



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 7TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. NAIK (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

- General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic)  
Mr. Pfeiffer (Federal Republic of Germany)  
Mr. Racz (Hungary)  
Mr. Canales (Chile)  
Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria)  
Mr. Vo Anh Tuan (Viet Nam)

PROGRAMME OF WORK

---

\* 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.1/35/PV.7  
20 October 1980

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31 to 49 and 121 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the first speaker, I should like to remind Members that the list of speakers for the general debate on all disarmament items will be closed tomorrow, Tuesday 21 October, at 6.00 p.m. I hope that those delegations which are not yet inscribed will put their names down as soon as possible so that we can plan the programme of work for the next two weeks.

Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, first of all allow me, on behalf of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, to congratulate you on your election. May we express the hope that the First Committee under your chairmanship will be discussing questions of disarmament and the strengthening of international security in a constructive spirit and will achieve progressive results. At the same time, we should like to congratulate the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur on their election.

At the threshold of a new decade, peoples turn their eyes towards the preservation of peace. They justifiably expect that the positive results achieved during the past decade with regard to détente and arms limitation will be maintained and multiplied. What is imperative is to bring about a turn in the field of disarmament in the 1980s. It is precisely that requirement, in our opinion, that is the reason for and the purpose of the declaration of the 1980s as Second Disarmament Decade; it is the objective to which the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty has directed the proposals for reducing the threat of war and for disarmament and détente adopted at its session in May this year.

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

Despite the decisions adopted at the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, the contradiction between increased endeavours by the peoples towards political and military détente on the one hand and an intensified arms build-up on the other has particularly sharpened over the past two years. Even in recent times, the arms race has assumed new dimensions. The international situation has become more complicated and strained. The threat to peace and détente has perceptibly increased.

The question of what has caused such a dangerous situation occupies the minds of many people. Certain circles in Western countries, now as before, are trying to place the responsibility on an imaginary "military threat from the East". The assistance given by the USSR to the legitimate Government of Afghanistan and the loss of imperialist positions in Iran are taken as reasons for stirring up a military frenzy. Even the exercise by developing countries of their right freely to dispose of their own raw material resources is misused for that same purpose. That campaign of lies and slander is designed to befog the minds of the broad popular masses as to how matters really stand. It is fanned by the mass media that are in the hands of those circles which are the profiteers of the arms race.

An unclouded and unprejudiced look at recent events clearly shows that the real causes of the aggravation of the international situation are deeply rooted in the confrontation course upon which several States embarked some years ago. In that course, a pivotal role is ascribed to the attempt to replace the approximate military equilibrium existing between the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the NATO member countries by military preponderance.

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

It was not the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty that, during the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, adopted a long-term armament programme. It is not the Soviet Union that for a long time had impeded the elaboration of the SALT II treaty and that today is delaying its ratification. It was the States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) that almost one year ago in Brussels adopted the fateful missile decision that was conducive to the considerable complication of the situation in Europe.

For the 1980s, hence for the period of the Second Disarmament Decade, of all times, the NATO member countries envisage an immense intensification of their armament efforts. That includes a systematic increase in military expenditures by 3 per cent annually. Today not even as much as that satisfies certain circles. According to recent information, the United States plans to spend more than \$1 trillion for armament purposes during the first half of this decade. That is about twice the amount of this year's military expenditures of all the States in the world. I repeat: twice the amount of world military expenditures for 1980.

At the 67th Inter-Parliamentary Conference recently held in the capital of the German Democratic Republic, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, stressed that the responsibility for the aggravation of the international situation lies with those forces

"which are striving for military superiority and for an alteration of the military balance. This dangerous and incalculable policy is accompanied by an unprecedented escalation of the arms race, a change-over by certain circles to confrontation reminiscent all too clearly of the days of the cold war, a policy of boycott and an accumulation and exacerbation of serious conflicts. This is undoubtedly putting the policy of détente to a severe test and, indeed, threatening it to an extreme degree".

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

The danger emanating from such a policy is obvious. The basis of negotiations on arms limitation and disarmament is being undermined. Current negotiations on the curbing of the arms race are unilaterally broken off. Other negotiations have come to a standstill.

In contrast to that we demand that negotiations on arms limitation and disarmament be continued steadily, and that the SALT-II treaty be ratified immediately. The existing military balance must be ensured at an ever lower level. General and complete disarmament is the objective that that process is pursuing. Its achievement necessitates serious negotiations. In order for them to be successfully conducted, it is necessary to eliminate the difficulties and obstacles that have arisen out of the arms race and the policy of confrontation.

To bring about agreement on individual measures would already contribute to substantially improving the international situation. The German Democratic Republic therefore supports, as a sponsor, the draft resolution entitled "Certain urgent measures for reducing the danger of war", submitted by the USSR at the current session of the United Nations General Assembly. The proposals contained therein are suitable for initiating world-wide steps towards military détente and further current negotiations. Their implementation would create favourable conditions for curbing the arms race, strengthening the régime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and cutting back military expenditures.

In the interest of normalizing international relations and increasing confidence among States, it would be appropriate to overcome the division of the world into military blocs that oppose each other.

The socialist States want that and are ready for it. The Warsaw Treaty came into effect in reply to the setting up of the NATO bloc and its military course. We reject a conception aimed at gaining military superiority and hegemony in international affairs. Also, here we are in agreement with the non-aligned States, which in their Havana Declaration of 1979 pointed to the dissolution of military groupings as being a major goal.

Jointly with the other Warsaw Treaty member States, the German Democratic Republic has repeatedly addressed a proposal to the NATO States that both organizations be dissolved simultaneously. A first step could be the liquidation of their military organizations, beginning with the mutual reduction of military activity. A positive reply to the proposal is still outstanding.

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

On the other hand, NATO has increased its military activity to an unprecedented extent, specifically in the period since Helsinki. This was made evident also by this year's series of manoeuvres called "Autumn Forge", in which more than 300,000 military personnel participated. The German Democratic Republic cannot overlook the fact that most such activities have taken place in the immediate vicinity of its State frontier in the west.

As a matter of course, the dissolution of the military alliances involves complicated problems. This, however, will not prevent us from taking first steps towards that goal. Therefore, measures are urgently required in order to halt the expansion of the existing military groupings, to avoid the formation of new ones and to refrain from assigning military functions to existing regional groupings.

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

We should like to underline four aspects as regards the proposal of the Soviet Union that I have mentioned. First, a global approach would exclude the possibility for both sides of compensating for the limitation of certain activities in one region by expanding such activities in another region. Secondly, the proposal is addressed to all States, not only to the States members of military alliances, and specific obligations for all are foreseen. This corresponds to the fundamental responsibility of all States, without exception, for the strengthening of international security. Thirdly, the implementation of that proposal would create favourable conditions for a more comprehensive application of the system of collective security which is provided for in the United Nations Charter. Fourthly, and finally, the proposed measures could lessen regional tensions and build a real basis of confidence for regional and world-wide steps towards arms limitation.

The call upon all States and particularly those permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and countries which have military agreements with them not to increase their armed forces and conventional weapons, with effect from 1 January 1981, as contained in the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union, is likewise directed towards the attainment of that objective.

The achievement of such a measure leading towards military détente would meet the specific responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council for the preservation of world peace and international security and the limitation of armaments on the basis of Article 26 of the United Nations Charter. This would create a positive example for all United Nations Member States to follow.

As for the Warsaw Treaty member States, they have reaffirmed, in their declaration of May this year, that they are ready to take such a step. They have called upon all the States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe not to increase the numerical strength of their armed forces in the area defined by the Helsinki Final Act. For seven years now the socialist States have been advocating in the Vienna talks first steps to be taken towards the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. Freezing the current number of troops in Central Europe would help to achieve that aim.

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

States which renounce possessing nuclear weapons or having them stationed on their territories have the legitimate right to obtain guarantees that nuclear weapons will not be used against them. Such a measure would, together with nuclear disarmament, strengthen, in terms of both politics and international law, the security of States and the principle of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The best way to achieve that objective would be the conclusion of a pertinent comprehensive international convention.

This year's negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament, however, have shown again that some nuclear-weapon Powers are not yet willing to take a step with such far-reaching implications. In the interest of first steps in the direction of reaching a comprehensive international agreement, we support efforts to carry out limited measures for the time being. Such measures could consist of unilateral, and in substance similar, declarations by all nuclear-weapon States concerning the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States having no such weapons on their territories. The Security Council should adopt an appropriate resolution approving those declarations. We proceed from the consideration that those non-nuclear-weapon States which do not allow nuclear weapons to be deployed on their territories should benefit from security guarantees.

A decisive step towards halting the nuclear arms race would be the cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests. Some time ago the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Mr. Eklund, correctly pointed to the fact that a relevant treaty would contribute decisively to the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime.

The German Democratic Republic welcomes the progress made in this direction through the trilateral negotiations held in Geneva. With the required political will on the part of all participating States, it should be possible to conclude those negotiations successfully. We wish to express our satisfaction that the Soviet Union, in a number of far-reaching initiatives, has reaffirmed its fundamental interest in an agreement on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. The recent Soviet initiative also takes account of proposals submitted by other, mostly non-aligned, States, which are concerned



(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

about the further escalation of the nuclear arms race. The proposed one-year moratorium on nuclear explosions in all nuclear-weapon States could add fresh momentum to the trilateral negotiations. An agreement in that sense would clearly express the readiness of the five nuclear-weapon States to agree on a comprehensive nuclear test ban, which would create more favourable conditions for a global settlement, that is, a treaty on a complete test ban to be concluded by all nuclear-weapon States.

The new Soviet proposals are of great practical relevance. They are based on the Final Document of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament and they are consonant with the basic concern of the Second United Nations Disarmament Decade, that is, to take effective measures to curb the arms race and to achieve disarmament with a view to stabilizing and strengthening international security and political détente. They are additional evidence of the persistent endeavour of the socialist States to pursue a dispassionate dialogue with a view to averting the dangers provoked by a policy of strength.

All the more regrettable are decisions such as the one on the so-called new nuclear strategy of the United States. This strategy and pertinent decisions on the use of nuclear weapons, for example in the Middle East, are hardly reconcilable with the objectives laid down in the Soviet-American agreement on the prevention of a nuclear war, concluded seven years ago.

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

It is almost symbolic that the so-called new nuclear strategy was proclaimed at a time when mankind was commemorating the thirty-fifth anniversary of the nuclear destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In the final analysis this is not only meant to make the inconceivable - that is, nuclear warfare - conceivable, something an American strategist called for in the 1960s. There is the intention on the part of some to make such warfare feasible and, in complete disregard of reality, even the hope of winning such a war.

The proponents of limited nuclear warfare, which would amount to a dose of nuclear apocalypse, are indulging in dangerous self-deception. Only recently internationally renowned experts members of the Pugwash Movement or of the World Federation of Scientists have pointed to the fact that the assumption that a nuclear war could be limited, either quantitatively or qualitatively, is an erroneous one. Even official United States representatives have been forced to admit that a limited nuclear war could go out of control and lead to a global nuclear war.

The so-called new nuclear strategy can only have negative consequences for efforts to achieve nuclear arms limitation and disarmament. That decision has already preprogrammed an all-out nuclear arms build-up for years to come. To obtain new and allegedly invulnerable weapons for a nuclear first strike, new and more sophisticated systems of strategic missiles such as the MX-missiles are to be introduced. The development of additional missile systems to "revolutionize warfare" and, obviously, to secure additional super-profits for the armaments corporations, is openly propagated. Leading representatives of the American armed forces and armaments business try to prove that the strategic weapons and the more than 10,000 nuclear warheads stockpiled in United States arsenals do not suffice as a material basis for the new strategy. Where will this lead, peace-loving States are wondering.

There is another United States decision which causes alarm - the decision concerning the creation of new productive capacity for the manufacture of chemical weapons. In order to deceive world public opinion they are using the well-known methods of "psychological warfare". We had an example of this only recently when we heard the statement of a representative of a NATO country in this Committee.

We believe that we must embark on a different road, the road outlined by the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly. Today there exist strong forces that speak out in favour of reducing the dangers of

(Mr. Florin,  
German Democratic Republic)

war and advocate détente and disarmament. The closer the ranks of those forces become, and the stronger the commitment of the United Nations to solving this task, the greater the number of the successes that will be achieved in the political struggle for disarmament.

We must not let matters take their course. There is no reasonable alternative to arms limitation and disarmament. That realization is shared by ever broader sections of society. It was the basic assessment reached by such important forums convened this year as the Paris Meeting of European Communist and Workers' Parties, the Sofia World Parliament of Peoples for Peace, the Pugwash Meeting, and the World Conference against Nuclear Weapons, which was held in Japan this year.

The interest of peoples in the maintenance of peace and the pursuit of détente, so beneficial for all sides, determined the content of the Declaration of the Warsaw Meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty. The document contains a realistic programme that covers all essential aspects of the cessation of the arms race and disarmament and takes account of numerous constructive proposals made to that end by other countries. The German Democratic Republic expects the readiness of the Warsaw Treaty member States to limit or reduce all types of weapons on a basis of reciprocity to meet with an appropriate response.

The socialist States have shown their sincere interest in détente and disarmament by their concrete action. The unilateral withdrawal of 20,000 Soviet troops and 1,000 tanks from the territory of the German Democratic Republic, which has been carried out over the last year, is an effective step to achieve arms limitation and to diminish the military confrontation in Europe.

In the face of the present international situation it is now more urgent than ever to put an end to a state of affairs in which the speed of material preparation for war is greater than that of arms negotiations.

The tasks that face us have been clearly identified. We appeal to the thirty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly to take decisions embodying directives that will be conducive to making headway in the solving of those tasks.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. Chairman, first of all let me congratulate you on the assumption of your high office. My delegation is very much looking forward to working under your able chairmanship. My congratulations also go to the officers of the Committee. I sincerely hope that during this session the work of our Committee will have the positive results which the world situation so urgently requires.

The Federal Republic of Germany is committed to the preservation of peace. Our basic political convictions have been shaped by the experience of millionfold suffering during two world wars. Therefore it is with heightened sensitivity and great anxiety that we observe the military conflicts in today's world. The prime objective of our foreign and security policy lies in reducing tension and fostering co-operation between East and West, and North and South and in strengthening peace in the world on the basis of a growing security partnership and on stable military relationships.

Arms control and disarmament are at the heart of this policy which we endeavour to pursue in a realistic manner. Transparency and the building of confidence among States are basic elements of this concept.

We must work step by step towards the attainment of concrete results from arms control negotiations, aimed at a stable military equilibrium and guaranteeing at all stages of the negotiation process the security and independence of those involved. Only on the basis of concrete, balanced and adequately verifiable measures will it be possible to halt the arms race and achieve parity, equality and military stability at a lower level of armaments.

By adopting its Final Document, the first special session of the United Nations devoted to disarmament, held in 1978, laid an important foundation for progress in disarmament and arms control. In the programme of action, the operative part of the Final Document, the international disarmament machinery was reshaped in order to enable it to meet the tasks it was entrusted with. Concrete results were expected and, in fact, the initiation of international, regional and bilateral negotiations in various fields was promising. In the light of that, it is most unfortunate that this encouraging development suffered a serious setback the consequences of which have yet to be overcome. Our reaction cannot be resignation of inactivity and we do not want to be discouraged from continuing our efforts towards concrete results in arms control.

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal Republic of  
Germany)

However, we cannot ignore that a long shadow is being cast over arms control and disarmament efforts. Among this year's critical events let me mention the war in the Middle East and above all the armed intervention in Afghanistan which was condemned by the international community at the emergency special session of the General Assembly last January.

Let me also mention a recent event which is particularly painful for the Federal Republic of Germany. The decision by the German Democratic Republic to introduce a drastic increase in the minimum foreign exchange requirements for visitors to the German Democratic Republic and East Berlin severely hampers the possibilities of communication between the people in both German States. Now every single visitor is required to convert the equivalent of \$14 for every single day of stay in the German Democratic Republic and East Berlin. This constitutes in practice the doubling of the daily amount required so far. The increase, by which less privileged sections of the population are hardest hit, severely burdens the numerous family ties existing between people in both parts of Germany. It deals a blow not only to relations between the two German States, but also constitutes a serious setback for the process of détente in Europe.

One of the concrete arms control agreements of central interest to us is the SALT II treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union in which both sides have agreed on a contractually fixed balance in the field of intercontinental strategic weapons. The Federal Republic of Germany has welcomed that treaty as an important contribution towards stabilizing security and has advocated the continuous pursuance of the SALT process. The Federal Government has for a long time pointed out, as did the Federal Chancellor in his speech at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, held in the summer of 1978, that the existing and still growing Soviet potential in medium-range missiles is a cause for great concern and must not be ignored in the efforts to achieve a stable over-all military balance between East and West. The decision taken in December 1979 by the allies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to pursue the parallel course of modernization and arms control is an attempt to meet that concern,

My Government supported fully the United States' offer to the Soviet Union, first made on 18 December 1979, to enter into negotiations on the mutual limitation of land-based nuclear medium-range missiles within the framework of the SALT process. In line with this political interest of my Government, the Federal Chancellor, Helmut Schmidt and Foreign Minister, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, were able to use their visit to Moscow on 1 July of this year to contribute to the opening of American-Soviet talks on nuclear medium-range systems. My Government welcomes the fact that such talks began in Geneva on 17 October. This is an important step in the process towards mutual limitation of those weapon systems. In our view the objective must be to reach concrete limitations on both sides at the lowest level on the basis of the principle of equality and parity.

All efforts should be guided by the objective of achieving military equilibrium and bringing it to a lower level.

I recall article 82 of the Final Document, in the formulation of which my delegation was instrumental:

In particular the achievement of a more stable situation in Europe at a lower level of military potential on the basis of approximate equality and parity, as well as on the basis of undiminished security of all States with full respect for security interests and independence of States outside military alliances, by agreement on appropriate mutual reductions and limitations would contribute to the strengthening of security in Europe and constitute a significant step towards enhancing international peace and security. Current efforts to this end should be continued most energetically. (A/S-10/4, para.82)

The position which my Government and its allies take at the Vienna negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions corresponds fully to that request.

With its proposals of December 1979, the West attempted to promote the conclusion of an interim agreement. It hereby provided renewed proof of its readiness for compromise and, in particular, of its interest in the achievement of early concrete results. The proposal for interim results was accompanied by a proposal for associated measures which are designed to guarantee observance of the agreement, ensure greater transparency of military activities and hence strengthen mutual confidence.

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

This concept of an interim phase I agreement, as proposed by the West, forms the basis of the present negotiations in Vienna. Our Eastern partners have accepted it in principle, although they have not yet given a comprehensive reply to the Western proposal of December.

Once the East is willing to co-operate in the central issue of the negotiations, namely, the data base for the participating forces in the area of reductions, in my Government's opinion agreement can be achieved.

The negotiations on military aspects of security to be conducted at the Madrid follow-up Meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) could provide a new impetus for the arms control efforts in Europe. The first positive steps made in the form of confidence-building measures for Europe contained in the Final Act of Helsinki must, in my Government's view, be continued. To this end new, more effective and far-reaching measures which are comprehensive in scope must be developed. We therefore advocate agreement on militarily significant, binding and verifiable confidence-building measures applicable to the whole of Europe. Confidence cannot apply piecemeal; hence, confidence-building measures in the context of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe must apply to the entire European continent which is the geographical scope of the Final Act of Helsinki.

The best forum for dealing with this issue would be a special conference of all States participating in CSCE which would have to be established by a precise and substantive mandate of the Madrid follow-up Meeting of CSCE and which would have to remain closely integrated in the CSCE process. We therefore support the proposal submitted by France for a conference on disarmament in Europe which would provide a solid basis for continuing the necessary process of confidence building.

The concept of confidence building among States must be energetically pursued, above all at a time of critical developments. The more openness and transparency States permit in their political and military actions, the greater the certainty of reducing the dangers resulting from misunderstanding and misinterpretation of political and military actions. Increasing predictability

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

of the military position of States would be an important contribution to strengthening confidence amongst the members of the international community through concrete measures.

The Federal Republic of Germany and other Members of the United Nations have taken the initiative in studying the applicability of confidence building in different regions of the world and for developing concrete measures which can create and maintain confidence. These measures must correspond to the different conditions prevailing in various regions. They can be applied only if the States concerned have agreed to them in a free decision. In the group of governmental experts set up for this purpose by the Secretary-General, on a unanimous decision of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, we have discussed the problems involved with our partners from a total of 14 countries. Substantial progress has been achieved and the group has been able to submit its progress report on time. It is before the Committee in document A/35/422.

One set of measures which promotes confidence among States is the disclosure of military budgets and their comparison on a reliable data base. This issue was discussed in detail at this year's session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. In his statement before the General Assembly on 24 September 1980, Foreign Minister Genscher reiterated the need for the world-wide availability of reliable military data. Transparency and comparability are the key words. The Minister underlined the general significance that we attach to this issue in a different context in his statement when he stressed the importance of setting up registers in the United Nations which would cover development assistance, military expenditures and world-wide arms transfers.

The test run of the system devised by experts for reporting on military expenditures has enabled us to make considerable headway. It has been shown that the system is applicable in practice. We participated in that test run, as did a total of 14 Western and third-world countries, which is an encouraging result. It is therefore all the more regrettable that not a single Eastern country answered the questionnaire. It is important that all



(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

States now follow the example set by those 14 countries and report their military budgets. In particular, we support the recommendation of the ad hoc panel that organizational arrangements be made for processing the data collected. In our opinion, these data must be carefully registered and correctly classified so that an objective and reliable basis is obtained for all subsequent steps.

The Federal Government attaches special importance to the conclusion of an agreement on the complete prohibition of the production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and of an agreement on a comprehensive ban on all nuclear explosions. In both instances, however, dependable verification arrangements are indispensable. The Federal Government therefore welcomes the progress made in this respect both in the Soviet-American negotiations on a chemical weapons ban, supported by the working group of the Committee on Disarmament, and in the trilateral talks on a comprehensive test ban. We hope that the momentum which has been created in both cases will soon yield concrete results. A mere moratorium on nuclear tests without verification would, in our view, simply serve to delay these endeavours.

I should like to stress that my country is willing to engage in intensive and practical co-operation and mutual exchange with regard to all verification issues. This has been demonstrated, inter alia, by the international seminar held in my country in 1979 on the verification of the non-production of chemical agents by the civilian industry and by the seminar of the group of experts on international seismological data exchange which was held in July of this year, also in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Adequate verification of arms control and disarmament agreements is, in our view, the prerequisite for the trust which parties concluding such agreements must have in each other. Without internationally encoded verification arrangements confidence in the observance of agreements could all too easily be shaken by doubts, suspicions or a deterioration of the political situation. The credibility of all efforts aimed at arms control and disarmament is at stake here.

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

We therefore stress the need expressed in the report of the Committee on Disarmament for appropriate international measures to determine the facts concerning controversial allegations of violation of the 1925 Geneva Protocol on Poisonous Gases, which does not provide for a verification procedure.

The Committee on Disarmament has proved its value, also in this year which has been overshadowed by an international confidence crisis. All Member States have contributed to assuring the functioning of this single multilateral negotiating body. We will have to make a common effort to achieve in the coming year a breakthrough to concrete agreements which can be approved and accepted by the world community.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany welcomes the positive results achieved at the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which was concluded in Geneva on 11 October. It notes with satisfaction that it has been possible by means of patient negotiations to achieve, in an important field affecting the security of States, agreements on restrictions on the use of incendiary weapons, mines and booby-traps, which are most important for the protection of the civilian population.

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal Republic of Germany)

The Federal Republic of Germany and a large number of non-aligned and Western States would have appreciated it if it had been possible already at that conference to reach agreement on the establishment of a consultative committee of experts which, in the event of doubts about the observance of the agreements, would be able to initiate consultations and investigate the facts. My Government, together with the Governments of other interested countries, intends to pursue this proposal in future negotiations.

Mr. RACZ (Hungary): As my delegation is speaking for the first time in this Committee, allow me to extend to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the most able officers of the Committee my sincerest congratulations on your respective unanimous elections. The Hungarian delegation wishes you every success in discharging your responsible functions.

As stated by our Foreign Minister during the general debate, the Hungarian People's Republic welcomed and supported the initiative of the Soviet Union advocating that the General Assembly should include the item entitled "Certain urgent measures for reducing the danger of war" in the agenda of its thirty-fifth session. We did so because we regarded it, and still regard it, as being particularly important and timely. The proposals in question are further convincing evidence of the sense of responsibility felt by one of the world's strongest military Powers for the development of the international situation as a whole and for the efforts to limit the arms race and to consolidate international peace and security. We are convinced that their adoption and implementation would entail highly positive changes serving both the interests of the world at large and those of individual countries. We believe that the United Nations has a task and a role of its own to fulfil in this process.

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

We all know that the balance of military power in the world has created the possibility for the policy of détente to develop and prevail. The process of détente has exerted a favourable influence in all regions of the world, contributed to the development of manifold relations among States and promoted the cause of social progress. However, alarmed by the positive changes taking place in the world, international imperialism and the circles profiting by the arms build-up have started a new wave of the arms race to arrest détente. Invoking and using as a pretext the alleged military superiority and aggressive designs of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty Organization, they are trying to turn the prevailing military balance in their favour.

This is evidenced by the 1978 North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Washington decision on regular increases in military expenditures, and by the decision of the United States to develop new systems of strategic weapons and its postponement of the ratification of the SALT-II agreement. We see particularly grave perils in the 1979 NATO Brussels decisions on the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, not only because such weapons would threaten the security of our country, given its geographical location, but also because we are aware that any attempt to upset the balance of military power in Europe, where the dividing-line is drawn between the two strongest military groupings of the world, tends to increase tension with world-wide implications.

The leading role in this process is played by the United States, which is increasing its military presence in different parts of the world and seeking to enlarge the existing military-political groupings. The continuation of this process, if it is not halted, may lead to situations which could develop into armed conflicts and bring the peoples of the world to the brink of another world war.

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

The Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community advocate the necessity of maintaining the prevailing balance of military power. They regard the Warsaw Treaty Organization as a shield, a means of defence, which they are ready to renounce if NATO is simultaneously disbanded. They would do so all the more happily since, given the very essence of their social system, the socialist countries have no groups of people or social strata interested in arms build-up. Accordingly, the Warsaw Treaty member States have on several occasions declared their readiness to have their defensive organization and NATO simultaneously dissolved at any time. They have proposed as a first step the dismantling of the military organizations of the two groupings.

Until this goal is reached, we think it would be an important step for the States members of the existing military alliances to renounce the expansion of their alliances and for countries which are not members of such groupings to refrain from joining them. A positive change would also result from a commitment by all States without exception to avoid any actions which might lead to the formation of new military alliances. The proposal to prevent the assigning of military functions to those regional organizations which have no such functions at present is likewise one of great importance and timeliness.

The enormous arms expenditures impose ever-growing burdens on the peoples of the world. As was pointed out repeatedly in the general debate in the Assembly, the world spends huge amounts - some \$500 billion a year - on armaments. To be more specific, the countries of the world spend a yearly average of \$16,000 on keeping any one soldier in arms. One cannot fail to reflect on the fact that, against this waste of money, the outlay on the education of one school-age child amounts to as little as approximately \$260 annually on average.

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

This is not the only field where such disproportions are striking and keep on growing. Part of the arms expenditure, which increases from year to year, is allocated for nuclear devices, but the bulk of it is absorbed by conventional armaments. In our day even the production of modern conventional armaments is becoming increasingly costly, and the destructive power of such weapons is constantly growing and, for certain types, is approaching that of nuclear weapons.

The increase in armed forces drains away manpower from peaceful construction. A reduction in armed forces and conventional armaments would release considerable resources for the benefit of peoples, for the solution of pressing problems shared by mankind. Until that occurs, it would be an important step forward if, acting in accordance with the proposal of the Soviet Union, all States, and primarily the States permanent members of the Security Council and countries which have military agreements with them, did not increase their armed forces and conventional armaments from a certain date, for example from 1 January 1981. We are convinced that the implementation of this proposal would have a favourable influence also on the process of the limitation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

Every country is concerned at the knowledge that in the event of an armed conflict its territory might be the theatre of a nuclear attack. The danger of such an eventuality is increasing today, all the more so since certain imperialist circles are stepping up their propaganda to win acceptance for their doctrine that nuclear weapons might also be used in what they term a "limited" war. That has led to increased concern and anxiety on the part of those States having no nuclear weapons and not seeking to possess such weapons. The conclusion of an appropriate convention with the participation of all nuclear States and non-nuclear countries would best serve the interests of strengthening security guarantees for non-nuclear States. It is therefore fully justified and necessary that the General Assembly support the appeal launched by the Soviet Union to the other nuclear Powers to make identical solemn declarations concerning the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States which have no such weapons on their territories. Such declarations could be reaffirmed by a binding decision of the Security Council.

According to its known position, my country attaches primary importance to making progress in various fields of nuclear disarmament. We therefore regard the partial test ban Treaty of 1963 as a significant but limited result of disarmament efforts. It has had a tangible positive impact on pollution abatement in our planet's atmosphere and environment. Seventeen years have elapsed since the conclusion of the partial test ban Treaty. Those years have witnessed the continuation of the nuclear arms race. The Hungarian delegation feels, as do many other delegations, that the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests in all environments is an important and urgent issue which could contribute to curbing the nuclear arms race. It would be highly desirable, therefore, to draft and put into effect a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests as soon as possible.

Notable progress towards achieving that objective would be made by adopting the Soviet proposal that all nuclear-weapon States renounce nuclear explosions from a specified date in the form of a moratorium and make appropriate declarations to that effect. Such a step would certainly have a significant impact on the reduction of tension in the world and would favourably influence international efforts aimed at the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

My Government maintains that there is no task more urgent than that of avoiding the outbreak of a new world war, halting the arms race that is spiralling as a result of international imperialism, and elaborating and implementing effective disarmament measures.

We are of the view that early implementation of the proposals presented now by the Soviet Union would best serve to reduce the growing danger of war and the prevailing tension in international relations, would contribute to easing the burdens of military expenditure and to strengthening the non-proliferation régime and would bring about conditions propitious to making further progress in other fields of restraining the arms race.

In light of what I have said, it stands to reason that we lend our full support to the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union. We are convinced that a similar posture by the General Assembly could give a new impulse to the process of détente, would be consistent with the principles of the Charter and would contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security - the prime objective of our world Organization - and would generate considerable momentum while creating more favourable conditions for the development of comprehensive international co-operation.

Mr. CANALES (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of its statement, the delegation of Chile would like to express to you and the other officers of the Committee our sincere congratulations on your election to conduct the proceeding of the First Committee. We are convinced that thanks to your intelligent and wise guidance we shall successfully conclude the task before us.

It is undeniable that when the Second World War came to an end, the United Nations made many serious efforts to call a halt to the arms race; that was especially true in regard to nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction.

Although we recognize that some progress has been made, especially in the area of law, as the result of negotiations regarding treaties and conventions of



(Mr. Canales, Chile)

great importance - to which should be added a large number of resolutions adopted by the Organization in support of disarmament - we must say that we are most disappointed at the meagre results achieved. Year after year, we have seen a significant increase in military expenditures, a factor which impedes a solution to the many problems affecting the world.

We firmly believe that general and complete disarmament will be a reality only when all Member States in this Organization show the political will to achieve it as a final, real and concrete objective.

We have traditionally been a peace-loving country and at the regional and world level we have constantly said that we support this desire of the international community.

To achieve these things in world-wide disarmament, which is a matter of top priority, we must create an atmosphere of peace first and foremost, and peace can only exist if there is mutual trust among nations. Mutual trust and understanding require in turn unrestricted adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter and to the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and require respect for the fundamental rules of international law.

This year marks the beginning of the Second Disarmament Decade, and the principles that I have mentioned now acquire special significance. The fact is, though, that I have mentioned now acquire special significance. The fact is, though, that at present there is a climate of international crisis, at a time when, at this new session of the General Assembly we in the First Committee, must consider what real progress has been made towards disarmament.

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

Towards the end of last year, one of the major Powers gave us a most painful surprise when its armed forces occupied an under-developed and non-aligned nation - Afghanistan - in complete disregard of the international principles and rules which were the only bastion behind which that country could seek refuge. Notwithstanding the outcry of the international community, the situation has not changed, the occupation continues and the Soviet Union has failed to comply with the principles, which it has often proclaimed, of non-intervention in the internal affairs of another State and of the non-use of force in international relations.

Inevitably, this situation has had an irreparably harmful effect on international peace and, by the same token, on disarmament. Détente, which was to have been extended to the military sphere and implemented universally, has been weakened. Confidence has been lost in the military balance between the major Powers, and this will lead to an increase in military budgets as a means of creating nuclear equality, which, if realized, would simply mean that world peace will be based on fear.

In addition, there are other sources of tension which, if they spread or continue, will aggravate the present crisis in international affairs. Let me take a few examples. There is the situation in Kampuchea, where millions of human beings have had to face the ordeal of domestic warfare as a result of interference in their internal affairs by a neighbouring State. There is the situation in the Middle East, where no comprehensive settlement to the conflict has been found that would ensure a just and lasting peace for all. And then there is the conflict in the Persian Gulf, which has not been stopped and which, in addition to the disastrous consequences for both countries, has considerably aggravated the world economic crisis. In addition, one is truly dismayed to note that terrorism is being encouraged in the world and that the use of guerrillas is on the increase in the countries of the third world.

For all these reasons, the outlook is hardly cheerful for those States which truly yearn for peace. Our country, like many others, wants the kind of security that will guarantee the integrity and domestic order of our territory, as well as its sovereignty and independence, without it being necessary to divert to armaments resources that could be far better used for the social and economic development of our people.

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

But given the fact that the major Powers and the countries that export war matériel are responsible for most of the military expenditure, one wonders whether the smaller countries can really have any influence at all on preventing a continuation of the arms race.

After putting forward these considerations which we feel are necessary for a proper understanding of my country's position on these subjects, we should like briefly to review the various items that are on our agenda for this session. We realize fully that it is no easy matter to review 20 topics in a single debate. We therefore feel that it will be necessary for us to speak on two separate occasions. On this occasion we shall lay special emphasis on nuclear disarmament, for we feel that the limitation, control, reduction and elimination of weapons, which are now in a position to destroy mankind, are of transcendental importance.

Turning now to the subject of nuclear proliferation, the obvious solution at the end of the Second World War, when one of the Powers demonstrated its capacity to carry out mass destruction on a surprising scale, would have been for agreement to be reached so that the other military Powers having an equal or similar economic capacity would not have felt that they had to achieve a balance in this kind of weapons in order to safeguard their national security.

After 23 years had elapsed, agreement was reached on a treaty that was intended to put an end to both horizontal and vertical proliferation. It was also agreed that nuclear energy could be used for peaceful purposes. It was hoped that through international co-operation this tremendous source of energy could be brought to all the countries in the world with major benefits to mankind.

Exactly the opposite occurred. Notwithstanding the prohibitions contained in that treaty, an arms race began between the major Powers, and of particular note is the fact that the two super-Powers achieved a destructive capacity 1 million times greater than the destructive capacity of the weapons used at the end of the Second World War against two Japanese cities.

Then after a few years, five nuclear Powers emerged, and it is likely that there are now 10 more countries that could use nuclear energy for military purposes. Before this decade, in which we have high hopes that progress will be made towards the limitation and control of armaments, comes to an end, there will be more than 30 countries with the capacity to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and thus able also to manufacture nuclear weapons, unless substantial progress is made towards nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

Fully aware of the enormous responsibility involved, a few years ago the super-Powers started talks aimed at limiting the various types of weapons. Regrettably, the levels of limitation were set very high and they continued to stockpile weapons which, on the basis of studies carried out by specialized agencies, could completely destroy our planet.

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

As time passes, the quantitative accumulation of nuclear weapons has gone hand in hand with qualitative improvements, only serving to increase nuclear might which cannot be matched by other countries. The second round of the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT II), which was a significant step forward towards the objectives pursued at earlier talks, have been suspended because one of the super-Powers, in violation of the United Nations Charter, has militarily occupied another country. This has served to sow distrust in the international community and endanger world peace. At the conclusion of the SALT II negotiations we should still be only at the first stage of nuclear disarmament, that is, the limitation of these weapons, and there would still be no reduction, something which would have to take place before final elimination.

Because of the slow progress in the negotiations, horizontal nuclear proliferation will be able to continue, notwithstanding the peaceful applications of atomic energy, for preference will be given to the use of nuclear fuels for purposes of war. Military research is being carried out intensely, progress is being made towards sophisticated weapons such as the neutron bomb or the MX bomb. The cost of these weapons will be greater than \$30 billion, and their destructive capacity could bring about a veritable holocaust.

Every day that passes without progress towards nuclear disarmament costs the super-Powers about \$100 million. Moreover, the accuracy of these weapons has been becoming greater and greater, because military satellites are being used with them which are capable of directing them so that weapons fired from a distance of 13,000 kilometres can be accurate to within 30 metres of the target.

The many nuclear tests which have taken place to bring about this progress should have been halted under the partial nuclear test ban; tests should have been restricted to the earth's surface, the atmosphere and under water. However, regrettably, that treaty has not been respected by the other military Powers that have not reached the scientific and technical levels achieved by the super-Powers. While there is no agreement on

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

a general and complete nuclear test ban treaty to be adhered to by all States and to include a ban on underground tests, vertical proliferation will continue to increase and its elimination will only be a dream.

All States with the nuclear capacity for war must make progress in this area. Otherwise there will be no guarantee that non-nuclear States will not be the victims of weapons of this kind.

We welcome the efforts being made in both deliberative bodies and negotiating bodies to implement the disarmament measures which are set forth in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, which was devoted to disarmament, but we cannot fail to express our disappointment that no more speedy progress has been made on questions of such undeniable urgency.

As far as horizontal proliferation is concerned, it is encouraging that no new nuclear State has emerged but no one should be deceived. Other States might become, if not nuclear Powers, at least States capable of using nuclear energy for military purposes. They could use this energy for weapons of lesser capacity or atomic devices of various kinds which could cause significant damage, even though they may not lead to a widespread nuclear war.

It is undeniable that progress in nuclear energy could lead to a situation in which in a particular theatre of operations tactical nuclear weapons could be used without the adversary's necessarily having to resort to strategic nuclear weapons, as is the case with the super-Powers.

We should also realize that the sophistication of nuclear weapons could increase the capacity of the launching systems for these weapons. A larger number of them could be transported, and they might have greater destructive capacity. A country taking the initiative in atomic attack might very well not escape immediate reprisals from the Power attacked.

I should like to turn now to the question of nuclear-free zones. The theory of nuclear-free zones has improved vastly in recent years, but, unfortunately, we still find on our agenda items such as item 37,

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

"implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa", item 38, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", and item 39, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", and so on, but in fact these have not led to the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones, and defensive measures would have to be increased in the case of a nuclear war, although we still firmly believe that a widespread nuclear war would destroy all those objectives which have military importance anywhere in the world. Even if a denuclearized zone were respected in a world-wide conflict, it could not escape the effects of the atomic radiation which would surely reach all parts of the world.

For that reason we would call on the nuclear Powers which are primarily responsible for the use of nuclear weapons to make progress in their arms limitations talks and do something to reduce the distrust that exists today, which could produce a crisis leading to a third world conflict, which would become catastrophic.

We believe that would not happen, for it would only lead to the destruction of mankind. However, the present situation has led to the spreading of minor conflicts. Since the end of the Second World War there have been more than 100 international or internal conflicts, and that proves that peace cannot be achieved unless States commit themselves to respecting the principles of the United Nations Charter. United Nations control over problems of peace and disarmament must be enhanced until we reach the point where general and complete disarmament under effective international control is a reality, as has been suggested by all the speakers in the general debate at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. At the present time a study is under way of two international conventions with the same goal namely, to assure the non-nuclear Powers that the States possessing nuclear weapons at this time will not use them or threaten to use them in any circumstance. That would obviously bring comfort to the non-nuclear States, which then could use their resources to develop the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

The use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes is an inalienable right of all peoples. For it to become a reality we must develop international co-operation to the maximum and we must ensure strict respect for the safeguards established by the International Atomic Energy Agency.



(Mr. Canales, Chile)

For that reason we believe that the present conditions in which there are disproportionate military expenditures and the future is quite uncertain work against the objectives of the New International Economic Order, which are sought in order to close the enormous gap that exists between the industrialized countries and the countries of the third world.

In addition to those comments on nuclear disarmament we should like to make the following observations. There must be security regarding nuclear fuels, as to avoid losses that might damage or allow material to fall into the hands of irresponsible parties. The question of the effects of radiation from nuclear explosions is a matter that has been addressed by my delegation in the Special Political Committee.

The purpose of these comments is to set forth the position of our country on three matters that we consider to be of basic importance.

First, nuclear disarmament is imperative because if it is achieved the greatest danger to the world will be removed.

Secondly, nuclear disarmament is the fundamental responsibility of the major Powers, which by means of bilateral and multilateral dialogue could agree on concrete measures to reduce and eliminate the nuclear arms race.

Thirdly, we believe that we must increase the general awareness that these measures must not be postponed and that a tense international atmosphere does not justify the cessation of negotiations, because a similar argument could be used regarding other disarmament measures.

It is really inconceivable that we have reached a point at which the world military balance is so precarious and sensitive that all that is needed is a political decision by one leader or group of leaders for the lives of the 4.5 billion people that make up the world's population to be snuffed out.

Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate you on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee of the General Assembly. At the same time I should like to express the confidence of my delegation that under your competent leadership the Committee will succeed in promoting the cause of disarmament and the strengthening of international peace and security.

The people and Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria are firmly convinced that at the present time there cannot possibly be any problem more vital than of eliminating the danger of the outbreak of a new world war and guaranteeing peace for present and future generations.

Given the current international situation, this problem has assumed an even greater intensity. Under pressure from militaristic elements of the worst kind in the Western military-industrial complex, those in certain leading circles have opted for a naked and open policy of undermining the process of détente and stiffening military confrontation.

In the view of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the increased direct threat to peace stems from the actions of those elements in their attempt forcibly to halt development of the positive process in international life and to intervene in the internal affairs of other peoples in pursuance of what is known as the "position-of-strength" policy in order to impose their will at the world level. Those actions were directly reflected in the unprecedented effort to disturb the approximate military and strategic parity that had been established between the two socio-political systems, in order to bring about decisive military superiority to the detriment of the countries of the socialist community.

With a view to achieving all those goals, a whole series of notorious actions was undertaken, beginning with the multi-billion-dollar NATO programme approved in May 1978 and including the December 1979 decision to deploy in certain Western European countries new medium-range nuclear missiles so as to achieve what is being called the new United States nuclear strategy, which has recently been proclaimed and which provides for the possibility of waging so-called limited but prolonged nuclear war. Within the over-all scheme designed to bring about military and strategic superiority a very important place is given to the

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

enlarging of present military blocs and the creation of new blocs, constantly increasing armies and the accelerated augmentation of arsenals of nuclear and conventional weapons. Together with those material war preparations, attempts are being made to legitimize the idea of a war in which nuclear weapons would be used. All those actions have been undertaken under the camouflage of a vast propaganda campaign that once again makes use of the outmoded myth of the Soviet military threat and the danger from the East.

To continue on that political course will inevitably lead to a sharp escalation of the arms race to the point of exacerbating even further the already bad international climate, in which disputes which are insignificant in normal conditions may in fact grow into open armed conflict with catastrophic consequences for the whole of mankind. The vital interests of the peoples of the world make it essential to put an end to this dangerous trend of events.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria wishes to state that it is firmly in favour of immediately undertaking effective measures liable to limit the scope of military confrontation, to reduce international tension and to bring about a more healthy over-all world climate. In the present circumstances, when the danger of war threatens not only one country or group of countries but the whole of mankind, the United Nations cannot remain passive.

On the basis of the position I have just outlined, the People's Republic of Bulgaria wishes to state its pleasure at the initiative taken by the Soviet Union to have included in the agenda of this session the item entitled "Urgent measures for reducing the danger of war". Now that that item has been allotted to the First Committee, our delegation would like to stress the great importance it attaches to an in-depth discussion of the subject and the adoption of a positive resolution on it. We consider that this Soviet initiative is an important and decisive step in the right direction. Its purpose is to draw the attention of Member States of our Organization to certain measures which, although they cannot solve all the problems, are particularly relevant and appropriate in the present international situation. Implementation of those measures would not only be of direct benefit in limiting the danger of war and reducing tension but would also have a considerable political effect.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

Now, when those who initiated the militarization and arms race are contriving to curb and impede the disarmament process, the adoption and implementation of the Soviet proposals would create conditions propitious for progress in other areas relating to the limitation of the arms race. In this context, we wish to stress another positive feature of the Soviet initiative - the fact that it embraces measures within the fields of both nuclear and conventional disarmament. On the basis of these considerations, the Peoples Republic of Bulgaria fully supports the concrete measures set forth in draft resolution A/35/247.

In the first place, we attach particular importance to attainment of a universal agreement that would prevent the expansion of existing military-political groupings and the creation of new blocs as a first step towards eliminating the division of the world into military blocs. The People's Republic of Bulgaria, together with the other socialist States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, has put forward proposals which have been repeatedly reaffirmed, and which still stand, with regard to dissolving their own organization provided that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) bloc is dissolved at the same time. As a first step towards the dismantling of the military organizations of the two groupings, their military activities could be reduced.

From the historical standpoint, it is undeniable that the Western countries bear responsibility for the creation of opposing military groupings in Europe. It was they, too, which scattered military blocs around the world. Attempts to bring in new States as members of NATO and to transform certain regional organizations into military groupings are entirely contrary to the interests of peace and security, because they lead to the very extension of the scope of military confrontation and to the heightened danger of war.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

The socialist countries are opposed in principle to the so-called bloc policy. In support of my statement I would adduce article 11 of the Warsaw Treaty, which states, inter alia:

"In the event of the establishment of a system of collective security in Europe and the conclusion for that purpose of a General European Treaty concerning collective security, a goal which the Contracting Parties shall steadfastly strive to achieve, the present Treaty shall cease to have effect as from the date on which the General European Treaty comes into force."

The specific proposal submitted by the Soviet Union is convincing proof of this. Its adoption and implementation would help to overcome the division of the world into military groupings, ease the confrontation between them and strengthen trust among peoples.

Secondly, I should like to comment briefly also on the proposal that all States - primarily the permanent members of the Security Council and countries associated with them through military arrangements - cease to increase, with effect from 1 January 1981, their armed forces and their conventional weapons as a first step towards their eventual reduction. We are convinced that agreement on this subject would have the immediate result of ending the quantitative race in conventional arms and would foster progress in nuclear disarmament. Reduction of military expenditures in this area, where they are heaviest, would have the effect of creating conditions favourable to solving problems of socio-economic development and other pressing problems, both nationally and globally.

Thirdly, the present international situation has highlighted to a great extent the need to strengthen security guarantees for non-nuclear States. I take this occasion to express once again the special interest of the People's Republic of Bulgaria in this matter. It is our view that a total and effective

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

On the basis of these considerations, the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers most timely the Soviet proposal that the General Assembly should appeal to all States participating in the negotiations of the Committee on General Disarmament on the elaboration of the aforementioned international convention to do their utmost to reach an agreement as soon as possible. An important step forward would be the implementation of the proposal that nuclear weapons States should make solemn declarations identical in content, that they would not resort to nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States which do not have such weapons on their territories.

We also support the idea that the Security Council should examine those declarations and, if it considered them to be in keeping with the aforementioned objective, adopt an appropriate resolution to approve them.

Fourthly, the idea that all nuclear States should refrain from carrying out any nuclear explosions for one year is a very useful one, because it is likely to speed up work on a treaty on the total and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. We are convinced that if all States taking part in negotiations on this subject were to adopt the same constructive approach, the treaty would soon become a reality.

In conclusion, I wish to express the deep conviction of the People's Republic of Bulgaria that, in spite of all the complexities of the international situation, there are real opportunities to eliminate the danger of war and to safeguard and strengthen the process of détente. There are no regional or global problems - including the complex problems of the arms race and disarmament itself - which cannot be solved through political dialogue and by negotiations in good faith, provided there is respect for the principles of equality and the non-impairment of the security of any State. That is the spirit of the aforementioned proposal before us. It is in keeping with the interests of peace and deserves unqualified support.

Now, the growing proportions of the threat to peace nowadays should not give rise to pessimism, but, rather, should encourage us to take vigorous action and to be ready to take practical measures.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

That is Bulgaria's approach to the pending fundamental problems of the modern world. In his speech to the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace, a vast international forum of world public opinion held from 23 to 30 September this year in Sofia, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and President of the Council of State of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, stated, inter alia:

"We are perfectly well aware that in the complicated world today there are contradictions which could lead to crises, to conflicts. But we know that today war is not a way of solving problems but it is the road to the mass self-destruction of mankind. However, we are firmly convinced that in the world today there are forces at work much stronger than the goals and ambitions of the militarists and it is these forces which can prevent them from reaching for their weapons."

Mr. VO ANH TUAN (Viet Nam) (interpretation from French):

Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like, on behalf of the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam to congratulate you on your election to the chairmanship of this Committee. You may rest assured of the whole-hearted co-operation of my delegation.

I should also like to congratulate the Vice Chairmen and the Rapporteur of the Committee.

In a world in which the marvellous advances of science and technology are unfortunately being used to develop and manufacture the most sophisticated weapons, where every year hundreds of billions of dollars are squandered on the arms race, where the stockpiles of nuclear weapons are more than enough to erase all life from this planet, disarmament has become a major concern and the struggle for disarmament is becoming one of the most urgent tasks of the international community.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

Thanks to the combined efforts of the socialist countries, the non-aligned countries and other peace-loving forces, the first Disarmament Decade, which has just ended, was marked by encouraging results: among other things, important international agreements on disarmament were signed; a system of bilateral and multilateral negotiation was established; negotiating and deliberating bodies were expanded; and at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, convened on the initiative of the non-aligned countries, a Final Document with useful recommendations was adopted. Although the concrete results of the first Disarmament Decade have in no way dispelled concern and met fully the aspirations of mankind to peace, they did at least show the path to follow and that it was possible to reach agreement on concrete measures in the disarmament field, giving grounds for the hope that those measures would be put into effect.

However, the imperialist and international reactionary forces have unfortunately sought by all possible means to reverse this felicitous trend, to sabotage détente and to accelerate the arms race. As a result, the United Nations has begun the second Disarmament Decade in an international situation which is worse and more tense.

In their statements in the general debate at this session of the General Assembly and in the First Committee, certain delegations have maintained that the events in Afghanistan are responsible for the worsening international situation and the lack of confidence among States, thus compelling the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to take appropriate measures to safeguard their security.

Where does the truth lie? The truth is that the events in Afghanistan took place in December 1979, while those factors which gave rise to the present international situation existed long before that time, at least as long ago as 1978, and those factors have nothing to do with the events in Afghanistan.

In May 1978 the Council of NATO took a fateful decision: to increase annually the military budget of the countries of that bloc, practically until the end of the century. For its part, the United States publicly announced its programme for increasing its armaments at a cost of billions of dollars.



(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

In December 1978 the NATO countries decided to manufacture and to station in western Europe American medium-range nuclear missiles, with the clear purpose of tilting the balance of military power in that part of the world in their favour.

The Soviet-American Treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons, SALT II, signed in June 1979, has not yet been ratified by the United States. The United States has always sought pretexts for delaying ratification, linking it now with the so-called presence of Soviet military units in Cuba, now with the situation in Iran, and even with the events in Afghanistan.

In the Indian Ocean the American military presence goes back more than 10 years, with the construction of huge bases in Diego Garcia. Recently Washington's decision to create the so-called rapid deployment force and to increase its naval forces in that Ocean have made the situation in that part of the world extremely tense, thus arousing a legitimate concern on the part of the peoples of the countries of the Indian Ocean basin.

This brief and far from exhaustive recapitulation of recent measures taken by the Western countries in the armaments field shows clearly that it is not the events in Afghanistan which caused the tension now prevailing in the world. Nor are those events responsible for the deadlock in which the disarmament negotiations are now to be found.

We therefore have to look elsewhere to find the underlying causes of the obstacles to efforts to strengthen détente and to make rapid progress on disarmament negotiations. If we take a quick look back over contemporary history we can see that it was the colonialist, imperialist and reactionary forces which became rich on the proceeds of war. That is why they have sought to launch wars of aggression, to step up the arms race and to impede and sabotage all efforts towards disarmament. It was those same forces which started the First and Second World Wars, which cost the lives of tens of millions of people. Since 1945 those same forces have undertaken wars of aggression in various parts of the world, in particular in South-East Asia, the Middle East and in southern Africa, along with the establishment of military bases on the territory of other countries and the creation of aggressive military blocs. They are engaged in an unbridled arms race, aimed at bringing about military supremacy and disrupting the balance of military power which has come about in the world.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

Over the last few years, in order to achieve their great-Power hegemonistic ambitions, the leaders in Peking have been in ever closer collusion with Washington in the military field and have purchased a large quantity of American military equipment, as well as military equipment from certain other countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in order to modernize their military machine and make China a first-class nuclear Power. At the same time China has been providing arms to reactionary régimes, to the rebels in Afghanistan and is co-operating with the apartheid régime in South Africa in maintaining armed UNITA gangs against Angola. What is particularly bad is that China provided all kinds of weapons to the genocidal Pol Pot régime throughout its existence so that it could massacre 3 million Kampucheans. At the present time China is continuing to supply the armed remnants of the Pol Pot régime which have taken refuge in a neighbouring country and pro-Chinese groups in several countries of South-East Asia with military equipment, so that they can continue their subversive and anti-government activities. Washington and Peking have also put forward some extremely dangerous military ideas. The American so-called new nuclear strategy has given rise to profound concern among the world's public because that strategy is based upon an extremely dangerous idea, that of limited nuclear war and is an attempt to make people believe that nuclear war is possible and even acceptable. In that regard it is worth recalling that the United States is the only country in the world ever to have used this type of weapon in war.

As for the Chinese leaders, they have constantly rehashed their theory that a third world war is inevitable so that they can plunge the world into great chaos and encourage other countries to make war against one another so that they will weaken one another, while China, enjoying a large measure of peace, can succeed in asserting its hegemony over the world. Are the Chinese leaders dreaming of building their world hegemony on the ashes of a world covered in nuclear fall-out? Because a third world war, once it broke out, would most probably degenerate into a nuclear war.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

The negative attitude of the United States and China is particularly clear in the disarmament negotiation bodies. The United States has hindered and even broken off certain negotiations with the Soviet Union in the disarmament field: it did not demonstrate a responsible attitude in the negotiations aimed at putting an end to the manufacture of all kinds of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing existing stockpiles of such arms with a view to their total elimination; and it tried to hold up the negotiations on the total and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. It also gave a negative response to the Soviet proposal for negotiations on a reduction in armed forces in Central Europe and it unilaterally broke off the Soviet-American negotiations on the limitation and gradual reduction of military presence in the Indian Ocean.

China, a nuclear Power and a permanent member of the Security Council, for its part continues to pursue an irresponsible policy with regard to disarmament. For many years it boycotted the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Only this year, finally bowing to the pressure of world public opinion, China felt itself obliged to take part in the work of the Committee on Disarmament; but it did nothing, however, to change its negative attitude. Instead of taking part in negotiations on matters of substance, it did everything it could, as has been quite properly pointed out by certain representatives of the non-aligned countries in the Committee on Disarmament, to carry out anti-Soviet activities within that Committee. Exploiting its chairmanship of the Committee on Disarmament for the month of March 1980, China engaged in shady manipulations to try to bring the Pol Pot people into the work of the Committee, with the result that the Committee became involved in lengthy and acrimonious procedural discussions and the participation of non-member States in the work of the Committee was held up for a long time, in contravention of the spirit and letter of rule 32 of the rules of procedure of the Committee on Disarmament.

The present international situation which has been made tense by the militaristic policies of aggressive forces places the peoples of the world before the growing danger of a major confrontation fraught with consequences. In the face of such a situation the international community must combine its efforts to prevent war and to take urgent measures to restore détente and strengthen peace, to prevent the arms race from exceeding the limits beyond which it will no longer be possible to stem the tide by means of international agreements.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

That is why the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam fully supports the initiatives put forward by the socialist and non-aligned countries to reduce tension in the world, to diminish the arms race and to reverse it and to achieve partial disarmament measures as steps towards general and complete disarmament. It is in this spirit that we particularly support the initiative of the Soviet Union which has submitted for the consideration of this session an item entitled "Urgent measures for reducing the danger of war".

At a time when certain NATO countries and international reactionaries are feverishly pursuing their policy of creating tension in various parts of the world, of expanding existing military blocs and creating new ones, of increasing their nuclear and conventional armaments and of preparing for war, the new Soviet proposals are particularly timely and relevant. Such measures, if they were put into effect, would without any doubt help to ease existing tensions, thus creating favourable conditions for curbing the nuclear and conventional arms race and improving the international climate.

The Soviet proposal not to expand existing politico-military groupings and not to create any new ones and not to assign military functions to regional organizations is not only of vital necessity today but at the same time reflects the position of principle of the socialist countries against the policy of blocs, of dividing the world into antagonistic military groupings. The Soviet Union and the other States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty have indeed often declared that they are ready to dissolve the Warsaw Treaty Organization if at the same time the NATO bloc were done away with and if as a first step the military organizations of both groups were eliminated, beginning with reciprocal reduction in military activities. Any impartial observer cannot but welcome such a logical, reasonable and constructive proposal.

In the view of my delegation it is quite clear that that proposal, as well as the other Soviet proposals regarding the limitation of and reduction in nuclear weapons, security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States and the renunciation of all nuclear explosions for the space of one year, is aimed at serving the legitimate interests of all countries and creating an atmosphere of mutual trust and conditions propitious for new progress in the field of the limitation of the arms race.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

The struggle of the peoples of the world for disarmament is a long-term task which requires tireless efforts on the part of all those who hold dear the cause of peace, security and international co-operation. At the present time, there is no lack of initiatives or forums for conducting serious negotiations in order gradually to satisfy the deep-seated aspirations of the international community to general and complete disarmament. What is lacking is the political will of the imperialist and international reactionary elements, which persist in their arms race and their war preparations. As the Foreign Minister of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam said in the general debate of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly:

"However, the chances of preventing war and preserving peace are greater now than they were before the Second World War and better than they were in the 1950s and 1960s. The days when imperialism, relying on its supremacy in material resources and arms, made use of war as a means of dominating peoples are past, especially after the defeat of the American aggression against Viet Nam. More than ever before, our peoples have a real opportunity to prevent world war, to preserve international peace and security and to bring about peaceful coexistence among countries with different social régimes."

(A/35/PV.11, p. 26)

The CHAIRMAN: I have received a request from a delegation to be allowed to exercise the right of reply.

Since this is the first time that a delegation wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply, I should like to recall the relevant provisions of General Assembly decision 34/401:

"Delegations should exercise their right of reply at the end of the day whenever two meetings have been scheduled for that day and whenever such meetings are devoted to the consideration of the same item."

Since we have scheduled only one meeting for today, the right of reply can be exercised at the end of this morning's meeting.

(The Chairman)

The decision also states:

"The number of interventions in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation at a given meeting should be limited to two per item.

"The first intervention in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation on any item at a given meeting should be limited to 10 minutes and the second intervention should be limited to five minutes."

I shall now call on representatives who wish to exercise the right of reply.

Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic): On behalf of my delegation, I have to state the following. We vehemently reject the statement of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the decision of the German Democratic Republic on minimum foreign exchange rates for visitors to my country. That statement must be regarded as blatant interference in the internal affairs of the German Democratic Republic. By a sovereign decision, my Government has taken measures that fall exclusively within its own competence.

The remarks of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany demonstrate anew that certain people continue to be lost in their chauvinistic ideas and cannot put up with the existence of the Socialist German Democratic Republic.

Mr. KRUTZSCH (Federal Republic of Germany): With regard to the statement just made by the representative of the German Democratic Republic, I wish to draw the Committee's attention to a declaration of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg in which the Council dealt with this question. The Council criticized the decision taken with regard to the increase of the minimum foreign exchange requirements as a contravention of the spirit and the letter of the Final Act of Helsinki.

## PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: There will be no meeting on the morning of 23 October because on that day His Excellency Mr. Ramphal, the Secretary-General of the Commonwealth Secretariat, will address the non-governmental organizations in this conference room as part of the United Nations celebrations in connexion with Disarmament Week. As representatives know, Mr. Ramphal is a former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Guyana, was a member of the Brandt Commission and is a designated member of the Palme Commission. After his address a film will be shown.

I should like to inform representatives that our meeting at 10.30 a.m. on 24 October will be devoted to Disarmament Week. Messages from the President of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General of the United Nations will be read, and the Chairmen of the regional groups will also make statements.

Before I adjourn the meeting, I should like once again to remind representatives that the list of speakers will be closed tomorrow, Tuesday 21 October, at 6 p.m. Therefore, I again urge members of the Committee to inscribe their names on the list of speakers.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.