

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



FIRST COMMITTEE
18th meeting
held on
Thursday, 29 October 1981
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 18TH MEETING

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

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

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

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Kussey (Togo)
Mr. Pashkevich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)
Mr. Handl (Czechoslovakia)
Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan)
Mr. Gbeho (Ghana)
Mr. Ghaffar (Bahrain)
Mr. Oyono (United Republic of Cameroon)

* 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.18
30 October 1981

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

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

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. KUSSEY (Togo) (interpretation from French): Since I am speaking for the first time in this Committee I should like to begin by associating the Togolese delegation with all those delegations that have already congratulated the Chairman on his unanimous election to preside over the First Committee. It is a particular pleasure for us to see a man of his experience guiding the debates in this Committee. The consideration of items that are so important and so complex relating to international peace and security is certainly no easy task, but we are sure that, coming from Yugoslavia, a non-aligned country devoted to world peace, he will be able to guide us successfully through the debates at this session.

It would be remiss of me not to express my warm congratulations also to you, Sir and the other officers of the Committee on their election to their respective posts. The Togolese delegation assures the officers of its full co-operation to help them discharge their important responsibilities.

No one is unaware of the importance of the items on our Committee's agenda since problems relating to disarmament are well known. Such issues have been considered throughout the life of this Organization, and very many resolutions have been adopted on them. All States and peoples that cherish peace and freedom hope, after so many years of existence of the United Nations, to see real steps being taken towards general and complete disarmament. But here we are at the thirty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly, at a time marked by the aggravation of tensions and the speeding up of the arms race, and not only has our Organization not been able to attain the goals and objectives of the international community in this area, but in addition we have to note with distress that military expenditures have exceeded \$500 billion this year while at the same time the number of the hungry of the world has exceeded 800 million.

(Mr. Kussey, Togo)

It is sad to note that, while the world is living in such a tense atmosphere owing to the increasing number of conflicts, those in some self-seeking circles still encourage limited wars in different parts of the world, forgetting, or pretending to forget, that that kind of conflict could one day degenerate into a world-wide conflagration with the most terrifying consequences for the whole human race. Does not this serious rivalry between the two major blocs involve and lead to all sorts of crises throughout the world? Is détente not now becoming a phenomenon of the past in East-West relations? Those are just some of the negative aspects of our world today. Should the international community accept such a situation? Without a doubt the answer is "No".

Having listened carefully to the preceding speakers, I have been led to believe that within our Committee there is a broad convergence of views on most of the agenda items. We all agree that we should assume special responsibility in the search for new initiatives designed to curb the arms race. The Togolese Government is ready to support the adoption of a more effective approach and mode of action in this Committee and also in other bodies of the United Nations that deal with disarmament as a whole.

We have heard reasons advanced to justify the unrestrained arms race. My delegation does not want to reiterate those justifications; it wishes simply to state the views of the Togolese Government on this matter. In this regard I should like to read out a passage from the statement made by the Togolese Foreign Minister, His Excellency Mr. Anani Kuma Akakpo-Ahianyio, on 9 October last in the General Assembly. He said:

"To safeguard independence and freedom, the nations must work together for peace. ...

"The people of Togo ardently wishes for itself and for all the nations peace and progress. That peace must be real and must contribute to the effective emancipation of our different nations. That is why, faced with the disarray in the world, which threatens the international equilibrium, Togo has always advocated recourse to fraternal dialogue and permanent consultation in seeking in peace just solutions for the tragic conflicts shaking our world, which every day result in the loss of human life.'

(Mr. Kussey, Togo)

"It is in order to avoid such unnecessary loss of life and to consolidate the independence and freedom of States that nations large and small have joined and must join their efforts so that they may complement each other." (A/36/PV.33, p.41)

We reiterate here that the process of limiting arms and achieving disarmament is not an end in itself. Rather, it is one means of arriving at peace and stability on our planet so that we can devote ourselves exclusively to the vital problems that we must face. The Togolese delegation feels that all States must work resolutely to ensure scrupulous respect for the legal and moral principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter. The United Nations was created to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war by maintaining international peace and security. It is incumbent on all States to take effective collective measures in order to prevent any act of aggression and to avert any threat to peace. Our community must struggle against the fundamental evils that give rise to situations of conflict -- namely, fear, distrust, egoism, antagonism, hegemonism, exploitation and so forth, which often underlie disputes between States. We expect a great deal of the political leaders of the major Powers, and we urge them to demonstrate greater political will to come together around negotiating tables in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and trust.

While it desires continuation of the SALT negotiations, Togo hopes to see an end to the military rivalry between the super-Powers, in particular through an increase in the number of nuclear-weapon-free zones. In this regard Togo supports the declaration of Africa, the Middle East, the Indian Ocean and Latin America as nuclear-weapon-free zones.

(Mr. Kussey, Togo)

The immense human and material resources that are mobilized to increase the destructive capacities of nations mortgage the possibilities for economic and social development for many countries. It is important that disarmament measures be effectively implemented, so that vast resources may be released for development in the world. Togo trusts that proper preparations will be made for the second special session on disarmament in 1982. That event should draw the attention not only of Governments but also of world public opinion to the urgent need to halt the arms race. It should also emphasize that nations and peoples can benefit immediately from disarmament.

Before concluding, the Togolese delegation would like to reiterate that the various measures on general and complete disarmament proposed in the Declaration can be applied only if all States, particularly those with nuclear weapons, demonstrate the political will to take the steps envisaged in the Programme of Action and the Declaration on disarmament. In our view, the responsibility for attaining the final goal of general and complete disarmament rests on those States. We must remain true to the goals of the Charter of the United Nations. We must continue unflinchingly to explore the bases for a consensus that would bring us close to the objectives that we seek to attain. We must in particular help to restore a climate of confidence among nations. This is essential if we are to reach our final goal of a world free from those weapons that make aggression possible.

In the present situation of crisis we are convinced that no isolated country or group of countries can alone solve the many problems facing the international community. Togo appeals for international co-operation in achieving a more stable world.

We hope that the Disarmament Week that we are now observing will give us the necessary impetus and inspiration to save mankind from a nuclear catastrophe.

Mr. PASHKEVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): On 4 October 1957, for the first time in history, an artificial earth satellite was launched and the Soviet Union thereby inaugurated the era of the conquest of outer space by mankind. During the subsequent 24 years there have been truly amazing achievements in the exploration and conquest of outer space. Mankind now benefits widely from the fruits of the peaceful use of space technology. Communication satellites, navigational and meteorological satellites and satellites used for the remote sensing of oceans have all brought about a revolution in the means of communication, shortening distances, forecasting weather and locating mineral resources, and have increased safety at sea. The development of space technology has made it possible to resolve a number of important problems, in particular, in a number of areas of production on land. The study of the effects of long-term sojourns by man in space bring us closer to the time when people will be able to stay for long periods on large, orbiting craft doing research and productive work. For example, the Soviet cosmonauts Leonid Popov and Valerii Ryumin spent 185 days in space, from 9 April to 11 October 1980, carrying out research work aboard the orbiting space station Salyut-6.

This peaceful exploration of space has also demonstrated the tremendous potential for fruitful international co-operation in this noble and by no means easy task. Experiments have been carried out aboard Soviet space orbiting equipment in connexion with national programmes for space research by cosmonauts from eight socialist countries. Our country was happy to celebrate the joint flight of Soviet and American cosmonauts aboard the Soyuz-Apollo spacecraft as evidence of the true possibilities for businesslike co-operation in the conquest of space by the two countries with the most advanced space technology. Preparations are also being made for space flights to be made by nationals of other countries aboard Soviet spacecraft.

However, we are distressed to have to note that today the scientific and technological revolution in space is accompanied by a rather ominous development, namely, an attempt at the militarization of outer space. To the horror of peoples, these tremendous achievements of mankind in its constant effort to

(Mr. Pashkevich, Byelorussian SSR)

increase and widen its knowledge of the laws of our universe in order to improve the lives of peoples on earth have also opened up a new sphere for the arms race. And now those in militarist imperialist circles are rushing to exploit this opportunity.

In connexion with the launching last spring of the American spacecraft Columbia many articles appeared in the United States press revealing the far-reaching plans of the Pentagon for speeding up the arms race in space. In this regard, there were reports of their intention to place laser weapons, certain kinds of mines, and the like in outer space. These systems are intended to be used, among other things, for the destruction of artificial satellites and rockets.

Intensive work is being done on even more powerful radiological weapons. There is talk of a so-called X-ray laser in which a small nuclear explosion is used which emits intensive radiation. According to the calculations of military specialists, it will be possible to place this weapon in space by the end of the century. Within a short period of time chemical lasers will be ready for use in space for the destruction of ballistic missiles and aircraft.

An examination of the chain reaction of the establishment of new systems of weapons will reveal quite clearly the threat of the appearance of another very ominous source of military danger to mankind. Moreover, the militarization of outer space through the placement in it of anti-rocket and anti-satellite systems could lead certain irresponsible leaders who believe in the possibility of first strike, limited nuclear war, and so on, to press the buttons that control their rocket installations because they believe that the presence of their so-called wonder weapon in outer space will preclude any response to their nuclear attack.

(Mr. Pashkevich, Byelorussian SSR)

The arms race in space inevitably leads to stagnation and, indeed, a reversal of international co-operation in exploring outer space for peaceful purposes. And so the human race will not be able fully to take advantage of scientific achievements in the mastery of space to speed up the solution of the social and economic problems in all countries.

In other words, an urgent task faces the human race -- that of preventing outer space from being turned into a battlefield in future. That must be done as quickly as possible because it is always much easier to prevent something from happening and to prevent the dissemination of new sources of lethal danger than it is to allow them to happen and then try to eliminate them.

That is why the Byelorussian delegation was happy to see that during the general debate in the First Committee many delegations expressed unquestionable interest and, indeed, support for the new Soviet peaceful initiative -- namely, the proposal on the need to conclude a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. That proposal results from the Soviet programme for peace for the 1980s, approved earlier this year by the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It is also the logical result of the consistent policy of the Soviet Union as early as 1958, namely, not to permit the use of outer space for military purposes.

It is true that during this session of the General Assembly we have also heard voices making statements to the effect that there is no need to conclude such a treaty for, allegedly, in the past a number of international legal instruments were adopted designed to ensure the exclusively peaceful use of outer space. It is true that such instruments were adopted and indeed, some of them at the initiative of the Soviet Union, and they do indeed play an important role in curbing the militarization of space. Among them we could include the 1963 Moscow Treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere in outer space and under water. Unfortunately, not all nuclear Powers have yet become party to that treaty.

(Mr. Pashkevich Byelorussian SSR)

In 1967 the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies was concluded. In 1977, the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques was concluded. In 1979, the General Assembly adopted the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and other Celestial Bodies which prohibits the militarization of our nocturnal luminary.

However, an analysis of the texts of those documents in the light of recent facts connected with the development of military space technology certainly shows the urgent need to take these activities one step further, to go beyond what has been done, because those treaties and agreements that I have mentioned relate to the prohibition of the stationing in outer space only of weapons of mass destruction. For example, Article IV of the 1967 Treaty makes it binding on States .

not to place in orbit around the Earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, install such weapons on celestial bodies, or station weapons in outer space in any other manner. (General Assembly resolution 2222 (XXI) Article IV, para. 1)

This means that this Treaty really does not cover, for example, laser weapons or the placing of mines in space, and in future, possibly, other kinds of weapons which are not yet really called weapons of mass destruction, although they probably do increase the danger of nuclear war being unleashed. In that connexion, we should recall that a number of States expressed reservations in regard to Article IV of the 1967 Treaty.

In the light of recent events, what was approved at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament becomes even more relevant. It is contained in paragraph 30 of the Final Document in the provision that:

(Mr. Pashkevich, Byelorussian SSR)

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. (A/S-10/4 para. 30)

All this confirms the urgent need to conclude provisions or indeed, a new treaty in addition to the treaties already in force on the peaceful use of outer space that would ensure that States parties undertake not to place in orbit around the earth objects carrying weapons of any kind and also undertake not to install such weapons on celestial bodies or station them in outer space in any other manner. Weapons must not be placed on reusable manned space vehicles of an existing type or of other types which might be developed in the future. The draft treaty submitted by the Soviet Union contained in document A/36/192 contains, in addition to those provisions, another provision that States parties to the treaty should undertake not to destroy, damage or disturb the normal functioning or change the flight trajectory of space objects of other States parties, if such objects were placed in orbit in strict accordance with the provisions of the treaty. That provision of the treaty takes account of the desire expressed during this debate relating to the need to ensure the inviolability of space objects of all States placed in space for peaceful purposes.

The draft treaty also contains a necessary and adequate system for ensuring compliance with provisions of the treaty, this is contained in article 4 of the draft treaty.

As can be clearly seen from the content of the proposed treaty relating to the obligation of States parties, such an international legal instrument would require, under equal conditions, all present and future owners of technology for the production and stationing in outer space of weapons of any kind not to put such weapons into outer space. No single country would have any unilateral advantage and the human race as a whole would breathe more easily. Considerable resources could thus be released for the civilian sector of the economy.

(Mr. Pashkevich, Byelorussian SSR)

The adoption of the treaty would be a demonstration of a constructive approach to this question of limiting all weapons and achieving disarmament. It would also contribute, not in words but in deeds, to the realization of the aspirations of all peoples of goodwill for peace and security. The carrying out of this proposal would be in the interests of all States, irrespective of whether they participate or are directly involved in the peaceful mastery of outer space or whether they simply enjoy the fruits of such activities.

In the light of what we have said, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR appeals to all the members of this Committee to support the Soviet initiative on the need to conclude a treaty prohibiting the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. The most appropriate body for drafting such a treaty would clearly be the Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia): The wide-ranging set of disarmament issues, on the consideration of which our Committee has embarked, represents without doubt the most important and, for the preservation of world peace, which is the principal objective of the United Nations - the most pressing problem now facing the international community. It is a problem whose urgency is further enhanced by the fact that its solution must be striven for in a situation that has been considerably complicated by a number of steps and measures undertaken by the most reactionary forces of imperialism, in total contravention of the efforts for disarmament. Contrary to the pronouncements of those forces, such measures lead to a revival of the cold-war spirit and to the unleashing of an arms race such as has never been seen before and which - and this is particularly foreboding -- considerably increases the risk of a war catastrophe and of a world-wide nuclear conflagration.

These telling facts cannot be obscured by any apologetics of the originators of the arms race that have already been expounded in this Committee nor by any false arguments about a threat from the East or about some kind of military superiority of the USSR, nor by any doctrines proclaiming the necessity of

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

producing armaments allegedly in order to be in a better position, sometime in the future, to conduct disarmament negotiations. It is precisely that logic, which turns white into black, and black into the purpose of all policy, that has brought about the unfavourable reversal in the development of the international situation and has made the borderline between life and death for millions and possibly billions of inhabitants of our planet, between peace and a nuclear catastrophe, no longer as strong as it should be.

The awareness of this threat, which is today a real one, and the deep concern that is justifiably felt by the peace-loving people of the entire world run like a red thread through the work of our Committee and through all the deliberations of the current session of the General Assembly. They materialized in the draft of the declaration on the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe submitted by the Soviet Union, the idea of which - namely, to exclude any possibility of the outbreak of a nuclear war - must be close to the hearts of all peace-loving peoples and countries of the whole world. We believe that by adopting such a declaration the United Nations, born as a hope of peace from the conflagration of the Second World War, would be doing what it is bound to do by its Charter, that is, to strive to avert a new war which would of necessity be incomparably more terrible and destructive than any prior war and which could be nothing else but truly a nuclear catastrophe for mankind.

Once again we express the hope and conviction that this important proposal will receive the deserved support of the delegations representing their respective countries at the current session of the General Assembly as well as in the First Committee.

We trust that all those who wish to embark on the road of adventurous armaments, of an irresponsible gamble with the fate of the present generation and of indifference to the fate of future ones, will be able to realize, in time, their own heavy responsibility. We hope that they will be able to find again

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

the way to the development of fruitful, mutually advantageous international co-operation, the way to the continuation of the process of international détente and the way to providing the principles of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference with concrete content, both in the political and in the military spheres.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, together with the other countries united in the Warsaw Treaty, has never strayed from that road. Contrary to their counterparts in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the countries of the socialist community never sought to increase armaments in order to reach military superiority, never adopted a single decision on the production of new types of weapons that did not already exist in the arsenals of the Western countries, never proclaimed any doctrine in support of any strategy whatever of limited or global war. It has always been the United States and its allies in NATO that have in recent years been increasingly active in adopting decisions designed to fan the arms race, to build strategic superiority over the countries of the socialist community, to undermine international stability and security, to formulate the most varied - both new and old, but always equally dangerous - military doctrines. The facts speak for themselves. It was not the socialist countries which decided in 1978 on a planned increase of their military budgets. It was not the socialist countries that one year later adopted the plan for changing Western Europe into a launching pad for new United States medium-range nuclear missiles. Nor was it the socialist countries that made the decision on the manufacture of nuclear neutron weapons, of new powerful MX missiles, of the B-1 strategic bomber and on the creation of rapid deployment forces that can be used for intervention in any part of the world.

The exact opposite is true. It was the socialist countries - the Soviet Union and the other countries members of the Warsaw Treaty - that in the same period of time, true to their principled peace policy, stepped up the offensive for the preservation of international peace and security, that

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

submitted to their NATO counterparts a whole series of constructive and feasible proposals, beginning with the proposals for the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting the first use of either nuclear or conventional weapons, the proposal to convene a European conference on military détente and disarmament, and up to the proposals on a substantial expansion of confidence-building measures. It was the socialist countries that put forward initiatives relating to the conclusion of treaties on the prohibition of nuclear neutron weapons, radiological weapons and chemical weapons and to a general and complete ban of nuclear-weapon tests, as well as to the adoption of many other measures whose implementation would result in restraining the arms race, reducing the risk of war, improving the international situation and strengthening world peace and security. All those proposals continue to be valid. And, it must be added, if talks on each of these most important questions are not progressing, it is naturally not the fault of the socialist countries.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

The policy of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is fully focused on an active search for ways and means of reviving constructive disarmament negotiations and halting the senseless arms race. This was recently expressed by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Gustáv Husák, who said:

"Socialist Czechoslovakia stands firmly in the ranks of those who are struggling to avert the threat of war, for the strengthening of peace and security of peoples, for disarmament. Without peace, without favourable international conditions, we could not successfully continue the implementation of our programme of socialist construction. We live in the heart of Europe, in a place that has been spared by hardly any war on that continent. We wish that the future generations may not come to know such horrors. In that respect the interests and the needs of our peoples are completely identical with the interests and aspirations of the peoples of the entire world."

In that context, I should like to reaffirm the far-reaching and long-term significance that Czechoslovakia attaches to the peace programme for the 1980s proclaimed by the XXVth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, with which we fully associate ourselves and which we regard as a broadly conceived basis for concrete and practical negotiations both on questions of disarmament and on the most important questions of establishing firm and lasting peace, strengthening the system of international security, and safeguarding the undisturbed development of nations.

We fully support the proposal of the Soviet Union for the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. Outer space must not become another arena of the arms race. We reject the dangerous theory that what goes on in outer space does not concern the earth, because we know very well that the plans for the military use of outer space follow purely terrestrial designs.

We highly value the new important proposals and ideas relating to the solution of a number of aspects of disarmament problems which have been submitted to our Committee by the delegation of the USSR in the course of the current session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

The questions of halting the nuclear arms race and achieving nuclear disarmament have, of course, the highest priority on the agenda of our Committee. We highly value the new Soviet impetus aimed at starting practical negotiations in the Geneva Committee on general nuclear disarmament on the basis of an agreement on the content of the individual stages of nuclear disarmament. We believe it appropriate that in the first stage the question of halting the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction should be considered. The progress of these talks would undoubtedly be greatly facilitated by the establishment of an authoritative international committee composed of foremost scientists from various countries, which would underscore the necessity of averting a nuclear catastrophe.

It is exceptionally important for the step-by-step solution of the question of general nuclear disarmament to ensure an equilibrium in the field of nuclear weapons and to go on to their reduction. We believe that the willingness of the USSR to continue without delay the respective talks on the basis of preserving all the positive achievements in this field should not remain without adequate response. We resolutely reject the approach according to which a change of Government in one country means also a change in or even cancellation of the commitments it has assumed, as in the case of the SALT II treaty.

Czechoslovakia welcomes the opening of a dialogue between the USSR and the United States of America, as well as their intention to continue talks on medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. It is no secret that the situation in Europe in particular, has a great impact on the over-all situation in the world. It is therefore in the interest of world peace to preserve the existing approximate parity in Europe, preferably on the lowest possible level. The planned deployment of new United States medium-range nuclear missiles in a number of Western European countries would substantially disturb the existing balance. This would only lead to another round of the arms race, which, in its end result, would considerably reduce security and heighten tensions in that part of the world. We therefore express the hope that the Soviet-American talks will continue in a positive spirit and will lead to the adoption of a corresponding agreement.

Security in Europe would surely be enhanced by progress in the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe which, through no fault of ours, have been deadlocked for a number of years.

In connexion with the continuing dangerous activities of South Africa and Israel and their growing nuclear ambitions, the question of strengthening the régime of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is gaining importance. We underline in this context the irreplaceable role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in the application of the system of nuclear guarantees, as well as in the development of international co-operation in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We sharply condemn the recent piratical attack by Israel on the atomic research reactor in Iraq, and advocate the adoption of such measures as would compel the aggressor to pay compensation for the damage caused.

The consolidation of the nuclear non-proliferation régime, as well as the strengthening of the security of States, would certainly be facilitated by the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world. We support the proposals for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in Africa, in the Middle East, in northern Europe and in the Balkan Peninsula. We also resolutely encourage the efforts by the States in the region of the Indian Ocean to establish a zone of peace and to liquidate foreign military bases in that region. We are in favour of the earliest possible convocation of an international conference on that question, already approved by the General Assembly, but blocked by United States obstructions.

We equally encourage the transformation of South-East Asia and of the Mediterranean into zones of lasting peace and fruitful co-operation. The recent attack by United States armed forces against Libyan aircraft demonstrated once again the urgency of that requirement.

Czechoslovakia stands consistently for a speedy and concrete solution of the broad spectrum of disarmament problems. It is in favour of both broad and partial measures that will facilitate the achievement of the desired progress. We attach great importance to the work of the Geneva Committee on Disarmament, which is engaged as a negotiating body in the preparation of the individual disarmament agreements.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

An important item on that Committee's agenda for a number of years has been the question of concluding a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. The delegations of the socialist and non-aligned countries have proposed, as is known, the establishment of a special auxiliary organ for the consideration of this question. Unfortunately, the constructive endeavours of the overwhelming majority of Committee members have been blocked by the negative attitude of some countries. We continue to speak up for a speedy conclusion of the trilateral negotiations between the USSR, United States and the United Kingdom on the preparation of a joint draft of that treaty and we would wish that these talks might be conducted in a more effective fashion than has so far been the case. That, of course, requires sufficient political will on the part of all the participants to conclude such a treaty. The session of the Committee this year, however, has shown that such will is obviously lacking on the part of certain well-known countries. We believe, none the less, that it is necessary to continue the negotiations actively and to strive for their successful conclusion - both on the trilateral level and, concurrently, in the broader forum of the Committee on Disarmament.

We also believe it desirable that the Committee on Disarmament should continue intensive deliberations with a view to elaborating an international agreement on strengthening the security guarantees of non-nuclear States. We fully support the position that these binding guarantees should be extended to those non-nuclear countries which do not possess nuclear weapons and do not permit their deployment on their territories. We also take a positive view of the request, already embodied in the resolution adopted by the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, that States possessing nuclear weapons should, as a first step towards the conclusion of an agreement, make solemn statements, similar in content, on the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States which have no such weapons on their territories, and that these statements should be reaffirmed by a resolution of the United Nations Security Council. It is worth mentioning that so far only the Soviet Union has shown willingness to take this step.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

In the same manner, we support the demand that talks be activated on another important question - that of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. This question can now be considered in an organic interrelation with a new initiative proposed by the Soviet Union: also to agree on not increasing the number of nuclear weapons where such arsenals already exist. We believe that this measure could provide the answer to the question of how to prevent not only the horizontal but also the so-called vertical spread of nuclear weapons - in other words, a continued dangerous growth of their arsenals in various parts of the world.

Another matter of the highest priority is the elaboration of a treaty on the total prohibition of the development, manufacture and use of chemical weapons and on the liquidation of their accumulated stockpiles. We appreciate the fact that, despite obstruction by the United States, the respective working group of the Committee on Disarmament has reached, thanks to the active positions of many delegations, visible progress in identifying the principal elements of future agreement. The talks held so far have also brought about a rapprochement of the views on the question of verification as a uniform system of both national and international measures, the operative functioning of which would be ensured by a consultative committee of government experts. We want to believe that further talks will lead to the solution of this question, which has been ripe for a long time, and that the envisaged agreement will become another component in the gradually erected structure of disarmament negotiations.

We categorically reject the nefarious attempts by the United States propaganda machinery to cause further serious complications by disseminating fabricated and totally unfounded reports of an alleged use of chemical weapons in various parts of the world. These unsubstantiated allegations have been circulated anew recently, with the obvious intention of sharpening the international climate, erecting a new barrier to the conclusion of a treaty banning chemical weapons and, above all, justifying the Americans' own plans for the manufacture and deployment of new types of chemical weapons, such as the binary weapons.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

The cause of disarmament and of averting a nuclear catastrophe would undoubtedly be enhanced by the conclusion of an international agreement prohibiting the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, the draft of which has for several years now been discussed in the Committee on Disarmament. Here, too, it must be noted that the solution of this most timely question is hampered by the negative, unconstructive approach of the West. We are firmly convinced that the deadlock in the talks could be overcome by adopting the Soviet proposal that permanent members of the Security Council and other States of military importance should make statements, similar or identical in content, renouncing the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, which statements could subsequently be approved by a resolution of the Security Council.

The urgent need to prevent the emergence of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction and their introduction in the equipment of armies is graphically illustrated by this year's lighthearted and dangerous decision by the United States to commence manufacture of nuclear neutron weapons, a decision which has been bitterly opposed by the world public. It is necessary that the current session of the General Assembly, bearing in mind the danger inherent in the situation that has arisen, should give a new impetus to negotiations on the proposed convention on the total prohibition of nuclear neutron weapons, the draft of which was submitted by the socialist countries to the Geneva Committee on Disarmament as far back as 1978.

The same impetus is obviously also required to finalize the negotiations on the treaty on the prohibition of radiological weapons, which, despite considerable progress, have not as yet brought the awaited results.

A dominant position in this year's agenda of the Committee on Disarmament was occupied by the important question of elaborating a comprehensive programme of disarmament. The consideration of this question attests to the fact that the majority of States show a deep interest in the universal solution of the problem of disarmament and of averting a nuclear war. Czechoslovakia, too, is actively participating in these talks. Together with the other countries of the socialist community, Czechoslovakia consistently advocates in the Committee, as well as here in the United Nations, that the programme to be adopted in

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

several months by the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament should represent a practical instrument for a comprehensive revitalization of concrete disarmament negotiations in all necessary directions.

We would wish that the entire deliberations of the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly on disarmament should be carried out in the constructive spirit of joint efforts for the adoption of new, practical disarmament measures. In that context, it is necessary to draw attention to the tendency of some countries to bring to the fore the question of the verification of disarmament measures, which has already had an unfavourable impact both in the Preparatory Committee for the special session and in the current debate in this Committee. We believe that the question of verification cannot be separated from the content of specific disarmament measures, and even less that it can replace these measures. This course of action simply could not lead to any practical progress.

It is quite obvious and it has been made clear in many statements in our Committee that tangible progress in the field of halting the arms race and achieving concrete results in disarmament cannot be made without the immediate interest and political will of all States. What is more, this political will, international co-operation and a constructive approach to the problems of disarmament have never been more needed than in the present complicated international situation. That is why we believe that it is appropriate in this context to draw attention to the Declaration on International Co-operation for Disarmament, adopted on the initiative of Czechoslovakia by the General Assembly in 1979, and to emphasize again its significance as a code of conduct for States in disarmament negotiations, serving the interests of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted unanimously by the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the interests of achieving concrete results in disarmament negotiations. The Czechoslovak delegation will to that end submit specific proposals at a later stage of our deliberations.

I declare in conclusion that the delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is ready to co-operate actively with all delegations in the positive consideration of the question of disarmament and that it will make an all-out effort to ensure that the thirty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly makes the maximum contribution possible to the achievement of progress in this field. The Czechoslovak delegation reserves its right to state its position on further questions on our agenda at a later stage in our deliberations.

Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): As this is the first occasion on which I speak before the First, the Political, Committee, I feel privileged to be able to extend to our Chairman, the representative of friendly Yugoslavia, my delegation's most sincere congratulations on his assumption of his high office and to express full confidence that under his able stewardship the long list of questions on the agenda of this thirty-sixth session will be moved forward towards identification and, we hope, eventual resolution.

(Mr. Museibeh Jordan)

Needless to say, the work of this Committee which is specifically addressed to international peace and security through various modalities, methods, approaches, mechanisms and strategies leading to limitation of the awesome and accelerating arms race, is regrettably taking the form of a series of annual rituals, with action taking place elsewhere. Such being the case the meetings of the Committee have the potential to create, in a real sense, a false sense of security as they impart the complacent perception to large segments of humankind who are deeply concerned about the preservation of world peace and security that we are making a contribution towards that preservation of world peace and security, upon which the survival of humanity depends.

It matters naught whether the present arsenals of thermonuclear destruction are sufficient to destroy our planet once or 100 times over. It makes little difference whether mass destruction can be achieved through the use of radiological biological or chemical weaponry, though in limited wars - and there have been more of them than we like to remember since the Second World War - certain types of weaponry have been more bestial than others.

What is and should be the essence and thrust of our attention is to identify and make a serious effort towards resolving the underlying causes which have turned man's consciousness towards utilizing every scientific discovery for mass suicidal destruction.

It is, therefore, the political will and consciousness which, in the final analysis, are the arbiter of the problem of to be or not to be. It is not by chance that the name of this Committee, the most important Committee, is the First, the Political Committee, even though virtually all the items on our agenda form a litany of destructive military genres discussed and sophisticated in such frameworks as equivalence, a balance of power or a balance of terror mutually assured destruction, a margin of safety, a window of vulnerability, theatre nuclear wars and arms limitations, meticulously calculated in megatons, security triads, chemical and biological weapons and all the rest of the jargon that has become as ubiquitous as anything in our daily life.

From where we stand the real question is which comes first, the chicken or the egg the carriage before the horse or the horse before the carriage? Is war still a feasible or tolerable instrument of policy? It is only in the context of a considered answer to that question that we can

meaningfully address the question of arms limitation leading to eventual total disarmament.

A leading scientist, in the immediate aftermath of the atomic explosions in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, remarked in sober sadness that the world would never be the same again. Yet policy-makers in some parts of the world continue to behave as though the world continues to be the same, totally oblivious of the irretrievable change which has since bottled us up in an impossible set of choices. A huge cultural gap continues to exist between traditional political thought and the undreamed-of and ongoing technological breakthroughs which have vastly surpassed and rendered obsolete and irrelevant the contours which marked out the rules of the game in international relations during past generations of recorded history.

Perhaps what I am stating seems banal, simplistic and somewhat unrelated to what appears to be the real business of counting and equating how much armament, to whom and where. After all, we do not meet in the First Committee to sermonize but to assess in realistic terms - meaning in specific armaments terms - what our order of business is or should be.

Yet we have reached a stage of living on borrowed time, when it has become legitimate - indeed imperative - to take stock of our annual ritual and our real priorities.

There are three important questions which we must address, not only here but at the highest levels of policy making.

First, we must decide realistically, objectively and categorically that war in the nuclear age is no longer a feasible choice, except as an act of assured mass suicide.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

A heightened awareness of this fact imposes a fundamental reappraisal of our strategic thinking, suited to a new situation unprecedented in the past, no matter how unpalatable. This reminds me of a story I heard as a child, which I find has considerable bearing on the current arms race. A governor had been told about a man who was known for his insatiable greed. To test the limits, if any, of that man's greed, the governor said to him: "You can walk from dawn to dusk from this city to a village some 25 miles away. Every piece of land that you can traverse during that period will become your lawful acquisition." The man started the journey exhilarated, first walking, then jogging, then running faster and faster, fearfully watching for the advent of dusk. Just before dusk and before reaching his promised land he had so overtaxed himself that he collapsed from exhaustion and died, thus forfeiting everything.

And so it is with an uncontrolled and inherently uncontrollable arms race. It would overtax the resources of the super-Powers and others and so steal from their more immediate mundane needs that they would meet their death from internal haemorrhage, while their bloated arsenals remained helplessly in silos, airborne or beneath the bottomless seas, or even circling in outer space. It is high time for the SALT process to be resumed before the arms race renders that process totally redundant and chimerical.

Secondly, we must dispel any notion that since war has been a part of human nature since recorded history and since total war has become totally untenable, we must have an outlet for our pugnacious instincts in limited theatre nuclear wars. Again, this is a stupid fallacy and should be recognized as such. When two boxers enter the ring they do so with the expectation and determination of winning. They never make an agreement to use a quarter or half of their prowess. If the balance should tilt in favour of one side, the other side would most certainly escalate activity rather than suffer defeat. The masses of Europe are right in protesting against the concept of a theatre nuclear war, of which they would be the principal victim. But the fact is that once a war were

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

ignited, fear alone would make certain that all arsenals and peoples throughout the world would unavoidably become involved. Decisions in these matters must be made within minutes and it is extremely doubtful, indeed impossible, that the decision-makers would have the time or the powers of discernment to make sober judgements under such trying and unprecedented conditions. The margin of safety in the nuclear age and the capability of delivering nuclear arms against an adversary is continually shrinking as between the super-Powers - there would be no more than a 15-minute warning, and that could well be reduced.

Thirdly, it is necessary to dispel the concept that any national interest could be served, enhanced or preserved through war. In the shrunken village to which our globe has been dwarfed in distances and interdependence it should be rationally recognized that no national interest can survive regional wars. Even if nuclear weapons were not used, the sophistication of armaments has reached such a level of destructive capability that little indeed could be saved, and that development process is continuing and accelerating.

All the classic books that we read a quarter of a century ago about the concept of national interest as the be-all and end-all of foreign policy doctrines, based on such elements as raw materials, bases, prestige, influence and other components of national power, have become manifestly out of date. Resources can only be assured within a matrix of mutuality of interests. Influence and prestige, in an age of heightened awakening among all peoples of the world, can best be assured by a friendly, rather than an antagonistic, oppressive or one-sided relationship. Besides, even alchemists of old recognized and achieved a transformation of matter from one essential commodity to another. If, instead of fighting over what are regarded as non-renewable resources, as we read daily in the press, only a part of the scientific resources were mobilized to make what appear to be non-renewable resources into renewable ones in other forms but serving the same purpose, then our understanding of national interests would be drastically revamped.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

In discussing international peace and security we cannot realistically be unmindful of a set of imperatives which are genuine and closely germane to the maintenance of that goal. This was clearly recognized in the United Nations Charter, which, if complied with meticulously, would create and sustain conditions of peaceful coexistence and general agreement. If that is not observed on the basis of international law, justice and legality, then no matter how committed nations may be to peace no peace is possible, for their understanding of peace is a peace in which they live in security, legality, justice and morality. Otherwise it would ultimately be reduced to a peace of the grave, as the late President Eisenhower once remarked.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

It is therefore imperative that the General Assembly should do all in its power to redress injustices and deprivation. The Charter itself recognizes, in Article 51, the right to self-defence when all other avenues have failed.

The annual report of the Secretary-General states that if only 5 per cent of a total of \$500 to \$600 billion of annual arms expenditure were allocated to assist in galvanizing the international economic order, then the world would become a safer, better and more prosperous place to live in. This would be to the benefit, not only of what are known as the developing countries, but also of the developed countries who are at present trading within a narrow club, trading the same goods and commodities for which there is no need. No one can buy more than four refrigerators for his home; no one need buy seven automobiles, because there are no parking lots to put them in. But once you galvanize the two or three billion people of the developing world, then you will have created a market for consumers as well as producers of goods and services, and both the developed and the developing countries will prosper, even though there may be a short interim period during which it may seem that the developed countries are making a little sacrifice.

In the international community, as in national societies, massive and ever widening disparities and deprivations are as likely to undermine world peace and security as the accumulation of wasteful weapons of destruction. This is a subject which should better be left to the Second Committee and other international forums, but it would be irresponsible on my part to overlook the inseparable relationship between a spiralling arms race and the objective of building a more stable, prosperous and secure world.

My statement has hardly touched upon the specific and extremely important items which we shall be discussing in depth during this session and which will constitute, it is to be hoped, a most valuable contribution to the commendably successful work of the Preparatory Committee for the second special session on disarmament, to be held in June and July of next year.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

But I have dwelt upon such factors as political awareness, a readiness to live and let live, human nature and other pre-requisites for peaceful co-existence, in the absence of which the Programme of Action contained in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament -- which elated us all -- and the comprehensive programme of disarmament at present being negotiated in the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, for possible adoption by the second special session next year, will prove to be of no avail.

Mr. GBEHC (Ghana): Mr. Chairman, since this is my first time of speaking in the Committee, and before turning to the subject matter of this debate, let me first offer, through you, to the Chairman of our Committee, a representative of friendly Yugoslavia, warm congratulations on his unanimous election as Chairman of this Committee. His election is a recognition of his vast experience and the useful contributions which his country has made to the disarmament effort. I also wish to offer congratulations to you personally, and to the other officers of the Committee, on their election.

The debate on disarmament has constituted one of the major preoccupations of the General Assembly since its very first session. Colleagues will recall that the very first resolution adopted in January 1946 was on the subject of disarmament. Since then, hundreds of resolutions about disarmament have been adopted. In 1978, we held the first special session devoted to disarmament and, in a consensus document adopted at the end of the session, we committed ourselves to a Programme of Action to speed disarmament.

The General Assembly, in short, has since its establishment witnessed a consistent increase in the number of conferences and meetings, the proliferation of resolutions and declarations on the subject of disarmament, and we are even now preparing to hold a second special session devoted to disarmament in the summer of next year.

(Mr. Gteho, Ghana)

Despite these efforts, the level of the stockpiles and production rates of armaments are not falling. On the contrary, Governments are steadily increasing their military budgets and the number and quality of their weapons, and are also engaged in the modernization of their forces.

It seems that it is easy to intellectualize disarmament, adopt resolutions, commission studies, establish committees and study their reports, but there follows a regrettable failure to live up to commitments when it comes to the implementation of disarmament agreements. Thus, there is a wide gap between what is stated here in this Committee and the actual performance of Governments in the field of disarmament.

Figures relating to the huge accumulation of arms, particularly the nuclear arsenals of the two major nuclear Powers, have been quoted here time and again. But let me recall some of the conclusions of the report dated 12 September 1980, prepared by a group of experts on a comprehensive survey of nuclear weapons. Ghana had the privilege of providing an expert who participated in the preparation of that report. The survey painted a chilling picture of the nuclear arms race in five particular respects: first, there are more than 40,000 nuclear warheads, equivalent to one million Hiroshima-type bombs in the world today; secondly, one nuclear submarine alone can now deliver more explosive power than all the munitions used in the Second World War; thirdly, the super-Powers have increased the total of their strategic nuclear warheads from 5,500 to 15,200 over the decade; fourthly, that total includes some warheads that are so large that any one, if exploded, would release more energy than all the conventional explosives ever used since gunpowder was invented; fifthly, there have been more than 1,200 nuclear tests since 1945, and these tests are still continuing at the rate of about 40 or more a year.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

But there is another disturbing aspect of the problem. Today the total world expenditure on arms is in excess of \$500 billion annually in real terms. It is dramatically increasing every year, while the majority of mankind lacks shelter and basic medical care, and millions die of hunger and malnutrition. It is indeed a sombre picture of the reality of the world in which we live today.

We have so far avoided another major war, but, considering the mad rush to accumulate arms, we may not be so lucky at all times. We submit that the time has come to put an end to the unprecedented waste of human resources and the present unprecedented threat to the very survival of mankind posed by the arms race.

No nation can avoid the responsibility of providing an appropriate and adequate level of defence for its security. In the imperfect world in which we live, security seems to be the primary concern of all nations. The problem of security has therefore almost always been thought of in military terms. However, it is now generally acknowledged that the acquisition of weapons of destruction alone does not guarantee security and that at a certain point excess weapons would not guarantee security any better. This is particularly true in respect of arsenals of nuclear weapons. The continuous qualitative and quantitative expansion of nuclear weaponry has lost its meaning, at least from the military and strategic point of view.

The report in document A/36/356, on the relationship between disarmament and development, introduced by Mrs. Inga Thorsson on Tuesday last, 20 October, has established that arms race and development are incompatible. The conclusions of the study have again emphasized the serious economic and social consequences of the arms race for the international community, as well as the fact that security conceived in terms of the accumulation of weapons to meet perceived challenges arising from bilateral rivalry and confrontation is not enduring, and that in our world of interdependence, lasting peace and security can be attained through general and complete disarmament and the equitable redistribution of resources within the framework of the new international economic order. The experts have also confirmed that disarmament and the reallocation of the released resources to meet the socio-economic needs of the vast majority

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

of mankind is no longer a moral issue but an inescapable international obligation. The release of the report is timely and significant. I should like to place on record the Ghana delegation's appreciation to Mrs. Inga Thorsson and her team for producing such an excellent and thought-provoking report.

Three years ago, following the first special session devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly remitted a number of priority disarmament issues to the Committee on Disarmament for negotiation and the elaboration of treaty texts. Some of those texts were expected to be ready before the second special session on disarmament. It is appropriate therefore to reflect briefly on the report of the Committee on Disarmament contained in document A/36/27, which is now before us. I should like in this connexion to focus on the portions of the report relating to a nuclear test ban, nuclear disarmament and the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament. Let me hasten to explain that my doing so does not imply that we attach any less importance to the other agenda items considered by the Committee on Disarmament.

Ghana has consistently supported the call for a cessation of nuclear testing by all States in all environments. It is our belief that a comprehensive test-ban treaty will make an important contribution to efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons both vertical and horizontal. The conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty would in our view effectively curtail the development of nuclear weapons or the improvement of existing ones. This in turn would strengthen the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and help overcome the objections of those States that now see the Non-Proliferation Treaty as discriminatory and in favour of the existing nuclear-weapon States.

The Ghana delegation therefore supported resolutions of the General Assembly in which the three negotiating States were urged to conclude their negotiations and to transmit the results to the Committee on Disarmament for examination.

In the same spirit the Ghana delegation last year joined other delegations in commending the three negotiating nuclear-weapon States

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

for the progress report transmitted to the Committee on Disarmament in July 1980. However, it was our expectation that the Committee on Disarmament would be given the opportunity to examine the draft through its available machinery, in an ad hoc working group. As we stated in the general debate last year, there are a number of elements of the draft - especially those relating to the question of the duration and review envisaged for the Treaty - that require clarification and further negotiation.

My delegation therefore deeply regrets that in spite of the constructive co-operation of the Group of 21, the Committee on Disarmament failed to establish a working group to consider the draft because of the objections of two delegations. Ghana considers that the tripartite draft would benefit from detailed comments and suggestions by an ad hoc working group. We would therefore urge the two delegations that objected to the establishment of a working group to reconsider their positions.

My delegation is equally disappointed that the Committee on Disarmament could not establish a working group to deal with the item relating to nuclear disarmament in accordance with the mandate conferred by General Assembly resolution 35/152 C. In view of the positive results attained by the Committee on Disarmament through the use of working groups during its 1980 session, the Ghana delegation continues to believe that working groups are the best machinery available to the Committee on Disarmament for the achievement of concrete results in its negotiations.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

It is also a matter of deep regret to note that the Committee on Disarmament could not arrive at a consensus on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament and that the Committee is widely divided over the nature of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament and the measures it should encompass.

My delegation would hope that at the resumed session in 1982 the Committee would redouble its efforts to bridge the existing gaps in the positions of delegations. With the second special session on disarmament not far away, it is essential that delegations exercise the maximum flexibility, since rigid insistence on positions would not help advance the work in the Committee. It goes without saying that the credibility of the Committee on Disarmament as the single multilateral negotiating body on disarmament will be critically dependent on its performance. In this connexion, the current trend suggesting that the consensus rule is gradually becoming a Security Council type of veto should be a matter of profound concern to all delegations. We call for a reversal of this trend in order to allow for progress.

In the final analysis, the arms race will cease only if those who stockpile arms decide to stop it. The arms race has passed the point where the international community can be content with declarations that are constantly being rendered meaningless. We therefore consider that the **Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament** should not become another document which would find its way to the archives of the United Nations, only to be forgotten. It should be a legally binding document in conformity with the consensus reflected in paragraph 38 of the Final Document. We are, furthermore, in agreement that the priorities should be in accord with paragraph 45 of that Final Document.

In this connexion, the forthcoming second special session devoted to disarmament could provide a useful forum for assessing the impact of the decisions at the first special session on disarmament and afford the opportunity for meaningful initiatives, if necessary. However, the significance of the coming second special session on disarmament would most certainly be lost unless delegations, particularly the super-Powers and their allies, show a greater commitment to disarmament than they have hitherto demonstrated.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

I would now turn to the item relating to nuclear-weapon-free zones, with particular reference to the denuclearization of Africa.

In 1964 African leaders, in their wisdom, decided to keep the continent of Africa free of nuclear weapons. To help achieve this objective, the General Assembly has by its resolutions constantly urged all States to respect the continent of Africa as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. However, the Secretary-General's report of the incident which occurred in the South Atlantic on 22 September 1979 has established that South Africa has the capability to manufacture nuclear weapons. Thus, the racist régime has not only frustrated the objectives of the 1964 Declaration of African leaders but has introduced a dangerous element into the African continent.

Although the report contained in document A/36/430 now before this Committee states that no further information about the racist régime's nuclear programme has been identified since the first report was issued a year ago, it is the view of the Ghana delegation that the issue should not be laid to rest.

The racist régime's nuclear ambitions, in our view, should continue to be monitored. The apartheid régime thrives on superior military power. Because it possesses nuclear capability, the racist régime has become more intransigent and defiant of the will of the majority of the international community.

It has continued to accumulate arsenals through the use of still unrevoked licences and patents received from Western countries despite the relevant decisions of the Security Council. Relying on superior military force, Pretoria has on numerous occasions, including the recent waves of aggression against Angola, launched unprovoked attacks on neighbouring African countries. This is an intolerable situation, which constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security. It is necessary, therefore, to place the racist régime's ambitions for nuclear weapons under constant surveillance.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

We are strongly and frankly of the view that the international community has yet to address itself to South Africa's arms build-up with anything like the seriousness it calls for. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), the racist régime of South Africa spends four times as much on military budgets as do all other main countries of the sub-region together - Angola, Mozambique, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia. This is quite apart from the huge expenditures of the apartheid régime on the achievement of its nuclear ambitions. One may therefore pause to ask, is this an armed race against the countries of the sub-region, or is it a race against all of Africa? Implied among the objectives of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament are the denuclearization of regions, the reduction of transfers of conventional arms, and universal adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Clearly, none of these disarmament objectives can be achieved in the particular case of Africa so long as the militarization and the nuclear ambitions of the apartheid régime continue to pose an ever more alarming threat to the entire continent and, indeed, to the world at large. The international community must exert the necessary pressure on the racist régime through the application of mandatory economic sanctions. We call on delegations that have opposed comprehensive and economic sanctions against South Africa to show the necessary political courage now and fall in with the political will of the overwhelming majority of our Organization.

This year the total expenditure on the means of destruction will probably equal half the combined total income of all third-world countries and more than thrice that of Africa. At a time when world leaders are preoccupied with the serious social and economic plight of the poor majority in the third world, perhaps we should seriously reflect on how to divert this colossal expenditure on instruments of destruction for the improvement of the conditions of millions of starving people in the world.

Mr. GHAFFAR (Dahrain) (interpretation from Arabic). It gives my delegation great pleasure to extend to the Chairman our sincere congratulations on his election as Chairman of this important Committee. We are aware that his experience and wisdom will contribute to the success of the deliberations of this Committee. We should also like to extend our congratulations to the other officers of the Committee.

When one looks at the phenomenon of the arms race between States, especially the major Powers, one can only experience feelings of anxiety and pessimism and perceive the future of international relations as a sombre and shaky one. An in-depth analysis of this phenomenon will also instil a sense of desperate confusion vis-à-vis the strange contradictions in the reactions of the major Powers, which persist in building up terrifying stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction while calling for disarmament conferences as the production of lethal weapons is doubled and perfected.

In spite of the dark picture presented by the present situation, we must firmly proceed to devise new ways, based upon our past experience, to define genuinely and practically the attainment of general disarmament.

History abounds with indications that man in critical moments of suffering and tension succeeds in inventing new means of averting fear and dire catastrophe. We believe that the human brain, which discovered complex theories and rules that led to the production of weapons of destruction, can lead man, if only his intentions are pure, to devise a basis for disarmament that would be binding on everyone.

It is not a secret that the main stumbling block on the road to disarmament is the lack of mutual confidence among the major Powers. We are not exaggerating when we maintain that the failure of conferences on disarmament can be attributed to the loss of such real confidence. There is no doubt that the lack of confidence among the major Powers, especially the two super Powers, can be attributed to numerous objective reasons such as mutual fear, and that is not astonishing if we realize that fear has, throughout human history, constituted a decisive and dangerous element in forging the actions of States and their behaviour among themselves.

(Mr. Ghaffar Bahrain)

The element of fear is still all powerful in regard to the subject of disarmament. Therefore, we are increasingly convinced that the most valid step in all negotiations on disarmament must be that of dealing with the causes of fear, or at least to attenuating it in such a way as to make it possible to lay the cornerstone for the process of re-establishing mutual trust among countries.

The valuable study which appears in document A/36/356 presented by Mrs. Inga Thorsson on the relationship between disarmament and development is noteworthy and deserves study because of its importance. That study underlines how millions of people live in poverty and deprivation while countries spend billions of dollars on armaments. The Secretary-General has expressed his opinion on that phenomenon in his annual report on the activities of the Organization contained in document A/36/1 dated 12 September 1991 where he said.

This year \$500 billion is being earmarked for armaments at a time when development assistance, which makes a very important and fundamental contribution to international stability, is marking time. Only 5 per cent of that sum would suffice to reach the target for official development assistance set in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade. (A/36/1, p. 15)

We hope that those elements will be taken into account, especially when we analyse the various aspects of development and disarmament.

Israel, in a short span of time, has unleashed aggression against two Arab countries Members of the United Nations. In the first attack, the Israelis wantonly bombed several civilian targets in Beirut and massacred hundreds of innocent citizens including women, children and the elderly. Another aggression was the treacherous Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor set up for peaceful purposes. Repeated Israeli attacks on neighbouring Arab countries demonstrate the fact that the pillars of Israeli strategic theory reside in a false concept of attack as the best means of defence. That is the pretext to which Israel resorts whenever it needs to concoct new crimes against southern Lebanon or any other Arab country.

(Mr. Ghaffar Bahrain)

But it appears that that faulty theory which is applied by Israel and its well-known allies has been exposed, and therefore the international community can no longer be taken in by Israeli lies. That trend became clear when the world at large condemned the Israeli attack against civilians in Deirut and the treacherous attack against the Iraqi nuclear facilities intended for peaceful purposes.

The condemnation of Israel by the international community reminds us of the statement made by Mr. Chaim Weizman, the first Israeli President, in 1949, when he said: I am sure that the world shall condemn the Jewish State for the way in which it deals with the Arabs.

We believe that the Secretary-General's report on Israeli nuclear armaments which appears in document A/36/431 dated 18 September 1981 is of paramount importance because it reveals Israeli activities in the field of nuclear armaments. We hope that at its current session the General Assembly will give sufficient attention to that serious issue.

On the other hand, it is indeed important to examine this question at the international level so that we can study both the nuclear arms links between Israeli nuclear armaments and nuclear activities in South Africa, since the international community is clearly aware of the perils inherent in nuclear co-operation between the two racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv, and the threat that such activity poses to international peace and security.

The United States declaration on strategic collaboration with Israel has added yet another dimension to the tense political relations in the region of the Middle East and has increased the anxiety in that region, which already abounds with perils. In his statement before the General Assembly on 5 October 1981, my Foreign Minister clarified Bahrain's position on that issue when he said:

(Mr. Ghaffar Bahrain)

A further complication has arisen out of the announcement by the United States which is considered to be a mainstay of this Organization and the leader of the Western camp, that it intends to conclude an agreement for strategic co-operation with the Israeli aggressor, which occupies the lands of others by force of arms and rejects all international values and principles. Undoubtedly this will complicate matters further in that sensitive area of the world. (A/36/PV.21 pp.73 and 74-75)

Mr. OYONO (United Republic of Cameroon)(interpretation from French): As I take the floor again in this Committee, it is a pleasure for me, having already discharged the very pleasant duty of congratulating the Committee's Chairman, to extend my warmest congratulations to the other officers of the Committee and especially to the two Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur who are assisting him and whose well-known and appreciated competence and dedication will contribute to the success of our work.

Our Committee is studying the question of disarmament at a particularly difficult and serious juncture in international relations. Indeed, those relations are now characterized by a breakdown in détente, a resumption of the cold war and hegemonic rivalry between the major Powers, always in search of zones of influence, bases, clientele and raw materials, as well as by the arms race, and particularly the nuclear arms race.

The result is a general atmosphere of uncertainty, tension and malaise made even worse by the potential threat of a nuclear holocaust. That, in fact, is no longer merely a subject for theoretical speculation but has, with the proliferation and miniaturization of the atomic weapon, whose use is being seriously envisaged in case of conflict, become a credible hypothesis.

The development of the tactical atomic weapon is part and parcel of the concept of the use of the atomic weapon in military strategy and has rendered obsolete the theories of dissuasion and of the maintenance of international peace and security, replacing them with the balance of terror.

The turbulence of which Europe is now the arena owing to the deployment of nuclear medium-range devices is enlightening in this connexion. We can now understand why non-nuclear States are so anxious to obtain serious and necessary guarantees against the use or threat of use of such weapons.

How then can this increase of threats be remedied and catastrophe avoided? In my delegation's view, the reestablishment of an atmosphere conducive to trust and understanding, to détente and even co-operation, implies that all States must give up the illusory race for supremacy and their hegemonist

(Mr. Oyono, United Republic of
Cameroon)

designs. Towards that end, they must comply with the principles and provisions of the United Nations Charter to which they have freely subscribed and they must respect the application of the decisions, resolutions and recommendations of our Organization with regard to peaceful coexistence and disarmament.

The reestablishment of that atmosphere also postulates that all States must, without reservation, adhere to the process of general and complete disarmament, and particularly nuclear disarmament under effective international control. It is, first and foremost, up to the nuclear-weapon States who have particular responsibilities towards the international community for the maintenance of international peace and security, to put an end to that build-up and to resume dialogue with a view to the quantitative and qualitative limitation of their strategic nuclear weapons. The beginning of such a process could contribute effectively to the relaxing of international tensions and facilitate progress towards a general and complete disarmament under international control.

In the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly contained in resolution S-10/2 of 30 June 1978, which was adopted by consensus, the Assembly, after having expressed its conviction that disarmament and arms limitation, particularly in the nuclear field, are essential for the prevention of the danger of nuclear war and the strengthening of international peace and security and for the economic and social advancement of all peoples, adopted a Programme of Action setting forth specific disarmament measures that should be implemented over the next few years. Since that tenth special session, no noteworthy results with regard to a real, general and complete disarmament have been recorded. Quite the contrary, not only have Powers proceeded to increase their military budgets, sometimes to levels rarely attained in peacetime, they have also increased and perfected their nuclear arsenals and their conventional weapons. The ubiquitous Power rivalry is also continuing to aggravate the instability of the three developing

(Mr. Oyono, United Republic
of Cameroon)

continents, Asia, Africa and Latin America. The upheaval, tensions and conflicts that that situation creates in third world countries compels them to mobilize, to the detriment of their economic and social development and out of the need for security, a considerable portion of their resources. That situation is all the more disturbing in that those same countries are the principal targets of international subversion and the main victims of the present economic crisis. Such necessary expenditures, however, represent only a tiny proportion of the fantastic sum being allocated this year to military purposes by the developed countries, which is more than \$500 billion. Need we mention all the economic and social achievements that would be made possible were such sums to be employed for peaceful purposes for the benefit of masses of humanity in third world countries still living in a state of intolerable deprivation and suffering the scourges of hunger, malnutrition and illness?

An essential condition for progress in the field of disarmament, as is stipulated in paragraph 17 of the annex to General Assembly resolution 35/46, is the preservation and strengthening of international peace and security and the promotion of confidence among States.

Nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization. It is therefore essential to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race in all its aspects in order to avert the danger of nuclear war. The ultimate goal in that respect is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and the adoption of concrete political measures with international legal guarantees aimed at strengthening the security of States.

(Mr. Oyono, United Republic
of Cameroon)

This question of security is of particular concern to Africa, a field for the ideological and hegemonic quarrels of the major Powers, where South Africa practises the cruel and inhuman system of apartheid, and hopes to find in its power and in its military and nuclear capacities legitimacy for its continuation, which is so strongly denounced by the international community.

South Africa's accession to the nuclear weapon, with the complicity of certain Powers, is a very serious danger to the security of African States. This is in contrast to the often expressed peaceful will of our Heads of State to keep Africa free of nuclear weapons.

In this connexion, we place great hope in the second special session devoted to disarmament to be held next year. It must adopt appropriate specific, and above all, practical measures for general and complete disarmament under effective international control, and provide for the effective implementation of international arrangements for assurances to the non-nuclear States against the use or the threat of use of such weapons.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Israel, Mr. Eilan, has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. Before calling on him, I should like to remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements made in exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): I should like to exercise my right of reply to statements made today and also to some statements made earlier on in the debate.

We have a long list of items on our agenda, but none deals with the action of the Israel Air Force against the Iraqi reactor. Although the subject was inscribed as an item on the agenda in the General Assembly, it was referred for discussion in the plenary and not in the First Committee.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

Israel's reply to the allegations contained in the wording of the item will therefore be given in full at the right time and place. The introduction into the present debate of an extraneous item may make sense for those who wish to curry favour with an oil-exporting country. However, it does little to advance the cause of disarmament or contribute to a detached treatment of the grave problems this Committee is now facing.

The statement of the representative of Syria this morning in its tone and content is a faithful reproduction of Syria's statements in this Committee in the past. The recipe is always the same - the Syrian delegate begins his statement by voicing a number of platitudes about the evils of the arms race, and then settles down to the real purpose of his speech, which consists of unleashing the usual flood of unbridled hostility against Israel.

A serious attack on Israel in a debate on disarmament must be viewed against its own record on such questions as the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the full-scale safeguards agreement, and the arms race in the Middle East. It should be recalled that it was Syria, which, on signing the NPT, made reservations with regard to Israel. It was Syria, which last year in this Committee refused to consider Israel's offer to negotiate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. It is again Syria, which, 11 years after the signing of the NPT, has not yet fulfilled its obligations in accordance with Article 3 of the Treaty with regard to the safeguards agreement.

Since the business of this Committee is to advance disarmament, I should like to draw the Committee's attention to reports in reputable international publications that Syria increased its military budget last year by more than 50 per cent, a record even for the Middle East. It is with this record in mind that Syria's appearance in this Committee as a champion of disarmament should be judged.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

The Bahrain statement this afternoon does not deserve the financial outlay involved in the printing and translation of a right of reply.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, Mr. Haydar, has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. HAYDAR (Syrian Arab Republic): I stand by every word I said this morning. What we have just heard is nothing more than the traditional ritual of useless rhetoric. I shall fully disregard that because, to us, the question lies there in the Middle East. Who is in fact threatening peace and security in that area, who is occupying other lands, and who is carrying on daily aggressive campaigns in more than one Arab country? Those are the questions to which there should be a reply.

Furthermore, last year the General Assembly approved by consensus resolution 35/147, which calls for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. We stand by it and are ready to implement it fully if the other side is ready to do so.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.