armed with the consensus Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, the international community must fully utilize the upcoming second special session to set in motion an effective and practical process of disarmament. Towards this end, the second special session devoted to disarmament should adopt a comprehensive programme on disarmament which includes specific disarmament measures to be implemented according to agreed phases within a specified time frame.

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

To ensure the implementation of the results of the forthcoming special session, the central role of the United Nations must be strengthened and the United Nations machinery on disarmament in particular must be made more effective. The causes that impaired the effectiveness of the Committee on Disarmament must be squarely addressed. Ways and means to enhance the role of the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative organ must be explored. The advisability of the creation of additional organs required for the effective implementation of whatever is agreed upon at the second special session on disarmament must be carefully - and in some cases even favourably - considered. A United Nations satellite monitoring agency and an international disarmament fund for development are cases in point.

To provide the necessary technical and substantive support required for such reforms of disarmament machinery and to underscore the central role of the United Nations in disarmament, the Centre for Disarmament should be provided with the necessary resources and made into an independent department within the Secretariat.

I should now like to discuss the work of the Committee on Disarmament in somewhat greater detail. The Committee on Disarmament created by the tenth special session was together with the Disarmament Commission, meant to underscore the collective commitment to disarmament.

It is for that reason that we view with concern and apprehension the state of affairs in the Committee on Disarmament. The Committee has been paralysed by the lack of political will of some of its members to achieve meaningful progress on the road towards the common objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The consensus rule has been used in a way that has prevented the Committee from realizing even some procedural progress, such as the establishment of two ad hoc working groups to deal with items to which the General Assembly has accorded the highest priority, namely, the nuclear test ban and the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. We sympathize with the contemplated possibility that if

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

such a situation should recur, the Committee on Disarmament should consider the possibility of freeing the establishment of subsidiary bodies from the present interpretation of the consensus rule. On the other hand, on matters which are of lesser priority but nevertheless of great importance not only to my country but to the majority of the international community - such matters as chemical weapons, radiological weapons, the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament and effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons - hardly any meaningful progress has been realized. It is our hope that the Committee on Disarmament would be able - or, rather, enabled - successfully to conclude negotiations on the various disarmament instruments now before it.

Towards this end, we strongly support the following: first, initiating negotiations on the scope and arrangements for verification and final clauses of a nuclear test-ban treaty at the beginning of the 1982 session. Secondly, intensive negotiations must be conducted from the beginning of 1982 on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament to ensure its adoption at the second special session on disarmament, for it is our firm view that the programme should be the centre-piece of the special session. The programme should, we believe, contain concrete disarmament measures in defined stages leading to the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament within an agreed time-frame. Egypt, together with the members of the Group of 21, has submitted a working paper containing specific disarmament measures to be included in the various stages of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, as well as a working paper on the principles underlying such a programme. Thirdly, pending the realization of complete nuclear disarmament and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, all nuclear-weapon States should provide the non-nuclear-weapon States with clear and unequivocal assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in the form of an international instrument of a legally binding nature. Towards this end, my country, together with the other members of the Group of 21, supported and played an active role in the negotiations in the Ad Hoc Working Group dealing with this matter within the Committee on

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

Disarmament to evolve an agreement on a common approach or formula that could be included in the desired international instrument. Fourthly, widening the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group on chemical weapons so that it may negotiate on a multilateral convention and, fifthly, the successful conclusion of a radiological weapons convention. In this connexion, I should like to emphasize that the Israeli air attack on the Iraqi peaceful nuclear reactor - a development my delegation regrets and shall address in detail when the relevant item is discussed in the plenary meetings of the General Assembly - has rendered all the more essential the Swedish proposal for the inclusion of a provision in the Convention on the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities.

I should now like to turn to two of the thorny subjects on our agenda, the first being the study of all aspects of the conventional arms race requested in General Assembly resolution 35/156 A. I wish to reiterate the position of my Government on this issue. We support, in principle, the undertaking of that study as long as it is conducted within the correct perspective. First, it should be realized that the priority in disarmament, as agreed by the international community, clearly rests on nuclear disarmament. The study should therefore take full cognizance of that fact. Secondly, the study should take into account the root causes of the conventional arms race. It should in no way be used as a vehicle to infringe on the rights of peoples and States to self-determination and to protect their sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence within the framework of the principles and purposes of the Charter.

The second subject to which I should like to address myself is the reduction of military budgets. Since the General Assembly's adoption of resolution 3093 A (XXVIII) in 1973, which requested the permanent members of the Security Council to reduce their military budgets by 10 per cent from the 1973 figure during the following financial year, global military expenditure has increased tremendously. Since that time the General Assembly has been engaged in what we

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

believe is a marginal, although not totally worthless, exercise in accounting and reporting. Reductions in military budgets cannot and should not be solely dependent on the comparability of military expenditures. It has been agreed that to effect reductions in military budgets a climate of confidence must prevail. But how can a climate of confidence be created when the arms race is spiralling at a maddening pace? The answer clearly lies with the nuclear weapon States who also happen to have the largest military budgets. They must heed the call of the international community and take it upon themselves first to freeze and subsequently to cut their military expenditure by an agreed amount. We even venture to call upon the two super-Powers to take up this matter whenever they resume their bilateral talks on arms limitations. Parallel with this step, an effective monitoring and verification mechanism administered by the United Nations should be instituted.

As stated earlier, the greatest danger that faces mankind is destruction as a result of nuclear war. Conscious of this fact, the international community has made nuclear disarmament a matter of absolute priority.

Towards this end, we continue to believe that the most effective way to eliminate the threat of a nuclear war, pending the achievement of nuclear disarmament, is to prohibit the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons - not the first use alone, but the very use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The Non-Aligned Movement has a long-standing position in this respect. As recently as last February, the ministerial meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement held at New Delhi pronounced itself on this matter along the following lines:

"A new international instrument along the lines of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, which prohibited the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons... covering nuclear weapons would provide a satisfactory answer."

This, to my delegation, remains the only reasonable approach.

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

Although the highest priority rests with nuclear disarmament, and thus our efforts should be directed at encouraging the nuclear-weapon States to take concrete measures towards this goal, it remains equally important, however, to tackle the security problems of the non-nuclear States that arise as a result of the nuclear arms race and which, if tackled properly and effectively, will contribute to nuclear disarmament.

We recommend to non-nuclear States three avenues to be energetically pursued towards enhancing this objective:

The first is the enhancement of the effectiveness and credibility of the non-proliferation régime. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to which Egypt became a fully-fledged party after its ratification in February of this year, continues to be an important contribution in this regard in spite of its inability effectively to arrest vertical and horizontal proliferation, particularly the former. Developments in the past decade have proved that the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), particularly its faithful implementation, requires close examination.

We regret that the Second Review Conference of the NPT held last year was unable to agree on how to make the Treaty more effective. From the time Egypt signed the Treaty in 1968, until ratifying it last February it has always maintained that the Treaty is a first step towards a credible non-proliferation régime. In spite of its shortcomings, the NPT continues to be the best guarantee both against the spread of nuclear weapons and for ensuring the right of all States to nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

Nevertheless, to render the NPT régime more effective the following three objectives should be speedily realized: the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty; the conclusion of an agreement as to what constitutes a nuclear explosion for peaceful purposes and what does not; and the initiation of a nuclear fuel supply system under appropriate international supervision. Equally important is the necessity that non-members of the NPT adhere to its purposes and principles.

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

Secondly, nuclear-weapon States should provide non-nuclear-weapon States with legally binding assurances not to use nuclear weapons against them; and, thirdly, the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace in the various regions of the world, such as the Mediterranean, South-East Asia, the Indian Ocean and the Middle East.

For its part, Egypt is making its contribution towards the goal of general and complete disarmament in line with the considerations presented above. Attracted by the NPT contribution towards an effective non-proliferation régime, Egypt ratified the Treaty in February of this year. In becoming a fully-fledged party to the Treaty, we took it upon ourselves to spare no effort to help evolve it into a credible instrument for non-proliferation.

In addition, for the past seven years, Egypt has espoused the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Aware of the perpetual tension and instability that characterize the region, Egypt has spared no effort towards the realization of this objective. Year after year, either alone or in co-operation with another party, we have submitted proposals on this score to the General Assembly both at its regular sessions and at its tenth special session. Since 1974 the General Assembly has adopted, with increasing majorities, a series of resolutions on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. However, it was only last year that the General Assembly adopted resolution 35/147 by consensus, a consensus in which all the concerned parties in the region, as well as all nuclear Powers, participated. Such a development should be fully utilized as a springboard for further action towards the establishment of the zone. A nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East has become more imperative and more urgent.

Based on the consensus resolution 35/147, the General Assembly should find it appropriate at this session to declare the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East along the same lines as the declaration on the denuclearization of Africa. As to the implementation of the declaration, appropriate arrangements concerning the modalities will have to be devised. In this regard, the United Nations has a major role to



(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

play. Although guidance may be sought from the comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects (A/10027/Add.1), it will be necessary to explore the specific modalities for the establishment of the zone in the Middle East. We therefore believe that the Secretary-General should dispatch a special representative to the concerned parties in the region in order to ascertain their views on the scope and modalities required for the establishment of the zone. The Egyptian delegation will soon present this Committee with a formal proposal in this regard.

The purpose of this statement was to present the views of the Government of Egypt on the disarmament process in general. However, in concluding I cannot but return to the theme with which I opened my remarks, namely, the triangular relationship between disarmament, international security and development. It is the view of my delegation that any effort at disarmament cannot be effective unless it is taken within the context of this triangular relationship. Any disarmament effort should therefore be complemented by equally determined efforts to strengthen international peace and security and enhance the development of developing countries. Towards these two objectives the purposes and principles of the Charter must be strictly observed; in particular respect for the rights of peoples and States to genuine self-determination and non-recourse to the use or threat of use of force in the settlement of disputes, and the restructuring of international economic relations giving rise to the New International Economic Order based on justice and equality, which must proceed without interruption.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.