

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



FIRST COMMITTEE
22nd meeting
held on
Monday, 2 November 1981
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 22ND MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

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

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Rwetsiba (Uganda)
Mr. Jerad (Tunisia)
Mr. Korneenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)
Mr. Kabia (Sierra Leone)
Mr. Sulaiman (Oman)
Mr. Johnson (Liberia)
Mr. Dorr (Ireland)

UN LIBRARY
NOV 5 1981
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, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

81-64128

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/36/PV.22
3 November 1981

ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEMS 39 to 56, 128 and 135 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. RWETSIBA (Uganda): Mr. Chairman, allow me to congratulate you, on behalf of the Uganda delegation and on my own behalf, upon your election to the high office of Chairman of the First Committee. We have no doubt that, with your unquestionable ability and your well known diplomatic skills, you will be able to steer this Committee towards successful deliberations. We are particularly pleased to have guiding our work a distinguished representative of Yugoslavia, a country with which my own country enjoys excellent and cordial relations. Most befitting also is the fact that Yugoslavia is a founder member of the movement of the non-aligned countries, a movement which cherishes and upholds world peace, the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States and the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination. This year, as that movement marks its twentieth anniversary, we feel particularly honoured that a Committee which addresses the issues of world peace and security should have as Chairman a representative of the founder member of that very organization.

May I also take this opportunity to extend our very warm and sincere congratulations to the other officers of the Committee on their election to their important posts. They are all assured of my delegation's full co-operation in the effective discharge of their heavy responsibilities. We wish them every success.

In his statement to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, His Excellency the Honourable Dr. Albert Picho Owiny, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs and Chairman of the Uganda delegation to the thirty-sixth regular session of the United Nations General Assembly, summed up the international situation in the following terms:

(Mr. Rwetsiba, Uganda)

"The year 1981 has witnessed a general deterioration in the international political situation. Events in most regions of the world, particularly in the existing areas of conflict, have dimmed our hopes for greater peace and security in the world. We have this year experienced increased human affliction caused by senseless acts of aggression and continued warfare. We have also experienced heightened tension caused by a deplorable return to the vicious arms race between West and East."
(A/36/PV.14, p.109-110)

As we meet here today, a month or so after that statement was made, the international situation has barely changed. There is continued deterioration in the atmosphere of international peace and security: the crisis in the process of détente remains unsolved; the trend of super-Power rivalry continues; regional tensions are constantly being created and fanned so as to provide pretexts for big Powers to claim spheres of influence wherever that suits their power schemes.

All these developments are pitted against a spectre of rising global military expenditures and the arms race. It is now estimated that military spending is in the range of about \$600 billion a year. Instead of diverting the much needed resources to improve the conditions of the world's poverty-stricken majority, the largest portion of those resources is committed to the production of instruments of war and the arsenal of destruction. Peoples of the third world, where most of us belong, have nothing to gain from these ominous developments. It is the perpetrators and architects of these dangerous designs who stand to benefit most.

It is now common knowledge that meaningful financial and economic aid packages are increasingly being superseded by increased military aid to areas of tension. My delegation cannot but deplore policies which, far from helping to resolve international conflicts, encourage the arms race and distort the development priorities of poor countries.

Through the General Assembly and the First Committee, the United Nations has all along been preoccupied with finding long-term solutions to these problems with a view to achieving equality among all the nations of this globe. However, this objective has continued to elude us owing to the lack of meaningful progress in our disarmament efforts and the ever increasing

(Mr. Rwetsiba, Uganda)

trend in the production, stockpiling and proliferation of armaments both nuclear and conventional. It will be a great day when the vast resources which the world is devoting to the arms race are usefully channelled to the social and economic development and welfare of the poor and needy nations of the world.

The danger of nuclear war looms high and has become closer to reality than ever before. Whereas during the last decade the talk was about how to prevent a nuclear catastrophe, the talk of the 1980s seems to concern the possibility of now winning or surviving a nuclear holocaust. To most of us this is idle talk and sheer fantasy, and my delegation does not and will not subscribe to it.

A nuclear war, whether limited or unlimited, will achieve the same end result, namely the total annihilation of life and the complete destruction of a large portion of the earth. In the world of today, in which military technology has been perfected and nuclear armaments have assumed astronomical proportions and are of greater devastating power than ever before, there can be no victors or losers in a nuclear war.

We in Africa do not and cannot take too lightly these ominous developments as the shadow of a nuclear threat gets closer to home. Africa is sandwiched between two imperialist outposts, Israel and South Africa, both of which are known to possess nuclear capabilities.

The fervent desire of the peoples of Africa, Asia and the Middle East to establish nuclear-free zones in their respective regions is obstructed by big-Power rivalry. The objective of a General Assembly resolution adopted two decades ago, to ensure a nuclear-free Africa, has not been realized. That has allowed South Africa sufficient time to acquire military superiority, including nuclear power, which it can put to use to preserve its privileged position by fighting off every attempt to eradicate the apartheid system.

In his statement before this Committee last year, commenting on South Africa's nuclear capability, Ambassador Olu Aidineji, the representative of Nigeria, stated as follows:

"A régime which by its policy of apartheid has made itself the outcast of the international community is capable of any irrational act, including the use of or threat of use of nuclear weapons to protect its criminal policy of apartheid." (A/C.1/35/PV.15, p.31)

(Mr. Rwetsiba, Uganda)

With the possession of nuclear capability, South Africa finds itself in a position where it can hold the whole of Africa to ransom and perpetrate the heinous system of apartheid in that country and seek to dominate the neighbouring States.

(Mr. Rwetsiba, Uganda)

That is not all. The dangers facing Africa are compounded by developments in the Indian Ocean. Acts of war in that region have escalated. Those acts, which have consistently been in disregard of the aspirations and interests of the peoples of the Indian Ocean region, pose an increasingly dangerous situation. The States of the region are faced with the proliferation of big-Power military bases. The expansion of existing bases, the establishment of new ones and the increasing build-up of naval forces have heightened the concern of the peoples and led to increased tension in the Indian Ocean region. That situation has encouraged the South African racist régime to commit acts of aggression against front-line States and to perpetuate the oppression of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia. The proposal for the Indian Ocean to be a zone of peace is an authentic expression of the desire of the peoples of the region to preserve their hard-won independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. My delegation hopes to see the United Nations Declaration in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) translated into action so that there can be no further delay in transforming the Indian Ocean region into a zone of peace, devoid of nuclear weapons and foreign bases. It is in this light that we add our voice to the voices of those who advocate the urgent convening of a conference on this burning issue, as recommended last year by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. We note with profound regret that the conference was not held this year because of the negative and obstructionist attitude adopted by certain countries.

Uganda welcomes and strongly supports the proposal made by Mr. Didier Ratsiraka, President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, for a summit meeting to be held at Tananarive in 1982 to address the issue of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

I turn now to the general question of disarmament. It is the view of my delegation that all peace-loving peoples and nations of the world have a role to play in world disarmament, security and co-operation. We do not accept the opinion, sometimes expressed by some delegations, that problems of security should be the monopoly of the big Powers. The scourge of war looms over everybody, and this therefore must become the concern of all.

This principle was well recognized by the General Assembly at its first special session devoted to disarmament, resulting in the reconstitution of the Committee on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission as the principal

(Mr. Rwetsiba, Uganda)

multilateral negotiating and deliberative organs respectively within the disarmament process.

We note with appreciation progress in the following areas: the creation of working groups in the Committee on Disarmament to examine substantive questions relating to the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their deployment; assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States against nuclear attacks; the prohibition of radiological weapons, and a comprehensive programme of disarmament as envisaged in paragraph 109 of the Final Document adopted at the first special session on disarmament.

It is a matter of deep regret, however, that there still exist numerous divergencies concerning disarmament questions. It is the view of my delegation that verbal assurances and unfulfilled guarantees offered by nuclear-weapon States of the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States are entirely inadequate. There must be concluded an international convention that would impose, without any preconditions, legally binding obligations on nuclear-weapon States not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States.

We note with equal concern that some countries have relentlessly opposed the overwhelming desire for the establishment of a working group in the Committee on Disarmament to tackle the question of a nuclear-test ban. Technical and scientific aspects of the problem have been so fully explored that what is now lacking is political will amongst some of those closely related to the matter. The question of the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament has been given priority within this Committee.

The nuclear Powers must urgently and speedily embark on serious negotiations to put an end to all nuclear tests and to draw up a comprehensive programme on nuclear disarmament. The Non-Proliferation Treaty must not be seen as an end in itself, but as a means to an end - that is, the achievement of complete nuclear disarmament. My delegation hopes that this will constitute a priority item on the agenda of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament next year. The nuclear States, through the Committee on Disarmament, should present such a programme before that session for adoption.

(Mr. Rwetsiba, Uganda)

In our view, priority in the nuclear disarmament process should be placed on the reduction and eventual elimination of existing vast arsenals of nuclear weapons rather than on the prevention of the emergence of those that are not even in the offing. In saying this, we are not in any way providing pretexts for certain countries to "go nuclear". On the contrary, we are vehemently opposed to the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

However, we do recognize the right of every State to peaceful uses of nuclear energy. No State has a mandate to prevent other sovereign States from the peaceful uses of nuclear energy that can promote the social and economic conditions of their people and contribute towards international co-operation and global peace.

It is against that background that we unreservedly condemn the recent unwarranted and cowardly act of aggression carried out against Iraq's nuclear research centre, Osiraq. Such irresponsible acts of aggression should serve as a reminder of the imminence of nuclear catastrophe if the nuclear-arms race is not reversed and halted altogether.

With regard to the functioning of the Committee on Disarmament itself, my delegation notes with regret that it has been unable to discharge its responsibilities effectively because some delegations have misused the consensus formula to the extent of converting it into a veto power. Thus, my delegation fully shares the sentiment that, if it is not possible to reach positive decisions within that Committee, it is necessary to re-examine what further steps should be taken to ensure that its rules of procedure are not used in such a way as to prevent it from conducting negotiations.

The First United Nations Disarmament Decade came and passed without the achievement of any meaningful progress in disarmament efforts. Despite the existence of international instruments, chemical weapons continue to be manufactured and possibly put to use in areas of conflict. There has been failure so far to reach an agreement prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of those weapons. There are also ominous signs of the continued militarization of outer space. Not only life on our planet, but space above and beyond, is being made uneasy. The unbridled arms race, both nuclear and conventional, is escalating in disregard of world public opinion. Uganda joins with all those the world over which have expressed and continue to express their public indignation against the arms race in both the nuclear and conventional spheres.

(Mr. Rwetsiba, Uganda)

With the adoption of the Final Document by the first special session devoted to disarmament in 1978 the hopes of those who yearn for world peace and tranquillity were heightened; but three years after the unanimous adoption of that historic document those hopes have continually eroded and have since virtually disappeared. No tangible agreements have been arrived at on basic disarmament issues. Global military spending continues to escalate unabated. The strategic arms limitation negotiations have been ruptured, although there are signs that the situation might change. The nuclear-weapon States have thwarted any efforts to conclude a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. There is a growing danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons. Efforts to achieve limitations on nuclear and conventional arms in Europe have crumbled. There is also a lack of disarmament progress in other no less important areas, including prohibition of neutron bombs, creation of additional nuclear-weapon-free zones, bans on new types of weapons of mass destruction and the limitation of conventional-arms build-up and transfers.

Yet, amidst all this paralysis in the disarmament process, there still persists a fervent desire by those who cherish peace to see a second special session of the United Nations on disarmament convened. It is the sincere hope of my delegation that that session will lead to an increased awareness about the urgency of progress towards disarmament. Governments and their peoples must be reminded of the commitments already made in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament and the importance of implementing them. The forthcoming second special session devoted to disarmament must focus public opinion on, and build their support for, concrete action towards disarmament. It must adopt the comprehensive programme of disarmament at present being considered by the various working groups of the Committee on Disarmament.

Despite our misgivings, it is my delegation's earnest hope that that session will chart a guide for serious action towards complete disarmament. We will need the full co-operation of the nuclear Powers to ensure the success of that session. It is the hope of my delegation that that co-operation will be forthcoming.

Mr. JERAD (Tunisia)(interpretation from French): On behalf of my delegation I should like to extend to you, Sir, our sincere congratulations on your election as Chairman of the First Committee as well as to the other officers of the Committee who are working with you. Our congratulations go also to your country, friendly Yugoslavia, which has always distinguished itself in the fight for peace and the search for understanding among peoples. With you presiding over this Committee we have a guarantee that our discussions will be frank and our exchanges of view fruitful as we seek the best course to disarmament and peace. As you said in your inaugural statement, the world situation is tense, the dangers of conflict are great and we are particularly concerned because that tension is accompanied by increasing quantities of weapons with ever greater destructiveness.

Our desire, like that of all the other members of this Assembly, is that the voice of reason should prevail and that a return to détente and dialogue may come about.

It was with great satisfaction and optimism that we listened to the statements in this Committee by the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union on the resumption of talks on disarmament at a forthcoming meeting on 30 November. Perhaps our Committee will wish to be guided by that state of affairs as it examines many questions on our agenda, some of which have been awaiting solution for some time.

We believe that the question which deserves priority because it determines all others is the nuclear test ban. The continuation of discussions in the Committee on Disarmament, in spite of this year's disappointment, would make it possible to formulate proposals which the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament might give more concrete form to and thereby be able to take credit for.

By reaching a consensus on a nuclear test ban in any form - legal, treaty or moratorium - the Assembly would promote the generalization and the universality of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty which, with the nuclear test ban, forms the keystone of all agreements on nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Jerad, Tunisia)

Adhering to the Non-Proliferation Treaty is the best way for the non-nuclear States to show that they do not intend to manufacture or use nuclear weapons. Iraq gave that guarantee when it submitted its installations to control by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), as stipulated by the Treaty. In spite of that the international community was shocked and dismayed last June when it learned of the Israeli bombing of those installations, which, as a result of impartial rigorous international control, had been declared to be for peaceful purposes.

Notwithstanding the fact that similar Israeli installations have not been placed under international control, we have before us the Secretary-General's report in document A/36/431 in which there is overwhelming proof that those facilities can produce nuclear weapons and that it is probable that those weapons already exist. As the Director-General of IAEA has said on the subject of principles, we cannot help but conclude that it is the Agency's safeguards system which is under attack.

Israel could not have had nuclear weapons had it not been for supplies of uranium and transfer of technology from another country also in possession of nuclear weapons, namely, South Africa, which is a perpetual threat to peace in the African region.

In addition to affirmation of principles in the search for solutions leading to disarmament, our Committee has very firmly condemned Israel and South Africa, which are bound by the same attitudes - use of force, scorn for conventions and international law - attitudes which have been frequently denounced here and elsewhere.

There is another equally important problem having to do with the conduct of countries, that is, the accumulation of conventional weapons in significant quantities out of all proportion to their security needs. Rules must be enacted to limit those weapons, the growth of which is a constant threat to the stability of States, to world security, not to mention the fact that significant quantities of important resources are being diverted that could be devoted to development, as was so eloquently stated here by Mrs. Inge Thornson, Under-Secretary of State and Disarmament of Sweden, when on 21 October 1981 she introduced in this Committee the study on the relationship between disarmament and development in document A/36/356.

(Mr. Jerad, Tunisia)

As disarmament should be viewed as a whole, we cannot be indifferent to the dangers of the use of chemical weapons and the Committee on Disarmament must consider those dangers if it is to find a just, speedy and satisfactory solution.

Of course, our consideration of these technical questions must not rule out the fact that one day we may wish to take up the strategies which justify these weapons. Therefore no type of weapon should be overlooked even though nuclear disarmament should be sought as a matter of priority because of the dangers posed to mankind by nuclear weapons; we must bear in mind the fact that the existence of certain peoples is threatened by the use of conventional weapons, a term that gives them a false, inoffensive image.

Thus, the disarmament campaign which is to serve to make public opinion aware of the issues involved in the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly on disarmament must have the support of us all and contribute to alerting public opinion to the dangers to mankind of the accumulation of considerable quantities of atomic and conventional weapons both by the great Powers and by other countries.

Notwithstanding the clouds and threats looming over our planet, we do not doubt that the voice of wisdom will in the end triumph and we place our trust in the United Nations, which has, notwithstanding vicissitudes and conflicts, managed to prevent a widespread conflict. Next June's special session, the agenda for which has recently been adopted by the Preparatory Committee, will be the second in four years to be devoted to disarmament. This testifies to the fact that that question is foremost among the concerns of the international community and nothing must be spared to adopt a realistic and achievable comprehensive programme.

In conclusion I should like to recall the appeal made by Mr Caid Essebsi, the Tunisian Foreign Minister, who spoke in the General Assembly on 5 October when he said:

(Mr. Jerad, Tunisia)

"It is time for relations between States, whether they be large or small, to be based on mutual respect, and differences in social or economic systems should not be allowed to be a source of conflict. It is time for every State to be able to organize its national structures in terms of its own realities and to define freely its policies, without having to fear seeing itself encountering the interference of other States. This is what has come to be known as peaceful coexistence, which should have led to authentic détente; but, I am afraid, this is something which today we have come to see as belonging to the past."

(A/36/PV.25, p.53)

Mr. KORNEENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The discussion in the Committee has shown very convincingly that the overwhelming majority of delegations are deeply alarmed at the danger of nuclear catastrophe which looms over mankind and have demanded the adoption of effective and urgent steps to curb the arms race.

That being so, it is the duty of the United Nations to embody in concrete resolutions the clearly expressed desire of peoples and to do everything it can to promote businesslike negotiations between States with mutual respect for each other's equality and security.

Unfortunately, however, it is quite obvious that not everybody in our Committee shares this approach. Some have, indeed, made attempts to justify the stepping up of nuclear arsenals and at the same time have sought to place responsibility for the arms race in the camp of the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community.

The statements of a number of delegates have, with irrefutable historical facts, more than convincingly already proved that it is none other than the United States, motivated by the aspiration to nuclear superiority, which has been the instigator of every new round of the nuclear arms race, both in the creation and perfection of nuclear weapons and in the development of their vectors: missiles, strategic bombers, submarines with atomic missiles and so on.

If we now turn to more recent events, once again it is the United States alone which has carried out the elaboration and deployment of cruise missiles, invented the barbaric neutron weapon and taken a decision to manufacture them on a large scale.

To deny those facts would be deliberately to distort the truth. However, there are politicians who do that and in order to camouflage their own aggressive plans and imperial ambitions they are inventing new variations all based on the theme of their fabricated "Soviet military threat" and are resorting to monstrous deceit and massive disinformation.

No falsification and disinformation can conceal the fact that it was precisely the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community which have constantly and consistently, since the very creation of nuclear weapons, tried to put an end to their manufacture and to do away with their stockpiles. They have put forward numerous well-known and constructive proposals which are aimed at achieving that end. Those proposals have, however, been met on all occasions by the ever spiralling nuclear-ballistic arms race and various types of aggressive doctrines which seek to justify the admissibility and acceptability of nuclear war.

There is no other reasonable way, apart from negotiation, to resolve disputes at the present time, however acute and complex they may be. Naturally such negotiations should be conducted without any preconditions being set or any attempts to impose a diktat. As Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev said:

"Experience gained through history, including the last few decades, clearly indicates that success in negotiations between States can only be obtained when they relinquish attempts to dictate their conditions to each other and when there is a genuine desire for peace and mutual respect for the interests of their partners."

In that connexion it would be timely to recall that the refusal to recognize the Soviet Union as an equal partner during the cold war and the attempt to act from a position of diktat and force made it impossible at that time to conduct negotiations on the most paramount issues relating to the arms race, primarily the cessation of the quantitative and qualitative arms race. Valuable time was lost and as a result of that there was a considerable growth in the nuclear potential of the parties and a consequent threat to the existence of mankind.

Recently a great deal has been said about verification in the limitation of the arms race and disarmament. No one can deny the fact that verification is important and essential, but we still vividly recall the times when, in order to torpedo negotiations, some started talking about how verification should be carried out without having a clear idea of what precisely was to be verified. The countries of the socialist community, as has been frequently stated, were previously ready and are now, to conduct serious negotiations on verification in the context of specific means to curb the arms race and bring about disarmament. This is an approach which is shared by many. For example, in its working document on the question of verification in the field of disarmament, which was distributed in the Committee on Disarmament as document CD/209, the delegation of India stated that:

"...it would be wrong to make a fetish of verification. It would be equally wrong to devise or establish a machinery of controls in the absence of genuine measures of arms limitation or disarmament. To do that would be like putting the cart before the horse. There can be no merit either in sterile and abstract discussions of the complexities of verification issues, kinds of verification régimes, or in stressing the need for some kind of an international verification organization without reference to any concrete measure of real disarmament or serious arms limitation." (CD/209)

The absence of political will, not the difficulties involved in verification, are the obstacles standing in the way of negotiations in this very delicate field, namely, the limitation of the nuclear arms race.

(Mr. Korneenko, Ukrainian SSR)

This is indicated by what happened to the SALT II treaty, which endorses equality in strategic weapons, reduces their number and sets a limit to their further qualitative and quantitative growth. However, the provisions of the treaty spelling out equality in reductions were not to the taste of some in the United States and there was a breakdown both in the ratification of the treaty and in the actual process of negotiating on strategic arms limitation.

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR considers that everything positive that has been achieved in this area to date should be preserved and that negotiations on this, on the basis of equality and equal security, should be continued without delay. All countries and peoples of the earth would stand to gain from this. In this connexion we welcome the agreement reached this month in Geneva to re-open the Soviet-American talks on medium-range nuclear devices in Europe.

In the past year no real results have been achieved in the reduction of nuclear arms, although the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly recommended that immediate negotiations be undertaken on a cessation of the nuclear arms race. There were also specific proposals made by the socialist countries - in the Committee on Disarmament in particular - as to how these talks should be started. The immediate initiation of such talks is also favoured by the non-aligned countries. As was emphasized in the present discussion, the socialist countries believe that the cessation of the production, the reduction and the elimination of nuclear weapons should be carried out stage by stage, on a mutually acceptable and agreed basis and with the participation of all nuclear-weapon States. At the same time, the degree of involvement in each step by various nuclear States should be based on taking into account the qualitative and quantitative significance of existing arsenals of nuclear-weapon States and other States involved. At all stages the existing balance in nuclear power should be maintained inviolate with the gradual reduction of its levels and the strict observance of the principle of not jeopardizing the security of other States. At the first stage, in particular, we could decide to put an end to the elaboration and the deployment of new kinds and systems of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Korneenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Representatives of a number of Western States have stated that such talks would be premature. Naturally, in conditions when these States have embarked on a policy of achieving military supremacy, which involves a considerable increase in the production and deployment of new forms of nuclear weapons, for example, the neutron weapon, it cannot therefore be a surprise to anyone that any talks on their reduction are regarded not only as premature by them but, indeed, dangerous for those who represent the military-industrial complex and all those who grow rich on the arms race. However, such a militaristic approach runs directly counter to the vital interests of mankind and the purposes of preserving civilization and curbing the arms race.

The General Assembly should condemn the policy of holding up under contrived pretexts the talks on the cessation of the production of all forms of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of stockpiles of such weapons until their complete elimination and call for the immediate initiation of such talks in the Committee on Disarmament.

I should like now to address the question of the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests which, quite rightly, occupies a major place in the discussion. It is not the fault of the Soviet Union that the tripartite talks on this matter have come to a halt. However, we are now told that once again the time is not ripe for them to be successfully concluded, and this despite the fact that 36 years have elapsed since the first atomic bomb was exploded. And it was not the Soviet Union but, rather, the United States and the United Kingdom which this year blocked the idea of creating a special working group in the Committee on Disarmament, where it would have been possible to continue to examine the problem of prohibiting nuclear tests in all their aspects in order to promote the swift conclusion of a treaty with the participation of all nuclear States, completely banning such tests.

Nor has any progress been made on the strengthening of the security guarantees of non-nuclear-weapon States and the non-deployment of nuclear weapons in countries where there are no such weapons at the present time, a matter which is acquiring more and more significance in present circumstances. The cause for this is exactly the same: the resistance of those who, in accordance with their aggressive doctrines, would like to preserve broad opportunities for the use of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Korneenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR believes that the General Assembly should call for renewed efforts in talks on all these matters. As has been proposed by the socialist and many non-aligned countries, extra efforts should be made to prohibit the use of neutron weapons, on a mutual basis. A draft convention on this point has been before the Committee on Disarmament since 1978.

Talks on the prohibition of chemical weapons are also going on more slowly than they should. The bilateral Soviet-American talks, which could have made significant progress in concluding a multilateral convention prohibiting chemical weapons, were broken up by the United States.

At the same time, we cannot fail to note the useful work done on the prohibition of chemical weapons this year by the Working Group in the Committee on Disarmament. The exchange of views which took place there once again showed the exceptional complexity of this problem. Like no other, this type of weapon is intimately related with the peaceful branches of States' economies; therefore, a cautious and thoughtful approach to elaborating the provisions of the forthcoming agreement - provisions which should not impinge upon the peaceful activities of States in this area - is the only real way for success to be achieved.

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR hopes that next year the Committee on Disarmament will continue this useful work and achieve further success. We should also like to express the hope that bilateral talks on this matter will be re-opened.

Naturally, holding such talks, both on a multilateral and a bilateral basis, can be successful only if all States participating in them refrain from any actions tending to undermine them, in particular, the elaboration, production and deployment of new types of chemical weapons, including binary weapons. However, facts indicate that the United States is actively working in this direction. According to evidence provided by the American press, the United States Senate has earmarked a considerable sum to build, in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, a factory to produce binary weapons equipped with paralytic nerve gas. As has been emphasized by the press, this is only the first step in a process designed to go on for many years.

(Mr. Korneenko, Ukrainian SSR)

A propaganda confirmation of the fact that the United States has embarked upon a chemical-weapon race has been revealed by the campaign started in the West about alleged violations of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 in certain parts of the world. Obviously, this was needed in order to cover up previous unsavoury acts in Viet Nam, and now those against Cuba, which has been attested to in document CD/211 distributed in the Committee on Disarmament.

The Ukrainian SSR has consistently opposed the manufacture of new forms and systems of weapons of mass destruction and is a staunch supporter of a radical solution being found to this problem, that is, the elaboration of a comprehensive agreement prohibiting new forms and systems of weapons of mass destruction. It should also be possible to draw up special agreements prohibiting individual types of such weapons. We believe that the General Assembly should call on the Committee on Disarmament to intensify its negotiations with the participation of qualified governmental experts with a view to drawing up these essential international legal instruments.

(Mr. Korneenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR also supports the proposal of the Soviet Union that States permanent members of the Security Council and other militarily important States should, as a first step towards the conclusion of a comprehensive agreement, make similar declarations to the effect that they will refrain from developing new forms and systems of weapons of mass destruction; such declarations could then be approved by a decision of the Security Council. Those declarations would help in the future achievement of a complete prohibition of the development of qualitatively new forms of weapons which, when manufactured, could make their control, and therefore their agreed limitation, extremely difficult if not impossible.

Unfortunately, the present session of the General Assembly will not be able to approve the text of a treaty banning radiological weapons. There can be no doubt that completion of work on this before the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament would not only be a contribution to the resolution of the specific problem of prohibiting that potentially dangerous form of weapon of mass destruction, but would also have tremendous moral impact and would demonstrate the ability of the world body in a complex international situation to achieve at least partial success in restricting the arms race. We would venture to hope that existing difficulties, often artificial in nature, will soon be eliminated, and that such a treaty will become a reality. It is the opinion of the Ukrainian delegation that this should be the purpose of relevant resolutions of the current session of the General Assembly.

In conclusion, I should like to refer to one further point. As a member of the Preparatory Committee for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament the Ukrainian SSR is gratified to note that the Committee has agreed on a provisional agenda for that session, and has also resolved a number of organizational issues. Like many other States Members of the United Nations, the Ukrainian SSR attaches extraordinary significance to that session; we regard it as an important spur to progress in achieving genuine, concrete disarmament measures and to the holding of talks on all aspects of disarmament, and as a stage on the way to the convening of a world disarmament conference.

We are convinced that, although the present international situation and the problems of limiting the arms race are marked by great complexity, their positive resolution is not only necessary, but possible. For this,

(Mr. Korneenko, Ukrainian SSR)

we need urgent, joint efforts on the part of all States. Any step which would lead to curbing the arms race and to lowering the level of military confrontation will contribute to removing the threat which is hovering over mankind.

I should like, therefore, to express the hope that the resolutions adopted by the First Committee this year will be focused on intensifying talks and on the speedy achievement of specific steps in the field of limiting the arms race and of disarmament.

Mr. KABIA (Sierra Leone): As this is the first time my delegation is making a statement this session, Sir, we should like to take this opportunity to offer you our warmest congratulations on your election to the high office of Chairman of the First Committee for the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. Your election is testimony to your wisdom and diplomatic skills, coupled with your rich experience and deep understanding of the disarmament issues currently before us. Sierra Leone pays a tribute to your great country, Yugoslavia, a country that has contributed immensely to the cause of international peace and security, to the policy of non-alignment and to disarmament. We should like also to pay a tribute, through you, to the other Committee officers and to congratulate them on their unanimous election.

As our Committee is again tackling the burning issue of disarmament, my delegation joins in the debate with a deep sense of scepticism and disappointment. My delegation is sceptical because after 36 years of a constantly growing multitude of resolutions and decisions, we are perennially confronted with the same agenda items in addition to new ones. That reflection sadly indicates that we may not be genuinely ready to disarm, as our current deliberations are taking place against the background of an escalating arms race, particularly in the nuclear field, and a growing polarization in international relations, especially in relations among those States that must, by virtue of their possession of the largest arsenals of weapons, bear the primary responsibility for disarmament.

Given such sombre realities, my delegation feels trapped, on the one hand wondering whether one more speech on disarmament issues will indeed contribute to disarmament, and, on the other hand, anxious to join voices with like-minded delegations, especially those of the African and non-aligned countries, in calling attention to the grave dangers posed to mankind's very survival by the unending madness of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race.

My delegation believes with regret that the public's growing disillusionment with the United Nations appears justified in the area of disarmament. Despite a few essentially cosmetic arms control - as opposed to actual disarmament - measures, our efforts to arrest the arms race and to proceed towards general and complete disarmament have been overtaken by measures in the opposite direction. Thus, while we talk we arm, resulting in more talk and even more armaments. In the process we do a great disservice, not only to the credibility of our Organization, but, even more ominously, to the cause of world peace and security, which depends so much on and is so greatly influenced by the levels of military forces and armaments procurement.

Granted that disarmament has become an increasingly complex question in both technical and political terms, it still appears to my delegation that the primary issue is quite simple. The delegation of Sierra Leone considers that what has been lacking so far is the political commitment to disarm. If all States - from East to West and from North to South - were to commit themselves completely to concrete disarmament, as opposed to paper disarmament, we believe that our noble objective of general and complete disarmament would be closer than the distant dream it appears to be now.

For Sierra Leone and for other developing and non-aligned countries, whose principal preoccupation is to safeguard their hard-won independence and to feed their people, the arms race is an expensive and menacing proposition. In fact, it is not a feasible option for our policy-makers. As such, the contribution of the developing countries to the world-wide arms race, while it has regrettably been rising in recent years, is still, as existing data convincingly demonstrate, only some 20 per cent of the world total. About 80 per cent of the world's military expenditure - estimated currently at over \$500 billion - is accounted for by the major military Powers, in particular the two super-Powers and their allies. Naturally, any meaningful progress in disarmament would not only have to have their participation, but in fact must begin with them. As that well-known saying goes, charity begins at home.

(Mr. Kabia, Sierra Leone)

My country, Sierra Leone, is dedicated to peace and progress at home; consequently we are prepared to support any realistic, fair and balanced measures that would contribute concretely and genuinely towards disarmament in our troubled continent, Africa, and the world at large. It is, therefore, within that framework that we will examine each of the disarmament items on our agenda. My delegation wishes to emphasize that our efforts should be in accordance with the order of priorities set out in the Final Document of the first special session, which rightly recognized nuclear disarmament as the highest priority item on the international disarmament agenda.

We believe that progress towards genuine nuclear disarmament would spur progress in other fields of armament and would significantly improve the general political climate. The nuclear arms race is particularly dangerous because, like no other weapons in existence, nuclear weapons directly threaten the total annihilation of mankind. It is against this backdrop that we are, therefore, extremely concerned about developments and policies that tend to increase rather than decrease nuclear armaments in the world, thus seeming to place a premium on such doctrines as deterrence based on mutual assured destruction - appropriately acronymed MAD - and contributing to that dangerous and fallacious supposition that nuclear war can be limited and winnable.

In the view of the Sierra Leone delegation, the only really practical guarantees for the security of non-nuclear, as well as nuclear-weapon Powers, is the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

In the shrunken world of interdependence, the ghastly effects of a nuclear conflict anywhere in the world are unlikely to be limited to any one particular location. All of us, therefore, have a stake in nuclear disarmament. What is lacking is the commitment to nuclear disarmament, a commitment to the mutual assured survival of the human race that can come only from the elimination of those monstrous arsenals of death and destruction. The credibility of our Organization and of the Committee on Disarmament would depend, to a large degree, on their performance in

(Mr. Kabia, Sierra Leone)

that field of disarmament. It is, therefore, in this regard that we call on all members of the Committee on Disarmament to facilitate the work of the Committee by supporting the proposal of the Group of 21 for the establishment of a working group on nuclear disarmament. We further appeal to the countries concerned in the tripartite negotiations on the test-ban agreement, to conclude their talks so as to enable the Committee to prepare a comprehensive test-ban agreement.

The United Nations efforts against the arms race are strikingly and ominously analogous to its efforts against apartheid in South Africa. Both efforts, regrettably, have been woefully unsuccessful, despite the great deal of time and the myriads of resolutions devoted to them. Both efforts are marked by massive contradictions: while on the one hand everyone claims to be against apartheid and the arms race, somehow those two forces of destruction continue to flourish, on the other. It is obvious that if our actions had matched our words, apartheid and the arms race would have been eliminated.

My delegation is extremely concerned about developments in South Africa in general. We are particularly concerned about that régime's terroristic and aggressive military actions against its neighbours and its nuclear ambitions, which are aimed at strengthening its hand to blackmail Africa in its struggle to eliminate racism and oppression from South African society. South Africa's programme could not have come about except through the support of those States which claim not to make a distinction between white and black, and yet proceed to arm racist South Africa's terrorist rulers, who are bent on subjugating the blacks, to enable them to carry out internal warfare, murder, external aggression and terrorism.

My delegation feels that South Africa's nuclear capability is a threat to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and to non-proliferation efforts in general, especially since certain nuclear-weapon States which advocate non-proliferation are the same States that helped South Africa

(Mr. Kabia, Sierra Leone)

to attain its nuclear status and also helped and continue to help South Africa to develop its military programme, as a whole, in contravention of relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

My delegation shares the views expressed on this subject by the Permanent Representative of Ghana at our eighteenth meeting, on 29 October, especially his suggestion that South Africa's nuclear developments be kept under "constant surveillance" by the United Nations. My delegation also shares the view that, unless concrete steps are taken to eliminate the military and nuclear threat posed to free Africa by racist South Africa, disarmament will amount to a suicidal proposition for free Africa.

We furthermore consider that the 1964 declaration of our Heads of State that Africa be regarded as a nuclear-weapon-free zone has, regrettably, been frustrated by South Africa's attainment of nuclear capability.

Before concluding my statement, I wish to refer to a number of expert reports submitted to the General Assembly this year by the Secretary-General. We commend the experts who prepared the report on the relationship between disarmament and development, and we hope that the report's recommendations - in particular, the one calling for the institutionalization of that relationship in the activities of the United Nations system - will soon be implemented. We also take note, with interest, of the report on institutional arrangements and propose that the General Assembly, at its second special session, should examine this issue with a view to ensuring the most effective and efficient operation of the Secretariat unit dealing with disarmament.

The Sierra Leone delegation is pleased with the progress made so far in the preparation of the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. We hope that that session will provide a concrete action-oriented programme of action, devoid of endless debate over procedure, empty resolutions and the persistent accusations and counter-accusations as to who is responsible for the arms race. We must endeavour to bring down this tension and insecurity caused by the attitude of confrontation and the increase in armaments. We must re-orient those energies towards a constructive attitude to negotiate, in good faith, the reduction of armaments.

(Mr. Kabia, Sierra Leone)

My delegation welcomes the report of the Secretary-General on the world disarmament campaign. As one of the countries which provided an expert to the group that prepared the report, we have followed the issue carefully and support fully its contents. We see the proposed world disarmament campaign as a broadly-based and well-co-ordinated operation, designed to provide objective and factual information on the arms race and disarmament to governments, non-governmental organizations and individuals, for the purpose of building a world-wide disarmament constituency. The search for disarmament in a politically complex world must aim at narrowing the gaps that ignorance creates for the purpose of developing a well-informed consensus in favour of international peaceful co-existence and co-operation.

Those are the few comments my delegation wished to offer at this stage. We reserve our right to speak again, as and when it is required, during the course of our deliberations.

Mr. SULAIMAN (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): On behalf of the delegation of Oman I should like to begin my statement with congratulations to you, Mr. Chairman, on your election as Chairman of the First Committee. We are convinced that your experience of the affairs of the United Nations and of multilateral negotiations, particularly in the area of disarmament, will guarantee positive results. We should like to pledge to you our full co-operation. We should also like to extend our congratulations to the Vice-Chairmen and to the Rapporteur.

During the 10 years since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2734 (XXV), the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, we have witnessed a serious deterioration of international affairs. The recent years have been characterized by the growing use of force in international affairs, by the continuing intervention in the internal affairs of States, and by exacerbation of competition among the major Powers. This has had an effect on the arms race, which is now unbridled, and shows that there is an absence of the two elements of good international relations: mutual trust and a feeling of security.

International peace, security and stability are an undisputed objective and in view of the crucial importance of this objective we support the principle that security cannot be guaranteed by stockpiling weapons, that is, unless one wishes to apply the most narrow concept of security, which is that one has one's own security even if there is complete absence of security elsewhere.

We have read the report of the Committee on Disarmament for this session, and we have concluded that multilateral negotiations on a nuclear-weapon test ban have reached a deadlock. This means only one thing, namely, that the parties concerned have not assumed their responsibility vis-à-vis the international community and are not implementing paragraph 51 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly (S-10/2), which considers that the cessation of nuclear-weapon testing is the first step towards general and complete disarmament. I should like to add that the vicious circle of the disarmament talks has had a negative effect, and the result will be that the concept of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons will become meaningless.

(Mr. Sulaiman, Oman)

One can conclude that the nuclear-weapon States have no intention of abiding by their obligations vis-a-vis the non-nuclear-weapon States. This prompts us to remind the Committee of the demand of the non-nuclear-weapon countries for the conclusion of an international agreement pertaining to the non-use of nuclear weapons against those countries, which, of course, have every right to demand such protection.

When we speak of a basis that might strengthen the nuclear-weapon non-proliferation régime, we should not neglect the need for guarantees on which the security of non-nuclear-weapon States might be based. We are thinking immediately of Israel's flagrant act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor. Israel could never have perpetrated that act if a proper system banning such an act had been in force. We are profoundly concerned about the negative effects of that act, which demonstrates the ineffectiveness of the International Atomic Energy Agency system of safeguards. That system is closely related to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to nuclear disarmament.

Regardless of Israel's claims, regardless of its attempts to justify its aggression, it is known-- the experts working with Iraq have confirmed this -- that the Iraqi nuclear facilities were being used for peaceful purposes. Iraq was exercising its sovereign right to progress in the technological and scientific fields. I should like to add that Iraq is a party to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and, as has been confirmed by the International Atomic Energy Agency, has pledged to respect the provisions of that Treaty and has submitted its facilities to that Agency's control.

It is obvious that Israel is trying, first and foremost, to obstruct the scientific progress of neighbouring countries, and is trying to monopolize technological progress in the Middle East. It is a known fact that Israel is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Its nuclear facilities are not subject to international control. In addition, the international community knows that Israel has been closely collaborating with the racist régime of South Africa in the nuclear field. There is proof of the fact that both countries have carried out nuclear tests in the southern Atlantic.

(Mr. Sulaiman, Oman)

The report of the Secretary-General mentions Israel's nuclear capacity, which makes it possible for that country to produce nuclear weapons, if it has not already done so. The Treaty of Tlatelolco has made Latin America a model to be followed in establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in other areas of the world. Yet, in spite of efforts thus far, the Middle East, South-East Asia, the Indian Ocean and Africa, have not yet been able to follow in the footsteps of Latin America.

Since the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones has very significant dimensions which bring us closer to our objective, namely, disarmament, the resulting reduction of tension by ensuring international stability, limiting the competition among the major Powers would be beneficial.

My delegation appeals to all peace-loving countries to pursue efforts to implement these noble objectives. It is our belief that there is no part of the world that has as great a need to be free from nuclear weapons as does the Middle East, because of the difficult and dangerous circumstances which prevail there. That is why my delegation believes that the Middle East must become a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Because of its geographical position, my country attaches special importance to everything related to the Indian Ocean, and believes that the stability that we desire is being impeded by the military interference in certain countries near our part of the world, which increases tension and insecurity, and creates a lack of confidence among the countries of the area.

(Mr. Sulaiman, Oman)

We hope that the foreign forces that have invaded land near the Indian Ocean will withdraw as soon as possible in order that confidence and stability may be restored in that region. We also hope that an end will be put to the foreign military presence and to the desire for hegemony, the source of which we are familiar with, which has made of areas near us stepping-stones for the conveying of instability in order to spread chaos in that part of the world, which is rich in natural resources, and in order to gain control over that wealth and to change economic and social systems.

My country, which supports the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace set forth in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI), adopted at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, attributes considerable importance to the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, of which we are a member. We have placed our hopes in the efforts of that Committee, and we hope that it will be able to implement the Declaration and in particular the contents of General Assembly resolution 34/80 B. My delegation regrets that the Conference envisaged in that resolution has not been convened, and we hope that it will be held in the first half of 1983.

The Second Disarmament Decade coincides with the Third Development Decade. In fact, both areas are closely linked. They are, it should be said, organically linked. I therefore need not present any related facts on this subject. We have the study of the governmental experts under the chairmanship of Mrs. Thorsson (A/36/356) which brings out the relationship that exists between disarmament and development. That study proves that the arms race does not serve the interests and aspirations of the various countries of the world that wish to see a New International Economic Order. According to that study, the world finds itself confronted with a choice:

"... the world can either continue to pursue the arms race ... or move consciously and with deliberate speed toward a more stable and balanced social and economic development within a more sustainable economic and political order." (A/36/356, p. 161, para. 391)

(Mr. Sulaiman, Oman)

The efforts of the Preparatory Committee regarding the second special session on disarmament to be held next summer deserve our gratitude, and we support the plan of action that has been prepared by that Committee.

We have high hopes that the second special session will produce useful work as it studies ways and means of putting an end to the arms race in all its forms, in particular the nuclear arms race. In this connexion my delegation hopes that it will have a chance to see a meeting between the two super-Powers before the end of this month in order to reach an agreement limiting nuclear strategic weapons. We hope that the two countries will manage to agree on a course that covers all aspects of the question.

In conclusion, may I say that we hope that the second special session will succeed in giving concrete form to new ideas which will make it possible for us to lay a foundation for the implementation of what has already been agreed upon so that we may reach our disarmament objectives.

Mr. JOHNSON (Liberia): Mr. Chairman, it is a profound pleasure for me personally and for my delegation to extend to you our warmest congratulations on your election to the chairmanship of this most important Committee on Disarmament. With your reputation as a skilful and experienced diplomat, we are confident that under your chairmanship our deliberations will be successfully concluded. Let me assure you of my delegation's fullest co-operation.

To the two Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur of this Committee we also extend our sincere congratulations and warm felicitations on their unanimous election, and we should like to assure them also of our full support and co-operation.

Human beings are extremely complex phenomena, and their behaviour is equally complex. Due to man's own ingenuity, we find ourselves coming here year after year, trying to find a solution to the gigantic monster and perhaps endlessly rising costs of the arms race, which man himself has created. This situation is becoming more complex.

Today we live in a world that has become much more dangerous than man can imagine. The world is in a serious crisis. We must act now or

(Mr. Johnson, Liberia)

suffer tomorrow the consequences of a nuclear catastrophe. Never before has mankind faced such a critical threat to its own existence. Peace is far removed from reality.

The world is experiencing a strange phenomenon in which military force is being substituted for diplomacy in international relations. We are also witnessing blatant interference in the internal affairs of other States, the occupation and/or invasion of sovereign States. We have also been reminded of the continuation of the so-called balance of power based on the arms race and of the existing competition between the two super-Powers to consolidate their influential positions. My Government's position on the arms race and disarmament has been echoed and re-echoed in this very conference room.

(Mr. Johnson, Liberia)

We do not believe that armaments provide any security. We believe, however, that progress in disarmament will increase confidence among nations. If we believe that disarmament is essential, we must also strengthen the belief that only through compromise, restraint and the harmonization of national goals can lasting and genuine international security be achieved. We must make a determined effort to return to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

It will be impossible to eliminate colonialism, eradicate neo-colonialism, strengthen the political independence and sovereignty of newly independent States, improve the quality of lives for the vast majority by ensuring their economic development and growth while the arms race is escalating with such enormous speed.

History will recall that the 1970s was proclaimed the Disarmament Decade. What can we honestly say was achieved during that Decade? Yes, we know too well what was achieved: massive increases in military spending, confrontations, terrorism, misleading war propaganda and of course the escalation of the arms race. In short, that period can be characterized as a period of massive military build-up in which only the producer benefited and the user was the loser, both in terms of men and material.

What can we hope for during this current Decade - a continuation of the past or a sense of purpose and direction that would produce some meaningful results? Let us for once in our lifetime come to grips with reality.

Let us try to remove one of the hideous hindrances to social and economic progress, so that genuine peace and security can be achieved. Control of the arms race and disarmament will not occur in a vacuum, nor will it come about by the mere passage of resolutions. It will come about only through serious and meaningful negotiations.

We hope that our deliberations here will serve as a turning point in mankind's efforts to free our one world from the threat of destruction by both nuclear and conventional weapons. Failure on the part of this First Committee, which is dealing with disarmament issues to produce a meaningful result would have serious repercussions for its credibility.

(Mr. Johnson, Liberia)

My delegation welcomes the forthcoming dialogue scheduled to take place on 30 November 1981 in Geneva between the United States and the Soviet Union. We can only hope that that exercise will generate effective measures that would ultimately halt and reverse the arms race in all its forms, a change that is so urgently needed. We also hope that the possibility of concluding an agreement, or perhaps even a treaty, to prevent the first nuclear strike will be discussed so as to prevent the preparation of a second strike capability.

We should now like to dwell on a specific item on our agenda that deals with the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

The Liberian Government is resolutely opposed to having nuclear weapons of any kind or in any form on the continent of Africa. It has made positively and unequivocally clear that it does not want Africa to become a nuclear zone.

Africa as a nuclear zone raises serious problems regarding disarmament and the strengthening of international peace and security.

It is quite unfortunate that it is impossible to speak about South Africa without referring to its inhumane and dehumanizing policy of apartheid and its nuclear activities. There are few if any precedents in modern history where a government has so persistently pursued a wholly immoral and impractical policy in the face of total condemnation by the rest of the world. In view of this, my delegation believes that that government is capable of any irrational conduct, including the use of nuclear weapons. It is against that background of international condemnation and rejection of apartheid that we hope South Africa's nuclear policy will be viewed.

Let me remind this forum that South Africa has refused to sign the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and is against the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa. Therefore we are appealing to all States to refrain from assisting South Africa in the development of its nuclear capability and to ensure the implementation of General Assembly resolutions 35/146 A and B of 12 December 1981 and of paragraph 63 (c) of resolution S-10/2.

In conclusion, it is my fervent hope that this Committee will be able to achieve concrete steps in the right direction to accommodate the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, scheduled for 1982.

Mr. DORR (Ireland): Mr. Chairman, the representative of Ireland on this Committee has already paid a tribute to you and to your country. Since, however, this is the first time that I personally have spoken in the Committee I should like to join in that tribute. I am very sure that the work of the Committee is in good hands at this session.

The representative of the United Kingdom has spoken already in this debate on 20 October on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community, including Ireland. I should like in addition today to make the following national statement on behalf of Ireland.

Eighty-two years ago at the Hague Conference of 1899, disarmament first came on to the international agenda.

Thirty-five years ago the United Nations General Assembly adopted its very first resolution on disarmament.

Some 20 years ago the General Assembly unanimously endorsed the aim of general and complete disarmament. Three years ago the special session devoted to disarmament agreed on principles and a programme of priorities; and one year ago, in this Committee room, we adopted some 40 further resolutions on disarmament questions to add to the hundreds of other resolutions adopted by the General Assembly over the years.

It is obvious that debate on disarmament and resolutions about disarmament occupy an important and worthy place in international life.

But how does the world stand today in the matter of armaments? Some figures from the latest yearbook of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) tell the story. World military expenditures now amount to some \$500 billion per annum, the highest in human history. This is a four-fold increase in real terms since the late 1940s. In contrast, total spending on aid now amounts to about \$29 billion per year. Over the past 10 years alone, total military spending was \$5 trillion. The third world's share of the total has increased over those years from 8 per cent to 15 per cent. The two super-Powers now have more than 15,000 strategic nuclear warheads - three times as many as they had in 1970. In all there are now probably some 40,000 nuclear warheads in existence and ready for use. Nuclear testing continues, as it has every year since 1945. There were 49 such explosions in 1980. More nuclear tests have been carried out since the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963 than before;

JVM/12

A/C.1/36/PV.22

49-50

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

783 since 1963 as compared with 488 between 1945 and 1963. There are now on average 46 tests each year as compared with an annual average of 27 in the years before 1963. The arms export business has been growing at the rate of \$5 billion per year since 1975, and global arms exports are close to \$25 billion for initial orders only, not counting spare parts. More countries are now exporting arms than ever before, and a larger number of new orders than ever before were signed in 1980.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

That is indeed a depressing catalogue; it goes on and on. The net point is that, over a period of three decades while the United Nations adopted a total of 400 resolutions on every conceivable aspect of disarmament, the growth of armaments continued inexorably. Military expenditure has now reached a level greater than ever before; it calls for an input of resources, technology and research greater than ever before, and it poses dangers greater than ever before to humanity as a whole.

But even those figures are not complete. The SIPRI Yearbook, from which many of the figures are taken, was published earlier this year. It deals only with the period up to the end of 1980. The daily news media take up the story. Almost every day brings some news, comment or speculation on further planned increases in military budgets, new weapons sales or new weapons deployment or development. Sophisticated weapons have become the common currency of international life - used freely and almost automatically to secure old friends and win over new ones. The talk - East and West - is of new "doctrines", of "counter-force capability" and of the possibility that one or other major Power might engage in a first strike. Even in recent days debate and controversy have developed about whether a limited nuclear war is possible after all and, if so, whether it could be confined to Europe.

But all that is in the real and harsh world outside. Within our Committee room here we are beginning another active session. We shall debate and adopt many resolutions to add to the 122 resolutions which we adopted in the last three years alone. We have the report of the Committee on Disarmament from Geneva before us, and we for our part will no doubt refer many of the resolutions back to the Committee. It in turn will report to us again for our regular session next year. In the meantime when our current session of the Assembly ends, we have the second special session on disarmament to look forward to next year.

In a word, it looks as if our work in the world of disarmament discussions - reports, studies and resolutions - can continue productively enough in its own terms, neither affecting nor greatly affected by the real and hard world outside, unless perhaps the present chill in super-Power relations makes some of our discussions a bit more difficult.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

Is there no way of bringing these two parallel worlds together so that our resolutions will have an effect on the world of real danger and waste of real resources which we all inhabit?

The need is urgent. After all reality with all its harshness could at any time break in on our discussions. It is true that we have escaped nuclear war over the 35 years since the Assembly adopted its first resolution. But we know, or must assume, that at this very moment the city and buildings in which we work, like so many major cities East and West, are targets for a missile in some missile silo or submarine somewhere. The missile is real. It is our attitude of complacency in the face of the most serious danger which humanity has ever faced which is unreal. So far indeed our luck has held; but can we believe that it will continue to hold, day after day, month after month, year after year?

If the two worlds are to be brought together, so that our resolutions help to change reality, we first need to understand more clearly what is happening in the world outside our debates and why.

To anyone not directly involved, the build-up of armaments in that world seems not only dangerous but mad and irrational. Many would go further, attacking the motives of those involved in major decisions or of pressure groups which stand to benefit from them. But the reality is more complex, and it is this which makes exhortation or condemnation by itself insufficient and accounts for the wide gap between those in Government who take the decisions and those who make the speeches.

Taken as a whole, the build-up of arms and weapons is indeed most irrational; and it is to this level we refer most often in our speeches about disarmament. But the world-wide build-up is the result of a series of decisions taken at a different level - the national level - each of which, to those who take it, appears quite rational, at its own level and in its own terms.

We live after all in a world of sovereign States for each of which the safety of the State is the supreme law. Each seeks to ensure that safety according to its means and abilities. In face of hostility or potential hostility by other States or groups of States, it may appear rational and

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

prudent for any State which can do so to try to increase its security through a build-up in armaments and military expenditure. But the sum of those decisions taken year by year to ensure the security of each is a world of greater and greater insecurity for all.

Insecurity is, of course, a relative term. In another age it meant simply the danger of attack by potential enemies - a danger against which a large and powerful State could hope to defend itself. Most Governments today, especially those accustomed to relying on their own strength, still think largely in those terms. But insecurity today when weapons have grown so powerful has another, wider and more ominous meaning - nothing less than the possibility that our world will be destroyed.

The essential question, then, is how to bring these two concepts of security together. How can Governments, in taking what they see as security decisions at the national level, be brought to take adequate account of the implications and consequences of these decisions for the newer and wider security that I have described and the insecurity which affects and threatens us all?

One approach is simply to exhort, to point out the dangers to each other, as we do here year after year, and to hope that those in Government in the major countries who take the decisions on armaments will indeed take some account of the common interest in survival - even if it may seem to their immediate disadvantage to forgo a new weapon or an increase in stockpiles. Our statements, resolutions and declarations in disarmament debates which take this approach may at times have a useful effect in mobilizing public opinion on an issue. Unfortunately, however, they have so far evoked very little response from major Governments used to thinking in terms of national interests, of national security and of national strength. This is surely evident from the frightening figures which I quoted at the outset of this statement.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

For that reason, I believe we need to look very carefully at proposals for more purely declaratory statements, especially if they are offered by Governments which are themselves deeply involved in the continuing build-up of armaments. Declarations may sometimes have an effect, but too many sweeping declarations which leave everything absolutely unchanged in the real world can actually be counterproductive.

A much more difficult but potentially more productive approach is to work through negotiation and by agreement towards concrete measures of arms control and disarmament. This is difficult precisely because the States involved are used to thinking of security in the older sense of an ability to repel potential attackers. They have built up arms for that purpose, and they will not limit or dismantle them, even partially, unless it can be shown to their satisfaction that their national security will remain undiminished at each stage of the new process.

The difficulty of such negotiations is further increased because the States most directly involved insist that political tension and political instability are the cause of the build-up and that it can be ended only when international tensions are reduced or when their potential opponents abandon their aggressive intentions. Of course it is true that if tensions were reduced then negotiation would become easier; but it is also an over-simplification to try to make progress depend entirely on this. Competition in armaments is both a consequence and a cause of international tension. Arms and tensions mutually reinforce each other. Therefore it is simplistic to focus on one side of the equation only - to say that there must be political stability before the arms build-up can be halted. It is essential in any negotiations or discussions to try to work towards both aims simultaneously.

If this simultaneous approach is followed, then the linkage between the arms build-up and tensions can be turned to advantage. Precisely because it is true that a growth in either reinforces the other, it is also true that an improvement on either side of the equation can help to effect a corresponding reduction on the other. That is to say, the process

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

of mutual reinforcement can work also in a downward direction. Any first step towards halting the build-up of armaments will help to reduce tension, and that in turn could make it possible to take further steps towards arms control and disarmament. It seems to my delegation to be most urgent that that approach be applied at present by those Powers which develop and deploy nuclear weapons and their delivery systems.

The build-up of nuclear armaments by East and West over several decades has occurred because each side deeply distrusts the intentions of the other, but the build-up itself increases the distrust. Each side is determined to maintain a "credible deterrent" in the sense of an ability to retaliate even after a surprise attack. The result is what we have come to call "the balance of terror" to which all of us are held hostage.

Of course, this balance cannot of its nature be static. The "mix" of weapons on both sides is not the same; and there is a constant refinement of weapons technology and a constant improvement in delivery systems on both sides. But each new development by one side to secure its position leads to a reassessment by the other of its own needs. since it cannot allow the balance to be upset. Since each believes that its very survival is at stake, there is a strong tendency to calculate in every case on the most pessimistic basis. This means assuming the worst in regard to the other side's intentions and capacity, which is difficult in any case to assess with accuracy in the absence of any common standard of measurement.

Such a pessimistic approach to each decision may seem to those who carry out these calculations to be prudent, since, after all, no one can really know with certainty the intentions of a potential opponent. But what is the result? Each step that one side takes to maintain "balance" inevitably alarms the other side and leads it to take a further step. This in its turn evokes a new reaction. The result is a spiral where the direction is always upward, because the process of suspicion reinforcing suspicion, once begun, develops a dynamic and momentum of its own.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

Is there any possible way out of this most dangerous competition in all human history - a competition where distrust causes a build-up of arms which itself increases distrust leading to a new escalation? Short of a basic change of approach by either side, the only way seems to be for one or the other to take a first step to reverse the direction of the spiral - because, as I have just said, the dynamic could work also in the opposite sense once a new direction is set. Just as each step based on distrust and pessimistic calculation of the intention and capacity of the other evokes a negative reaction, so too could a step based on trust evoke a more positive reaction which would lessen distrust on the other side.

This is not a plea for an excessively idealistic approach to armaments and security - a plea which in any case, I am sure, would be most unlikely to be heeded. It is simply a hope for one first step at this critical moment when the spiral is about to get a new twist: a deliberate exercise of restraint in new decisions now being taken on weapons and delivery systems. Such a step showing some restraint - no more than that - could in turn evoke a corresponding restraint on the other side, thus turning the spiral in a downward direction; just as the opposite decision to develop and deploy new weapons systems will inevitably direct it upwards again and give it a greater momentum than ever before.

The effect of some restraint now would be to increase confidence somewhat from the present abysmally low level; and this could be the prelude to the opening of serious negotiation of new arms control and disarmament measures of progressively greater importance.

Instead of restraint and increasing confidence, we know to our regret that the reality of the past year has been one of increasing world tension, due largely to the deterioration of relations between those super-Powers whose agreement is required for real progress towards disarmament. Bilateral talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on limiting the growth of strategic weapons and on other arms control issues have been frozen for over a year. The stalemate between these major Powers has, of course, also had its effect on multilateral negotiations; and there has been only the most limited progress at the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

Against this background, my delegation takes at least some limited encouragement from the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union have agreed to begin talks in Geneva on 30 November on limiting so-called theatre nuclear forces. A serious approach to this negotiation by both sides, together with restraint in the meantime in the development and deployment of new weapons and weapons systems, could have a beneficial effect in increasing confidence and improving the climate in the period remaining before the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament is held next summer.

However, that can be only a beginning. A great deal more in the way of practical, concrete measures will be needed if present dangers are to be reduced. I will list here briefly a number of issues which my delegation considers to be of immediate importance and on which we should like to see action simultaneously.

First, we want to see the United States and the Soviet Union resume in the near future their discussions on the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons - that is to say, the SALT negotiations - and we hope that the existing SALT Treaty, even if it has not been ratified, will continue to be observed. It is, of course, a very limited measure of arms control but it is at least better than completely unrestrained competition between the two main nuclear Powers.

Secondly, we want to see an end to all nuclear testing. That is to say, we want to see first a moratorium and then a comprehensive test-ban treaty banning all nuclear tests duly negotiated and signed. Since the partial test ban treaty of 1963 banned tests in the atmosphere, the pace of nuclear testing has actually quickened, and many more tests have been carried out in the 18 years since then than in the 18 years between the first test in 1945 and 1963.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

The attitude of the nuclear Powers to the idea of a comprehensive ban on testing is now coming to be seen by non-nuclear States as an indication that they have no serious interest in any steps towards nuclear disarmament nor even in restraint in the further development and refinement of weapons. In view of this, it could clearly be a development of major psychological importance if in the months before next year's special session the nuclear Powers either agreed on a treaty or even reaffirmed in some concrete way that they are serious about the question. Last year at least we had evidence of some progress in the trilateral negotiations between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. This year there has been none. We urge a continuation and an early conclusion of those negotiations.

We greatly regret too that the Committee on Disarmament failed to establish an ad hoc working group to negotiate issues related to verification and to the scope and final clauses of the draft treaty. Of course the agreement of the nuclear Powers is essential. But there is also a place for multilateral negotiations on issues of this kind. It is our hope too that those nuclear Powers which have not taken part in the trilateral negotiations could still be persuaded in the wider forum of the Committee on Disarmament to become involved in this important enterprise.

Thirdly, we want to see every effort made to strengthen the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the safeguards system established under its provisions. This is a question which has engaged the particular attention of my delegation for many years. During the Review Conference last year, we saw the failure of the nuclear Powers to fulfil their commitments under Article 6 of the Treaty and, as we stated already in the Security Council, we believe that the attack earlier this year by Israel on the Iraqi reactor was also an attack on the effort to consolidate an effective international régime against nuclear proliferation.

The Secretary-General in his report to the General Assembly has underlined the dangers of such proliferation and the importance of safeguards. We very much support what he said. Of course we fully accept the legitimate demands of States for access to supplies of nuclear material for peaceful purposes and we welcome the establishment by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) of the Committee on Assurances of Supply. This can be of help in harmonizing views as to how to restore confidence at international level in the security of

supplies and services for peaceful purposes and, at the same time, to strengthen assurances against proliferation of nuclear weapons. We trust that the convening of a United Nations conference to promote international safeguards in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy will also be of help.

A cut off of production of fissionable material for weapons purposes, a proposal which Ireland has sponsored at each of the past three sessions, would also be a most valuable contribution to the curbing of both the vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. Since production of fissionable material would henceforth be only for civilian purposes, the same IAEA safeguards could be applied to all - to nuclear-weapon States as well as to non-nuclear-weapon States. In our view that would be a most positive development. It would help to enhance the attractiveness of the non-proliferation régime for those States which have so far chosen to remain outside it.

Fourthly, we attach special importance to the early conclusion of an agreement prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling or use of chemical weapons and providing for the destruction of those already in existence. We note that the Final Document of the first special session declared that this was one of the most urgent disarmament measures. We are greatly concerned at reports of the use of chemical weapons and at the indications that some major Powers envisage programmes for their further development.

Some good work has been done in the Committee on Disarmament on drafting elements for such a convention. We hope that it will continue with urgency although we fully appreciate that problems still exist in regard to the scope of such a convention and the provisions for verification.

Fifthly, we want to see every effort made to prevent the extension of the arms race to outer space. We know, of course, that artificial earth satellites for some time now have been playing an increasing role in military matters. It is also clear that a certain amount of the investment being made in satellite development and on the development of other space systems is investment made for military purposes. However, this is an area in which it is still possible to introduce control and rationality before the race gets completely out of hand. If action is not taken soon we shall witness the competitive development of offensive weapons for use in space and constantly escalating measures to protect and improve the survival of military satellites in orbit. We shall see repeated

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

in that environment all that unfortunately we have seen already on earth. The end result will be not increased security for anybody, but greater risk for all.

We very much favour therefore any initiative aimed at preventing such a development. We want to see an agreement which would prohibit all weapons from space and which would prohibit the use of anti-satellite systems. Essentially only two States are involved in that area at the moment and we would urge them to begin meaningful discussions on those issues. We regret that no meeting has been held between them since June 1979 to deal with those very important questions. Such bilateral discussions would not, of course, preclude those questions being considered also in the multilateral area, for example, in the Committee on Disarmament. The matters involved are of grave concern to all. However, the principal responsibility undoubtedly lies with the two super-Powers and progress in that area simply is not possible without them. We urge them to negotiate on it at once.

Sixthly, it is clear that if there is to be progress in disarmament, conventional weapons will have to be included. Conventional military forces consume 80 per cent of total world military expenditure and 25 million people have been killed by so-called conventional weapons since the Second World War, most of them in the third world. Furthermore, it is clear that some of the nuclear-weapon States would simply be unprepared to accept major reductions in nuclear armament unless measures are also taken in the conventional area. In Europe, it appears that there is clearly a fear on one side that disarmament in the nuclear area could result in an imbalance in favour of the other side. For those reasons we supported the resolution put forward by Denmark at the last session of the General Assembly in favour of a study on conventional disarmament and we remain fully convinced that such a study is desirable.

That study will, of course, have to take into account the realities of the situation. The major suppliers of conventional arms are the nuclear Powers. The United States and the Soviet Union alone accounted for 75 per cent of the total export of major conventional weapons during the 1970s. We therefore have considerable sympathy with those who argue that the major responsibility for the conventional-arms race rests with those who also have the responsibility for the nuclear-arms race, and we believe that any study on conventional disarmament would inevitably have to be placed in the context of over-all disarmament and the relationship with nuclear disarmament would also have to be considered.

Nevertheless - and I want to stress this point - there are in our view sufficient specific aspects to the question of conventional disarmament to ensure that while the general context should not be ignored, the study should be a unique contribution and not simply a repetition of previous work on general disarmament questions.

In the case of conventional weapons, as in the case of nuclear weapons, concrete measures of arms control and disarmament depend on breaking the connexion between the three factors of mutual mistrust the imperatives of military technology and the inherent pessimism of strategic planners to which I have already referred, all three of which combine to impede progress. At the current review meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, at Madrid, efforts are continuing to secure agreement to the establishment of a conference on disarmament in Europe, originally proposed by France and supported by the 10 Member States of the European Community. An important element in that proposal is the agreement on confidence-building measures which would be binding, verifiable and which would extend to the whole of Europe. We think that agreement in Madrid on such a mandate would be a very useful contribution to resolving the problem of mutual mistrust - the first factor in the threefold combination I have just described.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe is, of course, concerned essentially with Europe - which has indeed been spared from war for 35 years. It is a depressing fact that the 50 wars or armed conflicts that have taken place during the past decade have been fought almost exclusively in the third world. More depressing still is the fact that, with a few exceptions, the weapons used in these wars were supplied by the industrialized countries. This graphically brings before us the question of the relationship between disarmament and development. The fact that the military spending of third-world countries has nearly doubled during the past decade is another relevant statistic. It is indeed a tragic situation when scarce resources are squandered, while ever more sophisticated conventional weapons are bought and sold, at enormous cost a fraction of which, if diverted to the alleviation of hunger and disease, could achieve so much.

I should like, on behalf of the delegation of Ireland, to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General for the study which has been carried out, under the able leadership of Mrs. Thorssen of Sweden, on this important question of the relationship between disarmament and development.

In the area of conventional weapons, there has at least been one modest concrete development over the past year. The convention on so-called inhumane weapons has been opened for signature and it has been signed by many States Members of the United Nations. This achievement, though modest, is encouraging. We urge those Member States which have not already done so to sign the Convention, as soon as possible. For our part, we intend to continue our efforts with other States to secure at a future date the establishment of a consultative committee of experts. Such a committee could hold consultations and investigate the facts if doubts should arise regarding observation of the Convention. We are convinced that the establishment of such a committee could be of great value in increasing the trust and confidence of the parties in the Convention they have signed.

I have listed six major areas where I believe it is important to make early progress - SALT, a test ban, strengthening the Non-Proliferation Treaty, chemical weapons, outer space and conventional weapons. This would be only a beginning, but it is very important, in our view, to do this both for its

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

own sake and in order to create a climate of confidence so that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament can be a success in June next year.

The forum in which some of these issues can be negotiated between now and next June - the body which has the main obligation to prepare concrete and specific disarmament measures - is the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva. Ireland is not a member of that Committee, but we follow its proceedings with interest and with concern. We very much regret that the Committee did not achieve more during the past year but now we look to it for serious progress on a number of issues to create the right climate for the special session.

The first special session in 1978 was an event of major political importance, at least to the extent that it resulted in the international community's most fundamental and comprehensive statement on disarmament in modern times. The Final Document, which established priorities, objectives and fundamental principles, set an accepted frame of reference for all those concerned with disarmament.

That first special session asked the Disarmament Commission to consider the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament and asked the Committee on Disarmament to negotiate the details. The thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly asked that the programme be submitted in time for the second special session of 1982. That comprehensive programme will be the most significant point on our agenda, provided that the programme has been brought to an advanced stage by the Committee on Disarmament. The Irish Government would very much welcome the adoption of the programme. We would hope that, as a follow-up document to the Programme of Action of 1978, it would provide disarmament guidelines for the foreseeable future.

The first special session was a success. The only thing missing so far has been the necessary will to convert universally accepted commitments to disarmament into concrete disarmament measures. Here again we see that great and yawning gap, to which I referred earlier in this statement - the gap between the decisions about armaments and the speeches and declarations about disarmament. What we badly need between now and the start of the second special session next

(Mr. Dorr. Ireland)

June is a serious effort at last by the international community as a whole, and particularly by the major Powers, to bridge that gap and thus for the first time for many years to bring closer together the world of debate about disarmament and that other most dangerous world where massive armaments could destroy us all.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of the United States has asked for the floor in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): I wish to follow up on what Ambassador Dorr just said about the difference between the real world and some of the statements made.

To dignify as outlandish a statement such as that made today by the Libyan representative is not my attention. But to let it go unanswered and uncontested is unacceptable. So, while forgoing a point-by-point rebuttal, I shall give a general reply.

The Libyan claim that the United States is threatening the sovereignty of States in the Arab world and in Africa stands truth on its head. It is indeed an Orwellian inversion of truth. For there can no longer be any doubt among reasonable individuals and delegations in this Committee that it is the expansionist régime of Colonel Qaddafi which is threatening the sovereignty of States in the Arab world and in Africa. It is the régime of Colonel Qaddafi which has sent its troops to Chad with the intention of annexing that sovereign State. It is now public and now quite clear that the sovereign State of Chad does not wish to merge with Libya. The President of Chad and the entire Cabinet of that Government have publicly called for the withdrawal of all Libyan troops from that country by the end of this year.

It is the régime of Colonel Qaddafi which publicly and persistently calls for and works for the overthrow of the Governments of Niger, the Sudan and Egypt, not to mention many other Governments and individuals that find themselves on Qaddafi's personal 'hit list'. On this we have the statements of African leaders themselves. Nothing I could add could be clearer.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

It is the régime of Colonel Qaddafi which sent its jets to fire on American aircraft patrolling over international waters in the Mediterranean last August. It was Libyan jets which fired first, a fact that Colonel Qaddafi has admitted and, indeed, boasted of. American fighter pilots returned their fire in self-defence.

It is the régime of Colonel Qaddafi which is not only destabilizing the area but also ushering in super-Power involvement. Last September Libya signed yet another arms agreement with the Soviet Union. Today there are 2,500 Soviet advisers in Libya. They alone control the MIG-25s; they alone operate the missile systems. Airstrips have been built to accommodate the gigantic Soviet Antonov planes transporting personnel and spare parts. One thousand Libyan soldiers a year -- all this according to the scholar Claire Sterling in The Terror Network, a book laden with specifics -- are being trained in the Soviet Union and some 3,000 Libyan soldiers are being trained in Bulgaria. More disturbing to Libya's neighbours is the wide perception of Libya as a staging ground for Soviet military adventurism in the Persian Gulf region and as a funnel through which to pour arms and material to groups around the globe which are dedicated to terrorism, and the overthrow of their Governments.

If the Libyan representative were to turn his attention away from such activities as this morning's vicious attacks on my country, if the Libyan representative were to turn his attention towards grave injustice, he might properly take up the invasion of Afghanistan. If anyone, such as Colonel Qaddafi, with any fidelity claims to be a true revolutionary, a true champion of self-determination and non-aggression, a true leader of Islamic people, then he would have to support wholeheartedly the Afghan liberation fighters in their noble struggle against 85,000 Soviet invaders. But where is Colonel Qaddafi on this conflict? Why has he not castigated these invaders and suppressors of Islamic people longing to be free, to control their own destiny?

We leave this question before the First Committee, as we return to the serious issues before us.

Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)(interpretation from Arabic): We are not at all surprised that the representative of the United States has launched an attack against my country, because he is convinced that Libya will be afraid of United States oppression and hegemony. But Libya fears no threats, and will constantly defend its policy, characterized by non-alignment and based on the principles of the Non-Aligned Movement. We are against the presence of United States bases and the United States fleet, which are now poisoning our region.

The representative of the United States, an aggressor country, should know full well that no difference of opinion exists between the Egyptian, Sudanese and Libyan peoples. The peoples of those three countries belong to a single nation with a single objective. It is the United States which is fishing in troubled waters, which is trying to sow mistrust among the peoples of our region. It is the United States which is sending aircraft to spy on our region and which sends them from bases in Western Europe to carry out espionage missions in Libya. That was stated by The Washington Post when the socialist victory was won in Greece: it was requested that American planes should continue to spy on Libya.

With regard to Chad, that neighbouring fraternal country, whose security is part and parcel of our own security, a country with which we share hopes, traditions

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

and many other values, we are astonished that the United States is concerned about its security. Chad is so far distant from that country, yet the representative of the United States criticizes Libya for being concerned about the security of Chad. The presence of Libyan troops in Chad is pursuant to an agreement between our two countries and is based on the consent of the Government of Chad.

The United States is now professing to have an interest in Islam, which is quite absurd. We know full well who it is that supports the attacks against Moslems in the Middle East. We know who it is that endorses Zionist imperialism in Jerusalem.

I point out to the United States representative that his country is paying more than \$15 million a day to support the aggression which has been perpetrated against Moslem installations.

The question of Afghanistan is being used by that representative for his own purposes. Libya's hope is that Afghanistan should be a non-aligned Islamic State, but we will never agree to the imperialists' profiting from this situation. What about the continuing demands being made on the United States to withdraw its missiles from Europe? We know that 4 million people in Bonn and another million in London and Rome held demonstrations protesting this state of affairs.

The United States representative should also consider El Salvador, Nicaragua, Grenada, and Cuba, for it is his country that creates instability in Latin America, in Africa, in Asia, in South-East Asia -- everywhere -- in an attempt to impose its hegemony and economic pressure, and in order to impose agreements such as the Camp David accords, which refused to take account of the interests of the Arab nation, but which simply resulted in settlements completely overlooking the rights of the Palestinians. My country, at any rate, has very close relations with the fraternal African countries.

The Organization of African Unity (OAU) has honoured Libya by agreeing to hold its next summit conference in my country next year. We are aware that the United States is doing everything in its power to prevent that conference of African leaders being held in Libya.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

In any event, it is the actions of the United States that are the source of threats to peace in the Middle East and Africa, because of its rapid deployment forces, because of its spy planes, and because of its interference in the internal affairs of States and its attempts to impose hegemonistic economic policies on the peoples of these regions.

But the Libyan people, which sacrificed half its sons in a way of independence at the beginning of this century, will redouble its efforts, and final victory will be won by the peoples.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.