

United Nations

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records\*



FIRST COMMITTEE  
14th meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 27 October 1981  
at 4 p.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 14TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

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

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Martynenko (Ukrainian SSR)  
Mr. Adelman (United States)  
Mr. Kapllani (Albania)  
Mr. Vo Anh Tuan (Viet Nam)  
Mr. Sola Vila (Cuba)

UN LIBRARY

OCT 30 1981

UN/SA COLLECTION

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

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/36/PV.14  
28 October 1981

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.

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

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. MARTYNIENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Today the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic would like to express its views on the question of the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space.

Next year will mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the day when the first practical step was taken in the conquest of outer space. A quarter of a century ago, the first Soviet artificial earth satellite in the world heralded the beginning of the space era in the life of mankind. Today with lengthy flights undertaken by joint teams in orbit, the study of outer space has become quite a normal phenomenon. From year to year the achievements in outer space are becoming ever more part of our daily life and are promoting the further development of the national economies of countries.

However, we should not forget that outer space, like the atom, can be used for creative purposes and for the good of the world, but it can also be used for purposes of destroying every living thing on earth and can become a new theatre for the arms race. After all, powerful missile systems are not only a fundamental technological means of space research but also the major vehicle for carrying nuclear and other weapons. Therefore, the struggle to turn outer space into a zone of peace and into a field for the exclusively peaceful activities of man is a very important part of the struggle for peace and disarmament.

At the very beginning of the development of the conquest of space, the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community proposed that an agreement be reached, particularly within the United Nations, on prohibiting the use of outer space for military purposes, on the basis of strict consideration for equal security and the prevention of any military advantages accruing to any party. Thanks to the efforts of all States concerned,

(Mr. Martynenko, Ukrainian SSR)

it proved possible to bring about a few concrete results in limiting the military use of outer space in a number of areas. First, that was reflected in the universal agreements which enshrined a broad range of principles and norms governing the activities of States in research into and use of outer space, the stipulation of norms prohibiting individual types of military use of outer space and particularly the stationing of weapons of mass destruction in outer space. Secondly, there were provisions of certain multilateral international agreements on taking partial measures in the field of disarmament, which also covered outer space. Thirdly, there were the bilateral agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation of anti-missile defence systems and the limitation of strategic offensive weapons. Those agreements laid down the relevant provisions which impose not only quantitative but also qualitative limitations on individual types of weapons.

However, the agreements which have so far been concluded have not excluded the possibility of placing in outer space such forms of weapons which, although they do not fall under the definition of weapons of mass destruction, are, at the same time, in terms of their destructive power, in no way less powerful than those weapons. As a result, the danger still remains -- and recently that danger has increased -- of a further militarization of outer space. The United States, by increasing the arms race to unprecedented proportions, is attaching a particular role to outer space in its military preparations and is banking on placing new armaments in outer space, hoping thereby to achieve military supremacy for itself and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization over the socialist States.

(Mr. Martynenko, Ukrainian SSR)

To this end, as has been reported in the American press, space combat systems are being developed designed for striking at targets in outer space, in the atmosphere and on earth. Great hopes are being placed also in the possibility of the military use of the recently-tested reusable manned shuttle system. With it, it is planned to launch into orbit military space stations equipped with anti-satellite weapons, to lay anti-satellite minefields, to establish space-based systems of anti-missile defence, and so forth. As is emphasized by the editor of Air Force Magazine, Mr. Ulsamer, the Defense Department openly characterizes the NASA shuttle as a substantial and integral part of the future military activity of the United States, and the Defense Department will be its primary user.

It is easy to imagine that the carrying out of these and similar plans for the further militarization of outer space and the stationing there of new types of weapons would do even more to whip up the arms race, lead to the emergence of yet another source of the danger of war for the whole of mankind, and be a serious obstacle to broad international co-operation in outer space research and in the peaceful uses of outer space.

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR believes that measures must be taken immediately to erect a reliable barrier to the further militarization of outer space. Such an approach would be entirely in keeping with the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. That document states, inter alia, that

"In order to prevent an arms race in outer space, further measures should be taken and appropriate international negotiations held in accordance with the spirit of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies". (resolution S-10/2, para. 80)

In the light of what I have said, we believe that the proposal of the Soviet Union for the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space is extremely timely and urgent. The draft treaty, which I believe all delegations will have had an opportunity to study, provides for the assumption by States of the obligation not to place in orbit around the earth objects carrying weapons of any kind, install such weapons on celestial

(Mr. Martynenko, Ukrainian SSR)

bodies, or station such weapons in outer space in any other manner, including on reusable manned space vehicles of an existing type or of other types which may be developed in the future. In this way, the proposed international legal document is designed to take into account the vertiginous pace of scientific and technological progress in outer space and military technology. States Parties, the draft treaty provides, would undertake not to destroy, damage, disturb the normal functioning or change the flight trajectory of space objects of other States Parties, if such objects were placed in orbit in strict accordance with the provisions of the draft treaty.

As we see, this proposal is designed to prevent outer space being turned into a theatre for the arms race. It is much easier to do this now, before that danger becomes a fait accompli.

In the present circumstances, where there is considerable exacerbation of the international situation, the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community propose that we come out firmly in support of honest and equal negotiations to prevent a further round in the nuclear missile arms race. The proposal on talks for the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space is designed to be precisely on those same lines.

The Ukrainian delegation would like to express the hope that the General Assembly during the present session will be able to take a decision on this subject which will make possible an immediate start on work in the Committee on Disarmament on producing the proposed text of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. The conclusion and implementation of that treaty would be a significant and concrete measure towards limiting the arms race, and would promote an improvement in the international climate as a whole, as well as the development of international co-operation.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): On 21 October, Mr. Rostow presented the views of the United States in a most positive, realistic manner on the critical arms control issues before this Committee and the Committee on Disarmament. On 23 October, the Soviet representative made his country's position known.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

As members of the Committee will see, the United States will be most positive here, as elsewhere. These issues are too important for empty polemics and tired rhetoric.

We agree with the statement made last Friday by the Soviet representative that this Committee must not be a "shop for second-hand goods". For this very reason, the United States representative stated in the General Committee on 6 October 1981 that the Soviet so-called initiative on the "prevention of nuclear catastrophe" was a matter that "the Soviets ritualistically introduced", which has "ritualistically been met with the same response .... We feel disappointed that the Soviets return to the same tired proposals - however dressed up as 'new' - instead of more serious and practical proposals for real, effective and verifiable arms control".

Our sentiment remains the same. This Soviet item is not second-hand goods - it is not even third - or fourth-hand goods, for this issue has been introduced in the United Nations off and on over the past 20 years or more.

One of the most important features of United States policy is the conviction that we must introduce realism into our endeavours if we are to have any hope of success. Arms control and disarmament objectives are inseparable from national and international security objectives, and cannot be pursued in a vacuum. As the international situation changes, some arms control objectives may have to be modified, and may even lose their validity, at least in the short term. This presents us with a real challenge to search for new approaches, approaches that will make a real contribution to international security. It is not useful to waste time in this Committee, or in any other forum, on empty propagandistic proposals, proposals which are no longer relevant or proposals which have been rendered invalid by the aggressive actions of some States. Arms control is a serious matter which should not be treated as political theatre. To do so shows contempt for the work of this Committee. Let us have no more of that; we have had enough already, during our opening week.

In his statement before this Committee last Friday, the Soviet representative saw fit to treat us to such an approach. His proposals for arms control initiatives included many of the same shop-worn propaganda items that have been served up to

this Committee for years, albeit sometimes dressed up in new finery. His assertions about the Soviet Union's devotion to disarmament, especially in the nuclear realm, are belied by the facts. For the Soviet Union has concentrated on nuclear weapons improvements steadily over the past 10 years, despite the fact that the United States, in the mid-1960s, began a decade-long strategic stall, basically abjuring new strategic initiatives. On this the record is clear. Since 1970, the Soviet Union has introduced at least 11 new or modified intercontinental ballistic missiles, compared to one for the United States. The USSR, since then, has introduced nine new or modified submarine-launched ballistic missiles, compared to two for the United States. Today, the Soviets have an open production line on both land-based missiles and manned bombers. The United States has an open production line on neither.

Last Friday, the Soviet representative accused the United States of preparing for nuclear war. Although the closed nature of Soviet society does not permit us the luxury of reading about strategic planning in that country, occasional articles emerge which cast a disturbing light on how Soviet military planners approach their task.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

As early as 1962, the publication Soviet Military Strategy stated:

"The basic means for armed combat in land theatres in a future world war will be the nuclear weapon used primarily with operational tactical missiles and also frontal aviation (bombers, fighter bombers and fighters). In addition, the strategic rocket troops and long-range aviation will deliver nuclear strikes against important objectives in the zone of offensive fronts ... On the battlefields the decisive role will be played by fire of nuclear weapons. The other means of armed combat will utilize the results of nuclear attacks for the final defeat of the enemy."

Other articles on this subject from time to time since then have continued to echo a similar theme. And just recently, in May of this year, writing in the Communist Party's theoretical journal, Kommunist, Lt. General P. Zhilin, referring to the Marxist-Leninist division of wars into just and unjust wars, rejected the idea that nuclear war was of itself unjust. He wrote:

"War was and is a continuation of policy, policy entirely irrespective of the level of development and the means of armed struggle."

These writings are not the idle musings of private individuals. They were written by high-level Soviet military figures and appeared in official publications. As such, they provide insights into past and current thinking of key Soviet military strategists, and there emerges from them a frightening picture of Soviet intentions.

Faced with this evidence, and the reality of Soviet actions, any reasoning person must come to the conclusion that the Soviet Union is now, and has been for some time, following a policy which does not exclude the use of nuclear force to achieve their goals. Moreover, they clearly indicate that the Soviet Union, despite its protestations, does not accept the concept of mutual assured destruction in a nuclear conflict, but rather believes that it can win a nuclear war, and that such a war could be limited.

The United States does not share these dangerous views. As President Reagan said on 21 October:

"As all Presidents have acknowledged, any use of nuclear weapons would have the most profound consequences. In a nuclear war, all mankind would lose. Indeed, the awful and incalculable risks associated with any use of nuclear weapons themselves serve to deter their use."



(Mr. Adelman, United States)

The Soviet initiative on non-first use should be judged in light of the considerations I have just outlined. It is instructive to note that the Soviet proposal does not reject the use of nuclear weapons. We should not be misled. The establishment of peace will come about only as the result of hard bargaining and mutual agreement on concrete measures which limit the manufacture and use of arms. Empty words have no utility in achieving the results which we all seek.

I am sure most of us in this room well appreciate that it is essential for true and effective arms control that both sides in any negotiation must know the facts and figures of where they are - in terms of military budgets and armaments - in order to know from what level to reduce or disarm.

In the United States, we publish extensive data from the Defense Secretary's report to the Congress, and the report of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and a multitude of other documents. We make public the endless congressional budgetary data on military equipment, endless testimonies in open session by our highest military and civilian leaders, professional studies by the Congressional Budget Office, General Accounting Office, and so forth. All these are available to the American people, to the First Committee, and to the world at large.

Where, one must ask, are the similar military documents from the Soviet Union? Where is the open material on future defence spending, on current armaments or military doctrine, on intentions and performances? There are none. Precisely the lack of what the Soviet representative called the "compilation of information on arms" has hobbled arms control efforts over the past thirty years.

This closed nature of the Soviet Union also seems to contribute most heavily to the Soviet penchant for sweeping but meaningless arms control and disarmament proposals designed to obfuscate the real issues and for opposing modest but concrete measures that could be the building-blocks for real progress. For example, over the past few years the Soviets have opposed resolutions calling for the establishment of a standardized reporting system for military expenditures, while the United States has supported and promoted this effort.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

Without a common data base no progress can be made towards coming to grips with the problem of controlling spiralling military expenditures. As I have stated, the United States has long made information on its military budget and activities in other military areas, including research and development, available to the world at large. If the Soviet Union were to do the same, we would be much closer to establishing the basis for enduring agreements in the arms control field. Instead, the Soviets trot out such propagandistic proposals as their initiative for a ban on new weapons of mass destruction, a meaningless proposal which addresses undefined and non-existent weapons and which would, in any event, be impossible to implement or to verify.

Another basic philosophical difference distinguishes the approaches of the United States and the Soviet Union to these issues. The United States, along with most countries, recognizes that the complexity of modern arms and armaments requires co-operative arrangements in furnishing verifiable data on the arms being limited or controlled. The Soviet Union apparently does not share this view, or if it does, the statements made by its representative here suggest otherwise.

To propose a dialogue on the general problem of verification, which is applicable to many types of situations, does not in any way compromise the principle that verification arrangements should be tailored to the particular agreement at hand. To say, as the Soviet representative did, that the United States is using the issue of verification to paralyse the work of the international community on arms control is to suggest that this Committee and the other multilateral organs dealing with arms control and disarmament should not deal with this vital issue. We must deal with it.

All delegations in this chamber have recognized the vital role of effective verification in constructing enduring arms control agreements. This recognition was embodied in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

The Soviet representative, in claiming that arms control negotiations in the 1970s have been undermined or blocked by the United States, conveniently ignores the threats to the continued viability of the biological warfare Convention, as well as the Geneva Protocol of 1925, which most assuredly did not come from the United States. I was surprised that the Soviet representative even mentioned chemical weapons and negotiations at all. While he stated that the Soviet Union would like to accelerate negotiations on chemical weapons, the people of Asia would like to stop the use of chemical weapons. This will be a topic for careful deliberation later in the First Committee.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

One wonders, however, why the Soviet Union is so sensitive to the investigation by the United Nations experts of reports of the use of chemical weapons. If those reports are without foundation, then there is nothing to fear. If those reports are, as the Soviet representative suggested, "irresponsible gossip", why should the Soviet Union not wish that to be firmly established? Our interest is in bringing the true facts to light, and this body, I am sure, will not ignore the urgency of this issue.

The Soviet representative's statement also ignores the USSR's rejection of the 1977 United States proposal for deep cuts in nuclear arsenals on both sides and the current United States Administration's approach to strategic arms reduction and its readiness to engage in negotiations to limit intermediate-range nuclear weapons -- negotiations that will begin before this year's General Assembly finishes its work.

These negotiations will take place against the background of Soviet rhetoric on these matters. Having deployed 250 of its highly mobile, MIRVed long-range SS-20 missiles targeted at Western Europe, and continuing to deploy a new SS-20 missile at the frightening pace of more than one a week, the Soviet Union now attempts to prevent the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) from adopting the necessary counter-measures to safeguard the security of democratic States. We hope that these negotiations succeed.

There is a strange silence from the Soviet side about the practical work that this Committee has undertaken in several fields. The studies on confidence-building measures and regional arms control are two such examples. The United States has given its full support to these efforts, which it hopes will lead to further consideration by governments and co-operative arrangements that will reduce tensions in various parts of the globe.

Contrary to what the Soviet representative stated, Mr. Rostow dealt concretely with the United States position on some of the important issues before this Committee. He made clear our support for the continuing efforts in the Committee on Disarmament to advance its work on chemical weapons. He explained our views on a comprehensive test ban. He stated our hope that a radiological warfare convention would soon be achieved and suggested that the Committee on Disarmament might wish to take up the question of arms control in outer space.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

While the Soviets are silent on a number of important matters, they are quite busy in terms of their relentless military build-up, now and for the future. Not only is the Soviet Union moving most assertively in terms of military production, as it currently spends three times as much as the United States on strategic forces and some one-third more on general-purpose forces, but it is also most active in terms of military infrastructure, upon which future arms programmes are to be mounted, where it spends some 80 per cent more than the United States.

According to various evaluations, the Soviet military is increasing its share of highly skilled labour, even though perhaps more than one-half its research and development scientists and engineers are already thought to be working on military projects. Their impressive efforts, marshalling increasingly scarce roubles, signal a wish to persist in acquiring larger and more capable military forces. Such activities also propel the Soviet society and economy into additional military endeavours, thereby seeding arms-related institutions and spawning military-oriented activities that, over time, gain a momentum of their own.

Despite these facts in the world, the United States looks forward to a continuing dialogue on issues before this Committee later in the session. Let us not be diverted by the charges emanating from the Soviet delegation that the United States is standing in the way of achieving progress towards arms control. In that regard, I would like to reiterate what Mr. Rostow said here last week. After referring to President Reagan's hope that the bilateral nuclear arms control negotiations, which will soon enter their more formal stage in Geneva, would contribute to the restoration of world public order, he said:

"Our work here and in the Committee on Disarmament is equally important and, if conducted in a spirit of realism, can... contribute greatly to that end." (A/C.1/36/PV.6, p.34)

Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania): Allow me first of all to express to you, Sir, the congratulations of the Albanian delegation upon your election as Chairman of this Committee. Our felicitations go also to the other elected officers of the Committee.

The problems of disarmament, which constitute one of the most serious concerns of the peace-loving countries and peoples, have continued to appear on the United Nations agenda since its very foundation. They were, in fact, debated even before our Organization was created.

The present debate on disarmament issues is taking place as part of our routine deliberations, but against an international background which has become more complicated and explosive than it was a year ago. Specific manifestations of the aggravation of the current world situation include the further increase of the war arsenals, the feverish pitch at which the protagonists of the arms race are pursuing their course and, more particularly, the frenzy of war preparations in which the two imperialist super-Powers are caught. The fine words and pronouncements about disarmament cannot but sound ironical when compared with the experience of reality, and the countless meetings, the endless debates accompanied by thousands upon thousands of pages of documents and a great number of volumes of adopted resolutions have not in the slightest contributed to any slackening of the armaments race, let alone to real disarmament. Even the best and most well-wishing thoughts and desires expressed with regard to the measures which ought to have been taken in the field of disarmament now sound like lost illusions and unfulfilled expectations.

We believe that even those who have long strived to inject their subjective optimism into the veins of this debate and to turn this optimism into a dominant feature of the discussion of this problem can now see that the dream of disarmament has become more unattainable and the prospects of disarmament gloomier. The regret and discontent which are currently being expressed with regard to the failing efforts on disarmament should be taken as a warning that the near future can but offer ever more difficulties to the solution of this problem.

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

Nowadays it is being said more openly than before that the United Nations' efforts with regard to disarmament have met with failure. Such pronouncements are being made even by those who have shown themselves to be very sparing in their criticism of the defects and limitations of the United Nations, for they have always, deep in their hearts, wished to paint a rosy image of this Organization. But reality forces them to speak otherwise.

The present reality shows clearly how harmful it has been to cherish the illusion that disarmament would come about through negotiations and resolutions. The existing situation proves the correctness of those early and sincere warnings that the protagonists of armaments would make use of the negotiations and the deliberations of other international bodies for promoting their own interests. If the United Nations has failed to accomplish anything in the field of disarmament, this in no way means that all the Member States are to be held responsible. Many are those democratic and progressive countries which, in consonance with their concepts and policy orientations, have honestly exerted their efforts so as to contribute to the discussion and solution of the disarmament issues. They cannot be held responsible for the lack of any positive results. Those who must be held responsible for this situation are the real opponents of disarmament, namely, the super-Powers and other imperialist Powers, whose policies and manoeuvres must be firmly opposed and unmasked.

The disarmament issues cannot be properly analysed, nor can a solution of them be arrived at, unless they are seen within the over-all context of the international situation and taking into account the tendencies of present-day historical developments.

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

The colossal war arsenals of all types of weapons existing today were not created by chance or accident, nor are they a product of the whims or miscalculations of certain individuals or isolated groups of people. Armament as a means of war and aggression, along with the arms race, is a concrete phenomenon they are the ugliest and most savage expression of the aggressive policies of imperialism, social-imperialism, and world reaction.

As in the past, now, too, the imperialist Powers are the main protagonists of armament. The super-Powers and other imperialist Powers look upon weapons and wars as being among their principal means, besides the power of their capital, to attain their aggressive, hegemonistic and neo-colonialist ambitions to the detriment of other countries and peoples. War is in the very nature of imperialism and social-imperialism; hence, they continue ceaselessly to arm themselves.

There is no doubt that the imperialist Powers, and particularly the two super-Powers -- the United States and the Soviet Union -- are in a mad arms race. In recent years, this race has become more frenzied and unbridled owing to the continuous aggravation of inter-imperialist contradictions and the ensuing deterioration of the international situation. This arms race has become more complicated still owing to the fact that, to the existing American-Soviet rivalry for armament and world domination, there have been added the ambitions of Chinese social imperialism to become a super-Power. In order to substantiate their super-Power ambitions, the United States, the Soviet Union and China alike need to have a huge military potential. Other imperialist Powers and groupings strive to secure and play their role in the armaments race, thus adding to the unknown factors in the complicated equation of the big super-Power game.

The arms race in which the super-Powers are engaged has been and continues to be a great danger to mankind. As a result of that race, stockpiles of most deadly weapons have assumed such monstrous proportions that even the most war-mongering minds of the past would have found it difficult to imagine.



(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

And the arms race still goes on unabated. The United States and the Soviet Union persist in their arms race with a passion and zeal that push it further ahead. As the occasion or the moment moves them, but always as a function of their aggressive and war-preparing policy, the two imperialist super-Powers have tried to reduce the questions of disarmament, world peace and security to a sheer matter concerning their relationship or concerning the relations between the aggressive political-military alliances controlled by them. For years now, we have seen how they insist that finding a solution to the problems of disarmament be left mainly to them alone and even that those problems be considered according to frameworks which they outline ideas they present.

During this session, too, we can see how the United States and the Soviet Union want to exploit the current debate so as to justify their aims and plans for further armament. For many years now, the United States imperialists and the Soviet social imperialists, while increasing their stockpiles of weapons, have aimed through their speeches, declarations and demagogic propaganda at convincing the world at large that they are working hard, and seriously, at disarmament. Often enough, they have boasted, even beating their chests, that in the numerous meetings they have had and the agreements they have signed they have been doing a great service to mankind in the field of disarmament, and that allegedly in a not-too-distant future they will save mankind from the horror caused by the existence of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

Naturally, they could not endlessly go on manoeuvring with such slogans and deceptions. Hence, their tactics have now changed, and we are hearing more often, especially this year, that the United States and the Soviet Union are accusing one another in rising tones -- each swearing to have righteousness on its side and cursing the other for trying to outwit or having outwitted the other party in matters of disarmament or in the promotion of its own interests in the world.

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

United States imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, in the words and statements of their chieftains and their generals and admirals, as well as through their propaganda machines, are attacking one another in an attempt by each to lay the blame on the other for the further escalation of the arms race. This is also happening in the work of our Committee, as can be seen in the statements by the representatives of the two sides. This war of words between the United States and the Soviet Union, which some are labeling as a cold-war comeback, is taking place for the purpose of justifying the new ambitious plans drawn up by them in the field of armaments, so as to conceal their preparation for a hot war. The facts are stubborn and speak for themselves. If this year the military expenditures in the world hit an all-time record of \$550 billion, the larger part of that sum is being spent by the United States and the Soviet Union. The military budgets of the two super-Powers are increasing at a rapid pace. The United States administration envisages spending some \$226 billion in the coming fiscal year for military purposes and increasing those expenditures progressively in the years to come. The Soviet Union, for its part, is not lagging behind the United States an inch in the matter of military spending, which at present accounts for about 14 per cent of its gross national product.

As is borne out by the most recent data, the militarization of the American and Soviet economies, and of the entire life of their countries in general, continues at full speed. The imperialist super-Powers and other imperialist Powers following them, in spite of the difficulties they are experiencing as a result of the economic and financial crisis which has them in its grip, are not decreasing their expenditures for the upkeep of their armies, for armaments and for war preparations. On the contrary, such expenditures are being increased. While some branches of the economy - in the imperialist countries, of course - are witnessing chaos, unemployment and recession, the arms and war industries are working at full capacity

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

and are prospering. This only proves the well-known truism that militarization of the economy and life in the capitalist and imperialist countries accompanies the deepening of the crisis and is carried out as a function of their enhanced aggressiveness in the international arena.

The United States and the Soviet Union try to justify the intensification of their arms race to a new, higher stage through their already worn-out sophistry on the alleged need to establish and preserve a military balance and balance of power between the two super-Powers and on the parity between the aggressive North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Warsaw Pact blocs.

The United States and the Soviet Union have for years now been trying to create and impose a confusing psychosis that the establishment and preservation of a balance of power between them and a balance of their military potential, both nuclear and conventional, have allegedly become a must for our time, or that they are allegedly the only regulators of world development.

In the past decade, the United States and the Soviet Union have, through their propaganda about this balance, disguised the growth of their military potential and their agreements and accords for jointly programming the main directions of their arms race, in order to create and legalize their obvious military superiority over other countries, particularly in the field of production and perfection of nuclear weapons and their launching systems.

Through their slogans, meetings and agreements on disarmament, the two super-Powers have disguised their parallel armament. Naturally, as in everything else, in this field too their hegemonistic interests and ambitions have always run counter to one another's. Each of them has tried, through or without agreements, to secure partial advantages over the other in certain types of weapons or in the establishment of a military presence in various regions of the world. Life has shown that each super-Power, whenever it has wanted the invention or production of a new weapon or the initiation of a new round of armament, has depicted the other side as being more powerful; there has been talk about an upset of the balance.

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

At present, the super-Powers are making a big fuss about this upset of balance, although nobody knows for sure if that balance has ever existed, or if it has, what that balance was like. The United States imperialists are complaining vociferously, even with some anger, that the Soviet Union has not kept its word and has not lived up to the agreements concluded between them in this recent decade, but on the contrary has made use of every opportunity to ensure military superiority over the United States and to extend its military positions in the world. Washington has raised the tone of its statements and declarations about reviving the military potential and rearming America, even to create a military superiority and establish a leading role for the United States in the world.

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

On their part, the Soviet social imperialists are responding to this with a kind of warmongering rhetoric and insisting that the Soviet Union is the one that most needs to arm. They make statements to the effect that they will never tolerate America's surpassing them, no matter what sacrifices this may require them to make. Moscow takes pleasure in loudly claiming that allegedly the more soldiers and weapons the Soviet Union possesses, the better it is for the world.

This entire campaign of justification of armaments is taking place at a time when the two super-Powers are armed to their teeth with nuclear and conventional weapons of all types and with chemical, bacteriological or radiological weapons. This is happening at a time when they have placed their weapons of mass destruction on land and under the ground, at sea and under the water, and are working out ways and means of striking at our planet from above the atmosphere and even from space.

On more than one occasion we have heard the imperialist super-Powers boast about the immense destructive power of the weapons they possess and about their ability to strike at any target on any spot on the globe. We have heard them threaten others that their weapons are so powerful that they can destroy our planet several times over. And yet, the United States of America and the Soviet Union are the very ones who complain that they still do not have all the types and amounts of weapons they allegedly need to guarantee their interests and security. The least that can be said about such statements is that they smack of hypocrisy and cynicism. Sound logic has difficulty penetrating such an absurdity. The two greatest military Powers history and the world have ever known still find "valid" arguments to continue the stockpiling and perfection of their weapons.

The present American-Soviet argument and quarrel about the upsetting or reestablishment of the military balance are an arrogant expression of the super-Powers' intentions further to intensify their arms race: they constitute a challenge to sincere aspirations and desires to accomplish something, even something meagre and symbolic, in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

What rightfully worries the peace-loving peoples and countries is that the imperialist Powers, like aggressors through the ages, are indeed inventing and producing weapons, not to place them in public squares or simply to display them in military parades on significant days, but rather to use them in wars and aggressions, be they on a local scale or a world conflagration. There are many facts and events that testify to this.

During the first half of our century, 60 million people perished in two world wars. Since the end of the Second World War, the brandishing of arms and their use for aggressive purposes have not ceased. Ever since 1945, weapons have been employed in some 100 local conflicts, causing tens of millions of victims in human lives and colossal material losses. The United States imperialists have resorted to the massive use of the force of weapons in Korea, Indo-China and elsewhere in the world. The Soviet social imperialists have used their military forces to subjugate countries which they call their allies and have occupied Afghanistan. The Israeli Zionists continue to commit aggression in the Middle East. Armed conflicts and hotbeds of tension continue to exist at present in the Persian Gulf, in various parts of the African continent and in other regions of the world.

On the European continent, in spite of the words they uttered at the Helsinki Conference and later in Belgrade and Madrid about security and tranquillity, the imperialist super-Powers and their aggressive military blocs, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact, have accumulated a military potential which is three or four times that which existed on the eve of the Second World War. Some three million soldiers are concentrated at present in Europe. Five hundred thousand Soviet soldiers and 360,000 American soldiers are stationed in the territories of some European countries. The two blocs now have in Europe some 38,000 tanks, 9,000 airplanes and 10,000 tactical weapons, and they are proceeding with their plans to saturate Europe with the Soviet SS-20 missiles as well as with the American Cruise 2 and Pershing 2 missiles and the neutron bomb.

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

After the Helsinki Conference, and notwithstanding the endless and fruitless talks going on in Vienna, Europe has become a permanent arena for military exercises and manoeuvres conducted by the two imperialist super-Powers and their NATO and Warsaw Pact blocs. Not long ago, almost on the eve of the opening of the current session of the United Nations General Assembly, the two blocs organized and held in Europe big military exercises of an offensive character which were known to be the greatest ever held on that continent since the Second World War.

A similar grave situation also exists in other parts of the world where the imperialist super-Powers either already have established or are trying to establish their presence, either with military bases, warships or fleets, with military experts or advisers, or with the rapid deployment force, as the United States is attempting to do.

And all this is occurring at a time when the imperialists and social imperialists talk so much about their allegedly great concern for international peace and security, for disarmament and military détente. This is happening at a time when they are making solemn declarations and bombastic calls for the limitation of nuclear weapons, for the non-pre-emptive use of nuclear weapons, for the non-use of threat and blackmail against the non-nuclear-weapon States, and so on and so forth.

In recent years, and especially following the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, there has been a proliferation of agenda items on disarmament before our Committee. It would be a difficult task to mention even briefly all these items. However, notwithstanding their titles, their burden is the same, and we wish to point out that the views and ideas we have expressed now are also relevant to those items we have not touched upon.

The Albanian delegation cannot help but express the view that the time that has elapsed since the tenth special session has not seen justification of either the vague hopes expressed at the end of that session or of the very

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

equivocal documents it adopted. We know of no results accomplished in the field of disarmament since the special session, other than the increase in the number of meetings, bodies and agenda items, as well as in the number of resolutions on disarmament. What we do know is that the arms race has continued at full speed and at a higher rate than before. This was to be expected from the super-Powers and other imperialist Powers, so it should not come as a surprise.

It is our view that it would be more justifiable and more realistic not to be over-optimistic about the forthcoming special session, nor do we have any grounds to expect from it any better results than have been achieved heretofore.

We hold that the preparatory work for that session and the work during it should aim at posing the problems simply and frankly. In the present circumstances, the most realistic and useful thing to do would be to speak out openly to the peoples so that they would realize that not only do the imperialist super-Powers have no intention of disarming themselves, but that with their hegemonistic policies, they are leading the world to a new human slaughter. Any attempt to create illusions among the peoples about the alleged desires and endeavours of the super-Powers for disarmament will have very grave consequences. Such illusions do nothing but give the super-Powers a free hand to continue their frenzied arms race and war preparations.

We have on the agenda before our Committee a seemingly new item, but it is an item that is in fact as old as the demagoguery of the Soviet social imperialists. We are referring to agenda item 128, in which we are invited to consider the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space.



(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

At first glance it appears that the generosity of the authors of this proposal and their great concern about the destiny of our world knows no bounds. But, when we come to think what the Soviet social-imperialists and the United States imperialists have done and are doing to bring death and destruction to our planet Earth, we do not have to go far above and beyond the heavens, into outer space, to verify the sincerity of their pronouncements and declarations, their readiness to work for disarmament!

As regards outer space, though we belong to those who have not been able to reach that far, we know that it too has been turned into an arena of military competition between the United States and the Soviet Union, who are constantly launching their spy satellites and other means and devices destined for military purposes. Hence, the ideas about the conclusion of such a treaty as proposed in agenda item 128 can neither be any more sincere nor achieve any better results than the other concluded treaties of this nature pertaining to the stationing of weapons on land, sea or the ocean floor.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate that the People's Socialist Republic of Albania is resolutely in favour of measures for a genuine and truly effective disarmament. We hold that, in order for disarmament questions to be put on a correct path towards solutions, first it is necessary that a minimum of preliminary conditions be created. That would mean, first of all, to take effective measures to liquidate the aggressive military blocs, primarily the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Warsaw Pact, to ensure the withdrawal of the American, Soviet and other foreign troops from Europe and any other regions of the world, to put an end to military exercises and manoeuvres of an offensive nature, to dismantle the naval bases of the imperialist super-Powers in the territories of others, and not to allow the United States and the Soviet fleets entrance into and exit from the ports of other countries for supply or so-called friendly visit purposes.

The People's Socialist Republic of Albania will now, just as in the past, continue to expose and condemn the war mongering, aggressive policies and activities of the super-Powers, their arms race and arms brandishment, convinced that by so doing it renders its modest contribution to the struggle of the peoples for genuine and real disarmament.

Mr. VO ANH TUAN (Viet Nam) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, I should like to begin my statement by extending to you on behalf of the delegation of Viet Nam my warm congratulations on your election to the chairmanship of this important Committee. Your diplomatic qualities and your competence are well known to us all, and that is why my delegation has no doubt that you will succeed in successfully conducting the work of the First Committee. I should also like to offer my warm congratulations to the Vice-Chairmen and to the Rapporteur of the Committee.

This session of the General Assembly is taking place in circumstances of a serious deterioration of the international situation. The unbridled arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, has assumed unprecedented proportions. There is an exacerbation of the climate of military psychosis, and at the same time we are witnessing the development of dangerous doctrines on the admissibility and acceptability of a limited nuclear war and the inevitability of a third world war.

The gains made in the field of international détente and peace, independence and security of nations is now being seriously jeopardized. What is the cause of this dangerous situation? Imperialist quarters, particularly in the United States, are trying to ascribe responsibility for this to the socialist countries, particularly to an imaginary military threat from the Soviet Union.

A veritable campaign of slander has been launched in order to prevent the public from understanding the current situation, the true state of affairs, and to mislead people who are not too well informed.

However, if we take an objective look at what has been happening since the end of the 1970s, and in particular this year, we will clearly see that the true cause of the worsening of the current international situation and the new stage of the arms race lie in the intensification of the American policy of confrontation with the socialist community, pressure and aggression against national liberation movements and the independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Indeed, in order to upset the military balance between East and West and to strive for military supremacy, the United States and certain North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries have over the last

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

few years engaged in actions with the gravest consequences for world peace. Along with the failure to ratify the SALT II treaty, the unilateral withdrawal from negotiations with the Soviet Union, their obstructionist policy in the Committee on Disarmament, and the declaring of almost all parts of the world as zones of vital American interests, the new American Administration has increased military appropriations to a new record high. They have been intensifying the plan for deploying medium-range missiles in Western Europe and are manufacturing neutron bombs on a large scale. They have announced an enormous arms programme relating to five strategic interrelated fields: long-range bombers, MX intercontinental missiles, the new missile for the Trident submarine, etc. They are spending billions of dollars on developing new systems of weapons of mass destruction. In spite of all camouflage and rhetoric these activities and arms measures, which are assuming unprecedented proportions, prove that the United States has taken a new and extremely dangerous step in the arms race in order to obtain military supremacy to ensure its world-wide hegemonistic interests, thus thwarting the efforts of the international community to halt and reverse the arms race.

A vast wave of protest has arisen throughout the world, including in the United States itself, against that adventurist American policy. Millions of people have taken part in protests to defend their right to life. The new American Administration cannot fail to take account of that legitimate aspiration on the part of mankind. The allergic attitude of the United States towards arms control and disarmament, as well as its gigantic arms programme, are particularly dangerous because they are accompanied by the promulgation of doctrines designed to condition public opinion to the admissibility and acceptability of a limited nuclear war. It will be recalled that in the spring of 1979 Washington published Directive No. 59 proclaiming a new nuclear strategy and the possibility of waging what became known as a limited nuclear war. In this regard the last session of the General Assembly in resolution 35/152B expressed its legitimate concern at the risk of nuclear catastrophe associated with the "adoption of the new doctrine of limited or partial use of nuclear weapons giving rise to illusions of the admissibility and acceptability of a nuclear conflict".

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

Mankind must never forget that the authors of these suicidal doctrines are the leaders of a country which used atomic bombs against the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the distressing consequences of those acts remain with us to this very day. Subsequently, more than once, they threatened to use nuclear weapons against the peoples of Korea and Viet Nam. According to a British Broadcasting Corporation broadcast of 3 October last, an American official revealed that, during the Korean War, President Eisenhower considered the possibility of using nuclear weapons to force the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to accept a cease-fire. Twenty years later the United States once again brandished the threat of the use of nuclear weapons to stop the Viet Nam War at the beginning of the 1970s; but this was in vain, as was pointed out by the BBC.

We should not forget, either, that those who promote the doctrine of limited nuclear war are working together with the apartheid régime in South Africa and the Zionist régime in Israel in the manufacture of nuclear weapons. This constitutes a very serious threat, not only to the peoples of southern Africa and the Middle East, but also to peace and security in those regions.

The militarist policy of the Government of the United States has become even more dangerous to world peace with the increasing collusion between imperialism and hegemonism, the most recent manifestation of which was the American decision to sell sophisticated weapons to China. It is no accident that China, which views itself as the "NATO of the East", is among those few countries which acclaimed the decision of President Reagan to manufacture the neutron bomb. It is quite clear that military co-operation and strategic co-ordination between those two major forces of aggression are creating a direct threat to the peace and security of peoples, particularly those of Asia.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

Insofar as concerns the peoples of Viet Nam and the other countries of Indo-China, this collusion and this co-ordination are making the Chinese threat even more dangerous. The French newspaper Le Monde in its issue of 7 July this year raised a very serious question:

"The offer of weapons made to Peking by General Haig and, two days later, to Manila, his appeal for a crusade against the Soviet Union and...against Viet Nam - do these foreshadow a return in force by Uncle Sam to the region and a sharing of responsibilities with the 'Chinese gendarme' and a few more steps in the escalation?"

The policy of confrontation advocated by international imperialism and great Power hegemonism can only lead to dangerous crises and to deadlock and is not at all propitious for détente and international peace and security. In our nuclear era, dialogue and negotiation are the only rational and realistic means of resolving controversies in international relations, no matter how acute or complex they may be. The Vietnamese Government resolutely supports the idea of dialogue and sincere negotiations conducted on an equal footing and free from any preconditions or attempts to dictate by one party to another so as to resolve controversies of a global or regional nature and to forestall a new cycle in the nuclear arms race. My Government is ready to support any initiative along these lines from whatever country, socialist, non-aligned or any other, relating to matters pertaining to international peace and security.

It is in this spirit that my country warmly supported the Peace Programme for the 1980s put forward at the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This programme, which contains measures to reduce both nuclear and conventional arms, is based on the principled position of the Soviet Union, which is to preserve peace, and on its desire to resolve crisis situations by negotiation, to deepen détente and to develop peaceful co-operation among the States of the world.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

The new and important Soviet proposals for the conclusion of a treaty 'prohibiting the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space' and for the adoption by the General Assembly of a declaration on the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe demonstrate the constant desire of the Soviet Union and the socialist community to preserve intact for present and future generations our planet and its environment as well as the limitless ocean of outer space.

Thanks to combined efforts over the last two decades, we have seen the beginning of a favourable trend towards using space to meet the peaceful practical needs of mankind and preventing the arms race from being transferred to outer space. However, at the present time, there is another and dangerous tendency, that of spreading the arms race to outer space. The press has described Pentagon projects for the placing in outer space of military bases with anti-satellite weapon systems and anti-satellite mines. In the face of this situation the Soviet proposal for the conclusion of a treaty 'prohibiting the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space' is now a matter of urgent necessity so as to prevent before it is too late any militarization of outer space and to exclude the possibility of seeing outer space become a theatre for the arms race and a source of tension between States. Viet Nam believes that the United Nations can make an effective contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security by supporting the idea of concluding a treaty prohibiting the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space and calling upon Member States to work without delay on producing the text of such a treaty.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

The tenth special session - devoted to disarmament - clearly indicated that "removing the threat of a world war - a nuclear war - is the most acute and urgent task of the present day" (A/S-10/4 para. 18) and stressed the need for taking effective measures to "prevent the outbreak of nuclear war and to lessen the danger of the threat or use of nuclear weapons" (ibid. para. 20). The Soviet proposal for the General Assembly to adopt a declaration on the need to prevent a nuclear catastrophe falls squarely within the framework of the "effective measures" called for by the tenth special session.

In the present circumstances of extreme tension, my delegation believes that the immediate adoption of a declaration firmly and explicitly opposing the first use of nuclear weapons is the very least the United Nations can and must do if it is to exert a moderating influence over the dangerous course of international events. It is logical for the United Nations, as an instrument of peace, to adopt a declaration reflecting the profound aspirations of mankind for peace. To this end, the United Nations must solemnly proclaim that States and statesmen that would dare to be the first to use nuclear weapons would be committing the gravest possible crime against mankind and could never possibly be justified or pardoned and that nuclear energy should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and only for the benefit of mankind.

The problem of prohibiting chemical weapons is one of the most pressing problems within the field of arms limitation and disarmament. Viet Nam, which for decades was the victim of the use by aggressors of all types of sophisticated weapons, including the extremely dangerous types of American weapons of mass destruction represented by chemical weapons, attaches great importance to this problem.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

My country was a co-sponsor of resolution 35/144 B, which urged the Committee on Disarmament to continue as a matter of high priority negotiations on a convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction. It can only be regretted that so far the Working Group on Chemical Weapons has not been able to perform its task because of the delaying tactics and obstructionism of the United States of America and some of its allies. My delegation favours a revision of the mandate of that Working Group so as to enable it to get down to the work of drafting on matters which are the subject of agreement. At the same time, we are against any attempt to encumber the future convention with matters not directly connected with its actual purport.

It is a secret to no one that the United States not only possesses enormous stocks of chemical weapons, but has prepared plans for the development and manufacture of new and dangerous generations of chemical weapons, including binary weapons. The absence of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons would give them a free hand in that criminal endeavour. The General Assembly, in resolution 35/144 C, expressed its profound concern at the development of binary and multi-component chemical weapons whose field deployment could compromise the ongoing effort to prohibit the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and trigger a chemical arms race.

What is even worse is that recently the United States has been testing its chemical and bacteriological weapons in various parts of the world. United States-made grenades containing chemical products have been used by reactionary gangs which have infiltrated Afghanistan from a neighbouring country: chemical bombs "made in USA" have been dropped in large numbers on the people of El Salvador; so-called American defoliants have been used by the Pretoria racists to "pacify the disobedient". Cuba possesses irrefutable proof of the use by the United States of biological weapons against cattle, plantations and the Cuban people themselves, causing the death of 156 persons, including 99 children. Those illegal and criminal acts by Washington have been condemned by all people who cherish peace and justice.



(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

With respect to chemical weapons, the world still recalls with revulsion the magnitude of the chemical warfare which the United States Government waged for 10 years in Viet Nam. More than 100,000 tons of chemical toxins were poured into almost all the provinces of South Viet Nam, causing the death of 3,500 people and affecting 2 million others. The ecology of Viet Nam, present and future generations of Vietnamese as well as American and allied war veterans are still suffering the painful long-term consequences. That extremely barbarous chemical war, unique in history, has been condemned by the whole world, including people in the United States. In August 1970, United States Senator Gaylord A. Nelson, condemned that monstrous crime in these terms: "The history of mankind has never known a case where a country declared war against the environment of another nation. However, the United States has undertaken an experiment which no other nation has dared to try."

It is at once ironic and revolting to see the United States, which waged large-scale chemical warfare against the peoples of the three countries of Indo-China, and is using chemical and bacteriological weapons against several peoples of the world, whip up a campaign of slander against the Soviet Union, Viet Nam and Laos with regard to the use of those weapons. The hegemonists, imperialists and other reactionaries have echoed their support of that outrageous American undertaking. Nevertheless, those lies can deceive no one. Public opinion, scientists throughout the world, including the United States itself, have rejected those new fabrications and have expressed their scepticism in the face of those allegations which are without any scientific foundation.

It is clear that the defamatory words of the Head of the American Foreign Service pronounced just a few days before the opening of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly concerning the alleged use of chemical weapons in Afghanistan, Kampuchea and Laos were an attempt to deliver the United States from its difficulties and its isolation in the face of a powerful wave of protests on the part of the peoples of the world against its cold war policy and its unbridled arms race, including its production of the neutron bomb and new generations of chemical weapons. Those lies were also

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

intended to camouflage the actual use by the United States of toxic chemical products and biological weapons against the peoples of several countries. Those lies were also aimed at white-washing their terrible chemical warfare crimes committed in Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea and at diverting the attention of world public opinion from the horrible consequences of their chemical warfare as it affected several thousands of American veterans and soldiers of their allies.

The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam believes that the second special session devoted to disarmament will be an international forum of great importance, particularly as it takes place at a time when the international situation has deteriorated considerably and military arsenals are constantly on the increase.

In order to maintain international peace and security and eliminate the threat of war, it is indispensable for efforts to be undertaken to reach concrete decisions on all disarmament problems, beginning with questions of nuclear disarmament, partial measures such as the total prohibition of nuclear tests, the prohibition of chemical and radiological weapons and the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, including the creation of zones of peace in different parts of the world and the reduction of military budgets. In the view of my delegation, the Final Document of the first special session in 1978 remains valid and is a good basis for the work of the second special session, because it contains the fundamental principles of equal security for all at the lowest possible level of military power and a balance of forces.

It is important for the second special session to become a landmark along the road towards the convening of a world disarmament conference with the participation of all States. My country believes that a decision on that subject must be taken at the second special session and machinery must be set up for preparing for that conference in all its aspects.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

The mobilization of world public opinion in favour of disarmament is also of great importance. My country welcomes the initiative of Mexico for the launching of a world disarmament campaign.

If all Member States of the United Nations demonstrate a sense of responsibility and the necessary political will, the next special session will make a concrete contribution to curbing the arms race. Viet Nam, for its part, is ready to make an active contribution to that common cause.

Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba)(interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I wish to convey to you, on behalf of my delegation, and on my own behalf, our congratulations on your having been elected to conduct our work during the current session. We also extend our congratulations to the Vice-Chairmen and to the Rapporteur. Given your experience, skill, and knowledge of the subjects dealt with by the First Committee, we are guaranteed success in our work, which I pledge the support of the Cuban delegation.

We are beginning our work in an international climate that has deteriorated as a result of the increased arms race, the re-emergence of the cold war, the arrogant and threatening language of imperialism, the non-ratification of the SALT II treaty, and policies based on positions of strength. We are warned from various circles about the imminence of a war - a general, devastating war.

Last year we quoted in our statement the remark contained in the communiqué of the ministerial meeting of the non-aligned countries concerning the threat to the survival of mankind never having been as dangerous before, and the communiqué of this year's meeting lists a series of facts which "have brought the world closer to the brink of a worldwide conflict" (A/36/566, annex, p. 3), leading to the resurgence of the cold war and an increase in the danger of war and the total annihilation of mankind.

Further, the Ministers reiterated this year their concern over "the acceleration of the arms race, particularly in the nuclear arms race, the stockpiling of all kinds of weapons of mass destruction, the development of newer and more destructive and lethal weapons systems such as the neutron bomb, as well as attempts to promote new and dangerous concepts of '...nuclear war' aimed at blurring the distinction between nuclear and conventional warfare." (Ibid.)

The decision by the United States administration to manufacture, stockpile and station neutron bombs has been rejected by the whole of world public opinion. That decision is a part of the intensification of the arms race, as it is aimed at negotiating from a position of strength and once again brings the world closer to confrontation and non-co-operation.

The inhuman and terrifying nature of such a weapon is a self-explanatory indication of imperialism's opinion and concept of human beings.

(Mr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

The reasons why the neutron bomb represents an extremely dangerous qualitatively new step in the arms spiral are many and varied. First of all, it lowers the nuclear threshold, and blurs the indispensable distinction between nuclear and conventional weapons. Secondly, it is obviously a reflection of the strategic folly which allows for the contemplation of the possibility of launching - and even winning - an illusory limited nuclear war. The manner in which the attempt has been made to "sell" this deadly product to world public opinion, moreover, points to the possible attractions that it could have for a warlike mind: the neutron bomb, in fact, could be launched not only from the air, but also by missiles or eight-millimetre guns. Finally, its dispersal in large quantities, its nature, and its size would entail extreme difficulties for verification and control of any kind, and what is even worse, could make it available to a multitude of users, most of them field commanders of secondary rank. All these factors become even more significant if we consider the possible regions for the emplacement and use of this type of weapon. The Government of President Reagan itself has stated that the neutron bomb could be sent to Europe in a matter of hours. But the Secretary of Defense, Caspar Weinberger, has pointed to the possibility of its use in possible battlefields outside the European theatre. Finally, State Department officials have made it known - and this has been widely circulated in various press media - that one of the regions specifically contemplated would be the Gulf region, with the oil wells as a target. Thus, no part of the world would be free from the threat. Nor can the possibility be ignored that aggressors such as South Africa and Israel, which for years have enjoyed collaboration which has allowed them to achieve a widely known nuclear capacity, could, in a relatively short span of time, possess these weapons whose proliferation is hard to contain.

We are speaking out for the urgent establishment, within the framework of the Committee on Disarmament, of an ad hoc working group to prepare a convention prohibiting the manufacture, development, stockpiling and emplacement of neutron weapons, as was proposed in 1978 by a group of socialist States with the support of other members of the Committee on Disarmament. We would recall that on 6 August 1945 the atomic weapon was used for the first time; we would also recall that on 6 August 1981 the decision was taken to manufacture the neutron bomb: a sad irony, this legacy of the war-mongering United States policy.

It is illusory to believe that a nuclear war - whether with explosive or radiation weapons - could be limited to one's neighbours' property without affecting one's own.

President Reagan's recent statements concerning the possibility of limited nuclear war in Europe have filled all sensible and realistic people with stupor and consternation.

With the quantity and quality of weapons spread through the world today, it is illusory to believe that a nuclear war could be concentrated in a given territory. Any nuclear outbreak - whether an intentional assault or the mere mischance of a technical or human error - would inexorably lead to a world conflagration, catastrophic for the entire human race.

In its recent issue devoted to the nuclear arms race, the United States magazine Newsweek stated in a summary of its cover story that:

<sup>17</sup>The United States has decided that it must be prepared to fight and win a 'limited' nuclear war in order to be able to deter the Soviet Union from starting one. Scientists and defense specialists are in sharp disagreement on the merits of that policy, and some people are warning that it makes nuclear war both more 'thinkable' and more likely.<sup>18</sup>

(Newsweek, 5 October 1981, p. 3)

The publication immediately goes on to note the generalized reaction to this new strategy:

<sup>19</sup>A Newsweek Poll suggests that many Americans doubt that any nuclear war would stay limited for long.<sup>17</sup> (Ibid.)

(Mr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

We fully agree with this view. With the resolute and firm action of all of us, we must prevent such views from being bruited any further in our Committee.

The fact is that in 1981 the world has come even closer to a war, but so rapidly that it seems improbable that we can continue along the same course without a war actually breaking out. The imperialist policy which seeks to bring back diktat, blackmail and threat as instruments to return the world to the era of gunboats is condemned to failure, but its danger escapes no one in this era of sophisticated nuclear weapons.

A few hours ago, at the closing session of the second Congress of the Defence Committees of the Revolution, the President of the Council of State and Minister of Cuba, Fidel Castro, stated:

"Today the word 'peace' has a very different meaning, because technological development of military means simply implies that a war could lead not only to the death of thousands or even hundreds of thousands, or millions, or tens of millions, or hundreds of millions of human beings, but it simply means that war can lead to the end of mankind.

"We speak of peace when the word 'war' could mean the end, when the word 'war' may mean the ultimate, the last war; but not the last war simply because men have learned to live in peace, but merely because men would cease to exist.

"This is the true dramatic meaning of the danger of a war today and the vital meaning of the word 'peace' which is closely associated with the idea of the survival of mankind."

President Fidel Castro added:

"However, the dangers of war are growing. Manufactured nuclear weapons exist in the world, ready to be used and in sufficient numbers to destroy mankind, not once but ten times. This has added to the special importance of the effort to control the production of nuclear weapons, to put a stop to the manufacture of such weapons, as a hope that at some point we could embark on the course of reducing existing weapons and, finally, on a policy of disarmament."

(Mr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

The military expenditures programme of the United States has been constantly on the increase. For 1982 it amounts to \$225,700 million. That means that 29 per cent of the Federal budget will be devoted to armaments. In 1985 military expenditures will reach the sum of \$372,700 million and will represent 35.2 per cent of the total United States budget.

The end of this arms policy, of exaggerated military budgets, is not, as advocated by the spokesman of imperialism, aimed at confronting the alleged Soviet threat. It is clearly and simply an attempt to achieve military superiority, to impose their criteria of plunder on the peoples of the third world worldthe socialist community. The plan is not only aimed at the Soviet Union and the socialist countries; the plan goes much further. It seeks to embrace the whole world and to lead to world domination by American imperialism.

Although my country does not seek confrontation, we cannot remain silent before the prevailing situation which has deteriorated since the new United States Government came to power, with its obvious desire to break the existing balance in the world and to tilt it in its favour. Imperialist arrogance is reflected on every front, from the succession of strategic decisions enabling it to negotiate from a position of strength, without excluding the use of nuclear weapons in a "first strike", the unbridled and abusive attitude towards small countries which it seeks to humiliate, the marked encouragement of adventures by its more aggressive partners, South Africa and Israel, and even the new variant of "epistolary hegemonism", through which it requires sovereign States to account for their decisions on foreign policy.

The Committee on Disarmament in Geneva is making every effort to make progress in its work and to achieve agreements on disarmament.

Four working groups have been set up: on chemical weapons, on the comprehensive programme of disarmament, on guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and on radiological weapons. All these have worked with interest, despite the open or masked opposition of a nuclear Power, in order to achieve tangible results.



(Mr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

On the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament are two items which have priority: the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and the cessation of the nuclear arms race. The General Assembly has repeatedly requested that maximum priority be given to the question of nuclear tests, but the need to establish a working group to reach a specific agreement prohibiting nuclear tests has come up against the refusal of two nuclear Powers, the United States and the United Kingdom.

The Group of 21, the socialist States of Europe, a group of Western States, and China have spoken out in favour of the initiation of multilateral negotiations on the prohibition of nuclear tests. As if they were in the Security Council, the United States and the United Kingdom have imposed double veto on this just request of the international community.

With respect to the cessation of the nuclear arms race, in the Committee on Disarmament documents have been submitted by the Group of 21, and other documents were put forward by a group of socialist **States**, all aiming at the establishment of an ad hoc working group to begin negotiations on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament. This also was impossible to achieve.

We hope that the next session of the Committee on Disarmament will enable us to set up these two working groups and to begin specific multilateral negotiations which will lead the Committee to the achievement of its true objective, namely, the negotiation of disarmament measures.

My delegation nourishes the hope that specific results will be achieved in the Committee on Disarmament concerning the comprehensive programme on disarmament, chemical weapons, radiological weapons, and security guarantees for non-nuclear States in order to bring positive and concrete matters before the second special session of the General Assembly to be devoted to disarmament, which is to be held in 1982.

My country took part in the meetings of the Preparatory Committee of the second special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament, and did so in a constructive spirit and in a spirit

(Mr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

of mutual accommodation and understanding. We are gratified at the progress achieved by the Committee at the last session, thanks in large measure to the skill, patience and flexibility of Ambassador Adeniji, its Chairman. We trust that in the meetings scheduled for next year, the Committee will concentrate on the substantive preparation of the all-important event to be held in the months of June and July 1982. We further nurture the hope that by then the international situation will have changed, and we are firmly convinced that in any event the second special session devoted to disarmament will afford an irreplaceable opportunity to achieve the consensus of mankind which, however heterogeneous, tends necessarily towards peace and disarmament.

(Mr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

After the holding in 1982 of a successful special session on disarmament, the next logical step, in our view, would be the convening of a world disarmament conference to establish specific and irreversible commitments in that sphere. We hope that the remaining obstacles to that important initiative may be eliminated in the near future and that the convening of the conference will in due course become a reality.

The threats which we noted last year, and which were levelled against the initiatives, supported by an overwhelming majority of countries from the Middle East and Africa, of establishing nuclear-free zones in those regions, have only grown. To the growing certainty that Israel and South Africa have acquired the capacity to manufacture nuclear weapons is now added their unbridled aggressiveness, exemplified by their unprecedented acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and the attack against the Iraqi nuclear plant several months ago. The aggressive and repressive régimes of zionism and apartheid, strengthened militarily thanks, among other things, to the technological co-operation in the nuclear field given by the Western nuclear Powers which pose as the champions of non-proliferation, are today undoubtedly encouraged in their aggressiveness by the war-mongering policy of their most consistent protector, the present Government of the United States.

My country, which has participated actively in the meetings of the Committee on Disarmament since it was established, expressed its disagreement when, at the most recent session of that body, a virtual unilateral veto was imposed against the text relating to the nuclear capacity of South Africa. We hope that in the future there will be no further situations of such obvious blockage and that that important body may successfully carry out its important mandate.

(Mr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

That same protector of regional policemen is hampering progress in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. My country regrets that the holding of the Conference should have been prevented and reiterates its unconditional support for the pursuance of the meetings of the Committee without hindrance and hopes that in the very near future that body will carry out its mandate towards the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, because time is running out and inertia could very well lead to a dangerous situation from which it would be very difficult to retreat.

But not only in certain parts of the world is it urgent to take immediate steps to contain the arms race. Certain weighty indications, repeated insistently in the press, point to the dangerous fact that we are coming very close to the beginning of an arms race in an area that has no limits, that is to say, in outer space. It would appear that certain recent technological and scientific advances, hailed by mankind as important steps in the conquest of the cosmos, could very well serve as the wedge of a dangerous attempt at a devastating war on earth or beyond it. We therefore fully support the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space.

We have seen with interest the study of the group of governmental experts on the relationship between disarmament and development. The fundamental conclusion of that study is that in order to achieve disarmament and the establishment of a New International Economic Order we must arrive at specific disarmament measures.

The struggle for peace, détente, the cessation of the arms race and disarmament are inseparable parts of a New International Economic Order. While the overwhelming majority of mankind is prey to hunger, illiteracy, and poor health, thousands of millions of dollars are being invested in an unbridled arms race, which can bring to mankind nothing but its final destruction. We must halt and reverse this mad race and devote those resources to development. In order for peace to exist, we must create a more just and equitable world, where all peoples will be able to enjoy a full, healthy life, with the benefit of work, education and proper housing.

(Mr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

A hysterical, war-mongering campaign is at present being waged. Declarations are being made by spokesmen of imperialism, and the press in many Western countries is clamouring for limited war, an end to the liberation of peoples and a return to Fascist and anachronistic concepts. Within the world disarmament campaign, we must assemble convincing proof of the dangers of war, the cost of the arms race and the great harm which can be done by that mad war-mongering campaign. We must mobilize world public opinion, including the people of the United States, with regard to the enormous dangers which the present situation poses for mankind. In the light of the campaign waged by those who cry out for war, we must magnify the clamour of those who ask for peace and progress -- peace with dignity and equality for all, and progress with independence.

In these past years, Cuba has been afflicted by five serious scourges and epidemics, which have affected our cattle, our tobacco and sugar-cane crops and our people itself. These have been swine fever, blue tobacco mould, sugar cane rust, hemorrhagic dengue and hemorrhagic conjunctivitis, which have caused serious material and human damage. We are convinced that American imperialism is using biological weapons against Cuba and that it has unleashed an undeclared biological war against our territory.

This conviction of our people stems from the aggressive policy of imperialism towards the Cuban revolution ever since its triumph. This policy has been implemented through economic blockades, subversion and espionage, attempted assassinations of our leaders, invasions by mercenaries, slanderous campaigns, official radio broadcasts by the Government of the United States to bring about destabilization and counterrevolution in Cuba and the threat of naval blockade and direct attacks.

All these facts objectively lead us to the conviction that biological weapons have been used by the United States against Cuba.

(Mr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

This aggression, which is to be added to the chain of acts of aggression inflicted on us since 1 January 1959, will not change our firm revolutionary position, nor will it in any way affect the steadfastness and dignity of our people. Our delegation reserves the right to return to this subject at a later stage.

The aggressive policy of imperialism has brought the world to the brink of a holocaust. Serious dangers exist for the whole of mankind. The struggle is one between war and peace, disarmament and armament, progress and backwardness and national liberation and the enslavement of peoples. We firmly and calmly reject blackmail and threats. In the face of attempts to put a brake on the course of history, the peoples remain united in favour of a world of peace, progress and development. Cuba is and always will be in favour of peace, détente, peaceful co-existence and disarmament.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.