



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 23RD MEETING

Chairman: Mr. NAIK (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

- General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Petrovsky (USSR)  
Mr. Choueri (Lebanon)  
Mr. Heidweiller (Suriname)  
Mr. Bhatt (Nepal)  
Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola)  
Mr. Hepburn (Bahamas)  
Mr. Erdembileg (Mongolia)

UN LIBRARY  
NOV 6 1980  
UN/SA COLLECTION

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 166 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.

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has taken the floor once again to share its thoughts about some questions that have arisen in the course of the general debate on disarmament questions.

Our debate has made it abundantly clear that there are no two opinions about the fact that the international situation has recently worsened considerably, and that we must in the present circumstances multiply our efforts to reduce the tension that has arisen and to breathe new life into talks on limiting and halting the arms race. In order to find a prescription for overcoming the existing difficulties, we must of course first establish a diagnosis and identify the causes for the deterioration in the general situation in the world and in particular in the area of disarmament talks.

With regard to a factual diagnosis, we cannot but note that it involves a disease that could well be called an ambition to achieve world hegemony. At various times, this disease has manifested itself in different forms. Today, its main manifestation is the attempts of imperialist circles to disrupt the existing military-strategic balance of forces to the detriment of the socialist countries and to secure for themselves a position of predominant force, whatever terms are used now, such as military "supremacy" or securing a "margin of safety" for themselves.

As a pretext for covering up this blatantly militaristic policy, attempts are being made to use the assistance the Soviet Union has been giving the Government of Afghanistan to repel armed intervention and intrusions from

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

outside organized and inspired by those same imperialist circles. We have already had occasion to show in detail how unfounded such attempts are. Soviet assistance to Afghanistan is totally in keeping with the bilateral Soviet-Afghan treaty of 5 December 1978, and with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. Moreover, the search for a pretext for exacerbating the international situation and undermining talks in the field of disarmament was begun by imperialist forces long before the events in Afghanistan -- as a matter of fact, immediately following the adoption in May 1978 of a programme for the automatic increase of military expenditures by the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). It was all the more necessary for those countries to find this pretext because the programme for the arms build-up was adopted at a time when the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament was taking place, and as everyone here will recall, NATO representatives were unstinting in proclaiming their intention and their desire to halt the arms race. Those who adopted this policy of intensifying the arms race were prepared to go to any lengths. How can we fail to recall in this connexion the attempt in the autumn of 1979 to create the so-called Cuban mini-crisis, whose failure even official Washington itself was forced to acknowledge. Now they have found a pretext: the events in Afghanistan.

(Mr. Pétrovský; USSR)

Attempts by certain delegations from NATO countries to represent matters in such a way as to suggest that the Soviet Union is aiming at the build-up of its armaments on a scale exceeding its defence needs are also unfounded. Just one glance at the map of the world should make it absolutely clear who is threatening whom and who is surrounding whom. The whole United States and NATO military machine is not in a defensive posture but an offensive one. Those who seek to defend themselves do not have to position their bases, armies and armaments on the frontiers of other countries thousands of kilometres from their own territory - but American bases on the territory of other countries, according to American estimates, number more than 3,000. They do not need to piece together military alliances, they do not need to create rapid deployment forces for armed intervention in all parts of the world that have been declared spheres of their vital interests and they do not need to proclaim nuclear war as a rational instrument of policy.

The picture would not be complete if we did not add that the Peking hegemonists are operating together with the imperialists, giving the task of comprehensive and full-scale preparations for a new world war priority over their whole internal and foreign policy. One of the present Peking leaders frankly sought to prove at the eleventh Congress of the Chinese Communist Party that world war was inevitable because, so he said, 'it is an objective law, independent of the will of people'. In the light of that, we find it particularly ominous that while in terms of the level of national income per capita China occupies the one hundred and twenty-fifth place in the world, at the same time it possesses the largest regular army, numbering more than 4 million men, plus a multi-million so-called national militia.

In spite of the difficult state of the international situation the Soviet Union still believes that we must do our utmost - even more than that, we must multiply our efforts - to secure a breakthrough in disarmament talks and to make sure that they yield effective results.

In a memorandum entitled 'Peace, disarmament and international security guarantees', contained in document A/35/482, the USSR has put forward concrete substantive points on all the questions that are under consideration by our Committee.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Furthermore, in document A/C.1/35/L.1, the Soviet Union proposes the immediate adoption of a whole range of concrete measures, which represent the very minimum of what is needed in present circumstances to reduce the danger of war. In view of the urgency of those measures, we believe that, by their very nature, they should not require any long drawn out or complicated talks or technical studies. The political will of States should be enough to implement them and halt the development of a dangerous trend in the international situation. What we have in mind specifically is the following.

First, the Soviet Union proposes that States belonging to military alliances should refrain from actions conducive to the expansion of the existing military-political groupings through the admission of new members, and that States which are not members of the existing military-political groupings should refrain from joining them. Furthermore, all States without exception are called upon to avoid any actions that might lead to the formation of new military-political groupings or to the assigning of military functions to those regional organizations which at present have no such functions.

Can that proposal mean the perpetuation of existing military alliances? Certainly not. As we have repeatedly stressed, the policy of blocs is organically alien to the Soviet Union and other States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty. The Warsaw Treaty Organization was founded by the socialist countries in 1955 in response to the creation in 1949 of the foundation of the military-political bloc of NATO. The Soviet Union and other States parties to the Warsaw Treaty have repeatedly declared their readiness to agree to the dissolution of their alliance if the NATO bloc is dissolved at the same time.

The Soviet Union now views the non-expansion of existing military alliances as a first step towards their subsequent elimination. Therefore, the appeal not to expand existing military alliances and not to create new ones does not and cannot mean the perpetuation of military blocs, but since agreement on the total dissolution of military groupings - and we have seen that clearly in the course of this debate - is being blocked by the members of NATO, then the simplest measure towards that end at this stage could be the reaching of an agreement not to expand them.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Secondly, the Soviet Union proposes that all States, and above all the permanent members of the Security Council and countries which have military agreements with them, should be called upon not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments, as a first step towards their subsequent reduction.

Does that mean that the task of achieving disarmament in the nuclear field has been relegated to a secondary status? No, it does not.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

We fully share the view that priority in disarmament matters should go precisely to nuclear disarmament, in parallel with the strengthening of political and legal guarantees for the security of States. This approach is fully in keeping with the Final Document of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Furthermore, as is well known, the Soviet Union has consistently advocated, and has taken initiatives towards, the implementation of measures to halt the nuclear arms race and to cease the manufacture of and eliminate nuclear weapons.

For many years now, the Soviet Union has consistently believed that we must make an early start on business-like talks on this issue. However, while giving priority to nuclear disarmament, does that mean that we must exclude from our field of vision disarmament problems in the realm of conventional armaments? In our view, it would be wrong to proceed in that way. As is stressed in the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament:

"...progress in nuclear disarmament would be facilitated ... by parallel ... progress in the limitation and reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments of ... States ... ." (S-10/2, para. 54)

Therefore, we now propose that an entirely concrete and tangible measure be adopted: conclusion of an agreement not to increase armed forces and armaments. Such a measure, in our view, would be in keeping with the interests of all States and would ensure the preservation of the existing approximate military-strategic balance of forces in the world. No one would find himself in a losing position, and no one's security would be threatened.

Thirdly, the Soviet Union proposes that possible variants be considered for settling the question of the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States that do not have such weapons on their territory. In particular, we have appealed to other nuclear Powers to make solemn declarations, identical in content, on this subject, to be subsequently strengthened by an authoritative decision of the Security Council.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The Soviet Union shares the view that a final settlement of the question of the non-use of nuclear weapons should be sought by means of halting the manufacture of and eliminating nuclear weapons. Does this mean that before nuclear disarmament has been brought about efforts should not be made to ensure security guarantees to non-nuclear countries against the use of nuclear weapons against them? Certainly not. Until the goal of nuclear disarmament has been attained, the Soviet Union, taking into account the wishes of the majority of non-nuclear-weapon States, is in favour of working out concrete measures against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against them.

The provisions of section III of the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union is aimed at making it easier to bring about early agreement on solid security guarantees for non-nuclear countries.

Fourthly, the Soviet Union proposes that all nuclear-weapon States should renounce the carrying out of nuclear explosions for the period of one year and should make the relevant declarations to that effect. We are convinced that the declaration of such a one-year moratorium would promote the early and successful conclusion of talks on general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing.

Does that proposed moratorium in any way hinder the working out of a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapons testing? It certainly does not. On the contrary, it is actually designed to create more favourable conditions for the early conclusion of those talks. And it is precisely for this reason that we believe that a time-limit must be set for that proposed moratorium. Setting such a time-limit would, in our view, be an additional source of encouragement likely to promote the early conclusion of talks on the subject.

However, the members of NATO and China have rejected the new Soviet peace initiative. We see nothing surprising in this, of course. It is obvious that such opposition pursues very clearly defined goals. Let us take China, for example.



(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The representative of the People's Republic of China in his statement avoided considering the Soviet proposal in substance and attempted to replace it by the usual array of anti-Soviet slander. There is no need to go into detail in explaining what that policy is actually aimed at. The facts - particularly the most recent facts - speak for themselves. The Chinese representative spoke against the one-year moratorium proposed by the USSR on any nuclear explosions which would involve the participation of all nuclear States so that China could maintain its capability of conducting nuclear weapons tests, as in the Chinese explosion of 16 October which was mentioned with such concern by representatives of many States. It has now become known that, as a result of that explosion, the atmosphere has been polluted by radioactive fallout of long half-life which could do damage to the health of the population of many countries - not only neighbours of China but other States, too. Radioactive poisoning of the atmosphere has also created a real danger to the flight of civilian aircraft. As is well known, China is the only State which, contrary to widely acknowledged international norms and the demands of the world community, is continuing to carry out nuclear-weapon tests in the atmosphere. That is what lies behind China's attitude towards the Soviet proposal of a one-year moratorium on nuclear explosions.

Now a few words about the position of the States members of NATO in their attitude towards the Soviet proposal for "Urgent measures to reduce the danger of war".

First of all, I should like to refer to the statement of the representative of the United States of 30 October. We are not surprised that he has called the disarmament proposals made by the Soviet Union propagandistic. All of us who, for so many years have been dealing with disarmament problems know very well that this is a well-worn tactic of the West with regard to Soviet disarmament proposals. It began as far back as the 1920s, when the Soviet Union was the first to put forward the idea of general and complete disarmament, which has now been acknowledged by the whole international community as the ultimate goal of efforts to limit and halt the arms race.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

We cannot, however, fail to take note of another point: the United States representative's flat rejection of the new Soviet proposals as totally unacceptable. This is very typical. He did not even deem it necessary to produce any particularly weighty counter-arguments with regard to the substance of the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union. This approach, which is an inherent part of the traditions of imperialist thinking of long by-gone days, is not at all in keeping with the practice which has been established here in our Committee of a serious business-like approach to the consideration of proposals put forward by representatives. Neither is it in keeping with the United Nations Charter, according to which States should direct their efforts towards co-operation rather than confrontation.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

We cannot fail to note that, in order to give their negative disposition some respectability, other countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) are using various devices too. They sometimes raise the question of the need for control procedures where experience has shown that that is not required or tried to prove that a further growth of closed military groupings and the creation of new ones is in fact the best way of strengthening peace and is, they allege, in keeping with the United Nations Charter. It is necessary to recall in this regard the recent assertion that the security system provided by the United Nations Charter is based not on closed military groupings but on the collective security of States Members of this Organization.

I should also like to draw attention to another particular feature of the approach of those countries to the Soviet proposal. By all accounts, it seems that they do not find to their liking the simplicity and clarity of the measures proposed by the Soviet Union. Those countries -- or some of them -- state that that proposal is too simple. I think that one may be permitted to recall in this regard that not too long ago when the Soviet Union, together with the other socialist countries, put forward the proposal for halting the manufacture of nuclear weapons and the step-by-step elimination of such weapons we heard voices raised by those very same States saying that it was not acceptable because of its extreme complexity and subtlety and the difficulty of holding long-drawn-out and complex talks. So the impression is created that, no matter what proposals the Soviet Union may put forward, it always turns out that, in the view of the members of NATO, they are either too "simple" or too "complicated and difficult". We cannot help wondering whether those States fail to appreciate the proposals in the field of disarmament not in terms of their content but in terms of their provenance. Accordingly, if the author of proposals is the Soviet Union, then one gets one of two things: the proposal is unacceptable either because it is too "complicated" or because it is "simple and clear".

Those manoeuvres can be explained by the fact that, having adopted a policy of building up the arms race, the United States and its military and political allies naturally see a threat to the execution of their plans and

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

designs in the Soviet peace initiatives. For their part those countries have typically introduced nothing into our present discussion, apart from polemical points.

For the Soviet Union, words and deeds in the field of disarmament are inseparable. Our policy has been and remains not one of confrontation but, rather, one of co-operation and mutual understanding. And that has been demonstrated also by the unilateral peaceful actions taken recently by the Soviet Union in order to create more propitious conditions for resolving complex international issues and preserving international détente. I would recall, for example, the unilateral withdrawal by the Soviet Union of 20,000 military personnel and 1,000 tanks and other military equipment from the territory of the German Democratic Republic, which was concluded by the fifth anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act on 1 August this year. In sharp contrast to the plans and deeds of the West in increasing military expenditures is the consistent course followed by the Soviet Union in reducing defence expenditures. In accordance with a law adopted by the recently concluded fourth meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR at its tenth session, the State budget of the USSR for 1981 has reduced defence expenditures to an amount estimated at 17.05 billion roubles, which represents 5.7 per cent of total budgetary expenditures.

As recently stated by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, L. I. Brezhnev:

"The whole of our peaceful foreign policy bequeathed to us by the great Lenin is aimed at ridding mankind of the threat of war. And this has been expressed in our concrete deeds, in our constructive initiatives."

We should like to express our conviction that this session of the General Assembly will with the utmost sense of responsibility proceed to the consideration of questions of disarmament, particularly the question of "Certain urgent measures to reduce the danger of war" and take decisions in favour of limiting the arms race and making a start on genuine disarmament.

Mr. CHOUERI (Lebanon): Sir, even at this late stage in our work, I should like to join other delegations in expressing our congratulations to you and the other officers of the Committee.

The search for disarmament has been the concern of our Organization for over a quarter of a century. During this period of time the efforts of the United Nations in this field have been to raise the alarm at the threat to the very survival of mankind posed by the development of nuclear weapons. Expert studies and also sufficient literature and scientific evidence have been made available to demonstrate this fact. We have established a number of United Nations bodies to pursue the complex task of disarmament and have concluded a number of important treaties and conventions. However, a general assessment of our endeavours obviously shows that we have a long way to go and that the aim of security still eludes the world community.

United Nations studies have also shown that disarmament is the avowed purpose of all peoples. The great challenge facing our Organization is to find the most practical way to achieve this goal. In this connexion we note the realities of power relationships among States and the predominance of national interests in the motivations and actions of States members of our international community.

In the view of my delegation, negotiations remain the only means to achieve arms control. In this context small States have an important role to play. They should persist in driving home the realization that the world community must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation. In the words of the Swedish representative, we should not think for a moment that this task is too big for us or that it is the preserve of the big Powers.

(Mr. Choueri, Lebanon)

We believe that nuclear disarmament should remain the paramount objective of the international community, as is stressed in the Final Document of the tenth special session. To halt the nuclear arms race it is necessary to take measures leading to the cessation of nuclear tests and agreement not to use nuclear weapons and to guarantee the security of non-nuclear States. We also feel that the SALT II treaty is an important step towards freezing the present level of strategic nuclear weapons.

The report on a comprehensive test-ban treaty which was prepared by the Committee on Disarmament demonstrates not only that such a measure is necessary but also that it is not impossible to achieve. We agree with the statements made by many speakers in this debate that the tripartite negotiations on the cessation of nuclear tests should be concluded soon and that the Committee on Disarmament should conduct multilateral negotiations on an acceptable agreement.

The overwhelming majority of countries are non-nuclear-weapon States. They do not wish to acquire nuclear weapons and they seek guarantees and assurances against the use or threat of use of those weapons. We are aware of the difficulties encountered in the Committee on Disarmament with regard to negotiations on those assurances. We also believe that an international convention on such assurances might be the best way to reach agreement on effective international guarantees.

Other measures of nuclear disarmament can be found in the regional approach, such as the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace. We are aware of the difficulties facing such an approach but, in the absence of any other viable alternative, it remains the only choice left for various regions in the world. As we have done in the past, we support the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and express our concern about the ominous development resulting from the emergence of nuclear weapon States in the area and particularly the Israeli nuclear capability. Similarly, we share the concern of African countries about the threat represented by South Africa's nuclear potential. In general, we support denuclearization not only in

(Mr. Choueri, Lebanon)

the areas which are the subject of existing proposals but in any region in the world where denuclearization is possible. We are encouraged by the Latin American experience and hope that it will serve as an incentive for other areas.

This year the Disarmament Commission, at the request of the General Assembly, elaborated a draft text declaring the 1980s the Second Disarmament Decade. After a major effort the Commission reached agreement on a text of that declaration. We hope that the Assembly will be able to endorse the text which consists in a plan of action to be achieved during the Decade.

The second special session on disarmament, which will be convened in 1987, should, in our view, be carefully prepared. In addition to reviewing and assessing the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the first special session on disarmament, it will be incumbent upon the second special session to consider in connexion with the Disarmament Decade the comprehensive programme which is under discussion in the Committee on Disarmament. In this connexion, my delegation wishes to propose that Heads of State be invited to take part in an international summit meeting during that special session so that the questions of disarmament can be given the priority they deserve at the highest level by the international community. We believe that this would dramatize the subject of disarmament and might contribute to speeding agreement on certain issues. We intend to submit a draft resolution to this effect for consideration by the First Committee.

A number of studies have been prepared by the Secretary-General on nuclear weapons, on regional disarmament and on South Africa's nuclear capability. Others are under preparation and will be submitted to the thirty-sixth session. I refer in particular to the very important studies on: first, the relationship between disarmament and development; secondly, the relationship between disarmament and national security; thirdly, Israel nuclear armament; and fourthly, confidence-building measures. My delegation believes that those studies will be most useful in the preparations for the second special session.

(Mr. Choueri, Lebanon)

The international community remains gravely concerned about the fast pace of the arms race. The present climate of increased tension in the international situation makes the dangers of the arms build-up more imminent. Our approach in the Second Disarmament Decade in the 1980s should be not to pass judgement on the past but to reaffirm our determination to pursue those objectives in the future with persistence and realism.

A major responsibility in this regard falls on the small States, and more particularly the developing countries of the third world. Those societies, after centuries of deprivation, have just begun to define a strategy for economic development. Their hopes for a better future are now compromised by the diversion of great resources to weapons production and purchases and by the threat which the proliferation of weapons represents to their limited development achievements.

Arms control remains an integral part of our search for international peace and security. In the view of my delegation, the best climate for arms control is détente among the great Powers and international efforts to eliminate causes of instability and tension within certain small States and in some regions which are the result of external rivalries, whether between regional Powers or super-Powers. Lebanon suggested during the last special session on disarmament, in 1978, that small States facing such problems should be given a special status of internationally guaranteed neutrality under the aegis of the United Nations and United Nations peace-keeping forces. Such proposals should form one of the items to be considered during the coming special session, perhaps under the item on security and disarmament. We request that in the preparations for that session, the appropriate body conduct a study of this project before the convening of the special session, given the fact that this idea has gained greater credibility recently as the ideal solution for countries facing problems of this nature.

Despite the predicament in which our country finds itself, we intend to take part together with other States within the framework of the United Nations in the efforts to pursue the search for disarmament. Perhaps because of our predicament we are more aware than ever of the dangerous consequences of the unlimited proliferation of weapons, even small arms. We are therefore committed to working for the attainment of mankind's most urgent aim, the halting of the arms race.



Mr. HEIDWEILLER (Suriname): Mr. Chairman, I have already expressed, at the beginning of this session of the Committee, the happiness of the delegation of Suriname at seeing you preside over the deliberations of the First Committee. We consider your election to the high post of Chairman also as a recognition of the outstanding role played by your country, Pakistan, as current Chairman of the Islamic Conference.

I should also like to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Davidson Hepburn of the Bahamas, one of the most skilled and efficient representatives of our Latin American region.

Speaking on the question of disarmament, the delegation of Suriname agrees with those who have expressed their discouragement and dismay at the very poor record of the world community in this field. My delegation will limit itself to those aspects of the disarmament question which at this moment are, in our judgement, to be given top priority.

The stark failure of the world community in its pursuit of world-wide disarmament was once again dramatically exposed during the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which took place between 11 August and 7 September 1980 in Geneva. Since we believe that nuclear arms pose the greatest threat to mankind and that the problem of nuclear disarmament is therefore central to the larger problem of disarmament, the Government of Suriname paid close attention to the outcome of the Second Review Conference. While maintaining our conviction that there should be a total and comprehensive prohibition of nuclear arms, we consider the NPT of 1968 to be a vital and fundamental attempt to stop more countries acquiring and producing such weapons.

Pending the attainment of the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament, we should support all efforts aimed at reinforcing the Treaty's credibility and authority. We certainly do not consider the Treaty as perfect. We are, in particular, seriously concerned about its failure to oblige the nuclear Powers to negotiate without delay a nuclear disarmament agreement and a treaty forbidding nuclear testing.

Professor Robert Oppenheimer, one of the fathers of the atom bomb, once compared the United States and the USSR to two scorpions shut in a bottle. And Professor Oppenheimer was a knowledgeable man, being, as I have said, one of

the fathers of the bomb. What he could not foresee, however, was that those scorpions were going to swallow some additional 10,000 atomic warheads in the next two decades.

Leaving aside for one moment the terrible possibility of one of those super-Powers unleashing its deadly treasures on our beloved planet, another extremely disquieting phenomenon which has appeared on the sinister stage of nuclear warfare needs to be mentioned. A number of so-called threshold States have gathered sufficient technological capacity in this field during the past decade and now seem bent on joining the nuclear club. This has added a special dimension to the importance of the NPT, which, if adequately reinforced and expanded, might serve as the last and only obstacle to their less than lofty aspirations.

In this respect, it is to be noted that one of the main objections raised by some nations to the ratification of the NPT is to be found in the Treaty's system of safeguards, which would subject them to international control.

Another reason why it is necessary to enhance the authority of the NPT is the rising concern that countries enmeshed in nationalistic wars over frontiers or for supremacy within their regions might be tempted to resort to nuclear weapons. The super-Powers, being more knowledgeable about the holocaustic results of nuclear warfare, and having lived since the 1960s with the philosophy of assured mutual destruction, are presumably more realistic about the dangers of a blast-off. Their being more aware of the lethal results of a nuclear war, however, does not mean that the use of such weapons by the super-Powers does not continue to pose the greatest threat to the civilization of mankind.

For these reasons the members of the world community vested great hopes in the Second Review Conference in Geneva. The world community had expected an exhaustive and honest evaluation of the Treaty, resulting in a final declaration that would serve as a further impetus to efforts in halting the horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. Such a declaration would at the same time have established a basis for sincere co-operation for the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

The developing nations, already in the stranglehold of ever-increasing oil prices and payments deficits, had expected a more generous and wiser attitude

(Mr. Heidweiller, Suriname)

on the part of the nuclear Powers, since they had faithfully complied with article II of the Treaty, prohibiting horizontal proliferation, while the nuclear Powers had cheerfully violated their obligations concerning vertical non-proliferation. The nuclear Powers, further, had virtually not implemented article IV regarding the transfer of technology for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

In not agreeing on a final declaration, however, the Second Review Conference was an unmitigated disaster and we would prefer to let it rest in the limbo of sad memories were it not for the conclusions and recommendations of the Group of 77 and several positive contributions by other States.

Having said this, my delegation wishes to express its continued and unswerving support for the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We also support a new and thorough evaluation of its functions and operations. In the meantime, the Government of Suriname will be guided by the conclusions and recommendations submitted in the Group of 77 at the Geneva Conference and contained in working paper NPT/CONF.II/C.1/2 of 26 August 1980, which it fully endorses.

The delegation of Suriname, however, wishes to reject in advance all arguments by those who will try to use the negative results of the Geneva Conference in an attempt to mask their real purpose: that is, the acquisition of the capacity to produce nuclear weapons.

The second subject I should like to discuss is the conventional arms race. While it is true that the nuclear arms problem poses the greatest threat to mankind's existence and development, the unabated race in conventional arms has already resulted in bloody and devastating geographically limited wars. With the exception of the Viet Nam war and the Afghanistan war - and a war the latter is, be it on the invitation of the Kabul régime or not - the wars waged during the past two decades have been limited to small nations. It is a sad fact of life that they all involved mainly sister developing nations which, at the expense of their scarce and limited hard currency, got their arms from readily accessible armaments industries in developed countries.

The ironic fact of some of the arms-producing countries frequently crying wolf over increasing international tension once again reminds us of the finiteness of the human condition.

(Mr. Heidweiller, Suriname)

The constant flow of conventional weapons to certain regions or countries will generally not immediately change existing patterns of attitudes and relationships, but work its way through it eventually will.

The many wars in the Middle East, the South East Asian region and now in the Persian Gulf only demonstrate an age-old adage that one cannot build a peaceful world on a heated powder-keg.

The delegation of Suriname, therefore, is of the opinion that the Committee on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission should continue to deal with this problem simultaneously with their activities on the questions of nuclear disarmament and chemical and radiological weapons.

We were gladdened by the results of the Conference which goes by the excessively difficult name of the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions and Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects which was held recently in Geneva under the chairmanship of the distinguished Nigerian diplomat, Ambassador Olu Adeniji

We would suggest that the Committee on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission, in the light of rising international tension, give special attention to the problems of sales or deliveries of conventional weapons.

The representative of a sister Latin American country, Venezuela, Ambassador German Nava Carrillo, in his statement on 21 October in this Committee, mentioned the Riobamba Charter of Conduct, signed last September by the Heads of State of the countries of the Andean Group - that is, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela - and by the Presidents of Costa Rica and Panama and the personal representative of the Government of Spain.

The Government of Suriname fully supports the objective of that charter to promote a subregional and regional disarmament process, thus constituting a significant contribution to general and regional disarmament which will permit the release of resources for economic and social development.

(Mr. Heidweiller, Suriname)

The Riobamba Charter emanated from the Declaration of Ayacucho, signed by eight Latin American countries in 1974. One of the most important aspects of the Declaration was that the signatories undertook to end their acquisition of armaments for offensive purposes.

The Riobamba Charter and the Ayacucho Declaration are not the only examples of Latin America's efforts in the field of regional disarmament arrangements. I refer, of course, to the regional Treaty establishing a nuclear weapon-free zone, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which could serve as a model for similar treaties for the regions of the Middle East, Africa and South Asia, all subjects which figure on the agenda of this Committee.

I am sure that the Secretary-General of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (OPANAL) established under the Tlatelolco Treaty, Ambassador Hector Gros Espiell, and his secretariat and other experts on that Treaty - and I see here present the father of that Treaty, Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico - would gladly give their advice in this matter.

Having stressed the unique value of this Treaty, His Excellency Mr. Andre Haakmat, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Suriname, also pointed out in his address to the General Assembly on 3 October 1980 that Argentina has yet to ratify and Cuba and Guyana to accede to the Tlatelolco Treaty. At the same time, he called on the United States and France to ratify Additional Protocol I to the Treaty.

The Government of Suriname cannot be too complacent about the status of that Treaty as long as two of its neighbours are not bound by its obligations.

My delegation wishes, finally, to reserve its right to speak during the debate on various items of our agenda.

Sir. BHATT (Nepal): It gives me pleasure, Sir, to see a person of your qualities, experience and professional skills as Chairman of this Committee. I am happy to congratulate you on your election, which is also a tribute to your country, with which my country has excellent neighbourly relations. I am confident that under your wise guidance the work at the current session of the First Committee will be productive and fruitful in adopting concrete measures on disarmament. I take this opportunity of extending felicitations to the other officers of the Committee on their election to their respective posts.

Our task of achieving the cherished goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control has met one setback after another. The ever-increasing military budgets of States, intense competition among the super-Powers to produce more sophisticated nuclear weapons of mass destruction, improvement upon the existing lethal conventional weaponry, growing social, political and religious unrest in many parts of the globe, economic recession, the failure to establish a new economic order and direct military interventions have prevented the satisfaction of the aspirations to world disarmament. These factors have led the peoples of the world to frustration and the super-Powers to confrontation.

The general trend appears to be for States to give priority to their survival through strength alone. It is for this reason that the arms race has become a gallop. There is world-wide competition for the possession of more lethal weapons, with each State trying to outnumber its so-called adversary.

Along with the growing pace of the arms race, the total value and volume of the arms trade has been rapidly increasing. World military expenditure figures are growing every year. In the First Disarmament Decade, when efforts were made to halt and reverse the arms race, the total value of arms trade was three and a half times greater than in the previous decade. The 1970s saw an increase in the number of arms-importing States. States are demanding more sophisticated weapons systems and also the transfer of know-how through which more arms can be produced indigenously. This would further intensify the arms race.

(Mr. Bhatt, Nepal)

It is a paradox that States find security in the acquisition of arms. The truth is that arms acquisition brings more insecurity. It impairs military balances, aggravates rivalries among States and increases tensions among States. The arms race benefits only the military-industrial complex, not mankind. It has therefore become an urgent international task to control the arms trade. In the Second Disarmament Decade, which has been declared for the 1980s, the arms race should be curbed so that the resources are not misused in the production of weapons, both nuclear and conventional. The super-Powers and the other arms-exporting countries are primarily responsible for the intensification of the arms race and therefore they should also shoulder the responsibility for halting and reversing the arms race. My delegation will welcome any effective move or action taken by the super-Powers and the arms-exporting countries, either within the Committee on Disarmament or outside it, through bilateral or multilateral negotiations.

The Final Document of the tenth special session, in its Programme of Action, recognized that the gradual reduction of military budgets, particularly by the nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States, would first contribute to the curbing of the arms race and secondly increase the possibilities of the reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries. So far, no mutually agreed basis as set out in the Final Document has emerged. The result is that huge amounts of resources are being wasted every moment. Reallocation of a fraction of those wasted resources could have made the life of the people in the developing countries a little easier than it is today. A reduction of military budgets would certainly have curbed the arms race.

(Mr. Bhatt, Nepal)

The Group of Governmental Experts appointed by the Secretary-General has rightly pointed out in its conclusions in document A/35/416 the necessity for conventional disarmament. While realizing the priority of nuclear disarmament, we should not underrate the danger of the scale of destruction that can be caused by sophisticated conventional armaments. Besides, the interrelationship between the escalation of the one and the other is obvious. Aside from the resources involved in conventional arms build-up, it provides an incentive for the escalation of the nuclear arms race. Thus, there should be an over-all effort to halt and reverse the escalation of the conventional arms build-up as well.

Nuclear weapons are the greatest single threat to mankind. In the existing political situation, as I said earlier, there is a real danger that a local or regional conflict could escalate into a nuclear war. If nuclear weapons were used there would be a catastrophe of unimaginable proportions. I deem it fitting at this juncture to quote from the Final Document of the tenth special session, which reads:

"Mankind today is confronted with an unprecedented threat of self-extinction arising from the massive and competitive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced. Existing arsenals of nuclear weapons alone are more than sufficient to destroy all life on earth." (resolution S-10/2, para. 11)

There is also a possibility that a nuclear war could be triggered by accident, folly or miscalculation. False nuclear alarms have already demonstrated the possibility of such a nuclear holocaust at any time. It is in this light that disarmament has become imperative and the achievement of general and complete disarmament an urgent task. The vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons makes necessary efforts to consolidate and strengthen the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). It would be most dangerous to have more nuclear-weapon States, but there are indications that a number of States seem to be on the verge of acquiring nuclear weapons. Some of them are suspected of already possessing a nuclear-weapon capability. In such circumstances, it becomes essential to prevent the continuance of proliferation. But the behaviour of the nuclear-weapon States has indeed not been



(Mr. Bhatt, Nepal)

conducive to the further strengthening of the non-proliferation régime. Their assurances regarding the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States are diverse. Their different positions on the issue of security assurances have complicated the process of nuclear disarmament. Widely accepted objective criteria would have been more welcome.

In order to prevent further nuclear proliferation it is essential to take concrete steps to strengthen the non-proliferation régime. Many States with significant nuclear activities have chosen not to become parties to the NPT. The indigenous nuclear facilities of many countries are beyond full-scope safeguards. It is regrettable that the Second NPT Review Conference had little success. The non-party States should be encouraged and induced to adhere to the NPT. Measures should be adopted further to strengthen the authority of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The existing safeguards system should be made more stringent so that fissionable material is not diverted to military purposes.

The International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation has in its report made clear that there is a direct link between nuclear energy and nuclear explosive capability and that the solution to the proliferation problem lies in the political will of States. The nuclear-weapon States and the threshold States must demonstrate their political will in favour of disarmament, wherein lies the survival of all mankind. In the meantime, internationalization of the nuclear fuel cycle may prevent clandestine proliferation. A reliable arrangement for the supply of fuel for the national nuclear energy programmes and storage of plutonium under the authority of the IAEA would be a concrete measure against the spread of nuclear proliferation.

Underground nuclear tests have continued unabated. In 1979 alone there were 53 nuclear explosions. A comprehensive ban on all nuclear test explosions would have been an important measure in preventing nuclear proliferation and also an essential step towards limiting the production of nuclear weapons. The tripartite report submitted to the Committee on Disarmament did not come up to expectations. It seems that more intensive negotiations are still needed. It is regrettable that the three parties to those negotiations have not so far been able to reach agreement on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Multilateral negotiations are long overdue. My delegation reiterates its earlier position

(Mr. Bhatt, Nepal)

that the three parties should agree to the proposal for a moratorium during which the negotiators would voluntarily stop nuclear testing pending agreement on a comprehensive test ban.

There is a state of crisis as regards détente. The SALT II treaty, which was formulated after long deliberations and negotiations, still remains to be ratified. The acceptance of SALT II by both super-Powers would result in the limitation of strategic arms. It is essential that both super-Powers should undertake to abide by the SALT II agreement pending its ratification. If this treaty is abandoned, a new, more vigorous race for nuclear superiority would follow. Both parties to this treaty should therefore initiate negotiations on European theatre nuclear weapons without awaiting the SALT II ratification procedure.

Europe is today the centre of the arms race between the two major alliances. The position regarding mutual force reduction talks looks gloomy. A breakthrough in those talks is needed. My delegation is hopeful that all parties participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe meeting in Madrid next month will co-operate in the attainment of positive results concerning confidence-building measures. The participating States should work in a constructive way to reach agreement on security and co-operation in conformity with the Helsinki Final Document and to create the prerequisites for a European disarmament conference.

The special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament endorsed the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones, to be established on the basis of arrangements arrived at in good faith among the States of the region. We feel that mere assurances regarding the non-use or non-development of nuclear weapons cannot ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. Such assurances carry credibility when they are supported by binding legal instruments such as the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

(Mr. Bhatt, Nepal)

Chemical weapons are among the most abhorrent of weapons. We appreciate the fact that we are now reaching a stage of chemical disarmament.

The joint United States-Soviet report submitted to the Committee on Disarmament may lead to the establishment of a chemical weapons convention in the near future. My delegation hopes that both parties will expedite the negotiations so as to reach a final conclusion within a short period of time. The complete and effective prohibition of all chemical weapons and their destruction would constitute a significant disarmament measure.

The creation of zones of peace for keeping certain areas free from the interference of extra-zonal Powers can contribute greatly towards the relaxation of international tension. It can provide opportunities for States of a certain region to solve their regional problems without outside interference. We have welcomed the idea of making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace so that the peace of the region would not be disturbed by rivalries of outside Powers. We earnestly hope that the proposed conference on the Indian Ocean, to be held in Colombo next year, will be a success. Similarly we welcome the initiative taken by the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) to make South-East Asia a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality. We also welcome all positive steps towards transforming the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation. The creation of zones of peace can bring relaxation of tension and allow the countries of the region to devote themselves to unhindered development. Nepal's total commitment to peace and development is manifest in its desire to make its land a zone of peace.

In conclusion, the new decade that we are entering should be a disarmament decade in the real sense. The United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, recently stated in his message on Disarmament Week

"The world is witnessing serious conflicts of power and interest. There is frequent resort to violence. The arms race is spiralling towards unprecedented heights. In a world whose population in large part suffers from lack of basic physical necessities, one million dollars are spent per minute on military pursuits. Civilization faces the real and ever present possibility of self-extinction." (A/C.1/35/PV.13,p.7)

It is high time that we checked our steps in the pursuit of costly and deadly weapons and turned towards improving the living conditions of mankind. We welcome the results of the United Nations Conference on certain conventional weapons that ended in Geneva a few days ago and hope that it will augur well for the conclusion of similar positive agreements in future. We sincerely hope that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to be convened in 1982, will play a positive role in making the Second Disarmament Decade a real success.

Mr. DE FIGUEIREDO (Angola): Mr. Chairman, as this is the first time that my delegation has addressed the First Committee allow me to congratulate you. Please accept our best wishes on your election to the post of Chairman.

Those of us who have never seen a world war or witnessed a nuclear holocaust will never really comprehend the dimensions of the catastrophe, either in terms of human suffering and death or of the destruction of the environment and of the fragile ecosystems that the earth and the atmosphere have maintained for millennia.

We do not need actual war to be in a state of warfare. Present world conditions are such that we need to declare a state of emergency to deal with them. There is still starvation, malnutrition and disease; every year 25 million children die in the third world of causes that can be prevented: there are inflation and recession, unemployment, economic refugees, migrants in search of the barest minimum; above all there is fear, fear of the present and fear of the future.

In the midst of all this poverty and blight, death and devastation of both man and his landscape an ominous arms race is being carried on. Advances in arms technology are such that even if a fraction of that effort were diverted to medical use mankind would be healthier today and certainly happier.

The statistics of the arms race are staggering. Almost one billion dollars are spent every day. Annual military activities throughout the world absorb resources equivalent to about two thirds of the aggregate gross national product of the third-world countries. The arms race is a waste of resources and a hindrance to national and regional development efforts.

The food crisis, the plethora of natural disasters and the losses left in their wake, balance-of-payment problems, the lack of educational and training facilities, hospitals and clinics - mankind would be far better served if attention was paid to these things that have to do with man's life rather than those that have to do with his death.

There is a moral link between disarmament and development in addition to the political, military and economic aspects. Smaller nations like ours are the victims not only of the nuclear capability and spending of more powerful countries, but we also suffer from the excessive expenditure of countries on conventional non-nuclear weapons. In fact the latter accounts for 80 per cent of all arms expenditure and all the wars since the Second World War have been fought with conventional weapons and in the third world more than 10 million people have been killed by them.

Arms sales by the industrialized countries to the developing ones represent 70 per cent of all arms exports. The United States, France, Italy and the United Kingdom are responsible for more than \$7.2 billion-worth of arms imports by the third world. The arms industry in those countries often aim at stimulating demand for arms in the third world irrespective of real defence needs.

We have now entered the Second Disarmament Decade, but the end of the first one has still not brought about either a decrease in expenditure on nuclear and non-nuclear weapons or an effective implementation of the many resolutions and declarations dealing with disarmament. What the last 10 years have seen is an abundance of such resolutions, as well as an increase in regional tensions.

What countries like ours wonder is whether, in the ultimate analysis, we shall be safe in an eventual collision of the giants, or whether we shall be the first victims.

We support the concept and practice of the legitimate defence of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. But surely that can be safeguarded without jeopardizing the future of mankind and without embroiling it in either military or economic warfare, which is what the heavy expenditure connected with arms sales amounts to.

The People's Republic of Angola has been a firm supporter of the concept of the denuclearization of Africa and has co-sponsored numerous resolutions on it. But Africa will have the sword of Damocles hanging over its head as long as the racist minority régime in Pretoria maintains and further develops its nuclear capability to threaten our continent, especially our region of southern Africa. That capability has been acquired by the Pretoria régime in the face of various United Nations sanctions. Moreover, Pretoria has given no international safeguards and is not a signatory of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Those Governments that have aided the racist fascist junta to become a nuclear Power will be held accountable should Pretoria's nuclear threats ever become a reality. In addition to its nuclear capability South Africa's defence expenditure represents a monstrous crime when one reads the statistics pertaining to the living conditions of South Africa's majority inhabitants. They are denied their human, civil and political rights, while Pretoria's war machine feeds on them, their labour and ultimately their lives.

South Africa's military adventurism is not restricted to itself. The people of Namibia have been suffering a racist military occupation, while South Africa, precisely because of its armed might, continues to defy international calls for the independence of the Namibian people.

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

Further, the racist boot of South Africa has trodden often on Angolan soil, defiled it, plundered our land, and killed our people. South Africa's acts of wanton aggression and armed invasion are directly attributable to, and dependent on, the vast military arsenal that it has collected to serve its racist and apartheid structure. What sort of peace can we have in our region if we are to be constantly faced by the threat of nuclear annihilation - or armed invasion at the very least?

My Government supports the Soviet proposal contained in document A/35/241 and in draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.1, entitled "Urgent measures for reducing the danger of war". The draft resolution deals with all those disarmament concerns that are vital for all of us - big States and small. It deals with military alliances, with potential military alliances, with political and international legal measures to strengthen the security of States and with the limitation and reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments. We appreciate references to the provision of guarantees to non-nuclear States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

We inherited a world devastated by two world wars. But what we are passing on to coming generations will be an irredeemable future if we do not desist from making war and manufacturing the instruments of war.

Instead of building empires, we should build the world. Instead of inventing new methods of mass destruction, we should eradicate disease, hunger and illiteracy. Instead of poisoning the rivers and defoliating the forests, we should be building dams and bridges. Instead of bombs, we should be building schools. Instead of releasing monstrous chemicals and radiation into the atmosphere with nuclear tests and atomic blasts, we should leave our heirs with the priceless legacy that is their birthright: pure air to breathe and uncontaminated soil on which to grow their food. There is enough on this planet for everyone: but if the arms spiral continues, there will be nothing left for anyone. Mankind will obliterate its own existence. There will be no survivors. And that is the one crime that we cannot commit - that is, deny future generations the right to participate in the human cycle. History will judge us; our own children will condemn us. This knowledge of impending disaster should arm us morally, politically and legally and do away with the type of nuclear and conventional arms that may yet envelop this world in a final, terrible, holocaust.

Until final victory, a luta continua.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker was described a few minutes ago by the representative of Suriname as among the most distinguished representatives of Latin America. It is true that Ambassador Davidson Hepburn of the Bahamas hails from Latin America, but he is the pride of the entire third world and, indeed, of the world community. So I take special pleasure in calling upon last year's Chairman of the First Committee.

Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): My delegation, in accepting the view that any debate on the question of disarmament falls under the headings of rhetoric, realism and solution, and given this premise, must ask: why is it that Member States seem to ignore the signals that summon the need for finding effective measures that would produce realistic solutions?

The rhetoric is that since the establishment of this Organization in 1945 thousands of resolutions have been adopted in every sphere of human activity, including that of the maintenance and protection of national interests and security by armaments. Without exception, all of these resolutions have sought to offer idealistic and practical solutions for the peaceful conduct of international and inter-human relations.

Having looked carefully at the items on the agenda allocated to the First Committee and studied the many resolutions issuing therefrom, my delegation recognizes a number of proposals that could very well suffice in effecting long-overdue progress. For example, the mere adherence to recommendations contained in resolutions on items 31, 33, 37, 38, 41 and 48 could help to bring about a lessening of universal tension. The first five items mentioned deal with regional proposals geared to slow down the process for arms build-up. Item 48 comprises nine subheadings which call for a number of measures the application of which could put an end to the operation of this Committee. On the contrary, my delegation senses a trend to add to the proliferation of items rather than try to solve the issues at hand. Logic tells me that if we are not endeavouring to decrease our Committee workload it is highly unlikely that talks on disarmament and curbing the arms race could be more than rhetorical. In this regard, my delegation is convinced that, on the one hand, the powerful and militarily strong nations are afraid of unilateral disarmament. They see a reduction in their defence budgets as a sign of vulnerability to other Powers which may refuse to take similar measures. In fact, there is no trust. On the other hand, developing countries which have little or no defence budgets may feel the need to develop some form of security in order to be prepared for any eventuality.



(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

My delegation refuses to quote statistics, as we see little need in highlighting the obvious. We are painfully aware of the negative fall-out from a nuclear holocaust and the aftermath of war. It seems to my delegation that natural disasters such as occurred recently in Algeria and Mexico and many other regions of our globe are common enough to deter us from creating man-made destruction through the barbaric use of conventional, chemical and nuclear weapons. What we need is to develop positive alternatives to the threat to international security.

Disarmament and peace, which are synonymous terms, ought to be seen as a business venture and managed as such. We need to sell the means to peace as we sell arms to war. Peace is such an inactive, passive, unauthoritative-sounding noun that we need to find slogans, perhaps, to market the idea of peace in the same way that agents sell insurance and designers compete to sell jeans, for example. Peace and disarmament must be given greater respect. It is the responsibility of the international community to initiate positive measures that could put peace on a par with war. There are non-governmental and student organizations and peace institutes ready to render invaluable service to the cause of peace. But they look first to the United Nations, and especially the super-Powers, for a positive nudge. Simply talking about peace and adopting resolutions calling for complete and genuine disarmament or confidence-building measures becomes ineffective, to say the least, after a while. This kind of qualification without action could be viewed as deception, disinterest or lack of political will.

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

The States Members of this Organization that are desirous of securing a seat on the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), the United Nations Development Programme or the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, to name but a few, do not sit idly by and hope that their good name or their record will bring support. On the contrary, they use all the means at their disposal to sell their point of view. Consequently, most often it is those States with the most active programme that become the victors. Should not peace and disarmament have a similar, if not higher, priority in our deliberations?

The Centre for Disarmament published a fact sheet recently giving guidelines on what the United Nations, Governments and non-governmental organizations could do during Disarmament Week in order to promote the cause of peace. The General Assembly in resolution 34/83 I emphasized

"the urgent need for and the importance of wide and continued mobilization of world public opinion in support of halting and reversing the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race in all its aspects."

Those carefully chosen words cover the total range of our responsibilities and obligations. For positive results, we need only to implement them. But I suppose that that suggestion is too simple, too logical and too non-controversial to command the concerted support of everyone.

Disarmament Week, though a positive reminder of the unfinished business regarding the arms race, should, in my delegation's view, be an ongoing programme geared to increasing public awareness not only to the dangers of the arms race but also to the fact that the acquisition of peace will not come solely through the abandoning of arms.

If a greater degree of positive progress had been made during the 1970s in the field of disarmament, there would have been little need to declare the 1980s as the second disarmament decade or to schedule a second special session on disarmament for 1982.

The reality is that two-thirds of the peoples of the world live in abject poverty. The remaining third, while enjoying or having the wherewithal to satisfy most, if not all, material needs, does not by and large enjoy a qualitative existence. Mr. Robert S. McNamara, President of the World Bank,

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

in an address to the Board of Governors, was moved to say:

"Economic growth, of course, is obvious enough. And once one has been in contact with developing societies, so is absolute poverty:

It is a condition of life so limited by malnutrition, illiteracy, disease, high infant mortality and low life expectancy as to be beneath any rational definition of human decency."

Absence of development endangers the world, and it is difficult to be more explicit than that.

Gains in the satisfaction of physical needs have been undermined by the rise of psychological ills characterized by deep-seated, if often unexpected, feelings of alienation from a world which, paradoxically, is becoming more and more understandable and, hence, conquerable, at least in a scientific and technical sense.

As if that were not enough to bear, mankind - both the majority "have-nots" and the minority "haves" - as a result of the ambitions and myopia of some of its members regarding the human condition, is additionally subject to the sword of Damocles represented by the refusal to undertake genuine and complete disarmament.

The foregoing illustrates that we in the United Nations have been linking disarmament with development, and my delegation compliments the international community for this expression. However, while no sensible individual could refute the benefits that could be derived if savings from reduction of arms spending were earmarked for economic and social development, my delegation feels that the approach is found wanting. Instead of asking Governments to reduce military spending and give the savings to development projects, they should be requested to allocate a percentage of their budgets, no matter how small, to development aid. The two could work hand in hand, for it has to be understood that a decrease in military expenditure does not automatically mean an increase in funds for development. For reasons stated earlier, it seems that the former appeal is falling on deaf ears. So this alternative need not interfere with direct military spending, no matter how abhorrent. It simply places the onus on Governments to assist a cause which concerns us all. Most importantly, the threat is lessened, making it easier for the sensitive Government to respond favourably to a call which would be in its best interests. We have indeed

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

already broadened the horizon of peace and disarmament by qualifying the terms and singling out areas that are of the greatest danger to our survival. In so doing, we concentrate on the parts and not the whole and, while slight progress may have been made in curbing the use of nuclear and chemical weapons, there is a build-up in conventional and other kinds of supposedly less harmful weapons.

Having rambled on about how ineffective implementation has been to date in the area of curbing the arms race, I am obliged to present a proposal for consideration, not as an alternative but, rather, as a supplement to the many worthy proposals already in progress.

On 23 May 1978, at the opening of the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament, the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, made a suggestion that the United Nations

"devote to national and international disarmament efforts \$1 million for every \$1,000 million currently spent on arms. This would constitute a valuable step in correcting the huge imbalance in our priorities."

(A/S-10/PV.1, p. 23-25)

While that proposal may be somewhat vague in its recommendations, it seems to contain certain positive measures which were focused on by Network to Educate for World Security. Some representatives here may already be privy to the data which was sent to Member States by that non-profit organization. The Director has made certain assumptions which underlie the purpose of the plan. As far as my delegation can understand the proposal, the Director wants to create an education programme flexible enough to accommodate the attitude and concern of everyone from kindergarten to old age. The programme is a comprehensive one and poses an enormous challenge to all who would wish to participate.

Along those lines, my delegation believes that, if education is to be the prime objective, then money must be available to put the plan in action. Towards this end there could be a central fund earmarked for general education on disarmament. To this fund nations could contribute not only the needed finance but also expertise, such as exchanges of views concerning programmes and projects which have failed or succeeded in their communities. This idea complements

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

the reference made by the Secretary-General only, it goes a bit farther by suggesting that the United Nations be the clearing-house or central depository to handle the total operation of the financial aspect of the programme.

The solution is that, because of the threat to human survival - which is the right of all mankind - which the lack of disarmament presents, and which no human being escapes, it behoves every individual, to the extent of his or her consciousness and capabilities, to refuse to be used, directly or indirectly, in any process which encourages obstacles to disarmament and which denies the commonality of the human condition and its implications for peaceful human existence.

The attainment of real or realistic disarmament, then, depends on the sum total of the efforts of all Member and Observer States of the United Nations.

The Bahamas stands ready to support any programme geared to strengthen and maintain universal peace and security and "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): At this meeting of the First Committee, the Mongolian delegation would like to make some points of a general nature on individual items of the agenda. In the present circumstances of the exacerbation of the international situation, when the danger of the growth of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, is becoming ever greater, the task of finding an immediate solution to questions which are of vital significance for eliminating the threat of nuclear war and preserving universal peace and security is more important than ever before. The attainment of that goal requires States and Governments to display to the utmost political will and firm determination. In our view, we must find common ground in our positions and not seek divergence, which means acting in a manner that would promote the renewal or the continuation of the bilateral and multilateral talks which have already been begun, or which need to be begun, on questions of limiting and halting the arms race and bringing about disarmament.

In our view, it is important to take a sober approach to the existing political and military realities and to recognize the particular responsibility of the peoples of the world to maintain international peace. This relates primarily to those States which possess nuclear weapons and which are striving for one-sided military supremacy.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have unambiguously pointed, and continue to point, to the inadmissibility of violating the existing military balance of forces.

The socialist countries, consistent in their support of the achievement of concrete agreement on such a key issue as the question of halting the nuclear arms race and achieving nuclear disarmament, both in this body and in the Disarmament Committee have been making constructive proposals for holding talks on halting the manufacture of nuclear weapons in all their forms, and the step-by-step reduction of stockpiles of those weapons, up to and including their total elimination.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

As we see it, many people believe that the Geneva Committee on Disarmament is a multilateral negotiating body with considerable prestige and the most appropriate forum for the detailed consideration of this subject in order to find a mutually acceptable solution. For their part, the socialist countries members of the Disarmament Committee have put forward concrete ideas concerning the beginning of such talks and the procedure for holding them. They have proposed that within the framework of the Committee a special working group should be established on the question of halting the nuclear arms race and bringing about nuclear disarmament and that the mandate of such an auxiliary body should be defined. As members know, that proposal enjoyed appropriate support in the Group of 21 which, in its turn, put forward in the Committee the idea of establishing a special working group to discuss questions relating to the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon testing.

As members will recall, the socialist countries actively supported that idea. However, our Western partners in the talks and representatives close to them did not show any readiness to adopt a decision to establish the two working groups I have mentioned. I must say frankly that their reluctance to do that was determined by their negative position, underlying which is the concept of changing the strategic balance in their favour by means of achieving a nuclear advantage. Such a course of open opposition has a very bad effect on the multilateral efforts aimed at bringing about positive changes in the field of disarmament. Anyone who believes that it is possible to be successful in those attempts in the Disarmament Committee to organize slanderous and provocative campaigns against the socialist States and to divert that important multilateral negotiating body from it is seriously mistaken.

Despite the specific difficulties and obstacles which have been encountered, the Disarmament Committee reaffirmed its own competence in the holding of constructive businesslike talks in order to achieve agreement on the individual aspects of disarmament. And, the establishment of four working groups within the framework of that body would, in our view, promote that goal.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The Mongolian delegation believes that the Committee on Disarmament should decide immediately to establish working bodies which would deal with the detailed consideration of agenda items relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and the achievement of nuclear disarmament.

The memorandum submitted by the Soviet Union to this session of the General Assembly contains a number of important points, namely, the cessation of the nuclear arms race, renunciation of the use of force in international relations, prevention of the possibility of a sudden and unauthorized attack, strengthening of the nuclear weapon non-proliferation régime and others. We continue to attach tremendous significance to the questions relating to nuclear disarmament that are the subject of bilateral and trilateral talks or, indeed, multilateral talks of a regional nature.

In this context, we should like once again to stress the great importance of the immediate ratification of the SALT II treaty, and its entry into force, which would allow for talks on a SALT III treaty to begin.

A valuable contribution towards reducing the threat of nuclear conflict and maintaining international peace and security would be the successful conclusion of talks on limiting nuclear armaments in Europe and progress in the Vienna talks on reducing armed forces and armaments in central Europe.

Moreover, we firmly believe that the time has come for more profound consideration in the Disarmament Committee of the question of concluding an international convention on strengthening security guarantees for non-nuclear States and the reaching of agreement on the question of the non-deployment of nuclear weapons on the territories of those States where there are no such weapons at present. The earliest possible achievement of an international agreement on those vital issues would undoubtedly facilitate the further strengthening of the nuclear weapon non-proliferation régime. That is indispensable in the present complicated international circumstances, in which there is a growing danger of the horizontal and vertical spread of this extremely dangerous weapon of mass destruction. This has been stressed by the majority of participants in the Second Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which came out firmly in favour of making this important international instrument universal.



(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

With regard to the question of so-called negative guarantees, I should like to add that some delegations have attempted to stress the absolute nature of the guarantee. But our position in this matter is entirely clear: we are in favour of sound and effective guarantees. In this connexion we should like to ask how it is possible to understand the actions of China, which says that it will under no circumstances ever use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States, but in actual practice calls upon States to arm themselves with nuclear weapons and continues to poison the atmosphere with its nuclear weapon explosions, thereby encouraging South Africa, Israel and others in their nuclear ambitions. In our view, actions of this kind by Peking can only be described as adventuristic and a manifestation of the Chinese policy of great-Power hegemonism and expansionism.

The Mongolian delegation, in its previous statement, put forward its views, in particular about the possible interim measures which could be taken in the realm of security guarantees for non-nuclear States. We believe that an effective measure could be the adoption of a decision on this question in a regional framework. In this connexion we warmly welcome the proposal of the socialist countries members of the Warsaw Treaty for resolution of this issue on the European level. This was reflected in the Warsaw declaration of 15 May this year. In my statement, I also highlighted the importance of achieving international agreement on a general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

I should like now to say something about the question of prohibiting other systems of weapons of mass destruction. Few people would deny the need to conclude the long drawn-out talks on arriving at an international convention on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons and their destruction. In our view, work on this convention and on ensuring its universality, along with the convention which came into force in 1975 on the prohibition and destruction of bacteriological (biological) weapons, would represent a logical conclusion of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and would be a further measure of genuine disarmament.

In this context, I should like to recall that the Mongolian delegation, in the Committee on Disarmament, put forward its views about the undesirability

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

of including in a future draft convention provisions which would call into question the ensuring of the effectiveness and universality of such an international document and which would constitute a precedent for possible attempts to review other international agreements in force in the area of limiting the arms race and of disarmament.

As members of the Committee will recall, last year in the Committee on Disarmament a Soviet-American communiqué was submitted which went into further detail about a joint approach to solving this problem. We believe that a further initiative by the participants in the bilateral talks would enable the Committee to make progress in bringing about as soon as possible a universally acceptable agreement in this important area of genuine disarmament. This is called for by the serious concern of the world public aroused by reports of the use in Afghanistan by the forces of internal reaction against the peaceful population of chemical weapons of American manufacture as well as by Western press reports of the intentions of military circles in certain Western countries members of NATO to continue refining this type of weapon of mass destruction and to expand their production of it. Therefore an urgent solution to this problem - that of a comprehensive prohibition of chemical weapons - is dictated by the interests of preserving international peace and security.

In approaching the problem of prohibiting new forms and systems of weapons of mass destruction, the Mongolian delegation proceeds from the premise that the most effective way to solve the problem would be the conclusion of a comprehensive agreement on the subject. At the same time we are in favour of drafting special agreements on individual new types of weapons of mass destruction, bearing in mind that these would promote a radical solution of the problem as a whole. In concrete terms, we have in mind the prohibition of radiological weapons, and it can only be regretted that at this year's session of the Committee on Disarmament it was not possible to produce a draft international convention although, we feel, all the conditions necessary for this existed.

The Mongolian delegation hopes that the special working group set up in the Committee on Disarmament will, in the course of the next stage of its work in 1961, be able to complete work on a draft convention on the subject.

A practical measure towards limiting the arms race and releasing considerable funds for peaceful purposes would be an immediate start on concrete talks for reducing the military budgets of States, primarily the permanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations and militarily powerful countries. The proposals and initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for a reduction of military budgets, in absolute or percentage terms, is, in our view, aimed precisely at solving that problem.

The Mongolian delegation has consistently favoured the creation of zones of peace and of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world. We view them as an important step towards the limitation of the arms race, both on a regional and an international level. Of particular seriousness and urgency now is the idea of converting the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. This is an area where the United States, contrary to the efforts of peace-loving forces in the world, is continuing to build up its military presence, thus creating a new and dangerous source of international tension. In our view it is vitally necessary as soon as possible to resume the bilateral talks - for the interruption of which the United States was to blame - on the limitation and subsequent reduction of military activity in the Indian Ocean. The forthcoming international conference, to be held in 1981, on converting the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace should have something very important to say about such an extremely important question as the limitation of foreign military bases. We believe that a positive solution to this problem could be promoted by the initiative of the socialist countries with regard to the consideration within the United Nations of, for example, the question of limiting and reducing the level of military presence and activity, whether in the Atlantic, Indian or Pacific Oceans, the Mediterranean Sea or the Persian Gulf. In their approach to the question of prohibiting new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, the socialist countries believe that an important place should be given to the task of prohibiting the manufacture, stockpiling, deployment and use of the neutron weapon. Several years have now gone by since they submitted to the Committee on Disarmament a draft convention on the subject. However, because of the negative attitude of certain Western countries, which have the capability to create such weapons, genuine talks have not yet begun. The immediate adoption of a decision on a legal treaty settlement of prohibiting neutron weapons would be a solid barrier against the emergence of this lethal weapon.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

As I have mentioned, four working groups were set up this year in the Committee on Disarmament to deal with concrete aspects of disarmament.

The Ad Hoc Working Group on a comprehensive programme of disarmament has done a considerable amount of work and has held a useful exchange of views on the general outline, content and basic orientation of the programme, which has created good conditions for the embarking on effective talks in the Committee at its next session and the development of a specific draft document. It should be pointed out that a considerable amount of work was done also this year in the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

A group of socialist countries, including Mongolia, submitted to the Committee on Disarmament in August this year document CD/128 regarding the main elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

This document stresses that general and complete disarmament under effective international control still represents the ultimate goal of all measures undertaken in the disarmament field.

Without wishing to minimize the importance of working out a comprehensive disarmament programme, we should like to see further practical measures achieved in the field of limiting and halting the arms race and bringing about disarmament in the course of the Second Disarmament Decade, the urgent tasks of which had already begun to be reflected in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

In conclusion, I should like to say a few words about the beginning of the preparatory work for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Our First Committee still faces the task of working out a decision on the establishment of a preparatory working body, in which the many interested States would have the possibility of participating. This organ could learn something from the useful experience of the preparatory work done before the opening of a similar world forum in 1978, at which a Final Document was adopted on the basis of consensus. We believe that the main goal of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament must be to make a real contribution to the practical implementation of the basic provisions of the document to which I have just referred.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

In our opinion, the logical consequences of such dynamic efforts on the part of the United Nations in the disarmament field would be a world disarmament conference whose task it should be to take important decisions which would be binding on all States of the world.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.