

*United Nations*  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
FORTIETH SESSION  
*Official Records\**



MAY 19 1987

FIRST COMMITTEE  
16th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 28 October 1985  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 16th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Lechuga Hevia (Cuba)  
Mr. Granderson (Trinidad and Tobago)  
Mr. Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic)  
Mr. Kessely (Chad)  
Mr. Milad (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

\*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 DC-2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.1/40/PV.16  
29 October 1985  
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3. 25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 to 69 and 145 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Mr. LECHUGA HEVIA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to congratulate you on your election to the chairmanship of this Committee. I have known you for some time now and I am familiar with your diplomatic skill, your dedication to our work, and I am sure that you will guide the work of the Committee to a positive outcome.

Forty years after the last World War and the birth of the United Nations, we find our world in a state of crisis - a crisis of confidence, an economic crisis, and also a crisis of the international machinery which came into being after that conflagration. These are facts which cannot be hidden and which, indeed, need to be brought out if they are to be solved at all.

There can be no doubt that, at the General Assembly this year, there are two facts which stand out above all the others: the irrational nature of the arms race, and the gravity of the economic crisis which affects everyone, but which has inflicted particular hardship on the peoples of the developing countries. The vast majority of those who spoke in the general debate dealt with both subjects with anguished concern. When compared with the deterioration of the living standards of the majority of mankind, the exorbitant expenditure on armaments demonstrates the tremendous injustice of an international order based on the threat of the use of force, or the use of force itself, in order to settle international disputes, and on the squandering of resources for the war industry as a kind of counterpart of a policy of despoliation of the economy of the weak.

This clearly justifies the link between disarmament and development, between peace and equitable relations in the international economic sphere.

(Mr. Lechuga Hevia, Cuba)

When billions of dollars are being wasted on weapons of mass destruction, the majority of the economically weaker countries paradoxically become, as is now happening, net exporters of capital. While hunger and disease are wiping out hundreds of thousands of people, and particularly children, the propaganda machine is set in motion and financial and intellectual resources are devoted to the promotion of a new escalation of the arms build-up, this time in outer space.

When the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, have to confront the tragedy of an external debt which they cannot pay off, and find their development opportunities exhausted, the world is being brought to the brink of a nuclear disaster by an absurd policy of supremacy at all costs, as if the world of today was that of the early period and the heyday of imperialism.

World public opinion is clamouring for the cessation of the arms race, for the cessation of nuclear testing, and for negotiations leading to an atmosphere of peace and security. And in response to this outcry, warmongering propaganda is churned out, the facts are distorted, and realities are misrepresented in order to justify a policy of force aimed at perpetuating this régime of despoliation, which is what makes possible the tragedy of the world economic crisis and feeds the voracious appetite of the war industry.

(Mr. Lechuga Hevia, Cuba)

The principles of the Charter are more valid today than ever before. To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, as the Charter says, is the watchword of the world of today. The struggle for peace is an imperative demand that cannot be evaded, as is the struggle for an international economic order that will ensure justice for all peoples in their relations and will destroy the cancer of the arms race.

Both those objectives must be kept in mind. While concern over the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war is justified by the militaristic policy of daily accumulating more and more sophisticated weapons and by proposals to militarize outer space through the so-called Star Wars idea propounded by the United States Government, it is equally true that there is increasing awareness of the urgent need to embark in a resolute and practical manner upon the task of solving the economic crisis by diverting resources from the armaments industry to peaceful purposes.

Every day there are examples of the way in which the struggle for peace and a new economic order is being extended. To give a concrete example, only a short time ago, on 23 October, the countries of Latin America observed Continental Day against the External Debt and its Disastrous Effects. That Day, organized by workers' organizations of all political persuasions, linked the debt problem to the problem of peace, proposed the reduction of expenditure on armaments and use of the savings thus achieved to liquidate the external debt, and supported the struggle to achieve equitable conditions in the world economy.

In view of the squandering of resources on the arms race and the lack of resources for development, the peoples will, with each passing day, play a more important role in the fight for survival. We must respond to that popular outcry with deeds within the framework of the United Nations and the Conference on

(Mr. Lechuga Hevia, Cuba)

Disarmament. The crisis of confidence in international machinery must be overcome with a willingness to negotiate in good faith and negotiate quickly to break the current deadlock reached in multilateral negotiations.

I shall not try the Committee's patience by giving a detailed account of the subjects on which negotiations are now paralyzed, for everyone is only too familiar with them. The General Assembly rehearses the list every year, without any progress being made. The responsibility certainly cannot be laid at the door of the non-aligned and neutral countries, nor of the socialist countries. That is a well-known fact. The records of the General Assembly and the Conference on Disarmament bear witness to it. The initiatives of the socialist countries and the non-aligned and neutral countries also proclaim that truth. But while there is no need to give details of that very frustrating process, it is worthwhile to point out once again that the major responsibility for the stagnation of the negotiations rests principally on the Government of the United States and some of its allies.

It is against the background of that reality that we are now considering in this Committee the problem of disarmament, not in black and white terms but, rather, in various shades peculiar to each group of countries because of their occasionally differing approaches to these problems. However, the essential thing is the willingness of some to arrive at solutions and the absence of willingness of others.

Let us welcome the forthcoming Summit Meeting, because it offers an opportunity to give up the madness of the arms race. Let us welcome the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, with the aim of struggling without faltering to make a reality of the purposes that inspired its creation. However, after the statement made in the General Assembly by the President of the United States it is hard to be optimistic about the results of disarmament negotiations. Therefore, it is more than ever necessary to continue struggling for peace, demanding an end to

(Mr. Lechuga Hevia, Cuba)

the arms race and striving for the implementation of the principles of the Charter and for an end to the present international situation, which is fraught with danger because of the militaristic policy of those who time and again have put obstacles in the way of the negotiations desired by the majority of Member States of the United Nations and the greater part of public opinion in every country.

Mr. GRANDERSON (Trinidad and Tobago): Trinidad and Tobago is a small, island, developing State, with all the limitations that such a situation entails. Our only strength is that which derives from unswerving respect for international law and strict adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter. We believe, however, that our views on disarmament items must be put forward in this general debate, for the simple reason that no State, no matter how small, no matter how remote, no matter how weak or powerful, is immune from the catastrophic consequences of nuclear conflagration. We also hold the view that at a time of increasing global insecurity, arising from regional conflicts, more attention must be devoted to the issues concerning the proliferation of conventional weapons and conventional disarmament.

The prevention of nuclear disaster is the single most important challenge facing the global community. Failure to rise to this challenge will obliterate all our attempts at social progress, economic development and greater justice; in short, all our efforts to construct a better world for ourselves and our children will be to no avail.

Only last week we celebrated with great fanfare the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. Anniversaries are not only occasions for celebration; they should also give us occasion to pause and to reflect, to glance into the past in order better to understand the present and the future. For the framers of the Charter, the maintenance of international peace and security was

(Mr. Granderson, Trinidad  
and Tobago)

inextricably linked with progress in arms limitation and disarmament. The record of the United Nations in this crucial area is not totally blank. International agreements to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to prohibit the use of weapons which are excessively injurious to civilian populations are examples of achievements which come readily to mind. We must, however, condemn the continuing nuclear collaboration with South Africa, which reinforces the nuclear capability of that racist and aggressive State and undermines the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Heartening progress has been achieved in other important areas, such as the negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament of a convention for the prohibition of chemical weapons.

Regrettably, success continues to elude us in the areas of greatest concern. We are still quite some distance from a nuclear-test-ban treaty which would totally prohibit test explosions of nuclear weapons, an essential stepping-stone in the long and difficult task of ending the nuclear arms race. The mad race to accumulate and to devise ever more sophisticated and destructive nuclear weapons continues unabated. The chilling fact that existing nuclear weapons can reduce our world to rubble several times over; the sobering awareness that the wintry effects of nuclear warfare could produce global climatic consequences more catastrophic than the nuclear blast and radiation; the increasing feelings of anxiety and apprehension being made public in so many countries of the world concerning the nuclear arms race and its consequences; even the knowledge that a mere fraction of the stupendous sums of money devoted to the arms race could eliminate hunger, disease and poverty in the world - all those factors seem not to inhibit, but, paradoxically, to spur on, those who mistakenly believe that nuclear weapons can bring security, those who labour under the illusion that nuclear advantage can be achieved and perhaps even maintained.



(Mr. Granderson, Trinidad and Tobago)

Forty years after the signing of the Charter, the reduction of arms and the prevention of war in the nuclear age are still the principal objectives of the United Nations. Indeed, so far is the United Nations from the attainment of those objectives that the arms race is today poised on the threshold of a quantum leap into the unknown, with its possible extension into outer space.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Caribbean Sea and its islands were a battleground for the competing Powers of the day. The islands changed hands with alarming frequency, in keeping with the wild fluctuations of the balance of power. The island of Tobago holds the unwanted record of having changed hands the highest number of times. The concept of the common heritage of mankind has been established to prevent the recurrence today of that type of wasteful and dangerous competition in unclaimed areas of our universe such as the high seas and outer space. Trinidad and Tobago would like to call for the elaboration, as a matter of urgency, of measures and agreements to prevent the extension of the arms race to outer space. Outer space is the common heritage of mankind, and therefore should be used only for peaceful purposes and for the collective benefit of all mankind.

International peace and security cannot be attained by a spiralling arms race, which only fosters greater insecurity. It cannot be attained in an atmosphere of mutual suspicion and misunderstanding. It is in that context that Trinidad and Tobago welcomes the resumption in Geneva of talks on arms control between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Meaningful nuclear disarmament can be achieved only when the two States that between them possess some 95 per cent of the world's nuclear arsenals can reach an effective agreement. Trinidad and Tobago also looks forward to the coming summit in Geneva between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev and hopes that it will



(Mr. Granderson, Trinidad and Tobago)

usher in an era of better understanding between their two countries and a period of decreasing tension for the remainder of the world.

Our rightful concern over the nuclear arms race and the threat of nuclear war should not blind us to the dangers of the increasing proliferation of conventional weapons and their use in conflicts, particularly in the third world. We pride ourselves on having prevented the outbreak of nuclear war, but do we realize the horrendous and dangerous dimensions of conventional war and the threat it carries to the international system and to international peace and security? The post-War history of the world has been marred by some 150 conflicts, all of which have occurred in the third world. Even those relatively limited conflicts have caused millions of deaths, unspeakable human suffering, economic dislocation, and the exodus, voluntary or forced, of millions of people from their homes and countries, making the refugee problem in the third world one of the greatest untold human tragedies of our times.

Each new conventional war is characterized by the increasing sophistication and destructive capability of the weapons used. These wars could not have escalated to the destructive scale that some of them have attained without the continuing flows of weapons from the industrialized countries. The 1984 World Armaments and Disarmament Yearbook of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute informs us that those flows of weapons are constantly increasing. Compared with the previous five-year period, the total volume of transfers of major conventional weapons for the period 1979 to 1983 is about 30 per cent greater.

The economic determinants of arms exports, the use of arms exports as a foreign policy instrument, and the attractive research and development possibilities offered by the arms industry in the developed countries are compelling factors, whose influence on this increasing proliferation of conventional weapons should be closely studied. Likewise, increasing international

(Mr. Granderson, Trinidad and Tobago)

insecurity and a decreasing respect for to the rule of international law have forced many third-world countries, as a means of self-protection, to build up their own military capabilities to the detriment of their economic development.

There is, without doubt, dynamic interaction between disarmament, development and security. There is also a direct correlation between the threats to the international system arising from regional conflicts and the super-Powers' perception of and responses to each other. In matters of international peace and security, the immediate threat to third-world countries is seen as stemming from conflicts employing conventional weapons.

The Trinidad and Tobago delegation is of the view that regional initiatives to reduce expenditure on arms and to limit the accumulation of conventional weapons should be given every encouragement. The need to control transfers of conventional weapons has never been more urgent. Yet international efforts to limit the global arms trade have come to a virtual halt. It is for all those reasons that my delegation believes that this Committee should devote adequate attention to issues concerning the proliferation of conventional weapons and conventional disarmament.

My delegation notes with interest that the Preparatory Committee for an International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development has met and has submitted its recommendations for the date, duration, venue and agenda of the Conference. We welcome the convening of this important Conference, for a comprehensive consideration of this question is of critical importance not only for the developing countries but for the entire global community.

In an increasingly interdependent world, all the States Members of the United Nations must collectively rise to the challenge of putting an end to the nuclear arms race, and must commence meaningful disarmament. As the Secretary-General said in his recent report on the work of the Organization,

(Mr. Granderson, Trinidad and Tobago)

"Without collective determination and the acknowledgement of a minimum common interest in survival, there can be no meaningful progress in disarmament". (A/40/1, p. 7)

Those who have the greater power have also the greater responsibility. We call upon them to exercise greater determination and political will, to display greater wisdom, vision and moral fibre to save the world from careening down the road to nuclear annihilation.

Mr. VONGSAY (Lao People's Democratic Republic): I should like first of all, on behalf of my delegation, to congratulate you most warmly, Sir, on your impressive election to the important post of Chairman of this Committee. I consider this to be a sign of esteem for your country, with which my country maintains traditional ties of friendship and co-operation. I am convinced that, thanks to your proven diplomatic talent and under your wise and able leadership, the work of our Committee will meet with success. My delegation assures you and the other officers - whom we also congratulate - of its full co-operation.

Once again we are considering the crucial, urgent problems of peace and disarmament, problems on whose solution, in this nuclear age, depends the very future of mankind. Those same deep feelings were conspicuous in the statements made, during the general debate at the current session of the General Assembly and at the meetings commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of this universal Organization, by nearly all leaders and heads of delegation of Member States. It was clear that all the people of the world - men, women, children, scientists, religious leaders and others - earnestly aspire to life in a world of peace, security and well-being, free from the threat of a nuclear holocaust.

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

The international community is in duty-bound to do all in its power not to dash at this historical commemorative session the ardent and legitimate hopes thus expressed by all the peoples and nations of the world, whether large or small, rich or poor, powerful or weak, and independently of their political and social systems. Need one recall that the appropriate and effective means and instruments have been shaped and developed within the universal Organization and the bilateral framework and that their effective and sincere use could free mankind of this nuclear nightmare. Unfortunately, some Western nuclear Powers have always refused, and still continue to refuse, to implement the Final Document adopted in 1978 at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament on the initiative of the non-aligned countries.

The Lao Government and people, like all other Governments and peoples of the world that cherish peace, attach fundamental importance to the multilateral and bilateral negotiations on disarmament in Geneva, Vienna, Stockholm and Helsinki. We are closely following these negotiations and discussions, although our Government has not been able to take part in them. The position of the Lao Government concerning the thorny problem of disarmament is well known; it has many times been reaffirmed in the universal Organization as well as in other international forums.

Be that as it may, we deem it necessary and useful to reaffirm it and explain it further today. We are happy to note that in Geneva, within the framework of the premanent agenda of 10 items, called the "Decalogue", the Conference on Disarmament, the only international forum for multilateral disarmament negotiations, has, without having been able to reach agreement, focused its attention on the following crucial points: a ban on nuclear tests, an end to the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war,

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

including all related questions. It is regrettable that the group of Western countries has once again at the recent session of the Conference on Disarmament undermined the persevering and laudable efforts of the group of socialist countries, as well as those of the group of twenty-one, to set up a special committee with an appropriate mandate for negotiating on this crucial question of a ban on nuclear tests. This obstructionist stance is not surprising, since any negotiation leading to an international agreement or treaty banning nuclear explosions would run counter to the interests of the military-industrial complex whose avowed policy is to foster the quantitative and qualitative arms race in the nuclear and conventional fields.

In addition to the series of constructive proposals on matters of peace and disarmament previously put forward by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, the Lao Government welcomes and firmly supports the declaration made on 29 July last by the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gorbachev, on a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions starting 6 August this year until 1 January 1986. In a demonstration of goodwill and a constructive attitude, the Soviet Union adopted this concrete measure with the very laudable goal of strengthening the climate of confidence in the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva on the reduction of nuclear and space weapons. It is regrettable that, as everyone knows, the American Government has taken not only a negative but a diametrically opposed decision: it has recently proceeded to a further nuclear explosion. With regard to the question of preventing nuclear war, including all related issues, again, as everyone knows, the Western nuclear Powers and their allies did not want the setting up of a special committee within the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva to negotiate seriously and in good faith this vital question for the future of the peace and security of mankind. These same

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

circles had recourse to the dubious subterfuge of lumping together nuclear war, which the international community considers as the most monstrous crime against mankind, and conventional armed conflicts, which no one doubts would have disastrous consequences. Happily, only very few hold to such a theory and world public opinion will certainly not be deceived.

My delegation wishes once again to reaffirm the total support of its Government for the latest constructive proposal recently made by the Soviet Union, which has been inscribed on the agenda of this session, entitled "International co-operation in the peaceful exploitation of outer space under conditions of its non-militarization". In addition to its contributing substantially to preventing the risk of nuclear war in outer space, we believe that this initiative would meet the legitimate aspirations of all peoples of the world, large or small, developed or developing, which should be able to exercise, on an equal footing, their inalienable rights to the peaceful exploration and exploitation of this common heritage of mankind. Unfortunately, the American Government has not taken any account of this constructive and beneficial proposal. What is more, that Administration recently proceeded to test these new anti-satellite weapons, while the Soviet Union already two years ago assumed the unilateral commitment not to be the first to station such weapons in outer space.

The negative attitude of the other party can be seen within the context of the "star wars" programme, euphemistically known as the "strategic defence initiative", towards the realization of which astronomical sums have been earmarked. It is obvious that these weapons are not defensive; on the contrary, they are an integral part of "space attack systems".

The whole world is now in a position to distinguish between those who genuinely, not hypocritically, cherish peace and disarmament and those who, by



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

their actions, oppose the untiring efforts of the international community for decreasing tensions, restoring détente, putting an end to the unbridled arms race on Earth in both conventional and nuclear weapons, and preventing the militarization of outer space, the sea-bed and so on.

These imperialist circles must abandon their irrational and immoral dream of obtaining military superiority over the socialist countries, which are more than ever determined to preserve at all cost the current approximate military and strategic parity between the two military blocs. They must listen to the voices of reason and morality, especially since they emanate not only from other parts of the world but also from their own children, their own citizens who do not wish to die, for it has been scientifically and logically proved that nuclear war and the survival of mankind are incompatible. Those who promote the arms race must not harbour the illusion that nuclear war, even though limited, can be won. Renowned scientists and physicists the world over - at least those who are intellectually honest and are really concerned over the future of the human race and civilization - have not failed to address a pressing appeal to those who take lightly the untold catastrophic consequences of the "nuclear winter" following upon any nuclear conflagration.

Like all other countries and peoples of the world that cherish peace, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the Lao people reaffirm their total support for the spirit and letter of the Delhi Declaration, in which the Heads of State or Government of six countries from five continents at the beginning of this year ardently appealed to the nuclear Powers to cease all testing, manufacturing and deployment of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery. This important political document also spoke of measures on the prevention of an extension of the arms race into outer space and on the speedy conclusion of a treaty banning nuclear



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

tests. In the same spirit, the Lao delegation, although it was not able to take part, welcomes the results of the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), held recently in Geneva. Almost all participants in the Conference requested nuclear-weapon States to engage without delay in negotiations within the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva with a view to concluding a treaty banning all nuclear tests.

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

Our Government, like the Governments of all the peace-loving countries of the world, attaches crucial importance to the Soviet-American summit in November in Geneva, and is convinced that a positive result would greatly contribute to strengthening the climate of confidence and therefore influence the results of current bilateral negotiations concerning the reduction of the nuclear weapons of the two great Powers. By the same token, the Lao Government welcomes and supports unreservedly the specific proposal of the Soviet Union as explained by General Secretary Gorbachev in Paris during his recent official visit to France. We must express the hope that the American administration will take it into account, as also its Western NATO allies.

In speaking of the limitation of armaments and of disarmament, my delegation cannot underestimate the importance and urgency of multilateral and bilateral negotiations on the limitation, progressive reduction and total elimination of other weapons of mass destruction such as chemical, biological and radiological weapons. We hope that the participants in the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, especially those that have up until now tried to obstruct the negotiating process, will evince good will and adopt a positive attitude in order to make possible the working out and speedy conclusion of an international convention prohibiting the perfecting, manufacture and stockpiling of chemical weapons and calling for their destruction. It is regrettable that a certain major nuclear Power should not have abandoned its programme of manufacturing binary chemical weapons, whose eventual deployment in Europe would certainly cause deep concern in peace-loving public opinion in that most vulnerable part of the world. It goes without saying that such an action would run counter to any efforts so far taken to work out and conclude an international instrument in this field.

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

Laos fully supports the constructive proposals of the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia for the conclusion with the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany of an agreement on the creation of a zone free of chemical weapons in their respective territories. That proposal proves beyond doubt the sincere desire for peace of their authors, especially the German Democratic Republic, which, as everyone knows, has often reaffirmed its solemn unilateral undertaking that no new war will ever be started from its territory.

This Committee has certainly noted with satisfaction the statement made last year by the representative of a certain nuclear and space Power that his Government also wishes to ban the perfecting, manufacture and even the use of chemical weapons in certain parts of the world, including, as he said, South East Asia. My delegation, like those of all countries devoted to peace and justice, is grateful to him and congratulates him on having had the courage to recognize tacitly the guilt of his Government, which had, during its aggression against the three countries of Indo-China, spread about a huge amount of chemical materials, causing untold suffering and great devastation among the population, the fauna and the flora. We hope that that nuclear Power will once and for all renounce any sinister idea of repeating that most heinous crime against the three countries of an area who wish only to live in peace with all the countries of the world, whatever their political and social systems. Similarly, we note with regret that certain countries of the region, which in the past were accomplices in such crimes against the peoples of Kampuchea, Viet Nam and Laos, have, instead of making honourable amends, or at least remaining silent, today chose once more to take the side of the same imperialist Power.

Such a spirit, such a campaign of libel, in which attempts are made to accuse others of the guilt of one's own crimes, will certainly be harmful to any process

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

of restoration and strengthening of the climate of confidence and co-operation among the peoples and nations, which is indispensable to disarmament, nuclear or conventional. We fully share the legitimate concern of the non-nuclear countries, which makes them oppose any deployment of such weapons on their territory in view of the nuclear threat of which they could be victims. In this connection we think the Special Committee of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva should do all in its power to ensure that negotiations with nuclear-weapon countries - at least those that have shown us interest up to now - lead in the near future to an agreement on effective international arrangements to protect the non-nuclear countries with no nuclear weapons deployed in their territories against the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

It is certain that the only effective means of safeguarding any country against such risks is the total elimination of those weapons. The Lao Government is fully in favour of the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world and negotiations on the drafting of international instruments on the lines of the Tlatelolco Treaty for Latin America, providing for the creation of such zones. In this spirit we wish to welcome the adoption, on 6 August last, of such a treaty by the States of the South Pacific.

With respect to South East Asia, the area to which we belong, the Lao Government, together with the Governments of the People's Republic of Kampuchea and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, would be happy to be able to discuss this matter in further detail with neighbouring countries and other countries directly concerned.

Since disarmament, peace, security and co-operation are interdependent concepts, that is, different facets of the same reality, it is logical and natural that peoples should ardently aspire to transform their respective geographic areas

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

into oases of peace, security and mutually advantageous co-operation. In this connection it is greatly to be hoped that an international conference on the Indian Ocean will be called in Colombo, Sri Lanka, within the time-limit established by the General Assembly last year so that the United Nations Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace can be adopted. As for the three countries of Indo-China, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Democratic Kampuchea and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, they have never spared any effort to contribute to the creation as soon as possible of a zone of peace, stability and co-operation in South East Asia. The constructive proposals contained in the joint declaration of the eleventh conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the three countries are eloquent testimony of our good will in this respect.

Such are the general ideas the Lao delegation wanted to put forward in this consideration of the many crucial items considered under the heading of disarmament during the initial phase of the general debate in this Committee. My delegation will spare no effort to make its contribution to the general debate in its later stages.

In conclusion I should like to quote a relevant passage from the message His Excellency Mr. Souphanouvong, President of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, has just addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the occasion of the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of its founding:

"On this happy occasion allow me to assure you that our multi-ethnic people is ready to work with great determination together with other peoples in order to preserve international peace and security and to fight for the restoration of a more just international order, and to embark upon the economic and social development of the country so as to contribute positively to the elimination of poverty, hunger and malnutrition, and thus contribute to the social progress of the peoples of the world."

Mr. KESSELY (Chad) (interpretation from French): Last week, on the occasion of the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, it was made quite clear that the Organization has failed in its main mission, which is to spare mankind the scourge of war. None the less the representatives of those nations that drafted and sign the Charter sincerely believed that the system of collective security was going to disarm the world and thereby establish true lasting peace among the nations.

But what a delusion that proved to be. Very soon the negative factors that led to the Second World War reappeared. Those are the traditional jealousies and rivalries originating in conflicts inadequately resolved that lead to a constant clamour for vengeance; prejudices and distrust of various sorts, which the permanent conflict of ideologies has deeply rooted in the minds of peoples; a certain feeling of superiority over other races; and the sense of a divine mission that must be carried out.

(Mr. Kessely, Chad)

Therefore, shortly after the signing of the Charter, hope was displaced by pessimism, and trust and mutual understanding for a harmonious world retreated in the face of fear and distrust, setting in motion a vicious circle of insecurity. As a corollary, armed conflicts broke out everywhere, and the best that our system of security could achieve in each case was a ticket to witness the spectacle.

Since the United Nations was founded, there have been more than 150 international conflicts which have cost more than 20 million lives. These are the fundamental facts on which we should focus when considering the *raison d'être* of the United Nations, namely, the quest for peace, and which should also lead the First Committee to devote a little more time to the means which keep these conflicts going and which have caused so many deaths, namely, conventional weapons and armed forces.

We read that conventional weapons claim between 4.5 and 7.7 per cent of the gross world product, and absorb four-fifths of the total arms expenditures. At the present time they are allegedly responsible in part for the present world economic crisis. For us Africans, Asians and Latin Americans, conventional weapons constitute our foremost fear. Fear because we do not have enough of them, fear because our neighbour has too many, fear because wishing to have more we have to divert the major part of our meagre resources to acquire them, and fear because they cause social upheavals.

Unable to join the arms race for new generations of weapons, some countries recently pampered by petro-dollars have started making vast stockpiles of conventional weapons. Such windfalls can only give rise to bellicose ideas, and those countries act aggressively towards their neighbours and try to impose upon them new rules of conduct. A good example is Libya which, having bought thousands of fighter planes, thousands of tanks and millions of individual weapons, started



(Mr. Kessely, Chad)

by occupying, under fallacious pretexts, part of our territory in 1973, and then in June 1983 sent 5,000 men from its regular army, thousands of mercenaries from its Islamic legion, and half of its military arsenal into the northern part of Chad, nearly 550,000 square kilometres in area.

Conventional weapons are just as if not more important as other weapons, because they are the ones that at present are bringing terror, poverty and grief to the majority of the peoples of the third world. That is why we must, in our debates on general and complete disarmament, try to limit conventional weapons, horizontally and vertically, rather than try to achieve disarmament in other categories of weapons. Despite the bitterness my delegation feels about conventional weapons, we do not ignore other types of weapons, such as nuclear, chemical, biological and radiological weapons. The delegations which have already spoken have said everything that there is to be said about those weapons. None the less, the importance of nuclear weapons requires that we should refer to some of their aspects. In the first place, military applications of nuclear energy have rapidly outstripped civilian applications.

Artificial radioactivity was discovered in 1934. The Joliot-Curies of France had just modified matter for the first time and had proposed a whole range of applications: energy, radiotherapy, biological research, medical diagnosis and, in a way, weapons. But this was just before the Second World War and military considerations prevailed over civilian considerations. Research was going to be geared to military applications. This led to the first nuclear test of 16 July 1945 in New Mexico, and 24 days later the first actual use of a nuclear weapon. Just after the war, opinions were divided as to the use of atomic energy. Albert Einstein, for example, felt that man was doomed to plunge into the nuclear-arms race, even though he knew it would lead to a catastrophe beyond his

(Mr. Kessely, Chad)

control. But the pacifists disagreed, and said that nuclear energy was the driving force of tomorrow. It would revolutionize industry.

It was not until 1951 that the first nuclear power station was started up in the United States. By the end of 1984 there were only 345 such nuclear power stations in operation. In the military sphere, however, hundreds of thousands of warheads were soon built, half of them put either on top of ballistic missiles in silos or on bombers, submarines, and the world was well under way towards its objective. Now, in addition to A-bombs and H-bombs, there are neutron bombs, enhanced radiation bombs, x-ray lasers and particle beamed weapons.

This parallel development shows that, with the help of the shock wave of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the great Powers sought nothing but confrontation, or at least equilibrium. But based on what? This brings us to our second comment.

In the 1950s it was pointless to talk about victory in the event of a nuclear war. We knew in the 1960s that there was no point in wondering who would emerge victor or vanquished in the case of an A-bomb or H-bomb war, or one involving enhanced radiation weapons. The SS-20s and the Pershing IIs which have brought us close to the danger of nuclear war in the 1980s, do not constitute - and I apologize here to the Europeans and the Asians for this remark - a planetary danger in themselves. Thousands of intercontinental ballistic missiles cruelly contradict anyone who would say otherwise.

And this famous "star wars" which has caused so much talk in the last two years - would it give rise to danger greater than that posed by intercontinental missiles? The world knows that the deployment of SS-20s gave rise to the deployment of Pershings and particularly the development of neutron bombs and x-ray laser weapons. What else can we expect from the research centres or top secret documents on nuclear armaments? The future will soon tell us.

(Mr. Kessely, Chad)

Our third comment is that we have seen that all these weapons absorb billions of dollars each year, whereas thousands of persons are dying of hunger each day. Clearly, therefore, if these expenditures disappeared or were simply reduced, mankind would put an end to its major problem of the present day: the desperate plight of human beings due to hunger and disease.

This is one of the fundamental reasons, if not the main one, why my delegation will wholeheartedly support the conference to be organized next year on the relationship between disarmament and development. This could be a fresh start in our approach if those objectives were attained. We are confident of its successful outcome because certain events, which are to precede it, such as the summit meeting in Geneva, are grounds for optimism.

At any rate, we know that in this relationship between disarmament and development, as in everything pertaining to disarmament in general, the United Nations has a key role to play. The Charter has assigned it particular responsibility in this sphere, and we must help it to do its job fully.

Before concluding, I wish to say a word about the denuclearization of the African continent.

In addition to famine and interference of all sorts in the internal affairs of States leading to social upheavals and the occupation of the territory of weak countries by powerfully armed neighbours, Africa is now suffering from an ill which could prove fatal to it, namely, the nuclear threat brandished by the South African racist minority.

Ever since the Bothers realized that Africans are determined to seize their most elementary rights by force, they have been behaving exactly as if they had their backs to the wall. Everything that could help them safeguard their cherished apartheid régime has been tried. The development of technology, of nuclear facilities and material is part of this diabolical plan. This nuclear capacity has

(Mr. Kessely, Chad)

been made possible thanks to the aid which certain countries have provided, even though they knew that Africa had been declared a denuclearized zone. The Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, adopted in July 1964 at the summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity, in fact clearly provided for the categorical renunciation by the continent of the right to acquire or manufacture nuclear weapons. It called upon foreign Powers to respect this peaceful intention scrupulously. It is therefore with dismay that we take note of South Africa's nuclear capacity.

However, we feel it is not too late. It is still possible to thwart South Africa's murderous intentions. This depends only on the handful of countries which are helping it in this sphere. For our part we call upon the Secretary-General to continue to provide all necessary assistance to the Organization of African Unity to implement the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last speaker on the list for this afternoon's meeting. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. MILAD (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I did not indeed have the intention to speak at this stage. However, the representative of Habre has compelled me to make a statement now. No one can deny facts, even through unfounded claims. The actual situation of Chad is indeed an internal conflict emanating from the rebellion of Habre and his faction, which, with the help of the imperialist forces, effected a coup against the National Unity Government of Goukouni Weddeye, which was formed in a democratic way on the basis of the Lagos Agreement of National Reconciliation signed by the 11 main factions in Chad with the support of the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

The instability, and the inability to achieve national reconciliation in Chad was due to the tendency of rebellion and domination on the part of Hussein Habre.

This was usually a source of destabilization in Chad, and was responsible for all the tragedies that befell Chad since the coup against the legitimate government, and I see no reason to recount that in full.

We wish to indicate once more that the Libyan people gave support and help to brothers in Chad. This is not new, because the people of Libya have historical, spiritual, geographical as well as cultural links with the Chadians, with whom which we have fraternal ties since time immemorial.

Habre has attempted from the beginning to obstruct all sincere attempts aimed at effecting national reconciliation in Chad at a time when Hussein Habre represents merely one of the several factions in Chad. Consequently, the international community, in my view, will not be deceived by the government of one faction which came into being as a result of a rebellion, with the support of the imperialist forces, of their allies and of mercenaries.

(Mr. Milad, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

What has been taking place in Chad is a civil war that dates back to the beginning of the sixties, as a result of the existence of rebellious elements like those of Hussein Habre who were blinded by selfish interests to the detriment of the interest of the country and people. The claims of the representative of Hussein Habre is an attempt to hoodwink the international community with regard to what is now taking place in Chad. This is effected through distorting the picture and making unfounded claims directed against the Jamahiriya's contribution to a solution of the Chadian problem.

My delegation asserted at the present session, on 9 October 1985, that the Jamahiriya is ready as a neighbouring country to fraternal Chad, to help as it did in the past, in any endeavours, within the framework of the efforts of the OAU, to achieve peace, security and stability in Chad. However, at the same time, my country reiterates that it will keep its territorial integrity in accordance with the annexed chart of the report of Adrian Bilt, the then United Nations Commissioner for Libya, on the basis of which a United Nations resolution on the independence of Libya was adopted in 1951, as contained in official documents of the fifth session of the General Assembly, annex 15 of document A/1340.

Mr. KESSELY (Chad) (interpretation from French): I would merely want to invite the representatives not to pay any attention to the tissue of lies woven by the representative of Libya. I would not want to delve into the historical analysis of the conflict between Chad and Libya. The numerous debates in the Security Council and elsewhere have been very clear. Therefore, I am not going to engage in this.

But I would like to note that it is not up to the delegation of Libya to speak of a coup d'etat of rebellion. We know whence the present Libyan régime draws its legitimacy. Before the Libyans can hand out deeds of legitimacy, we must not forget that Colonel Qaddafi brought down the legitimate Government of King Idris.

(Mr. Kessely, Chad)

I said a few minutes ago that Libya had occupied Chadian territory. Libya had 5,000 regular troops in Chad. This is against all principles of international law. The Government of Libya libyanized the whole of the occupied zone. It staged a public burning of the Chadian flag. It has many prisoners in gaols in its occupied zone, and has given them Libyan identification cards. Arabic has become a working language instead of French. There is a militarization of the occupied zone. The part of Chad that has been taken over is nothing but a garrison for Libyan troops. The Tripoli régime has built vast landing strips for its military cargo planes. The army of aggression has heavy artillery ready to attack the freedom of the Chadian people. The Qaddafi régime is the main obstacle to the return of peace and stability in Chad. We think that most representatives in this room know these facts full well. We would like to tell the Committee that all we wish for is peace. And as long as Qaddafi continues to interfere in our internal affairs, peace must remain a vain hope. We ask the Libyans to leave our country. We invite them to withdraw their occupation forces. Let the Libyans leave us alone so that we can settle our own problems ourselves as a sovereign people.



Mr. MILAD (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I apologize for speaking once more. I wish only to say again what we have said on several occasions in the past, that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has no troops in Chad and is not occupying any part of the territory of Chad. We have experts there, at the request of the legitimate Government of Chad.

I also wish to confirm that we never have interfered in Chad's internal affairs and never shall interfere in them. What is happening in Chad is a conflict between warring groups there.

Mr. KESSELY (Chad) (interpretation from French): I apologize for speaking again, but if I let pass those brief remarks by the representative of Libya, other representatives might think they were true. In fact, they are completely false. The problem in Chad is not a purely internal matter; it is an international conflict between Libya and Chad. That conflict derives from the bellicose intentions of the Libyan Government, and particularly of Qaddafi, who believes that the north of Chad is a natural extension of southern Libya. We want representatives here to realize that it is truly an international conflict.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform members that at 10.30 a.m. on Thursday, 31 October 1985, the First Committee will hold a special meeting in observance of Disarmament Week. The Third United Nations Pledging Conference for the World Disarmament Campaign is scheduled to be held on the same day at 3.00 p.m.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.