

United Nations

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records*



UN/SA COLLECTION

FIRST COMMITTEE

12th meeting

held on

Thursday, 23 October 1980

at 3 p.m.

New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 12TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. OYONO (United Republic of Cameroon)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

- General debate

A statement was made by:

Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan)
Mr. Wyzner (Poland)
Mr. Kostov (Bulgaria)
Mr. de Laiglesia (Spain)
Mr. Bole (Fiji)
Mr. Erdembileg (Mongolia)

* 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, 56 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.12
24 October 1980

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31 to 49 and 121 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I feel privileged to join the other delegations in congratulating Mr. Naik of Pakistan on his election as Chairman of the First Committee. His eminent role in the United Nations, including the field of disarmament, which is the major concern and challenge before this most important Committee of the General Assembly, has been given concrete recognition in his election as Chairman of the Committee. I wish to extend my delegation's congratulations and best wishes also to the other officers of the Committee.

A landmark in the ardent pursuit by the United Nations of the goal of general and complete disarmament was universally acknowledged in the Final Document adopted by consensus by all Member States at the tenth special session of the General Assembly, which was devoted to disarmament, held from 23 May to 30 June 1978. The programme of action was almost all-inclusive, covering basic priorities and the vitalization of the machinery in the deliberative as well as the negotiating bodies. The Disarmament Commission was re-established as a deliberative body, and the Committee on Disarmament was to continue its work as the negotiating body. Thus basic objectives were defined and articulated, with the participation of Heads of State and Government; the forums, the tools and the techniques for achieving those basic goals were perfected or at least augmented and improved.

Yet, with all the euphoria and the hopes - and I remember them distinctly - that accompanied that historic session on disarmament in 1978, people all over the world feel a sense of profound let-down, of accelerating descent into a situation of crisis and deep concern over the peace, the stability and even the survival of the world.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

Instead of gradual and measured limitation, as we had hoped, of armaments, both nuclear and conventional, under appropriate international supervision, we find ourselves today in the quagmire of an unbridled and heedless arms race whose only consequence would be a further erosion rather than a strengthening of world peace and security. No matter how much we try to sugar-coat this fact, it is the truth, which most citizens of the world feel very deeply about.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

The trend in the world today is no longer a trend towards further confidence-building measures but an intensified drift towards acute tensions and brinksmanship.

What we hear today is a debate on the possibilities of war and peace as though war in the nuclear age were feasible and conceivable, and not globally terminal, particularly if it were to involve the super-Powers. That is what we read and hear every day. There are already at least 40,000 to 50,000 nuclear warheads, or the equivalent of some 13 billion tons of TNT according to the comprehensive study on nuclear weapons in document A/35/392 dated 12 September 1980. There can therefore be no winner or loser in a nuclear holocaust. Any additions to this arsenal would simply be an uncalled-for waste of precious resources in a world which is already facing extremely serious economic and social ills. And if we look in depth, such economic and social ills have always been the underlying causes of international conflicts. The accelerating arms race and the ever increasing threat of global destruction has been and will continue to be the nightmare which overshadows the fate and future of all peoples.

It is not accidental that the First Committee was named the "Political Committee" rather than the "Committee on Disarmament", even though disarmament and the maintenance of peace are its cardinal concerns. For it is the view of my delegation that no matter how much we perfect the instruments, the machinery and the identification of what is going on in the armaments race - and we have plenty of literature accumulating on the subject - all our efforts will be to no avail and indeed an exercise in futility unless and until the policy decision-makers at the highest levels articulate and exercise the necessary political will, to acknowledge that wars in the nuclear age are not only unprofitable but also inconceivable.

This is perhaps ostensibly over-simplistic and does not take into account some of the legitimate concerns and fears of nation States and power blocs.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

The crux of the matter is that unless disarmament is dealt with in a broader and historical perspective, with a coherent and integrated approach and within a framework of national and international life in their totality, human nature in its complexity and the laws and norms of international conduct based upon legitimacy, justice and understanding and not on selfish aggression and aggrandizement, or the political, social, psychological and cultural dimensions which motivate the behaviour of nations, our debate and its outcome will at worst come to naught and at best produce a largely cosmetic or minimal change, with little impact upon the awesome prospect of the self-extinction of the only planet in the universe where so far scientists have discovered conditions which are amenable to the existence of life as we know it.

Weapons systems - and they are becoming more sophisticated and destructive every day - are not self-propelled. As with a computer, the miraculous and expeditious performance of a weapons system depends not on its metal and wiring but on the human mind which has fed into it the relevant data for solving pertinent problems. It is political will, therefore, based on sound perceptions and a realistic recognition of the consequences of every step that policy makers take, which ultimately decides issues of war or peace, détente or conflict, fear or trust and regulates other complex traits and impulses which are continually competing within every human nature.

The only bright spot on the horizon is a mutation of consciousness in favour of peaceful coexistence based upon law, mutual respect, justice and enlightened national self-interest, not a narrow misperception of national interest. Let us hope that human nature is not immutable but is amenable to rational transformation. If we have not had a third global war as yet - and I hope we never shall - even though we have had many limited wars since the Second World War, it is not because of any lack of slogans or ideologies, the substantial lessening of fears and tension, assumed self-righteousness or remorse for the massacres of the past.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

It is largely because a third global war would indeed fulfil the proclamations about the First World War to the effect that it would be the war to end all wars because it would end existence and livable life on this small planet and would consequently deprive the pugnacious human of indulgence in the atrocious game of war.

The truth is that humankind has, for the first time in its recorded history, become super, not in ethics, morality, justice or human trust, but in its ability, through mastering and manipulating the latent forces of physical nature - and these are infinite; we are just at the start, at the outset - to a degree sufficient to inflict upon itself the final act of total self-extermination.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

As a human being entrusted by the Creator with the unique privilege of developing and enriching human life, man has remained, on the ethical and even on the rational scale, an infantile delinquent. I cannot see much difference between the leaders of 2,000 years ago and the leaders that have already brought about heaven knows how many wars during this century. Neither moral imperatives nor pure reason seem to ensure meaningful constraints upon man's behaviour.

With all due respect to the powers that be, the many items on our agenda on disarmament and the treaties arrived at outside the framework of the United Nations, such as SALT II, which my Government hopes will be ratified at the earliest possible date, one cannot but feel overwhelmingly saddened when the questions of disarmament are still being negotiated piecemeal and in terms of numbers of ICBMs, mobile versus silo-launched missiles, long-range bombers, cruise missiles, nuclear submarines, neutron bombs, payloads of destruction of this or that magnitude, laser beams, radiological weapons systems, chemical weapons and bacteriological weapons - and heaven knows what other new and more destructive weapons are secretly being developed right now. We shall learn about them only several years from now.

I am not in the least advocating that we should bury our heads in the sand or give up tackling these issues patiently and piecemeal, provided they are within a comprehensive framework. We cannot afford to give up in despair. Any contribution by statesmen and experts - and, of course, by our First Committee - in their efforts to bring about a gradual limitation on armaments and non-proliferation are highly laudable and must be fully supported. Indeed, the apprehensions of the big Powers are all the more formidable on account of their greater inside knowledge of what the capabilities of the arsenals of destruction are and will be.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

The Jinnee is irretrievably out of the bottle. Our task is to work out how best to harness its awesome power for life-sustaining rather than life-destroying purposes.

The political dimension of disarmament should always be uppermost in our minds as we plough through the intricacies of the disarmament items on our agenda.

Mr. WYZNER (Poland): In my first statement in the disarmament debate a few days ago, I dealt with the important issues raised, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, in agenda item 121. Today I should like, in particular, to refer to those items on the agenda of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly that are covered in the annual report of the Committee on Disarmament or which otherwise concern efforts pursued during 1980 at Geneva and elsewhere.

Significantly enough, the questions of détente, international security and world peace were the keynote of the majority of statements during the general debate of the current session of the General Assembly.

In that regard, the debate has highlighted a virtual consensus as to the urgency of constructive steps to halt and reverse the arms race, to bring about measures of genuine disarmament and to consolidate détente in Europe and encourage peaceful co-operation between all nations. On this score, Poland's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Jozef Czyrek, stated in his address to the General Assembly last month:

"Our Polish experience of history and the vital interests of all nations generate a desire that the world follow a road based on peaceful co-existence, strengthening of mutual understanding and just, equitable co-operation and on the implementation of the noble, humanistic purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. It cannot, however, be based on the escalation of dangerous and costly armaments, the incitement of mutual distrust and the creation of ever-new tensions." (A/35/PV.10, p.23)

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

As the international community stands on the threshold of the Second Disarmament Decade, and as it marks the 10th anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, it is aware, of course, that not all goals set for the first Decade have been attained and that, regrettably, insufficient progress has been reached so far in an effort to halt and reverse the arms race and to consolidate international security. At the same time, we cannot ignore the unquestionable record of the Decade. Perhaps its most remarkable result has been the consolidation of the process of détente and co-operation based on the principles of peaceful co-existence. Intrinsicly associated with Europe, that process proved beneficial to the world at large, bringing tangible gains virtually to all States and peoples.

Seeking to identify the most timely and pressing targets for the Second Disarmament Decade, we must be clear not only about the specific order of priorities but about the origin and nature of difficulties which need to be overcome fast if our quest for disarmament and security in the world is to be more successful during the second Decade than it was during the first. The Polish delegation believes that the most urgent targets for the Second Disarmament Decade must include the consolidation of détente and resolute measures to halt and reverse the impending new spiral of the arms race. They must also include the strict implementation and observance of the principle of the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 34/103 of 1979.

My delegation attaches quite particular importance to two issues - the SALT II agreements and the fateful decision concerning the deployment in Western Europe of new types of nuclear missile weapons.

My country - as, indeed, did many others - hailed the signature in Vienna of the SALT II documents as an act of historic significance which, as we all then believed, would reduce the danger of nuclear conflict, promote détente and restrain the most dangerous manifestations of the arms race. Those expectations are yet to materialize. Indeed, we trust that the SALT II agreements, responding not only to the vital interests of the Soviet Union and the United States but to the cause of world peace and security, will be ratified at the earliest possible date, thus paving the way to SALT III negotiations.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

Mindful of its historical experience, Poland is directly and vitally interested in halting and reversing the nuclear arms race, especially in Europe. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) decision to bring new types of nuclear missile systems to Europe has become a factor hindering the process of détente to a degree which goes beyond the European continent. That decision imposes on Europe a new round of the technologically sophisticated and hence costly arms race, which would upset the existing parity of military potential. For these reasons, Poland firmly supports the Soviet proposal concerning concurrent and organically linked negotiations on medium range nuclear missile systems in Europe and United States forward based nuclear systems.

Poland therefore welcomed with satisfaction the fact that a negotiating process was inaugurated by the Soviet Union and the United States in Geneva on 17 October. We wish the negotiating parties early success in their efforts which it is hoped will offer a realistic chance of sparing Europe yet another debilitating round of the arms race.

In our view, the constructive and consistent implementation of the Programme of Action embodied in the Final Document of the tenth special session would significantly promote military détente, if only because of its reaffirmation of the basic principles: equal security for all at the lowest possible level of military potential and balance of force. We believe that strict respect for those principles could pave the way for meaningful progress in the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. Poland and other nations of that region urgently need such progress to bring down the dangerously high level of military confrontation which obtains in that part of the European continent.

Considering the realities of the situation now prevailing in Europe, we believe that there is an urgent need to proceed to the elaboration of a satisfactory negotiating formula concerning military détente and disarmament. That could be done most appropriately by taking up and

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

and developing the idea of a conference devoted to that question, as proposed by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty. Stressing that there is no acceptable alternative to the policy of détente, the Foreign Ministers of States members of the Warsaw Treaty, who met in the Polish capital on 19 and 20 October, stated that a decision to hold a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe would represent an important element in the development of a Europe-wide process, inaugurated by the 1975 Helsinki meeting of the leaders of European States, the United States and Canada.

As is well known, Poland has offered to host the conference in Warsaw, and we believe that an appropriate decision on the timing and venue of the conference will be adopted at the forthcoming Madrid meeting of the participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE).

I should now like to turn to those specific issues on which the Committee on Disarmament focused its attention earlier this year. To begin with, my delegation is not alone, I believe, in finding the Committee's voluminous report both informative and interesting, while at the same time somewhat disappointing.

Even a cursory examination of the Committee's report indicates that its 1980 session marked an important departure point, both procedural and substantive, in the multilateral approach to disarmament negotiations.

By establishing four different subsidiary bodies, that organ made a commendable attempt to pass from the traditional modality of general considerations to a more pragmatic and constructive examination of the specific priority items on its agenda. Thus, to some extent the Committee was able to live up to its designation by the tenth special session as "a single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum" (resolution S-10/2, para. 120).

At the same time, a sense of disappointment is generated by the lack of definite disarmament measures in the form of concrete draft agreements, especially in the fields of a comprehensive test ban and chemical weapons. We also

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

regret the Committee's failure to submit to the General Assembly at its current session, as we had every reason to expect, a concrete draft of a multilateral convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons. In the view of many delegations, in that area, given goodwill and determination on the part of all members of the Committee, there was a practical possibility of elaborating such an agreed draft.

Poland attaches the highest importance to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and to nuclear disarmament -- a position fully consistent with the priorities set by the tenth special session of the General Assembly and the realities of the nuclear age. It takes no exceptional perspicacity to conclude that the greatest and most immediate threat to world peace and security derives at the present time not only from nuclear hardware -- the technological sophistication of the nuclear arsenals -- but equally from nuclear software -- the false assumptions and doctrines suggesting that nuclear war, a limited nuclear war, may be fought and can be won. The greatest and most immediate threat to us all, to civilization as we know it today, appears to come from those who are prepared to destroy the world "in order to save it".

It is therefore comforting to find in the Committee's report evidence that the gravity of the nuclear danger and the urgency of effective nuclear disarmament were fully appreciated in Geneva by an overwhelming majority of the Committee's members. Following on their previous proposals, the socialist countries, among them Poland, urged practical negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed.

The urgency of reaching an agreement on a comprehensive nuclear weapon test ban treaty and its fundamental significance for the cessation of the nuclear arms race are likewise unquestionable. In that respect, the Final Document of the special session contains very specific and clear language, as in fact do countless other General Assembly resolutions. Its topicality was

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

abruptly brought home to us a few days ago as the radioactive cloud from an atmospheric nuclear explosion conducted recently on the Asian continent passed over New York.

The feasibility of an early agreement to ban such explosions is fully corroborated by the findings of the ad hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events, which form part of the report of the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

Against that background Poland, like many other countries members of the Committee, welcomed with satisfaction the tripartite report on the status of negotiations between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union on a treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests in all environments and its protocol covering nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. The significance of that document resides perhaps not so much in the indication of progress made by the three negotiating Powers as in the expression of a strong political commitment of the three Powers to the completion of their task. The initiative of the Soviet Union concerning the declaration of a moratorium on such tests is only the latest manifestation of that commitment by the Soviet Union.

Poland has always considered that the importance of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons rests in the fact that it effectively contributes to the limitation of the territorial scope of the nuclear-arms race. The stabilizing effect of the Non-Proliferation Treaty takes on special meaning today, when numerous destabilizing factors tend increasingly to erode international security. Viewed from this angle, the preservation and strengthening of the non-proliferation régime is one of the basic premises of world security today and in the years ahead.

The scrutiny to which the implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty was recently subjected at its Second Review Conference has made a valid contribution to the consolidation and sustained usefulness of the Treaty. Above everything else, it has confirmed that the principal provisions of the Treaty - the prohibitions contained in articles I and II - have been strictly observed and that there has been no violation of the Treaty by any of the parties thereto.

While an important divergence of views emerged in the assessment of other provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, few States parties to it deemed it appropriate or justified to level any criticism at the Treaty itself or its objectives. Although no final declaration has been agreed upon, the results of the review process testify unequivocally to the general recognition of the imperative requirement of the universalization of the Treaty as well as of the pressing need to further enhance its effectiveness. In this context, my delegation considers that the positive evaluation of the role played by the International Atomic Agency (IAEA), especially within the framework of its safeguards mandate,

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

is well deserved even though the safeguards function of the Agency needs continuous streamlining and improvement.

While attaching the highest importance to the question of nuclear disarmament, my country is aware that other weapons of mass destruction may be in the arsenals of States and that other still more lethal types of such weapons can be developed unless determined efforts are made without further delay.

In this regard, my delegation notes with satisfaction that the work of the Committee on Disarmament in 1980 appears to have been somewhat more rewarding, at least in the field of the elimination of chemical weapons - an area of traditional interest to Poland.

Owing to the establishment of an ad hoc working group under the leadership of Ambassador Okawa of Japan, the Committee was able to undertake an ambitious effort reconciling a multilateral approach to the prohibition of chemical weapons with the ongoing bilateral Soviet-United States negotiations. By turning to a more pragmatic, in-depth examination of specific issues to be dealt with in a negotiating process ultimately leading to the elaboration of an effective and complete ban on chemical weapons, the Committee on Disarmament responded in a constructive way to the request which the General Assembly addressed to it in resolution 34/72. We share the view of those delegations which feel that, as a result of this year's work, a solid foundation has been laid on which to continue and advance in 1981 the efforts aimed at the elaboration of an appropriate chemical weapons convention.

As is well known, for Poland an appropriate chemical weapons convention means, first and foremost, an agreement comprehensive in scope that does not detract from other multilateral agreements. It must, of course, be verifiable and the verification procedures must be effective, adequate and commensurate with the scope of prohibition.

The ever-present threat of a technological breakthrough in the field of chemical weapons leaves no room for further tolerance of the existing state of affairs. The realistic possibility of elaborating a universally acceptable chemical weapons convention must not be put off until tomorrow. We therefore feel that it is imperative that every effort be exerted for the speediest conclusion of the negotiations on the prohibition of the development, production

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction. Accordingly, in our view the General Assembly should urge the Committee on Disarmament again to continue with determination and dispatch its useful and promising work in regard to the elimination of chemical weapons. As on a number of past occasions, the Polish delegation is once again prepared to take an active part, together with other interested delegations, in the elaboration and presentation to the Committee of a draft chemical weapons resolution that could gain general support in this Committee.

While pressing for an urgent solution to the chemical weapons problem, we do not necessarily subscribe to the proposition that the horizon of disarmament efforts should or need be narrowed to one area. In fact, when it comes to weapons of mass destruction, the international community must not lose sight of the broader threat of new types of such weapons that can appear as a result of vast research and development programmes. This is why the socialist States have formulated a proposal to reach an agreement on a comprehensive ban on the development of weapons of mass destruction. At the same time, identified types of such weapons, such as the neutron weapons, should be banned under individual agreements on a contractual basis.

In our view, the question of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction should be carefully monitored by the international community. To this end, we support the idea first formulated in the Committee on Disarmament by the USSR that a special ad hoc expert group be established for this purpose under the auspices of the Committee.

The amount of attention which the Committee and its subsidiary body have so far devoted to the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament seems to justify our confidence that the deadline for the elaboration of such a programme - the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament - will be successfully met. Evidently this would be hardly possible without the constructive guidance which the United Nations Disarmament Commission continued to offer to the Geneva negotiating organ in 1980.

When drafting a comprehensive programme of disarmament, we must bear in mind that in the nuclear age there is no alternative to peace and that therefore we must seek to disprove the saying that the history of mankind "est faite de guerres gagnées et de paix perdues". Drafted on the basis of the Final Document

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, such a programme must assure and strengthen peace in the interest of present and future generations. This goal, as it will be recalled, has also inspired the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, which the General Assembly adopted at its thirty-third session and which has definite relevance also in the context of disarmament.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

The United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects belongs to the category of positive disarmament efforts. The successful completion of its work on the format of the general agreement and the three protocols on specific weapons represents, we believe, an important achievement of 1980 to which my country, has made a valid contribution, as indeed have many others.

That Conference and its results are only one illustration of the fact that there is no issue that is too difficult to be discussed, considered or negotiated with a view to its successful solution, as long as all the parties involved are prepared to demonstrate flexibility and the indispensable political will. Such will stems from the understanding of the vital significance of the most important factor, the consolidation of international peace and security through effective disarmament.

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): I should like in this statement to outline the views of the People's Republic of Bulgaria on certain topical aspects of the problem of halting the arms race and making headway in the process of disarmament. Some of these questions are dealt with in the Soviet memorandum (A/35/482) and in the report of the Committee on Disarmament (A/35/27).

We have listened with great interest to the statements made so far and we share the deep concern expressed by the vast majority of States at the deterioration of the international situation brought about by the imperialist and hegemonistic forces that cast a long shadow over the negotiating process in the field of disarmament. The continuing stockpiling and sophistication of armaments that has been going on unabated for many years is now acquiring unprecedented proportions. For a long time now it has been known that the existing stocks of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery of those weapons are more than sufficient to destroy not once but many times over what we generally call human civilization.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

Faced with that situation people's common sense now rebels against the very meaning of the persistent arms race. The peoples of the world see clearly that the ability to destroy life on the planet many times over will not secure real superiority for anyone, since a person or a nation can be destroyed only once. In that context military superiority, even as a notion, becomes devoid of meaning. The only outcome of the continuance of the arms race would be the ever greater risk of a thermonuclear conflagration and the burdening of peoples with a still heavier load of military expenditures.

These are the main conclusions reached by the participants in the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace, held last September in my country's capital, Sofia, which was a major international forum of the world movement for peace, with the participation of 2,260 delegates and guests from 134 countries, representing 302 political parties and international organizations.

The stand of the Bulgarian people was spelt out by Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and Chairman of the State Council, who said in his address:

Not only does the arms race increase the danger of war, but in essence it is a war which is bloodless only in appearance, since with the efforts and resources it consumes, mankind could have saved from poverty, famine, disease and death hundreds of millions of children."

It is with that awareness in mind that we have to point out, very regretfully, that there has been no breakthrough in the struggle to put an end to the arms race.

We are witnessing a resurrection of sorts of the ambitions in certain milieux in the United States and in other Western countries to achieve military superiority over the socialist countries and to regain their positions as policemen of the world. Those forces are guided by various interests, economic, political and ideological. All of them, however, are united by one goal, that is, the continuance of the arms race with the aim of obtaining military superiority and upsetting the strategic military balance of forces in the world. Particularly dangerous is the assimilation of the question of war and peace and of the balance of strategic forces into election issues in certain countries, coupled with speculation on the subject of a so-called Soviet strategic superiority.

Past experience teaches us that election rhetoric always has the consequence of feeding the arms race. For many years that line of policy has been causing the deliberate stalling of the disarmament talks, the lack of real practical measures in that field, the rejection from the very outset of a number of constructive proposals and initiatives and persistent attempts to obtain unilateral advantages in the negotiations. No wonder that precisely when the problems of military détente came to the fore and even more urgent disarmament measures were needed some member States of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) resorted to deliberately causing the deterioration of the international situation and embarked on an open-ended course of accelerated military build-up.

My delegation has already had the opportunity to state its negative attitude to actions leading to an escalation of military confrontation and an enhanced risk of war. At this critical moment when humanity is faced with yet another unfettered round in the stockpiling and sophistication of armaments, the socialist countries call again for the initiation of constructive and open discussions based on the principle of military parity and the rejection of all attempts to seek unilateral advantages. At this session the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are reiterating, as they have done many times in the past, their willingness to conduct negotiations with a view to the curtailment or the prohibition of every type of weapon on the basis of reciprocity and without impairing the security of the parties. That stand was reaffirmed at the meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the member States of the Warsaw Treaty that has just ended in Warsaw.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

We strongly favour the immediate resumption and continuation of the talks, which are either deadlocked or suspended, and the initiation of new talks on the topical aspects of disarmament which have not been addressed so far.

The termination of the arms race is an exceedingly complex, yet not unattainable, goal, whose achievement requires political will and an honest and objective approach to the problem. The initiation of negotiations on the prohibition of the manufacture of all types of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of their stockpiles until they are completely eliminated is the first necessary step, which has to be taken without further delay. The efforts for taking measures to strengthen the system of political and international legal guarantees for the security of States must continue at a comparable pace.

The continuation of the process of the limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear weapons would impart a sizeable impetus to the nuclear disarmament efforts, and a first step in that direction would be the early ratification and entry into force of the SALT II treaty.

The vast nuclear arsenals and the spiralling qualitative nuclear arms race have raised yet another serious problem, namely, that of the prevention of the possibility of a surprise or unauthorized attack or accidental use of nuclear weapons. The gravity of such a threat has been confirmed by the repeated events among the armed forces of the United States involving false nuclear alarms which brought the world, on those occasions, to the brink of the precipice of a nuclear holocaust. Those incidents, which have aroused legitimate concern, cannot be viewed as innocent blunders or inevitable technical failures. On the contrary, they should be considered in the light of the unpredictable consequences that may follow.

Another source of legitimate concern is the so-called new nuclear strategy recently announced by the United States Government, the main goal of which, in our opinion, is to get public opinion accustomed to the idea of the permissibility of a "limited nuclear war".

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

It is hardly necessary to prove how naive it can be to consider that, in the world of today, there can be such a thing as "limited nuclear war". In a confrontation between nuclear-equipped armies, a rapid nuclear escalation would occur with loss for all.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria reaffirms its conviction that the continuation of efforts to prevent the danger of nuclear proliferation is a major avenue in the common struggle for ending the nuclear arms race. In our opinion, the right road in this key direction lies through the strengthening of the safeguards against the proliferation of nuclear weapons laid down in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons by making its membership universal. That is all the more urgent in view of the nuclear ambitions of such States as South Africa and Israel.

The Second Review Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons has reaffirmed that the Treaty is a reliable instrument for reducing the danger of nuclear war and for promoting international co-operation in the application of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons must, therefore, become a strict and binding instrument of international relations.

The conclusion of a convention on the strengthening of the guarantees for the security of non-nuclear States and of an agreement on the non-placement of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would also be vital for strengthening the safeguards against the proliferation of nuclear weapons. That would be in the interest not only of the non-nuclear States but of all States in the world. Bulgaria has committed itself to a serious and thorough consideration of those problems in the Disarmament Committee.

With respect to the problem of guarantees for the security of non-nuclear States against the threat or use of nuclear weapons, we are of the opinion that the active continuation of the work of analysing the different formulas which have appeared in the declarations of the nuclear-weapon States is of prime importance. The overriding objective must, therefore, be a search for a common formula acceptable to all, one which could be included in a future international convention or any international instrument of a legally binding character.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

My country unswervingly supports the idea of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace in various parts of the world. We resolutely support the efforts of the States of the Indian Ocean to make the region a zone of peace. The convening of a conference for that purpose in 1981 would be a significant step in that direction. There is no doubt whatsoever that the basic hurdle to be overcome in the establishment of such a zone is the growing military presence of the United States and its hectic activities for the expansion of the old military bases in the region and the creation of new ones. The immediate resumption of the bilateral Soviet-American talks on the limitation and consequent reduction of military activities in that region, as proposed by the Soviet Union, would be a necessary and timely measure.

The problem of the early complete prohibition of chemical weapons is still high on the agenda. Active bilateral talks between the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as negotiations within the framework of the Committee on Disarmament, will be necessary for the achievement of that aim. However, there is a growing conviction that the ultimate success of those talks will depend, in the final analysis, on the political will of the Western States and their preparedness to enter into an agreement. This conclusion has been reinforced by reports in the press about the intentions of some States to continue the improvement of chemical weapons and to increase their production. In this context, it is quite apparent what is behind the attempts to arouse suspicion by contending that some socialist countries have allegedly used chemical weapons, thus violating the provisions of the Convention on the Prohibition of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons.

The problem of the prohibition of the development and production of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction is becoming increasingly topical. My delegation is convinced that the settlement of that problem requires the elaboration of a comprehensive agreement of a preventive character and, where

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

necessary, of agreements on the different new types of weapons of mass destruction. An example of such an agreement is the treaty on the prohibition of radiological weapons. We think that the necessary prerequisites for its final conclusion are at hand and that the Committee on Disarmament must avail itself of this opportunity without delay. Nor should there be any further delay in concluding an international convention on the complete prohibition of neutron weapons. A draft to that effect is before the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

The reduction of the military budgets of the States having large economic and military potential, in terms of percentages or absolute figures, would lead directly to the curbing of military spending and would moreover, have a significant political and economic effect. We submit that what we need now is the immediate initiation of direct talks on the scale of those reductions rather than any sort of studies.

The forthcoming second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament demands that we focus our attention on the fullest implementation of the decisions of the first special session. Parallel with efforts to elaborate new measures in this field, more attention should be focused on the problem of enhancing the effectiveness of the disarmament instruments already in force. That could be achieved through universalization of those instruments. In that regard the United Nations can and should contribute by calling upon all States that have not yet done so to consider acceding to the international disarmament instruments.

In conclusion I should like to point out that now more than ever before there is an urgent need to make headway in the field of military détente and disarmament in Europe. The proposals of the Warsaw Treaty member States regarding this problem call for recognizing established strategic and political realities on the continent of Europe without tipping the existing approximate military balance in any side's favour, and the taking of steps for gradually reducing its level. While reaffirming all their proposals to that effect, the socialist countries emphasize in particular the important role to be played by a future conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe.

Practical possibilities for the cessation of the arms race were opened up with the proposal of the Soviet Union to start negotiations immediately on medium-range nuclear missiles along with and in close relationship with the forward-based United States nuclear missile forces. It would be in the interests of peace and security for the peoples of Europe and the world if the talks on the substance of this issue, including the aforementioned items, were to begin as soon as possible.

The new proposals of the socialist countries put forward in July last at the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

armaments in Central Europe constitute a possible breakthrough in the long and unwarranted stalemate in those talks. In view of those essentially compromise proposals as well as the example set by the socialist States with the unilateral withdrawal of a 20,000-strong Soviet military contingent from Central Europe, it is now up to the Western States to make a corresponding gesture of political goodwill.

Finally I should like to assure the Committee that my delegation is prepared to work constructively in this body in order to achieve consensus resolutions on the important items with which we must all deal at this session.

Mr. de LAIGLESIA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish):

Mr. Chairman, I should like first to say how happy we are to see you guiding the work of the First Committee. Your wide experience is the best guarantee that the far from easy tasks of our Committee will be carried to a happy conclusion. I should like also to congratulate the other officers of the Committee on their election.

In this its first statement in the general debate on disarmament the Spanish delegation intends to focus its attention on one of the questions to which, as is well known, we attach the highest importance. I refer to the question of conventional disarmament, and in particular the proposal for the preparation of an extensive study covering all its aspects. Subsequently, in a future statement in this same general debate, my delegation will have occasion to give its views on other items among those included in the First Committee's agenda. Today, let me say again, I wish to confine my remarks to certain considerations relating to the arms race and conventional disarmament, as well as to an analysis of this whole question.

Both in the General Assembly and in the United Nations Disarmament Commission the Spanish delegation has been stressing the desirability of elaborating a general approach to questions relating to conventional disarmament. One of the results of this concern of the Spanish delegation - and, indeed, of many other delegations - was the wide support given in the Disarmament Commission to the idea of recommending to the General Assembly

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

that at its present regular session it agree on the preparation of a study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces, as set forth in the Commission's report.

Before dealing with certain considerations of a general nature regarding the possible content of that study, the Spanish delegation wishes to state quite clearly its view that preparations for the study should be approved at the present session and not later - and for a very simple reason. The second special session of the General Assembly to be devoted to disarmament is to be held in 1982. One of the items to be considered then is the question of conventional disarmament. It would therefore be most useful to have a study, to be carried out following the usual practice of our Organization by a group of qualified experts to be appointed by the Secretary-General on the basis of equitable geographical distribution. That study would make it possible to identify the various elements of such a complex question and would greatly facilitate the work of the special session. However, if we want the study to be ready by then, there is no point in further delaying its preparation. If, as my delegation understands, the General Assembly is to decide to adopt that proposal now, the group of experts to be established will have little more than a year to complete elaboration of that study. It is therefore of the utmost importance for the First Committee and the General Assembly to take a positive decision this year.

We are fully aware of the complexity of the question of conventional disarmament and the reluctance its mere mention engenders. Nor are we unaware of, nor do we seek to disregard, the priority that should be given to nuclear disarmament as properly stated in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. But what we should not forget is that, according to oft-repeated estimates, approximately 80 per cent of the \$500 billion that mankind spends yearly for weapons is earmarked for conventional weapons and armed forces. Therefore we must do something to put an end to such a waste.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

We all could and should urge the nuclear-weapon States to take effective measures towards nuclear disarmament, but in the field of conventional weapons all our countries cannot only urge, request or demand but take action ourselves.

When we come to deal with the question of conventional weapons, it is desirable not to overlook certain fundamental considerations.

First of all, we should not overlook the usefulness of a comprehensive approach which, taking into account and assessing the full value of partial efforts now being made or those which may be undertaken in the future, places the question in a broad perspective, which should include its many specific aspects.

In the second place, we should not overlook respect for security. Any measure which does not take into account the security needs of the various countries and which therefore may endanger the legitimate right of each State to guarantee its security is inconceivable. There arises here a first complication, since the subjective ingredient of the concept of security is well known. The concept that each State has of its own security is as important as any allegedly objective considerations.

With regard to this question, the regional approach is equally important. The implementation of specific measures in relatively homogeneous geographic areas appears to be a more viable principle than any ambitious approach which can hardly take into account the diversity of the problems affecting each region.

As for the possible contents of the study, this is something to which very special attention should be given, in order that we may obtain an effective evaluation of all aspects of conventional disarmament. By way of indication and without claiming that the list is exhaustive, I shall venture to indicate some points that should be taken into account in the preparation of that study.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

A previous question but one not devoid of importance, is the defining of the concept of conventional weapons, since such a definition will have a decisive influence on the contents of the study. Once this question of the definition is solved, we should have to consider the production process of conventional weapons and take into account, inter alia, an analysis of the technological possibilities of the various countries, in order to obtain as complete a picture as possible of their productive capacity. It would also be necessary to make an analysis of the percentages of conventional weapons represented by domestic production and by arms imports in each country respectively. A study of the repercussions of military expenditures on economic and social development would also have to be carried out; and for this purpose the studies now under way of the relationship between disarmament and development would prove very useful. A study, in this context, of the possibility of recycling of military industries for use in industrial projects for peaceful purposes should also be carried out.

As an element that has a close relationship with the principle mentioned earlier, of maintaining security with the lowest possible level of armament and armed forces - as indicated in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament - the study should examine the level of conventional armament needed by States to guarantee their security. To this end, account should be taken of the regional approach when considering the availability of conventional weapons, starting from the premise that relative parity between the countries in a particular area is desirable. Similarly, we should have to include consideration of the needs of States in relation to their internal security problems and the advisability, in this connexion, of drawing a clear distinction between forces for public order and purely military or defence forces. It would also be useful to examine the evolution of expenditures devoted to the arms potential in the various countries and the trends followed by such expenditures both in the States that are regarded as militarily important and in the remaining members of the international community.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

The study should carefully take into account the complex problems of international transfers of conventional weapons and in this context consider, first and foremost, the existing trends in the arms trade, as well as the different attempts made so far to establish some form of international control over the arms trade. Very special attention should be paid to the serious problem of irregular transfers of weapons, in order to curb an activity that has such harmful consequences for the stability and well-being of peoples.

Lastly, the study should contain a series of recommendations on possible measures to be adopted by the international community with a view to halting the conventional arms race. Many of those measures have already been proposed in the past, such as transfer registration, unilateral publicizing of transactions, or control by some international bodies. All these measures and any others that may be possible should be studied very thoroughly by the Group of Experts in order to ensure that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to be held in 1982, will be able to discuss this important question in detail and recommend the adoption of effective measures.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

In referring exclusively on this occasion to conventional disarmament, and specifically to the proposal for the preparation of the study recommended by the Committee on Disarmament, I had a twofold intention: on the one hand, to contribute to the debate on the question by setting forth ideas that are, perforce, very preliminary in nature but that would make it possible to prepare an outline of the contents of that study; and on the other hand, and here I wish to stress this point in particular, to state clearly our conviction that the preparation of the study is urgent, that its presentation in sufficient time for it to be considered and discussed at the forthcoming special session is fundamental and that, in the last analysis, it is the General Assembly which must adopt the proposal for the carrying out of that study at the present, thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

The Spanish delegation will consider with keen interest any proposal that may be submitted to the First Committee along these lines and, if it deems fit, my delegation does not rule out the possibility of making its own contribution in due time to that end.

Mr. BOLE (Fiji): Even at this very late stage in the Committee's deliberations, my delegation would still like to extend to Ambassador Naik and to the other officers of the Committee our sincere congratulations on their election. The valuable experience of the Chairman in the field of disarmament will, I am sure, be appropriately reflected in the Committee's efforts.

As we enter the Second Disarmament Decade, that of the 1980s, it is well to keep in mind the reasons why it was found necessary for the Disarmament Commission to resolve to recommend to the General Assembly a declaration making the 1980s the Second Disarmament Decade. Whilst the First Disarmament Decade had as one of its objectives the adoption of effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race, nuclear disarmament and the elimination of other weapons of mass destruction, the 1970s nevertheless saw huge expenditures on new weapon systems, coupled with the further proliferation, both vertical and horizontal, of nuclear armaments. Whilst the First Disarmament Decade had as one of its

(Mr. Bole, Fiji)

objectives the formulation and adoption of a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, the 1970s saw many efforts towards that end sabotaged by the unwillingness of the nuclear States to tie themselves to a precise pattern of negotiation, since they preferred to keep strictly to themselves the judgement on which measures should be dealt with and when. Whilst the First Disarmament Decade had as one of its objectives the channelling of part of the resources freed by measures taken in the field of disarmament to developing countries so as to promote their economic development, the 1970s saw nothing of the sort - only the transfer of arms and other forms of destructive weaponry from the developed to the developing countries. For the period 1970-1976 that is estimated at \$US 48 billion, which represents 75 per cent of all arms transfers throughout the world for that period. The trend continues today.

Meanwhile, the annual ritual of adopting United Nations resolutions in support of the First Disarmament Decade continued: all nuclear testing was condemned and the nuclear-weapon States were once again urged to negotiate a comprehensive test-ban treaty. In short, the Second Disarmament Decade has now come about because of the failure of the First to accomplish those objectives.

The future is anything but bright. The report of the Committee on Disarmament clearly sets out the stage the Committee has reached in its multilateral negotiations on measures ranging from the cessation of nuclear testing to a comprehensive programme of disarmament. While my delegation is heartened by the progress made, as delineated in the report, we nevertheless must express our disappointment at the inability of the major Powers to come to any agreement on many of the important items.

Many of the delegations that have preceded me have expressed deep concern at the apparent impasse in many of the disarmament negotiations. Many have rightly pointed to the necessity of reaching some agreement now, given the mounting international tension of today. My delegation would like to associate itself with the delegations of those countries in their call for a concerned and concerted effort on the part of all, particularly the major Powers, to bring all our disarmament efforts to a speedy conclusion.

(Mr. Bole, Fiji)

On the report of the Committee on Disarmament, my delegation shares the view of the Committee that among measures in relation to nuclear disarmament, a nuclear-test ban must be regarded as a matter of the highest priority. Although our people live in a relatively peaceful part of the world, the introduction of nuclear testing into the Pacific by major Powers some years ago has made us only too aware of the danger it poses for our people, the inherent danger it poses for world peace and the consequences it has for the security of our region. The protracted negotiations on an agreement on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty are therefore a matter of the greatest concern to us.

Yet, despite the negative trends that have characterized our past disarmament efforts, my delegation can look only to the positive achievements of the Review Conference on the Treaty banning biological weapons and the Geneva Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects as holding some hope for the future. The encouraging positive outcome of the two Conferences should spur the international community on to strive for similar results in other negotiating forums.

Among other measures, regional approaches to arms control and disarmament in general have received and will always receive our fullest support. We see such approaches as not only promoting mutual arms reduction among countries of a region but also breeding in those countries a feeling of shared responsibility for the security of their region. Further, that feeling can extend to economic and social development, to the preservation of national and natural resources and to freedom from external intervention.

In our statement in the General Assembly early this month we applauded the notable progress achieved so far in the creation of nuclear-free zones, zones of peace and the denuclearization of Latin America and of Africa. Much is still to be done. For the small island countries of the Pacific, our efforts pursuant to General Assembly resolution 3477 (XXX) aimed at the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific have received lukewarm support, if any, from the major Powers of the region. It is my Government's intention to pursue this matter until it is resolved and we are hopeful that the support of the world community will not be wanting.

(Mr. Bole, Fiji)

Of particular relevance to us in the Pacific region is the question of the cessation of all nuclear testing in all environments. It may be recalled that the General Assembly, in its resolution 32/78 of December 1977, which was adopted by a very large majority, reaffirmed the urgent need for the cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and the speedy conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The negotiations subsequent to that resolution by three nuclear-weapon States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, according to a trilateral report submitted to the Committee on Disarmament, have achieved some measure of progress, but little towards the submission of a draft treaty.

In the meantime nuclear-weapons testing has continued unabated. Of late the neutron bomb has been added to the arsenal of destructive devices tested in our region. We only wish to recall in this regard a proposal put before the Committee on Disarmament for the specific prohibition of the neutron bomb as a particularly inhuman weapon of mass destruction.

Since the conclusion of the partial test-ban treaty of 1963, nothing substantive has been achieved. The bilateral efforts embodied in the threshold test-ban treaty of 1974 and the treaty on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes two years later were auspicious beginnings in bilateral fields, but at the end of 1979 both treaties had still to enter into force.

Given the situation we have just outlined, my delegation is convinced that for any meaningful progress to be made towards the successful conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, it is imperative that all nuclear-weapon States become parties to the ongoing negotiations. My delegation therefore supports, in this regard, the establishment of a working group within the Committee on Disarmament to include all of the major nuclear-weapon countries, which in any case are all members of the Committee.

(Mr. Bole, Fiji)

The question of verification remains one of the principal issues that has plagued both the trilateral and the multilateral efforts towards a comprehensive test ban. The progress report of the Ad-Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events has still to receive the full endorsement of the major Powers. While we commend the progress made in the last two sessions of the Committee on Disarmament, my delegation is hopeful that a consensus on this question will be arrived at in the very near future.

Even with the verification means near agreement, the question of a moratorium on all nuclear testing until we get a comprehensive test-ban treaty has always been ardently supported by my country. Although by its very nature a moratorium implies the resumption of nuclear testing at a future date, we have always in good faith held the view that in matters of importance such as this, affecting mankind's very survival, all avenues must be explored and every opportunity pursued. My delegation is, however, unable to subscribe to the suggestion of the effectiveness of individual moratoriums, as contained in the report of the Committee on Disarmament. We shall therefore continue to lend our support to those efforts that resolve to suspend all forms of nuclear testing within the framework of our international efforts towards a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The adverse economic and social effects of the arms race on the developing world cannot be over-emphasized. We referred earlier to the massive transfers of arms to the third world in the 1970s. The monetary value of the ever-increasing militarization of the third world brought about by those transfers has been enormous, and is estimated to have been between \$80 and \$90 billion in the last decade. What is more disconcerting for us - and, indeed, it paints a very bleak picture of the future - is the increase in the sophistication of weapons and associated military equipment supplied to those developing countries.

(Mr. Bole, Fiji)

The last decade has further seen the emergence of third-world arms producers - supplementing the deplorable efforts of the industrialized countries of both East and West in the export of their domestically produced arms and military equipment to the rest of the world. For these developing countries, now secondary producers of arms, the diversion of their scarce resources to armaments is in turn adversely reflected in their social and economic development needs not being fully met.

My delegation has always emphasized, in our attempts at resolving this problem, the need for a collective approach. It is all too easy to see in areas of conflict around the world the necessity for a country's acquiring more sophisticated weapon systems simply because its neighbours have acquired them. Any existing social or economic development needs are then subjugated to the armament needs for the sake of national security.

In highlighting these aspects of the arms race it is pertinent again to recall one of the goals of the First Disarmament Decade: the channelling to the development needs of the poor part of the resources freed as a result of military cut-backs. In terms of economic aid from the major arms-supplier countries for true development needs and humanitarian concerns, this has been sadly lacking. Too often this aid is channelled out of military and strategic concerns instead.

My delegation soberly notes that, even with this aid for development assistance, the goal of 0.7 per cent of gross national product for donor-States set by the international development strategy for the Second Development Decade has failed to be met, mainly by the major Powers - a sad commentary on our international efforts towards the sharing of the world's resources, as indeed towards the attainment of world peace. If anything, it is a stark reminder of the difficulties and problems that confront this world body as we look forward to the global rounds of negotiations.

My country's support of the Nordic countries' proposal in 1977, as now contained in General Assembly resolution 32/88 A, for an in-depth United Nations study to clarify the implications of military spending for all relevant aspects of the economy and to plan re-allocation of resources for civilian purposes is, given the deterioration of the world armaments situation, as strong now as it was then. The work of the Group of Government Experts on the relation between Disarmament and Development, consequent to the Nordic initiative and the Programme of Action in the Final Document of the tenth special session, receive our warmest endorsement. Bearing in mind General Assembly resolution 34/83 K of last year, my delegation looks forward to the report of the Secretary-General on this item at the thirty-sixth session.

At a time of ever-mounting world tension almost on the brink of military confrontation between the super-Powers, and amidst massive expenditure on armaments and equally-massive transfer of arms to the third world, it is only appropriate to echo the words of the Commonwealth Secretary General, Mr. Shridath Ramphul, at the special meeting this morning in observance of Disarmament Week, and I should like to end with this quotation from his address:

"If we have in the events of the 1970s caught even a glimpse of the limitation of military power and its increasing irrelevance to some of the central issues facing mankind, of the ever-growing linkages between the world's rich and the world's poor in their common future, I believe the two United Nations Decades would not have been without returns to the cause of disarmament and of development."

Mr. ERDENBILLEG (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, through you I should like most warmly to congratulate all the officers of our Committee and wish them success in their noble task.

In the 1970s, which the United Nations proclaimed the Disarmament Decade, certain results were achieved in the efforts of countries and peoples to restrain the arms race and to strengthen the process of international détente. A decisive role in that noble cause was played by the countries of the socialist community and other peace-loving States that consistently supported the materialization of détente. However, various opponents of international détente and disarmament have begun to intensify their resistance to that cause; this has led to a serious deterioration in the international climate.

Following upon the armed aggression against socialist Viet Nam, an undeclared war is being imposed on democratic Afghanistan. We are witnessing an exacerbation of the Middle East crisis and an explosive situation has been created in the area of the Persian Gulf. A serious hotbed of tension has been created in South-East Asia.

Those who have instigated such adventurist actions have been the military-political circles of the United States and their allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the present Chinese leaders, who are aiming at imposing their diktat on the world and achieving hegemony in international relations.

The forces of imperialism and reaction have taken the dangerous course of securing their own military supremacy and violating the existing military balance of power. That is shown by NATO's decision to deploy new American medium-range missiles in Western Europe and to build up a military presence in various parts of the world, and by the assertion of the concept of limited nuclear war. A policy of that kind is fraught with the most serious consequences for the cause of international peace and security.

In today's circumstances, there is no sensible alternative to the policy of détente and disarmament. And those realities are precisely the

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

basis of the constructive efforts made by the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community to preserve détente and universal peace. That explains the timeliness and effective purposefulness of the concrete proposals and initiatives in the field of limiting and halting the arms race which have been put forward at sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Those proposals have always been steeped in a spirit of constructiveness, focused and concentrated on making progress in limiting and reducing the arms race in order to prevent the outbreak of war.

In this context, the new proposal by the Soviet Union to include on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly as an important and urgent item the one entitled "Urgent measures for reducing danger of war" are most striking in their timeliness and relevance. It is therefore quite natural that this proposal should have found a broadly based response in this Assembly.

Ruling circles in NATO and their sympathizers are talking about a mythical Soviet threat in order to cover up world tension that is of their own making, are even expanding existing military blocs - and creating new ones - and are stepping up the tempo of their build-up of military potential by accumulating increasing amounts of nuclear and conventional weapons. By so doing, they are further aggravating the existing situation, which may drag the world to the very brink of a new war. In the circumstances, the new Soviet initiative sets a very urgent and timely task and it is proposed in that connexion to adopt a number of high-priority practical measures.

Thus, the Soviet Union is proposing that States which are members of military alliances should renounce the expansion of those alliances by admitting new members to existing military and political groupings. Countries that are not members of such groupings should renounce the idea of joining them.

All States without exception should avoid any action which might lead to the creation of new military alliances or the assignment of military functions to regional organizations which do not possess them.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The statements made repeatedly by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries with regard to their readiness to agree to dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty organization if at the same time the NATO bloc is also liquidated remain fully in force today. This statement serves to confirm the unswerving position of the socialist countries in favour of renouncing the idea of dividing the world into military groupings.

It is well known that the Warsaw Treaty organization is a defensive alliance of socialist countries created in response to the emergence of the NATO imperialist bloc. A most important stage in the activities of the Warsaw Treaty was the anniversary conference of the political consultative committee in Warsaw on 14 and 15 May of this year, which proclaimed to the entire world a programme of measures to strengthen peace, security and trust among States and to develop international co-operation in Europe and throughout the world.

I should like to repeat that the current negative change in international affairs is caused by a general turn-around in the policy of Washington, which has manifested itself in new plans for rearming NATO and the decision to deploy in Western Europe American medium-range missiles as well as in the military preparations of the United States in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf and the adoption by Washington of the so-called Directive 59, the basis of which is the new nuclear strategy. The United States is deliberately holding up the ratification of the SALT II treaty and is thus blocking its entry into force. The United States and its NATO allies and the Chinese hegemonists are subjecting the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries to increased pressure in order to transform that organization into a military-political alliance. That policy poses the danger of expanding the scope of the arms race.

The dangerous course of the enemies of disarmament is countered by the States members of the Warsaw Treaty by a broad programme of action manifested in the documents they have adopted, the Declaration and

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

Proclamation. Those two documents are both of immense significance for the consolidation of peace not only in Europe but also throughout the world. The proposals put forward by the Political Consultative Committee of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty are based on the current strategic and political realities of Europe today. The socialist countries have always demonstrated their readiness to continue a joint search for mutually acceptable decisions on the basis of the agreed principle of not jeopardizing the security of any of the parties.

To the Mongolian delegation, the purport of those proposals is entirely clear: not to disturb the military balance, the existence of which was recently acknowledged even by the member States of NATO, and step by step to move towards the gradual reduction of its levels. Such progress, in our view, would do a great deal to lead to the successful conclusion of the Vienna talks on a mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe and also talks on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe in close connexion with American forward-based systems.

We express the hope that the talks which began a few days ago in Geneva between the USSR and the USA on nuclear arms will lead to the achievement of the hoped-for results. As members know, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have proposed the withdrawal of 20,000 more Soviet and 13,000 American military personnel in addition to the unilateral withdrawal of 20,000 Soviet troops, 1,000 tanks and other war material from the territory of the German Democratic Republic.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The Final Document of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament stated that progress in the limitation and subsequent reduction of nuclear armaments would be promoted by the parallel adoption of political and international legal measures and progress in the limitation and reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments of States which possess nuclear weapons, and other States in the relevant areas.

The purposes of implementing this important provision is served by the proposal of the Soviet Union contained in the document entitled "Certain urgent measures for reducing the danger of war", namely, that all States, primarily the permanent members of the Security Council and the countries related to them by military agreements, with effect from 1 January 1981, should not increase their armed forces and conventional armaments as a first step towards their subsequent reduction. The carrying out of this measure would doubtless help to solve the urgent problems of economic and social development of the nations of the world.

In the light of the great significance and high priority of the task of halting the nuclear-arms race, the Mongolian People's Republic and other socialist countries have consistently supported the adoption of concrete measures in this vital area of disarmament.

As members know, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have repeatedly put forward constructive proposals for the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons in all their forms and the gradual reduction of stockpiles of such weapons up to and including their total elimination, and also the question of the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. They continue to view the question of strengthening the non-proliferation régime in intimate connexion with the problem of strengthening security guarantees of non-nuclear States and the non-deployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of those States where such weapons do not exist at present. These questions have been the subject of broad discussion both in the Disarmament Committee and in this Committee of the General Assembly.

In the course of the work of the Committee on Disarmament at its session this year, participants to the negotiations came to an agreement that agreements with regard to security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States should be effective and international in character. It should be pointed out that the Committee proceeded for the first time to consider such a question with the

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

participation of all five nuclear Powers, and this is by no means a negligible factor. However, not all participants in the talks from among the nuclear States have shown a readiness to produce such an international instrument that would ensure full guarantees for the security of non-nuclear States. In this regard, I should like to stress that the Mongolian delegation entirely shares the views of those who would like to see China participate in the talks with a sober awareness of its particular responsibility in achieving a positive solution not only to this problem but also to other important problems of nuclear disarmament.

This concern, as members are aware, has been aroused by the Chinese policy of resistance to any constructive efforts aimed at curbing the nuclear-arms race. Chinese obstructionism in problems of nuclear disarmament is demonstrated by a report about the recent testing by Peking of a nuclear weapon in the atmosphere, and this has, of course, once again aroused the legitimate indignation of public opinion in many countries of the world, including Mongolia. The Mongolian delegation believes that the most reliable means of ensuring security guarantees for non-nuclear countries would be the early conclusion of a convention on the subject with the participation of all nuclear and non-nuclear States, as is proposed in the new Soviet initiative.

It seems to us that in order to achieve a positive solution of the problem as soon as possible the Soviet Union does not exclude the possibility of considering other versions and other means of solving this problem. The Soviet Union calls upon the other nuclear-weapon States to make similar solemn declarations concerning the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States having no such weapons on their territories. It is important that other nuclear States show flexibility and a constructive spirit in attempts to achieve a mutually accepted formula. As we see it, it will be only in those circumstances that such declarations could be buttressed by the authority of a Security Council decision.

We attach great importance to the trilateral talks on the full and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests among the United States, the USSR and Great Britain. In our view, the joint report on the progress of the trilateral talks presented to the Committee on Disarmament this year indicated that considerable progress had been made towards attaining an agreement on the subject.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

In this regard, we whole-heartedly support the timely initiative of the Soviet Union whereby the General Assembly would call for work on, and the early conclusion of, an international treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. In order that this goal may be achieved, the Soviet Union has proposed that all nuclear-weapon States should refrain for a specific period of time from conducting any nuclear explosions and should make declarations to that effect. For this we must, of course, have some demonstration of political will and determination on the part of all participants. The proposed moratorium, the time frame of which would have to be agreed on from the very outset, should be extended to all States possessing nuclear weapons without exception, because a step of this kind would undeniably promote the creation of the necessary conditions for achieving agreement on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and make a tangible contribution to the limitation of the nuclear-arms race.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The Mongolian People's Republic welcomed the new peaceful initiative of the Soviet Union and wholeheartedly and warmly supports it. The First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Workers' Party and Chairman of the Presidium of the Grand National Hural, Mr. Tsedenbal, in a recent speech stated that the abovementioned constructive proposals of the Soviet Union on certain urgent measures to reduce the danger of war are rooted in its deep concern for the strengthening of universal peace and are designed to preserve and deepen international détente and to prevent war.

At this session of the General Assembly of the United Nations the Soviet Union has presented an extraordinarily important document, a memorandum entitled "For Peace, Disarmament and International Security Guarantees". It also raised the question of the historical responsibility of States for preserving the earth's environment for present and future generations.

The Mongolian delegation believes that this session of the General Assembly of the United Nations should take some important decisions on the items under discussion which have found concrete expression in the new peaceful initiative of the Soviet Union and also in its memorandum containing a whole range of questions relating to halting the arms race and achieving disarmament. The Mongolian delegation, like many others, is ready to do all it can to achieve such solutions that should promote the adoption of practical measures in such a vitally important area.

Mr. ARSOV (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) (interpretation from French): Allow me, under item 36 of your agenda on the proclamation of the decade beginning in 1980 as the Second Disarmament Decade, to mention briefly certain activities of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) undertaken pursuant to resolution 20C/Res.11.1 adopted by its general Conference in 1978 and entitled "The role of UNESCO in the creation of public opinion favourable to halting the arms race and proceeding towards disarmament".

(Mr. Arsov, UNESCO)

Under that resolution the Director General was invited to ensure that UNESCO participated, within the field of its competence, in the implementation of the relevant provisions of the final document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in the following ways: international multi-disciplinary research, publications or meetings on problems concerning disarmament the promotion of education for disarmament and finally the promotion of information relating to disarmament.

One of UNESCO's main contributions to the creation of public opinion favourable to halting the arms race and proceeding towards disarmament is the promotion of a better understanding of the problems involved by means of various research projects, studies and publications. It is important to note that those activities are in keeping with one of the objectives of the mid-term UNESCO plan for 1977-1982, that is, "the promotion of peace research, particularly on manifestations of violations of peace, the causes preventing peace from being achieved, the ways and means of eliminating them and the measures to be taken in order to maintain and strengthen a just, lasting and constructive peace among groups, societies and in the world".

Pursuant to those decisions of the General Conference, UNESCO is preparing the publication of a multi-disciplinary study on "obstacles to disarmament and ways to overcome them" that relates particularly to disarmament prospects and lays stress on the relationship between socio-economic development and the solution of problems linked to efforts made to eliminate and reverse the arms race and to promote progress towards disarmament.

With regard to the subject "damage caused to the environment, to social progress and to cultural development through the increase in armaments and military actions", some of the environmental aspects of the question are considered in the UNESCO publication on "dangers of modern weapons for man and his environment"; other aspects of the problem appear in the draft programme and budget for 1981-1983 that the General Conference, now meeting in Belgrade, is considering.

During the two-year period 1979-1980, UNESCO's activities aimed at facilitating research and the publication of disarmament studies have been intensified, as was called for by the General Assembly in paragraph 103 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Arsov, UNESCO)

During that period two new multi-disciplinary research projects were started: one relating to research activities - developments in the military field and their influence on the scientific community and on scientific and technological development; the other on strategic doctrines and their influence on prospects for disarmament. The publication of these two studies is scheduled for 1981-1983.

Furthermore, UNESCO has put out a "repertory of peace research institutions" that reports on the activities of institutions concerned with the problems of peace and disarmament and gives detailed information on each of them. Another publication, the "UNESCO yearbook of studies on peace and conflicts" includes in particular an annotated bibliography on the relationships between disarmament and development.

In the framework of the series entitled "new challenges to international law" that UNESCO has been publishing since 1978, it has been decided to issue its next volume on "the international law of disarmament, a new branch of international law" and it will appear in 1981.

Apart from the abovementioned publications, UNESCO is proposing to organize an international meeting of experts on the role of scientists in the arms race and their contribution to disarmament.

In the light of the importance that the UNESCO General Conference has attached to the role of information organs in many of its resolutions and in particular on the Declaration on the fundamental principles relating to the contribution of information organs to the strengthening of peace and international understanding, to the promotion of human rights and to the struggle against racism, apartheid and incitement to war that it adopted on 22 November 1978, it is also proposed in the UNESCO draft programme to organize a seminar on the way in which the press reports on armament and disarmament matters.

In the two-year period 1979-1980 one of the main elements in the UNESCO programme for promoting education concerning human rights, peace and international understanding was that of disarmament education and in particular the organizing and holding of a world UNESCO congress on that subject, as well as the establishment of a programme on those questions.

(Mr. Arsov, UNESCO)

The idea of considering disarmament education as a separate field of study was submitted by UNESCO to the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, which endorsed it in paragraph 107 of its Final Document, expressing its satisfaction at the initiative of UNESCO in planning to hold a world congress on disarmament education.

(Mr. Arsov, UNESCO)

With regard to the preparations for that Congress, I shall not tire members by enumerating the many working or information documents that were drafted or meetings that were organized on the initiative of member States and non-governmental organizations. However, I should mention here the preparatory meeting organized in Prague, Czechoslovakia, from 4 to 8 June 1979, thanks to the generous hospitality of the Government of that country. The results of that meeting appear in document A/34/147, which was submitted to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

The Congress was held at the Headquarters of UNESCO from 9 to 13 June 1980. At the inaugural meeting, His Excellency Mr. Rodrigo Carazo, President of Costa Rica, made a statement in which he stressed the paramount importance of the role of education and information in the struggle against the threat of war, hatred and violence.

The Congress brought together 132 specialists from 48 countries, as well as 107 observers from 55 member States and many non-governmental organizations, seven representatives from international governmental organizations and two from national liberation movements. A large body of documentation, including reports and studies by experts and institutions, was made available to the Congress. Following its work, the Congress adopted a final document which it made available to members of the Committee. That document includes a body of principles and considerations which should guide education for disarmament, conceived of as both education about disarmament and education with a view to disarmament. According to that document, this kind of education should be based on objective research of a scientific nature and take into account relations between disarmament and the life of the society, particularly development. It should provide the occasion for reflection on individual and collective violence, as well as on tension of all kinds, particularly tension stemming from inequitable international structures, and should be based upon the values of comprehension, tolerance, justice and human solidarity.

In its recommendations, the Congress, inter alia, called upon the Director-General:

"To produce, on the basis of the principles and considerations proposed, material to be included in the Declaration proclaiming the 1980s

(Mr. Arsov, UNESCO)

the Second Disarmament Decade, to make education for disarmament one of the essential means of achieving the objectives of that Decade and to transmit this material to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and request him to report on it to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session."

In the realm of information on disarmament, UNESCO took as its basis the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly and also the aforementioned resolution of its General Conference, which called on the Director-General to consider the increased use of information media available to the organization to mobilize world public opinion about the dangers of the arms race and the need for disarmament, particularly by publishing an increased number of brochures and books on the subject and by organizing artistic exhibitions and cinema festivals.

Following the adoption of the Declaration on fundamental principles regarding the contribution of information organs for the strengthening of peace and international understanding, the promotion of human rights and the struggle against racism, apartheid and incitement to war, its text was published in English and French and will shortly appear in Spanish, Russian and Arabic. Various national committees for UNESCO have had the document translated into the language of their country: Serbo-Croatian, German, Hungarian, Vietnamese, Korean, Maltese, Greek, Danish, Dutch and so forth, and other national committees have been invited to follow that example. Furthermore, a study of the background of the Declaration will be published this year in the UNESCO series Information Studies and Documents.

The Courier, the monthly magazine of UNESCO, gave an important place to disarmament: two of its issues, in fact, were devoted to that subject. The first, which appeared in April 1979, entitled The Arms Race, contains lengthy extracts from a United Nations report on "The economic and social consequences of the arms race and military expenditures", drawn up by an international group of experts.

(Mr. Arsov, UNESCO)

The United Nations noted with satisfaction the interest of that issue and called on UNESCO for its assistance in distributing it throughout the world through the United Nations Information Centres on the occasion of the Disarmament Week held in 1979. In response to that request, the Director-General approved an additional expenditure of \$24,000 to provide the United Nations with 85,000 copies of the magazine in English, French, Spanish, Arabic and Russian.

After the issue of that magazine devoted to the arms race, where this important problem was set forth without any guidelines being suggested to solve it, The Courier prepared another issue on the allied question of education for disarmament, which has just appeared. The purpose of that issue was to make public opinion aware of the role which education and information can play in curbing the arms race.

The Disarmament Week proclaimed by the General Assembly in the Final Document of the tenth special session has led to exceptional activities with regard to information on disarmament. On that occasion, the Director-General issued a message which was widely disseminated. It was sent to the United Nations and to the United Nations Information Centres; it was transmitted to national committees, to associated schools and national federations of UNESCO clubs; and it was also published in a press communiqué.

Among the other activities of the Disarmament Week it is worth mentioning the daily showing of two United Nations films entitled "Boom" and "Nuclear Count-down" and the exhibition of UNESCO publications on disarmament in special windows at Headquarters. Furthermore, radio broadcasts on the participation of UNESCO during the Week were transmitted to many stations in the territory of member States, particularly an English broadcast entitled "War is out of date" and a Spanish broadcast entitled "Disarmament Week". An exceptional radio programme in six episodes devoted to disarmament, "The Angel of Nagasaki", was broadcast to various radio services.

(Mr. Arsov, UNESCO)

In conclusion I should also like to mention an important information activity known as "Foundations for Peace", held at Headquarters from 12 to 16 November 1979. Fifty-six distinguished persons, including several Nobel Prize winners, came from all over the world on a personal basis to take part in that meeting, and the information services of many countries reported on it extensively. "Peace and the solution of conflicts", "The Building of Peace", and "Peace in the Minds of Men" were the three subjects of that meeting, the records of which have been published by UNESCO this year and have appeared in the special issue of the Bulletin of Peace Proposals of the International Peace Research Institute of Oslo, Norway.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The representative of Japan has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I call upon him.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): Yesterday afternoon, at the eleventh meeting of this Committee, the representative of the Lao People's Republic made a statement in connexion with a passage contained in the statement I made to this Committee at its eighth meeting.

I should like to make it clear that I did not by any means in that statement allege that chemical weapons had actually been used in Laos or by Laos. I merely expressed the concern of my Government regarding reports suggesting the possibility of such use in certain countries including Laos.

In response to the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic I wish to give examples of the reports I mentioned that suggest the possibility that certain chemical weapons may have been used.

I had in mind the articles contained in the issues of Asia Week dated 4 November 1978 and 1 December 1978, as well as an article contained in the 19 April 1980 issue of The Economist of London, which were partly based on testimony given by refugees from Laos. Those are but a few examples

(Mr. Okawa, Japan)

among a great many similar articles and reports on this subject. Japan, which has endeavoured over the years to make positive contributions towards the prohibition of chemical weapons in the United Nations, in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and in the Committee on Disarmament, cannot possibly remain unconcerned about those reports.

From both the humanitarian point of view and the point of view of the maintenance of international peace, Japan strongly hopes that those reports have no foundation. My delegation is therefore greatly encouraged by the fact that the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic has negated the possible implications of my previous statement. My delegation hopes that that signifies that chemical weapons are indeed not being used in Laos and that they will not be used in the future.

From the points of view of humanitarian concern, the maintenance of world peace and the advancement of arms control and disarmament, my delegation wishes to take this opportunity strongly to appeal strongly to all nations for the early realization of the prohibition of chemical weapons and the principle that those weapons must never and will never be put to use.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Before adjourning this meeting I should like to remind those delegations that have not yet submitted lists of members of their delegations to do so as early as possible to enable the Secretariat to issue the second addendum to the list of members of the First Committee.

May I remind members that tomorrow morning's meeting will be devoted to Disarmament Week. Messages from the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly will be read out, and the chairmen of the regional groups will make statements.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.