



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 16TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. CARIAS (Honduras)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

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

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Sikaulu (Zambia)
Mr. Gayama (Congo)
Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador)
Mr. Wan Ahmad Najid (Malaysia)
Mr. Issraelyan (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Mr. Thiounn Prasith (Democratic Kampuchea)
Mr. Anderson (Australia)

* 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.

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

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

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. SIKAULU (Zambia): I should like to begin by offering my delegation's congratulations to the Chairman and the other officers of the Committee on their unanimous election. I am convinced that with the vast experience and diplomatic skills of our Chairman, the Committee's work will be brought to a successful conclusion. The Zambian delegation pledges its fullest support and co-operation to the officers of the Committee in the discharge of its important tasks.

The First Committee is once again in session to consider the multifaceted problems of general and complete disarmament, against a background of increased tension in the world. The question of disarmament has become the most pressing issue on the world's agenda for peace and security. The issue is as pressing as it is complex, because of the intensity of its corollary -- and that is the continuing spiral of the arms race, which constitutes the gravest threat to human survival.

Our deliberations are taking place in the context of a situation marked by global military expenditures on both nuclear and conventional weapons that have reached unprecedented heights, by the continued qualitative and quantitative development of those weapons of mass destruction, and by the real possibility of a further proliferation of nuclear technology. The arms race therefore poses an unparalleled threat to the very survival of life on planet Earth.

(Mr. Sikaulu, Zambia)

We need to recognize that the human race is on the threshold of annihilation by simple human error or by miscalculation in dealing with the mammoth nuclear weaponry that spans the world today. The fact that the world community has so far lived through the nuclear age without a nuclear war is no guarantee that such a catastrophe might not occur in the future. Not much imagination is needed to visualize what could happen if the nuclear arms race were allowed to continue unabated. We believe that the danger engendered by a situation of arms build-up would be ignored at the peril of both nuclear and non-nuclear States. This makes all the more fallacious the notion of the so-called winnable nuclear war, which is currently being entertained in certain quarters. How could there be survivors of a nuclear exchange when a nuclear war would spare no life on this earth?

Furthermore, the availability of conventional weapons, which have become increasingly sophisticated and deadly as well, poses dangers to world peace and security in no small measure. This is especially so among the countries of the third world. Many of these countries are victims of a flourishing arms trade which has assumed alarming proportions, and the international community is only too aware of how regional conflicts have been brought about as a result of the abundance of these conventional weapons, thus threatening the fabric of world peace and security.

In terms of economic and social considerations, the world community, especially the developing world, can ill afford either the continuation or the intensification of the global or regional arms race. The world's human and natural resources are far from being limitless, and full use must be made of their potential to assist development aspirations. Otherwise, the needs of hundreds of millions of people in the world would remain only in dreams. There must be a way of deploying in a rational manner the \$540 billion currently being spent or squandered annually on the arms race. The world seems to have resigned itself to the mutual economic benefits that would accompany the end of the arms build-up if the resources which are now going into the armament race were transferred to the promotion of humanitarian activities.

(Mr. Sikaulu, Zambia)

We have a collective responsibility to live to safeguard continued human life, and not to live to find and improve upon the means of rendering the human race extinct, as the current arms race suggests. We can realize our collective responsibility through disarmament.

The period of detente that featured at the beginning of the last decade has now been replaced by a period of heightened tension, especially between the two super-Powers. The two are virtually poised on a collision course, as evidenced by their relations that are now characterized by bitter exchanges reminiscent of the cold-war period. These exchanges can result only in the intensification of the mad arms race. This, in turn, makes talk of disarmament by the two competitors all the less plausible.

It is disturbing to note that in the clouded atmosphere of tension between the two super-Powers the chances of their engaging in useful negotiations to arrest the arms race, since they are the leading arms producers and traders, easily evaporate. In the process they deny themselves the only sane way to put an end to the arms race between themselves, which would in fact go a long way towards ending the cancer of the arms race in the world as a whole. They should learn to appreciate the fact that total security for their nations does not lie in their gruesome stockpiles of the weapons of mass destruction, but that their total security lies in making this world free of such weapons.

So much has been said about the bilateral Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) between Moscow and Washington that my delegation feels equally obliged to pronounce itself on it. We feel that the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks are a global issue and not simply an issue confined to Soviet-American relations. It is, therefore, the duty of all peoples everywhere to make known their views about the vital importance of an early and serious resumption of the SALT process. We believe too that, whereas the SALT negotiations will not necessarily lead to the solution of all East-West political differences, failure of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks would be a major disaster with vast international implications. It is also evident that without a viable SALT process, many international issues or disputes will become far less manageable and the world situation will be rendered that much more precarious.

(Mr. Sikaulu, Zambia)

We urge both parties to accelerate this process without delay. Without the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), we believe the alternative would be an intensification of disputes, greater instabilities and the diminution of peaceful ties and exchanges virtually throughout the world. It means further diversions of resources to the armed forces of many nations with all the resultant economic problems and attendant political consequences that would accompany such a development. The absence of SALT would also mean an increased risk of war in Europe and the aggravation of tensions in other regions of the world.

For all these reasons, it is imperative that the two super-Powers should abide by their pledges to resume the SALT negotiations. We believe that these negotiations will contribute in large measure to the emergence of confidence-building between these two traditional adversaries. This is not only in the interests of the Soviet Union and the United States, but of the world as a whole.

It is indeed ironic that the 1970s, which saw not only détente between the two super-Powers but also the inauguration of the First Disarmament Decade, should be associated with the failure to arrest the bestial arms race. It has already been regarded as the decade of the arms race rather than the decade of disarmament. Yes, we have heard pronouncements during the First Disarmament Decade about the world's aversion to the arms race, but there was no concrete corresponding aversion to the arms race through concrete demonstrations such as unilateral reductions of military budgets during the same period. We believe that this would go a long way in contributing to disarmament efforts.

It is ironic too that the arms race should have continued its relentless surge even after the inauguration of the Second Disarmament Decade in 1980. My delegation attaches great importance to the Second Disarmament Decade and hopes that, unlike the first decade, the second decade can achieve positive results by making tangible advances towards the noble goal of disarmament.

(Mr. Sikaulu, Zambia)

Talking of efforts towards general and complete disarmament envisaged in the Second Disarmament Decade, my delegation is indeed gratified to be a participant in the Preparatory Committee for the second special session devoted to disarmament. We attach the greatest importance to the second special session devoted to disarmament. We therefore pledge our support and express our readiness to do everything possible to contribute to its success.

Our support for the second special session derives from the belief that such a session, with universal participation, would give a new impetus to negotiations on specific urgent problems of the arms race and disarmament. It would also be another step towards the convening of the world disarmament conference.

Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (interpretation from French): Please be kind enough, Sir, to extend to the Chairman of the Committee my delegation's congratulations and also to tell him how much his competence and his experience are indeed decisive factors in his having been elected to that post, representing a very heartening reason for optimism in this particularly troubled phase of international relations where once again we have an opportunity to consider the question of disarmament and to seek ways and means of staving off a nuclear catastrophe.

The fact that a citizen of Yugoslavia has become Chairman shows, I think, the central role which has been played by that country, which, being situated at the crossroads of history, is able for that reason better to appreciate the profound pulsations of a world which is in constant quest of a better life and unimpaired peace for all its inhabitants.

Since we share the ideals which are held in common in the Non-Aligned Movement, my delegation would like to assure the Chairman and the other officers of the Committee of its full co-operation and to address to them also its most sincere congratulations.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

If we were to say that the situation which we were experiencing today was dangerous we would be saying something almost bordering on banality, and this is where the tragedy is to be found. Members of this Committee will undoubtedly be aware that when, 20 years ago in Belgrade, the first summit conference of the non-aligned countries proclaimed the need for the nations of the world to adopt the principles of peaceful co-existence in their relations, it was calling even then for general and complete disarmament in order to lay the foundations for a lasting and fruitful peace for present and future generations.

But since then the arms race has accelerated to the extent that the inevitability of a fatal nuclear war is becoming more and more obvious as the days go by, if only because of the logic which prompted an eminent leader of a very major Power to say a few months ago that, obviously, nuclear weapons were conceived in order to be used.

Undoubtedly this is a gloomy truth, but nevertheless it is a truth and we would be mistaken if we were to underestimate it in the light of the present disarmament policies whose main feature is that they are concrete more often than not purely in conference rhetoric and, to say the very least, evanescent as far as their implementation is concerned.

In fact, the arms race takes up more time, resources and energy than any disarmament enterprise would. Disarmament, which, paradoxically, is considered much less important than the arms race, which is a sign of power, respect and domination, only seems to be the concern to the naive desire of pacifists, who have in their favour only feeble human reason, whereas militarism has behind it the all-powerful reason of the State, sometimes its cynicism and the iron-clad law of the vital interests of the nation.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

Unlike the situation we faced a few years ago, the danger of a generalized conflagration is more easily described now through all parts of the world because of the unprecedented quantitative and qualitative increase in arms, particularly nuclear arms, as well as the sustained increase in military budgets, very often to the detriment of the social well-being of peoples.

Quantitatively, we have thus witnessed the unbridled militarization of the present world. The super-Powers have accumulated such an enormous stockpile of arms, which is capable of destroying all traces of life on the surface of the earth approximately 25 times over, that they have finally neutralized each other.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

Now as if that frightening reality were not enough, we are also witnessing what could well be called indirect strategy, that is, the expansion of new possible theatres of operation which are more or less controlled by the two major rival military blocs.

No continent henceforth would be spared, even if the greatest concentration is to be found in Europe. But we should also be mindful of the considerable destructive power contained in a single weapon in the category which has quite properly been called weapons of mass destruction, to which we should add the so-called tactical weapons as if to establish a sort of continuity between the nuclear and the non-nuclear. Any possibility of surviving such weapons is further reduced when we bear in mind the vectors, intercontinental and other missiles, against which we cannot even arm ourselves despite the existence of anti-missile missiles and their redoubtable effectiveness.

Hitherto the balance of terror, armed peace or the cold war - whatever the current term might be - would attempt to have us believe that in the long run wisdom would prevail, if only in the form of a peace between warriors. The Helsinki Act, which followed the Conference on Peace and Security in Europe, the SALT I and SALT II negotiations, would have given us every reason to believe that finally reason would prevail. But peace is only a valid concept as a function of the policies which are implemented in order to promote it or to make it regress. For some there is no longer anything which exists under the sun that cannot fail to be seen in the context of East-West relations. Thus, certain Powers have unilaterally, without the least twinge of conscience, proclaimed that their vital interests may be found in other territories belonging to other sovereign States. An imagined or real threat to those interests would thus ipso facto constitute a casus belli likely to bring about armed intervention.

In that absurd logic, according to which anyone who is not with us is definitely against us, there is no longer any true autonomy with respect to political, economic or cultural questions which arise in any part of the world.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

In the case of Africa, for example, the question of Namibia, to which the provisions of the Declaration in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples are extremely relevant, has been erroneously placed by certain Powers in the context of their own world geo-strategic concerns.

Similarly, the South African apartheid régime is considered by the official circles of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as a friend and ally, a very serious concept which correspondingly reduces the chances of easing tension in southern Africa and gives grounds for doubt as to the real desire of the allies of Pretoria not to encourage its immediate and irreversible access to nuclear power.

Here again, as the acts of the Pretoria Government against neighbouring States have proved, it is something which could well promote South Africa to the rank of a nuclear State.

Now that everything is viewed from a geo-strategic standpoint, we have witnessed a quantitative spiralling of arms and of their involvement in economic policies, which is particularly obvious in these times of crisis. The "historic" decision taken by certain governments to proceed to the production of neutron weapons is part of this quite obvious impotence of political will as against selfish interests. The very existence of chemical and biological weapons is part of such an inhuman process that one wonders whether the military or political authority which might decide to use them one day would deserve the least recognition even on the part of its own nation whose interests it is supposed to defend or protect. In fact, we do not believe that people are so desirous of dominating others that they would go so far as to acquiesce in their mutual annihilation.

The breadth of reaction which has been seen in Europe against condemning that continent to death by those who would place nuclear weapons there precisely bears witness to the fact that people want peace. What remains to be done is to involve the headquarters of the military-industrial empires in that process.

But those whose livelihood depends on the industries of death are not at all certain that they will be able to convert those industries to peace. The sale of weapons is part and parcel of the traditional steps which have been dreamed up to overcome economic stagnation and inflation. The figure of more than \$500 billion spent annually for armaments testifies to the depth of the commitment of everyone involved in that evil undertaking.

The representative of the Congo recalled in the general debate in the General Assembly on 29 September last that \$20 billion of the more than \$500 billion would be sufficient in itself to resolve most of the economic and social problems which exist today, both in the developing countries as well as elsewhere, instead of that astronomical sum to which I have just referred, and which is increasing, being spent on armaments.

In the effort which is thus required for the well-being of mankind, we do not in the least underestimate the advances of science. But we refuse to accept as axiomatic that progress must necessarily be linked with arms. Research and its peaceful application, even in the nuclear field, offer such far-reaching prospects that they could quite usefully take up the time of, and be a matter of concern to, scientists, strategists and politicians, who up to now have been lured by the atomic madness.

Therefore, we should not, under the pretext of non-proliferation, prevent those who have the opportunity and the desire to do so to acquire the appropriate structures in order to make a positive contribution to the progress of science and history.

That is the view of the Republic of the Congo and that is how we define the concept of denuclearization. The creation of nuclear-free zones in Africa, Latin America, the Middle East or in South-East Asia should be interpreted, as we see it, in that light. That would not in any way authorize those Powers that are within or outside those areas to deploy their weapons there or to indulge in tests which would be dangerous for both ecology and man.

Consequently, we deplore the situation created in the Indian Ocean where, despite the desire of the nations bordering on that body of water, no international conference has yet been held in order to reach concrete solutions on demilitarization. That is an urgent matter and deserves to be appropriately followed up in accordance with the wishes of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

My country's often expressed conviction to the effect that peace is indivisible is a reflection, above all, of our desire to see the entire international community more closely concerned with a matter which so greatly affects its survival: the disarmament process.

As a member of the Preparatory Committee for the next special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament which will take place next year, the Congo intends to work sincerely to show that disarmament is the duty and the mission of the United Nations by virtue of its Charter.

The efforts made to this end on the multilateral level, particularly at the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva do not in our view detract in any way from the importance of bilateral efforts between great Powers or super-Powers.

The only proof of goodwill that could be put forward by the super-Powers would be at least to revive the SALT negotiations, thereby contributing to the creation of a climate which is more favourable to optimism. Furthermore, we cannot see how, unless they are devoted to the destruction of mankind, beginning with themselves, the great Powers can maintain their credibility when they speak of peace if they do not make a clear return to the road of negotiation.

Confident as we are in the ability of individuals and peoples to come to their senses, we venture, finally, to remain optimistic, reaffirming a truth well known to strategists which states that the main strength of armies lies in men: as a wise man said "It is men not stones, that are the strength of the ramparts that protect cities".

Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador)(interpretation from Spanish): I should like to express my delegation's satisfaction at Ambassador Golob's unanimous election to the chairmanship of this important Committee. It is clear that his country has a history of independence and respect for law, and a universalist attitude of understanding for the causes of developing countries, with which it identifies and whose struggles it shares. We also congratulate the other Committee officers.

The discussion of disarmament expresses sanity and universal hope, and is a raison d'être of the United Nations, in so far as results are achieved, at least gradually. It is in this forum where, witnessing the terrifying

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

increase in nuclear weapons and other fearful, distorted applications of science and technology and of economic power the vast majority of countries claim their rights as inhabitants of the planet Earth so that this frantic arms race can be stemmed and so that we can live free of the constant threat of catastrophe unleashed by accident, by the force of circumstances which might still be changed, or by the deliberate action of an insane desire for power or for the imposition of a political view.

Ecuador, a country which respects peaceful and just coexistence within the norms of international law, as well as democratic institutions and the right of peoples to devote their resources to their own development, has reiterated its unrestricted support for all disarmament proposals which, through the various international disarmament forums, are reviewed by this Committee.

At the Latin American level, the Constitutional President of our Republic, Mr. Osvaldo Hurtado, has clearly stated that Ecuador will participate in initiatives aimed at the disarmament of the region "in order thereby to release economic resources so urgently required for the development of our countries".

In turn, Foreign Minister Alfonso Barrera, speaking in the General Assembly, pointed to the fact that the prospect of war is even more fearsome:

"if one recalls that in industrial societies man has reached the absurd extreme of producing and storing some 50,000 nuclear bombs capable of exterminating the human race 20 times over. It is therefore urgently necessary to establish a continuous warning system so that mankind may recover a certain measure of good sense, for if it should come to the extreme of arguing in favour of certain recent weapons that they destroy only human beings, that would amount to declaring that human existence is subordinate to the armaments business.

"The unbelievably high military expenditure which now amounts to well over \$1 million a minute, is the real cause of inflation, of the disturbance of the very concept of international trade, and of distortion of the principles at the basis of economic activity, which is currently being conducted by the above-mentioned arms merchants. /Those expenditures must be halted./

"Consistent with that reasoning is the clear condemnation of the policy of increasing military expenditure in developing countries, particularly those whose confidence that they can impose solutions to their external problems stems from their belief that they have a greater military capacity than their neighbours." (A/36/PV.31, pp. 6-7)

Within the context of the growing proportion of resources devoted to weapons by developing countries - which in the past decade have doubled their military expenditures which have reached 16 per cent of the \$525 billion devoted world-wide to armaments and other military ends - I must underscore as absurd the regrettable case of countries which devote to their military expenditures a greater sum than that which they devote to education and health combined. Ecuador prides itself on assigning the highest priority in its budget to education expenditures and on the fact that, together with allocations for health and housing, this is more than twice any other type of expenditure of its limited resources.

My country believes that disarmament, which is the logical path of the non-use of force in international relations, must be strengthened in the system of the peaceful settlement of disputes, as long as it is operative and concrete, with machinery giving real force and effect to the relevant articles of the United Nations Charter.

At the same time we are concerned that the neutron bomb has been incorporated into the grim arsenal, a bomb which - a mercy for real estate investors - is said only to kill human beings. We therefore hope for progress in the trilateral negotiations on the banning of nuclear tests, and that the frightful military expenditures will be stemmed at a time when official development assistance amounts to less than 5 per cent of the sums devoted to weapons.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

It is not through nuclear or conventional weapons and their mass accumulation that it will be possible to arrive at understanding among peoples. Dialogue, negotiation and understanding are the only intelligent paths towards the fraternal coexistence needed, along with scrupulous observance of the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter, and in particular the rejection of the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of States and the non-interference in their internal affairs which are the bases of any lasting peace. The arms race is the negation of those principles. Together with stemming the unbridled arms race, especially in nuclear weapons, there is the need to reduce considerably and eventually to eliminate nuclear arsenals which exceed the defence needs of the States possessing them and which serve to heighten international tension and distrust among nations, both among the nuclear-weapon States and those that would also be the victims of atomic catastrophe. The nuclear Powers also possess thousands of missiles that are extremely accurate and precise, and we note the continual increase in that type of weaponry.

In resolution 33/91 B of 16 December 1978, the General Assembly, after stressing the importance of the statement in paragraph 93 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, that it is necessary, in order to facilitate the process of disarmament, to take measures and to pursue policies to strengthen international peace and security and to build confidence among States, requested the Secretary-General to carry out a comprehensive study on confidence-building measures with the assistance of qualified governmental experts. That Group of Experts, in which Ecuador was a participant, has submitted the results of its work to this session of the Assembly. The results of that study, which is contained in document A/36/474, demonstrate that confidence-building measures at the regional or global level can contribute to reducing or, in some cases, to eliminating the causes of distrust, fear, tension and hostility, all decisive factors in the constant increase in weaponry, both nuclear and conventional. The study

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

lists some of the measures States could adopt to promote and strengthen confidence, highlighting in particular measures relating to the military aspects of security that have a direct and immediate influence on the maintenance of world peace and international security. Nevertheless, it does not fail to point out the importance of plans of action and measures principally related to political, economic and social matters, such as respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States, non-interference in the internal affairs of a State, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in accordance with existing international instruments, the establishment of a new international economic order and respect for the sovereignty of States over their natural resources.

The Government of Ecuador hopes that the guidelines set forth in this initial study on this all-important issue will be welcomed by all Governments and will serve as a basis for the negotiation and implementation of concrete, realistic measures at the regional, inter-regional and international levels, thereby contributing to confidence-building among States.

In connexion with the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) between the United States and the Soviet Union, there can be no doubt that those talks are a highly important element in the process of negotiations for arms control and disarmament. My delegation therefore welcomes the announcement made on 21 October in this Committee by Mr. Rostow of the United States that within a few weeks negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States will begin on medium-range nuclear weapons and that parallel talks are proposed for the beginning of 1982 on the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons. My delegation hopes that that dialogue will be fruitful and that agreements will be reached in this crucial area, agreements that will mean real reductions in the vast nuclear arsenals.

Among the many matters dealt with in the report of the Committee on Disarmament, I should like to refer to two, because of their importance for efforts to stem the arms race.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

The first is the preparation of a treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests in all environments, a question which has been considered by the General Assembly for more than 25 years now and on which the Assembly has adopted more than 40 resolutions. In some of them, the Assembly has condemned all nuclear-weapon tests and has expressed its conviction that the continuation of such tests "will intensify the arms race, thus increasing the danger of nuclear war." It should also be recalled that in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, it is affirmed that cessation of nuclear-weapon testing would be in the interests of mankind and make a significant contribution to the aim of ending the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, the development of new types of such weapons and preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

On this topic, which the Committee on Disarmament, upon the request of the General Assembly, is considering on a priority basis, its report gives a discouraging picture. No progress whatsoever has been achieved; it could not adopt, for lack of consensus, the proposal of the Group of 21, contained in document CD/181, to establish an ad hoc working group that would begin multilateral negotiations for the formulation of a draft treaty. Moreover, the trilateral negotiations on the subject, on which we have placed such hopes for so many years, remain suspended. An end must be put to all nuclear tests which contaminate the environment and lead to the destruction of the atmosphere and of marine resources, thereby damaging countries that are not nuclear Powers.

We hope that at the next session of the Committee, positive steps will be taken towards the opening of the long-awaited substantive negotiations on this highly important issue.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

On the other hand, we are encouraged by the progress achieved in the negotiations under way in the Committee on Disarmament with regard to the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. Such deadly weapons, whose use in the First World War led to the Geneva Protocol of 1925, are at the present time an active component of military arsenals. Recently, there have been reports indicating the possibility that certain types of such weapons have been employed in several parts of the world. Such acts would constitute a regrettable regression in our efforts towards the prohibition of chemical weapons and a source of grave concern for relations among civilized countries.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

The report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons, established by the Committee, reproduced in paragraph 110 of the report of the Committee, contains draft elements for a future convention as well as comments made in this connexion by some delegations. It is clear that there are still important differences of view concerning certain elements, but in general it can be said that convergence of views is emerging on many questions and that the conclusion of a convention on chemical weapons could be one of the positive contributions of the Committee to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In her excellent and detailed presentation before this Assembly of the study on the relationship between disarmament and development, Mrs. Inga Thorsson, Under-Secretary of State for Disarmament Matters of the Government of Sweden, told us that the main conclusion drawn by the Group of Governmental Experts that prepared this study was that:

"the world can either continue to pursue the arms race with characteristic vigour, or it can move consciously and with deliberate speed towards a more sustainable international economic and political order. It cannot do both. The arms race and development are thus to be viewed in a competitive relationship, particularly in terms of resources." (A/C.1/36/PV.5, pp. 21-22)

We agree with the General Assembly's wish that military expenditures should be reduced throughout the world, and we hope that this process will become a reality, above all at the astronomical level of nuclear budgets. Of course, in accordance with the characteristic and sincere position of our country's democracy geared towards economic development and social well-being, we are in favour of any trend towards transferring resources to development purposes for the benefit of the quality of life of our peoples, without affecting Article 51 of the Charter, which enshrines the right of legitimate defence in the event of armed attack, but in clear fulfilment of the basic principles of our Organization, particularly paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article 2, indicating that the Members of the Organization will resolve their international disputes through peaceful means and that they will refrain from the use or threat of use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of any State

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

We are in the Second Disarmament Decade, but if nothing concrete is done it is most likely that there will be no human population to negotiate and achieve a third Decade.

Ecuador, an equatorial country, a country aware that outer space must be a dimension of peace, will support any resolution aimed at avoiding the military uses of outer space where, at the present time, devices aimed at espionage for military purposes, satellite-hunting satellites, and the use of nuclear energy in objects placed in outer space by the "space Powers" are being multiplied, while people feel that this new dimension should be placed at the service of the well-being of peoples.

We feel that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is fundamental, and we all hope that it will go beyond the achievements of the first special session of 1978, whose Final Document was given the authority of a consensus and continues to be the most complete document on disarmament ever accepted by the international community.

The fact that, in that Final Document, the Declaration was separated from the Programme of Action and the machinery as areas of consensus, is another demonstration of the universal will to come out of the stages of declarations to those of action through an effective international system which can provide the concrete results desired by all.

Ecuador, an original signatory of the 1967 Treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons in Latin America, welcomed the announcement made by the representative of the United States concerning legislative approval for the forthcoming ratification of the First Additional Protocol of that Treaty, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, to which it is already a party, and we hope for the ratification by the Soviet Union of Additional Protocol II, signed in 1978, to which the United Kingdom, the United States, France and the People's Republic of China are already parties. We hope that there will be similar progress on the denuclearization of Latin America, on the intelligent initiative of Egypt for the creation of nuclear-free zones in the Middle East and other similar procedures in Asia, on the declaration on the denuclearization of Africa and on the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

Ecuador this year signed the Convention on Prohibition or Restriction of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. We all know that the Convention and its three Protocols represent a step forward in the efforts of the international community to prohibit or at least restrict the use in armed conflicts of conventional weapons which are particularly cruel and inhuman. While the protection that these agreements offer to civilian populations is not as broad as the majority of countries that participated in their negotiation would wish, we are pleased that the Convention does provide machinery that will make it possible to broaden the scope of the existing Protocols through amendments, as well as the possibility of agreeing to prohibitions or restrictions on the use of other categories of that type of conventional weapons.

It is worthy of note that the Convention and its Protocols were negotiated and adopted at a conference of the United Nations, the final session of which took place in Geneva in September and October of 1980, demonstrating that the United Nations can be an effective forum where it is possible, given a spirit of conciliation as well as political will on the part of Member States, to arrive at agreements of great significance such as those which I have just mentioned, agreements which not only strengthen humanitarian international law, but also contribute largely to promoting and encouraging the control of weapons and disarmament.

We also consider it encouraging that thus far 45 States have signed the Convention. My delegation hopes that these instruments, the result of long and patient negotiations, will enter into force in the near future, and we urge all States to adhere to them so that they may have universal application.

The export of violence, the desire to impose political systems by force, and actions aimed at destabilizing governments and institutions must end. An end must be put to the abusive system of occupying foreign territories with foreign troops. Those territories must be returned to their legitimate owners, so that their peoples can decide on their own destiny through

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

free elections. It is weapons that prevent countries from living democratically, and it is arms merchants, the agents of hatred and violence, who oppose the peaceful co-existence of peoples and the exercise of freedom and human rights. There is no defence against nuclear weapons; the only possibility is disarmament.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

The stockpiling of weapons is a threat to the human race. The time has come to abandon the use of force in international relations and to seek security in disarmament.

What is lacking is the political will to listen to the voices of the majority of the members of the international community. Every day the peoples express ever more strongly their rejection of the arms race. Mass demonstrations condemn the stockpiling of nuclear weapons. Innumerable communities speak of the need to arrive at a world referendum on disarmament. World public opinion, the sole, yet powerful, force supporting the United Nations, must finally be heard, and we must arrive at general and complete disarmament, under effective and strict international control.

Mr. WAN AHMAD NAJID (Malaysia): Mr. Vice-Chairman, please convey to Ambassador Golob the warm congratulations of the delegation of Malaysia on his election as Chairman of this Committee. His election is a clear testimony to his wide experience and deep understanding of disarmament issues as well as a tribute to his great country for its numerous contributions to the cause of disarmament and international peace.

May I also express to you, Sir, my congratulations upon your election to the post of Vice-Chairman. I also wish to express my congratulations to the Second Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur on their election.

My delegation has listened with great interest to the statements made by the representatives during the course of the meetings of this Committee. We have constantly been reminded of the seriousness of the present situation, marked as it is by hotbeds of tension which are being further exacerbated by the upwardly spiralling arms race involving the massive development and stockpiling of nuclear weapons, as well as by an increasing tendency to use force in international relations instead of peaceful negotiations and accommodation, as enshrined in the Charter. If this situation is allowed to persist, we fear that the world will be headed on a collision course and the very existence of mankind will be at stake.

(Mr. Wan Ahmad Najid, Malaysia)

It would seem to me that the progress, wealth and power acquired by the industrialized nations of East and West alike have neutralized our moral and ethical values. Only a week ago, the Chairman of the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, in her report, highlighted our misguided priorities. While more than half of mankind lives in a state of poverty and deprivation, more than \$500 billion is being spent to amass great volumes of weapons, the use of which could only result in utter disaster for us all. Herein lies our greatest folly: if only half of the amount of these resources were channelled to social and economic betterment, particularly of the developing countries, this would greatly assist in ending human misery. In this regard, we highly appreciate the valuable contribution made by the Group in reawakening our conscience concerning the suffering of millions of human beings from poverty and deprivation throughout the world today.

The massive arms build-up that we are witnessing today is closely related to the present international tensions which have resulted from the heightened rivalries between the super-Powers and the actions by some Member States which have resorted to the use of force to assert their dominance, sovereignty and primacy. Located as we are in a region which has been a cockpit of external power rivalries, we have witnessed armed conflicts which have threatened regional peace and stability. Malaysia will not be a part of this intensified political rivalry of the major Powers, and we cannot subscribe to the proposition that peace and security may be maintained only by the precarious balance of mutual armed deterrence, which guarantees neither permanent peace nor continued survival.

We could not continue to live under the shadow of fear and distrust. The major Powers should not go on dealing with contentious issues on the basis of military might. We urge them to heed the clear warning of the

(Mr. Wan Ahmad Najid, Malaysia)

international community by taking appropriate steps to curb the arms race and embark on alternative means of ensuring peace and security not only for themselves but also for the rest of mankind. Malaysia has welcomed the inception of talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons. We continue to believe that the two super-Powers should bear the major responsibility for halting and reversing the arms race and their continued dialogue should complement disarmament efforts undertaken within the framework of the United Nations.

It has been more than three years since the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was adopted by consensus. That document is regarded as the framework for concrete efforts in the field of disarmament, with clearly set priorities and machinery to achieve the eventual goal of disarmament. Regrettably, just a few months from now, the second special session devoted to disarmament will convene and the Committee on Disarmament, a multilateral negotiating mechanism established by the first special session on disarmament, has achieved very dismal results. Not a single agreement has emerged in the years since the first special session. As indicated in its 1981 report, the Committee on Disarmament has only been able to establish working groups in four areas, namely, a comprehensive programme of disarmament, chemical weapons, radiological weapons and negative security assurances. The lack of progress in the negotiations of the Committee on Disarmament is yet another testimony of the unwillingness of the two super-Powers to reassert their political will and negotiate in good faith. My delegation expresses the hope that intensive negotiations before the second special session on disarmament will yield some tangible results that could accelerate the process of disarmament and arms control.

(Mr. Wan Ahmad Najid, Malaysia)

We are also disappointed at the failure to commence multilateral negotiations on the nuclear test-ban treaty. The stumbling block which impedes progress in that area is again reluctance on the part of the three nuclear-weapon States to allow the Committee on Disarmament to undertake multilateral negotiations. The conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty would have a positive influence on our endeavours to curb the nuclear arms race by halting qualitative improvements and the development of new types of nuclear weapons. We strongly urge that multilateral negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament should commence without further delay with a view to concluding an equitable and universally acceptable comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The first special session devoted to disarmament also envisaged that the comprehensive programme on disarmament should be the centre-piece of an international instrument of disarmament which could impose legal obligations upon States to implement the necessary measures for disarmament. The need to elaborate a comprehensive programme on disarmament has gained urgency in view of the current international climate and the priority that this item will assume at the second special session devoted to disarmament. My delegation fully supports efforts to establish priority and a realistic time-frame for the achievement of our ultimate goal of complete disarmament. While that remains our aspiration, however, progress in the Committee on Disarmament has in that respect been rather painfully slow. We strongly hope that negotiations on the comprehensive programme on disarmament at the coming session of the Committee on Disarmament will be more fruitful, so that the programme may be adopted at the second special session devoted to disarmament, which is expected to consider that item to be of high priority.

Another area of concern to my delegation is the prevention of horizontal nuclear proliferation. It is of paramount importance that there be universalization of adherence to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

(Mr. Wan Ahmad Najid, Malaysia)

Its effectiveness would further enhance the inalienable rights of States to develop - through international co-operation - the research, production and uses of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes under the recognized régime of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. We expect Member States fully to adhere to those safeguards and we view with concern the unprecedented attack on the peaceful nuclear installation of Iraq by Israel, which indirectly undermines the safeguard régime of the IAEA.

Another source of concern in the area of nuclear proliferation is the indication that South Africa may be in possession of nuclear armaments outside of any international control. This provides an extra and sinister dimension to an already uncertain climate and damages the credibility of the Treaty, as well as giving rise to dangerous tendencies towards even greater proliferation.

While giving priority to nuclear disarmament, it is not the intention of my delegation to downgrade the importance of current measures to reduce the conventional arms race. The accumulation of conventional weapons could also create similar conditions of instability in various parts of the world and could lead to the spiralling of the conventional arms race beyond the limits of self-defence. Measures to curb the level of conventional armaments necessitate mutual agreement on the need for a stabilized military relationship, and that in turn should be further complemented by progress in confidence-building measures and initiatives such as the establishment of zones of peace.

It is a matter of record that Malaysia has always supported the idea of establishing zones of peace in various regions of the world. Such zones of peace would create conditions conducive to peace and stability and would further prevent and eliminate super-Power rivalry for spheres of influence, thereby preventing potential regional conflicts and paving the way for regional co-operation in the fields of economic and social development.

(Mr. Van Ahmad Najid, Malaysia)

This regional concept of disarmament will greatly complement the goal of disarmament undertaken by various forums. Mindful of that fact, Malaysia and other partners in the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) will continue to pursue the realization of the concept of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia, which provides a basic framework within which to ensure peace and stability in that region.

The goal of establishing a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean also offers the countries in the region concerned the prospect of increased stability and security. My Government fully supports all efforts to bring about an early realization of that proposal. However, we wish to express our regret that the conference on the Indian Ocean scheduled to be held this year in Sri Lanka failed to materialize. We realize that there is still a divergence of views on the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. That divergence must be narrowed through a spirit of compromise and give-and-take, especially between the super-Powers. At the same time, the littoral and hinterland States themselves must exercise the necessary restraint and responsibility and not act in a manner inconsistent with the spirit of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

My statement today is merely intended to set forth Malaysia's views on some of the pertinent points that we consider to be particularly significant and of great concern to us. My delegation reserves the right to speak again on those issues as well as on other items on the agenda when they are taken up in detail by this Committee.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Today, the Soviet delegation would like to devote its statement to the question of limiting nuclear arms and nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Quite obviously, there is hardly any need in this room to attempt to prove what a threat to peace and security for peoples is posed by the arms race, and primarily the nuclear arms race. Under present-day conditions, when the nuclear arms race is increasingly becoming an instrument used by the United States to attain military supremacy and to undermine the approximate military and strategic balance which exists at the present time, that arms race is assuming the nature of a self-generating process which swallows up in giant gulps all that is best in mankind -- knowledge, energy, material and intellectual resources.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

And, as with most such processes, if it eventually got out of hand it might well end in an explosion that would wipe out mankind. At the same time, we are growing closer and closer to the threshold beyond which, as a result of technological perfection and the sophistication of the new generations of nuclear weapons, we may even forfeit the possibility of getting this process under control, let alone reversing it.

It has been suggested here that the problem of nuclear disarmament should have been tackled at the very dawn of the atomic era. We cannot, of course, fail to agree with that. That was precisely the approach taken by the Soviet Union. May I remind you of a few facts, particularly since attempts have been made in this Committee to distort historical truth.

At one of the very first meetings of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, to be more precise, the meeting of 19 June 1946, the Soviet representative on the Commission, Mr. Gromyko, put forward a draft international convention to prohibit once and for all the production and utilization of nuclear weapons based on the use of atomic energy for purposes of mass destruction. It was proposed that all parties to such a convention would undertake not to utilize atomic weapons under any circumstances, that they would prohibit the production and stockpiling of such weapons, and that within a period of three months they would destroy their entire stocks of manufactured and partially manufactured atomic weapons. It was proposed that the violation of the obligations undertaken should be declared a heinous crime against mankind. That would seem to be a very clear-cut proposal.

The United States, however, rejected the proposal, naively believing that they would be able to keep their atomic monopoly.

It was then that the "Baruch plan" was put forward for the creation of a so-called international body to control the development of atomic energy. That plan, which it is now attempted to present to us as a sort of panacea for mankind's nuclear problems, was simply intended to foster the creation of a world atomic pool in order to consolidate the American atomic monopoly. This was the leitmotiv of all the recommendations, drafts and documents, which were proposed by the American representatives in the United Nations.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

As early as 1947 we and many others pointed out that if unlimited powers were to be vested in that body, and if it was to be given full charge and control over atomic enterprises, that could only be regarded as an attempt on the part of the United States to secure its world supremacy in the field of atomic power.

The Soviet Union favoured the prohibition of nuclear weapons even at that time when it did not yet possess such weapons and thereafter when it created its own nuclear potential. In subsequent years the Soviet Union put forward a number of other concrete proposals, the implementation of which could have meant an end to the manufacture of nuclear weapons, and to the stockpiling of such weapons. The reply to the proposals of the Soviet Union was the constant policy of the United States to accelerate the nuclear arms race based on what has turned out to be a completely unrealistic desire to preserve and to perpetuate American nuclear supremacy.

Recently we have had occasion to hear that matters of nuclear disarmament are intimately connected with the national-security interests of States, and that nuclear arms limitation talks should not be held without taking account of those interests. Naturally, we entirely agree with such an approach, and we ourselves have frequently had occasion to emphasize that the elaboration and implementation of measures to limit the arms race and to bring about disarmament in the nuclear field must be solidly linked to the strengthening of the political and international-legal guarantees of the security of States. However, it is inadmissible that the security interests should be used as a pretext to justify the further escalation of the nuclear arms race and the refusal of any negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

It is precisely that approach that is being proposed to the international community by the United States. By claiming that agreements on arms control cannot and do not guarantee peace, senior American representatives conclude that arms control must be supplemented by military programmes, and that they cannot allow matters of control over arms to influence American strategy. Thus, any progress in nuclear disarmament is made to hinge directly on what

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

strategic concept is preached by the United States. But this, as history has shown, simply leads all international efforts to solve the paramount problem of the present day to a deadlock and, moreover, steadily brings the world closer to the nuclear abyss.

Having acquired nuclear weapons, and in 1945 having realized their "effectiveness", the United States immediately proceeded to devise, at first in secret and then quite openly, plans and doctrines for their military application. Starting with the notorious doctrine of "massive retaliation" and up to the most recent concepts of "limited nuclear war", American strategic plans have always had a very clearly expressed aggressive tendency. Thus, the core of the doctrine of a "limited nuclear war" is that it will be possible to deliver selected nuclear strikes against such targets as missile-launching silos, troop concentrations, and centres of military and political administration.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

It must be obvious to any specialist that if the plan were to deliver not a pre-emptive but rather a retaliatory strike as the representative of the United States has stated in our Committee, then for no reason whatsoever the target system would also include nuclear targets which had already launched their missiles. Furthermore, in the successful implementation of this strategy the element of surprise would be of paramount importance and, of course, could only be enjoyed provided one were the first to deliver a strike.

Thus, this doctrine is aimed at legalizing in one way or another the very idea of the acceptability of nuclear war and to force mankind to acquiesce in such a gloomy prospect. In fact, the very initiators of this concept, including the former United States Defence Secretary Mr. Brown have essentially recognized the invalidity of the argument that nuclear war can be kept to a restricted framework and will not in fact expand into a full-scale war. In this connexion I should like also to quote the words of the former Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Rusk, who stated in one of his articles that:

"Several hundred nuclear missiles aimed at 'military' targets with their accompanying cones of deadly fallout and the fatal pollution of the earth's atmosphere cannot be distinguished from an all-out nuclear strike except by playing with words unrelated to the real world. I have had enough experience with real crises to know that those carrying final responsibility are not going to confine themselves to scripts written in advance by think-tanks."

Obviously it would be difficult to question the opinion of those who by virtue of their past duties know full well what lies behind this kind of doctrine.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

As the report of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) notes, in 1981 the military and technological requirements for carrying out a limited nuclear war are practically identical to those which would have to be met in order to deliver a pre-emptive first strike. Thus, if we strip off the verbal camouflage from the new American strategy - and I am referring to the announcements about the need to "restrain Moscow", to maintain the military and strategic balance and so forth, then it becomes clear that that strategy is a specific programme for preparing a qualitatively new material foundation for a preventive nuclear war in which the main thrust would be placed on battle-readiness and even the capacity of emerging victorious.

In our time, unless we deliberately close our eyes to the realities of the present-day world, it must be abundantly clear that an increase in the accumulation of nuclear devices can in no way help to preserve a peaceful atmosphere and to prevent war. Doctrines and similar concepts of "restraint", "deterrence" and any varieties of these are simply capable - and this is perfectly obvious, as we have seen - of whipping up the arms race and of putting off indefinitely, if not completely blocking, any possibility of solving the most urgent and timely problems of the limitation of nuclear weapons and achieving nuclear disarmament.

In our view, the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly should unambiguously condemn as contradictory to the wish to preserve peace and to prevent any progress in the arms race any varieties or models of the concept of "deterrence" and the doctrine of "limited nuclear war" and loudly proclaim that not stockpiling nuclear arsenals but rather undertaking constructive negotiations to put an end to the production of nuclear weapons and talks on the gradual reduction of their stockpiles until they are completely eliminated is the rational way to ensure security and to remove the threat of thermonuclear conflict.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it has always been and remains a staunch opponent of any doctrines and concepts which lead to a nuclear arms race.

In this connexion we have to describe the statement made by the United States representative on 27 October as an attempt to denigrate, clumsily and in an undignified way, the military doctrines of the Soviet Union. Instead of reasonings and suppositions based on quotations taken completely out of context, he should have paid rather closer attention to the official statements of the Soviet leaders.

The present military doctrine of the Soviet Union has been formulated at the highest political and military level of our State and has been done so with sufficient clarity and lack of ambiguity. It also contains a reply to the question of whether it is possible to achieve victory in nuclear war.

In this Committee we have already had occasion to quote the statement made by the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, the Chairman of the Council of Defence of the Soviet Union, Mr. Brezhnev, to the effect that "to attempt to beat each other in the arms race, to count on victory in a nuclear war, is dangerous folly". (A/C.1/36/PV.9, pp. 23-25)

I shall also quote further words. The Minister of Defence of the Soviet Union, Marshal of the Soviet Union Ustinov said:

"The essence of Soviet military doctrine is aimed, on the basis of the principles of Leninist foreign policy of peace and international security, at protecting the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and at preventing aggression. Soviet military doctrine finds alien to it any preventive or predatory wars of any kind or size and also the concept of any pre-emptive nuclear strike."

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

That quotation states clearly and unambiguously what our doctrine is; there is no other doctrine.

Here the American representative tries to alarm representatives by quoting figures relating to a fictitious Soviet threat and to convince us that the Soviet Union apparently, as he suggested, traditionally tends to gravitate to arming itself. All of those figures are apparently taken out of thin air and are completely divorced from the realities of international life in the post-war period. They completely disregard the Americans' tremendous military potential, which is aimed from all directions at the Soviet Union and its allies. Those figures are obviously aimed at concealing the fact that the arms race is deeply rooted in American soil and that the Soviet Union has not been responsible for its recent spiralling.

If facts are necessary, by all means let us have them. After all, it is a historically acknowledged fact that it was the United States and no one else that unleashed rivalry in massive strike weapons in 1945, when it was the first not only to create but to use atomic weapons. The Soviet Union was obliged to respond by creating its own atomic bomb, four years after its proposal to prohibit the military use of atomic energy had been rejected.

The first thermonuclear explosion was caused by the United States in 1952. A year later the Soviet Union was obliged to create its own thermonuclear weapon.

The United States was the first to manufacture atomic submarines with ballistic missiles on board. Four years later the Soviet Union introduced similar submarines into its fleet. In 1970 the United States equipped its intercontinental missiles with multiple warheads. The Soviet Union was obliged to develop its own similar system in response a few years later.

There is an even more recent example. A short time ago our country proposed that we prohibit the creation of the Trident naval ballistic system by the United States and the analogous system in the Soviet Union. That proposal was not accepted. As a result, a new American submarine, the "Ohio", has been manufactured to carry Trident I missiles, and in the Soviet Union a similar system called Typhoon has been set up.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The same is true of the European continent. If there had been no American forward-based weapons in Europe and no medium-range nuclear missiles of other NATO countries, the Soviet Union would never have seen any need to create its own means of counterbalancing those missiles.

Those examples clearly show that it was the United States that started the nuclear arms race. The Soviet Union was in turn obliged to create its own military potential in order to ensure its own security and that of its friends. The Soviet Union has never allowed anyone to establish any military superiority over it, and I can assure the Committee that it will not permit that in the future either.

However, it is not the growing arms race but the process of reducing arms and reducing military confrontation that is our policy. In 1978 the Soviet Union put forward a proposal on the cessation of the manufacture of all forms of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of stockpiles of them until their complete elimination. A document to that effect was submitted by the Soviet Union, together with the other members of the group of socialist countries, in the Committee on Disarmament. That initiative was intended to make talks on nuclear disarmament completely comprehensive, because the final purpose of the talks is to do away with nuclear weapons. We see that that approach is necessary if we bear in mind that the intention is completely to eliminate nuclear weapons.

At the same time, we did not preclude the possibility of the talks encompassing other issues which would result in a genuine reduction or prohibition of any forms of nuclear weapons and means of their delivery, on a mutually agreed basis - for example, the production of fissionable materials intended for weapons use, missile launching vehicles and other such matters.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The subject of such nuclear disarmament talks would naturally require additional agreement. As for the number of participants, the Soviet delegation re-emphasizes that the task of completely eliminating all nuclear weapons urgently requires the participation in talks on the matter of all nuclear States: the United Kingdom, China, the Soviet Union, the United States and France. Otherwise, we should have an extremely bizarre situation, with some nuclear Powers negotiating on the restriction and reduction of their arsenals while others are moving towards increasing their stockpiles of nuclear weapons. Therefore, the statement by the Chinese delegation to the effect that the only way to reduce and remove the threat of nuclear war is to put an end to the nuclear arms race between the two super-Powers is obviously intended merely to circumvent any serious discussion of this matter and to attempt to justify blocking the taking of any substantive and comprehensive decision on it.

When making their proposal, the socialist countries held, as they hold today, that the task of eliminating nuclear weapons cannot be accomplished overnight. Its accomplishment will necessarily involve a number of stages. Measures for nuclear disarmament should be implemented gradually, according to a predetermined order or in parallel, according to a timetable which would be subject to agreement and which would need to be backed up by political and international legal guarantees of State security.

However, each individual step should be organically part and parcel of an over-all programme of nuclear disarmament which would guarantee the necessary comprehensive approach to solving the problems of eliminating nuclear weapons. One should proceed from each step to the next only if all the components of the previous stage have been dealt with. Such an approach is in accordance with the recommendations of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Paragraph 50 of the Final Document of that session (A/S-10/4) states that the achievement of nuclear disarmament should include agreement on:

"A comprehensive, phased programme with agreed time-frames, whenever feasible, for progressive and balanced reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, leading to their ultimate and complete elimination at the earliest possible time."

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The various stages of nuclear disarmament may differ from each other not only according to the actual steps carried out but also according to the degree of involvement of individual nuclear steps in the proposed steps, that is, differ according to the actual range or scope of the measures undertaken.

In order constantly to reduce the level of nuclear arms and, at the same time, to keep inviolate the existing balance in the field of nuclear potential, account must be taken of the qualitative and quantitative significance of existing arsenals which belong to States possessing nuclear weapons and other States involved. Such an approach will guarantee the desired degree of balance in those steps taken to eliminate nuclear weapons. Undoubtedly an important requirement here is strict observance of the principle of not in any way damaging the security of States. That approach makes it possible to take due account of the differences in the nuclear potentials of individual States and also provides the necessary basis for talks among all nuclear States on this matter, provided, of course, that they have the political will to do so.

As was previously said in a statement made by the Soviet delegation in our Committee, the Soviet Union would be prepared as an initial step to proceed to discussions - for example, in the Committee on Disarmament - on the possible stages for nuclear disarmament and their approximate content, particularly the content of the first stage. In our view, among those steps which would comprise the first stage it would be desirable to consider the question of putting an end to the designing and deployment of new forms and systems of nuclear weapons. We believe that such an approach could help to start a constructive discussion of the entire complex range of issues pertaining to nuclear disarmament. It would make it possible to increase international efforts devoted to solving that task. We would venture to hope that it is precisely that course, rather than attempts to distract the international community from the paramount tasks of the present day, which will win support during the present session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

In his statement on 27 October the representative of the United States made an emotional appeal to us all to display a spirit of realism. We have nothing against that approach. Unfortunately, however, the spirit of realism as interpreted by the Americans took the form, at least in this session, of simply rejecting out of hand any proposals made by the Soviet Union solely because they emanated from our country. That spirit of realism, as shown by the statements of the United States representatives in our Committee, also takes the form of resisting any other concrete proposals that talks should be started on the elimination of nuclear weapons both on a bilateral **and** multilateral basis. Thus, obviously also in a spirit of realism, the United States blocked the idea of establishing two working groups in the Committee on Disarmament, one on the question of nuclear disarmament and the other on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

We interpret a spirit of realism to mean something different. Realism, as we construe it, is first and foremost the taking of measures which are consonant with the demands which have been expressed by millions and millions of people throughout the world. One would indeed have to be deaf and blind not to be able to hear and see the giant wave of protest which has arisen against the nuclear arms race and the danger of a nuclear catastrophe, a wave which has swept through all continents, particularly the European continent. The peoples of the world are demanding that an end be put to confrontation and that negotiations be started. Thus, realism is essentially the holding of a constructive dialogue on the entire range of vital questions relating to restricting the arms race and bringing about disarmament and, of course, first and foremost disarmament in the nuclear field.

In putting forward specific proposals that talks be started to limit nuclear weapons, we do not in any way claim that we are the possessors of the absolute truth. We are putting forward those proposals precisely for them to be discussed. Realism, as we understand it, is a readiness to tackle the present-day problems whole-heartedly and substantively. We are convinced that only such a spirit of realism can in fact help to further the cause of disarmament and remove the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

Mr. THIOUNN PRASITH (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French): It is a great pleasure for me and for my delegation to convey our sincere congratulations to Mr. Golob, the representative of Yugoslavia, on his unanimous election as Chairman of this important Committee. His personal qualities along with the prestige of his country, the Federated Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia, its constant and stalwart struggle for international peace and security, independence, sovereignty and the territorial integrity of all countries and for the strict respect of the principles of non-alignment and of the Charter of the United Nations, are certain guarantees of success in our work. My delegation would like to assure him of its full co-operation and would like to extend its congratulations also to all the other officers of the Committee.

After three decades of efforts in innumerable meetings and debates devoted to disarmament in order, as proclaimed by our Charter, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind", we have all arrived at a consensus to stress that the arms race has never been as frenzied, and the threat to international peace and security never been as grave as it is today.

In his report on the work of our Organization, the Secretary-General correctly summarized that consensus when he stated that:

"The arms race, especially the competition in nuclear weapons, continues unabated, representing not only a perennial risk to human survival but also an inordinate waste of human and other vital resources." (A/36/1, p. 2)

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith, Democratic
Kampuchea)

In recalling the main events of the past 10 years, the Secretary-General stressed that

"In 1979, events ... particularly in Kampuchea, created new tensions which, despite all efforts through the machinery of the United Nations, still remain to be resolved. A further problem, giving rise to the most serious repercussions on the broader international scene, developed in Afghanistan." (ibid., p. 3)

No further evidence is needed for these facts. Everyone agrees that international tension is increasing year by year because of the use of force which has been growing unchecked in international relations, especially since late 1978, which saw the brutal and open invasion of my country, Democratic Kampuchea, by the Vietnamese regional expansionists, followed one year later by the equally brutal and open invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet global expansionists. These wars of aggression and invasion, which are continuing today, have revealed that the détente of the 1970s and the debates on disarmament were used by the very parties that claim to be the staunchest defenders of disarmament to screen the build-up and development of their nuclear, conventional, chemical, biological and other weapons, with the aim of achieving the goal of their strategy, world and regional domination. As was stressed by our Vice-Prime Minister in charge of Foreign Affairs in his statement before the General Assembly,

"Rarely in the history of the world has the gap separating words and deeds and proclaimed ideals and sombre realities been so great.

Never in the annals of international crime against independence and the freedom of peoples has demagoguery been used in such a cynical fashion to serve a strategy of regional and world domination." (A/36/PV.18, p. 47)

At a time when it makes use of the rostrums of international organizations to spread its "peace" propaganda and carry out its campaign of disinformation by proposing extravagant draft resolutions, the expansionist super-Power has sent to the Hanoi expansionists many millions of tons of weapons and military equipment and is giving them assistance in excess of \$6 million per day. It is thanks to that immense assistance that the Vietnamese expansionists continue to expose my country to violence and bloodshed, and have devastated the country, massacring nearly 3 million inhabitants, using conventional weapons, famine and

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith, Democratic Kampuchea)

chemical weapons. Without that Soviet assistance, the bloodthirsty Viet Nam would be unable to continue its war of aggression and expansion in Kampuchea and South-East Asia.

In exchange for this Soviet support, Viet Nam has ceded its bases at Cam Ranh and Danang to the military, naval and air forces of the Soviet Union. It has become an active element in the Soviet manoeuvring and expansionist strategy. The Soviet fleet, once confined to the Baltic and Black Seas, is now becoming an offensive force, patrolling the world's oceans. In the Pacific and our South-East Asian region alone, that force, thanks to the Cam Ranh and Danang bases, which are more than 4,000 kilometres from Vladivostok, today enjoys incomparable logistical support, which strengthens its mobility and striking force. Soviet warships passing from the Pacific Ocean to the Indian Ocean through the Straits of Malacca and Makassar are increasing in number.

This situation is a genuine threat to the peace and security of South-East Asia and the Pacific. This situation, which results from the Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, prevents the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and is ruining any hope of making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. The fine words of the representatives of these expansionists - such as those we have just heard, for example - cannot disguise the facts.

For some years now, and especially since the invasions of Kampuchea and Afghanistan, the international community has been shocked and angered by the increasingly intensive use of chemical weapons by the invaders of those two countries.

In Kampuchea, where the 250,000 Vietnamese soldiers and 50,000 Vietnamese civilian agents are irreversibly held back by the staunch and increasingly strong resistance put up by the people and the national army of Democratic Kampuchea, the Hanoi regional expansionists are continuing their massacre of the population in the hope of stamping out that resistance at its source. Since the beginning of their invasion, they have resorted to the use of deadly and incapacitating chemical weapons. Protestations of innocence by these war criminals can no longer hide the truth, which the whole world knows and condemns.

In April 1980, a Vietnamese artillery officer who had deserted his unit, the Vietnamese 75th Division, operating in north-west Kampuchea, revealed

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith,
Democratic Kampuchea)

that nearly all the types of cannon in use in Kampuchea are equipped with shells containing toxic gas, the use of which is authorized at the regimental level. On 9 July 1981, during a press conference in Bangkok, a Vietnamese officer, Captain Nguyen Quan, who deserted his unit, the 28th Artillery Battalion of the Vietnamese Fifth Division, based in Battambang province in north-west Kampuchea, revealed that the Vietnamese army uses toxic gasses against the civilian population and the national army of Democratic Kampuchea, and has done so since the beginning of the invasion. He revealed that on 19 January 1979 Vietnamese artillery fired 400 toxic gas shells at civilian and military targets in Democratic Kampuchea, in Kompong Cham province, on national route 7 in eastern Kampuchea, and that they fired 700 other toxic gas shells in the Am Leang region of Kompong Chhnang province located in the central plain of Kampuchea. He also revealed that to his knowledge four divisions of the Vietnamese forces occupying Kampuchea are equipped with chemical weapons and have been given orders to use them against civilian and military targets. Finally, he stressed that each regiment and each division of the Vietnamese army in Kampuchea has two Soviet advisers.

That presence of Soviet advisers was confirmed by another Vietnamese deserter named Do Hung Son, of the 20th Signal Company of the First Battalion of the Vietnamese 740th Regiment. That soldier revealed that in March 1979, when Vietnamese troops were trying to encircle the forces of the national army of Democratic Kampuchea,

"our Signal Company gave the order to all soldiers to put on their gas masks. Our Commander said that the Russians were going to fire toxic gas shells ... The shell was fired in the direction of the Phnom aly region from O La Hong ...".

which is in Battambang province.

Finally, on 16 April 1980 Radio Hanoi broadcast the news of the awarding of the Order of Ho Chi Minh, Third Class, to the "Chemical weapons service of the people's army" of Viet Nam. In the course of that ceremony, Colonel-General Le Trong Tan, Vice-Minister of Defence and a member of the Central Committee of the Vietnamese Communist Party,

"highly praised the efforts made by the chemical weapons service during the past 22 years to train and prepare for combat".

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith,
Democratic Kampuchea)

Colonel-General Le Trong Tan added:

Those soldiers and officers have actively studied and mastered science and technology and have been courageous, resourceful and creative in combat and in providing troop support. In fulfilling their task in the new situation, our officers and soldiers in the chemical weapons service must conduct scientific and technological research and train themselves to make effective use of the weapons and materials provided to them."

In response to the investigation of the Secretary-General requested by the General Assembly in resolution 35/144 C of 12 December 1980, and under paragraphs 6 and 7 of that resolution, the Government of Democratic Kampuchea has actively co-operated in the impartial survey on the use of chemical weapons and has communicated all relevant information to the United Nations, which has now been embodied in several documents of the Organization. According to a document issued by the Ministry of Public Health of Democratic Kampuchea dated 10 April 1981, and distributed as United Nations document A/36/254 of 15 May 1981, these chemical weapons can be divided into three groups.

The first group consists of toxic gas released from cannon shells and has the following effects. First, those near the point of impact die immediately. Secondly, those who are far from the point of impact, within a radius of approximately 500 metres, have the following symptoms: a breathing syndrome characterized by an acute dyspnoea and a sensation of intra-thoracic heat; a general bleeding syndrome causing the vomiting of blood through the respiratory and digestive tracts - the mouth, nose and rectum. This bleeding syndrome leads to acute anaemia; there is blackish urine. Lastly, the patient is in an extreme asthenic state with a sensation of imminent death and sometimes even a loss of consciousness.

The second group of chemical weapons consists of chemical powders that cause extensive skin lesions with a strong degree of hypothermia and lead to death if the patient is not treated in time.

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith,
Democratic Kampuchea)

Lastly, the third group of chemical weapons is poison introduced into drinking water. Six hours after absorption such water causes the victim to suffer repeated and abundant bilious vomitings, bleeding from the mouth and nose, and fetid breath; the patient loses consciousness and has repeated convulsions. A blackish and strongly fetid slimy liquid is excreted from the anus. There is intense asthenia.

This information was corroborated in a note verbale from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America dated 15 September 1981 and distributed as United Nations document A/36/509. The ranting and diversionary tactics of the Vietnamese and Soviet expansionists cannot alter this reality, just as they cannot ever deny their invasions of Kampuchea and Afghanistan or escape the condemnation of the international community.

On 13 October of this year the Ministry of Public Health of Democratic Kampuchea drew the population's attention to the fact that the Vietnamese invaders, caught in a total impasse on the military front, were, in their attempt to remove themselves from that impasse, intensifying their systematic use of chemical weapons during the 1981-1982 dry season. The Ministry stated:

"At the beginning of the month of October the Vietnamese aggressors spread toxic chemical products in lakes and ponds and introduced toxic chemicals into various foodstuffs, such as sugar and fruits, causing the death of 70 inhabitants of Maung-Pursat in the north-west region. On 5 October they killed 15 inhabitants of the city of Siemreap in the same manner. On that same day they sent a truck full of toxic chemicals to the village of Kauk Daung in the Varin district, Siemreap province, and also sent two helicopters to spread toxic chemicals in the Koh Sla district, Kampot province, taking 50 victims among the inhabitants, 40 of whom are in serious condition."

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith,
Democratic Kampuchea)

Lastly, the Ministry of Public Health issued guidelines so that all necessary and effective steps could be taken to prevent poisoning by the toxic chemicals and gases spread by the Vietnamese enemy and to make appropriate provisions for timely relief for the victims.

The atrocious death of tens of thousands of Kampuchians caused by Vietnamese-Soviet chemical weapons cannot go unpunished. The Government of Democratic Kampuchea and its people are grateful to all countries that cherish peace and justice and to the United Nations for their tireless efforts to denounce and put an end to the monstrous crimes committed by the expansionists in their war of aggression and genocide in Kampuchea. We will continue to co-operate actively in advancing the inquiries, which have obtained encouraging results thus far, and especially in the work of the Group of Experts established under General Assembly resolution 35/144 C.

The international community may well wonder how disarmament can be achieved and how the growing threat to international peace and security can be ended, or at least reduced, if the expansionists continue with impunity their policy of world and regional domination and trample underfoot the Charter of the United Nations, international conventions that they themselves have signed and all the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

My delegation believes that the best way of inducing such expansionists to come to their senses and avoiding a new world conflagration is to increase assistance to all the peoples now struggling against their aggression and their viles crimes against mankind; it is to strengthen the united struggle of all peoples and countries that cherish peace and justice; to denounce the hypocrisy and demagogy of these warmongers and to bring increasing pressure to bear on them to induce them to respect the Charter of the United Nations and international conventions, especially, as regards their crimes against my country and my people, General Assembly resolutions 34/22, 35/6 and 36/5.

(Mr. Thiounn Prasith,
Democratic Kampuchea)

In spite of the disappointed hopes in connexion with the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, many still place their hopes in the second special session, which will take place next year. Nevertheless, we are entitled to ask the question: can that second special session on disarmament really expect to succeed while wars of aggression and invasion continue in Kampuchea, Afghanistan and other parts of the world? For their part, the Government of Democratic Kampuchea, its people and its national army have no alternative but to continue their struggle for national survival on all fronts, for they remain convinced that that just struggle, supported by the vast majority of the international community, is also a contribution to the defence of peace and security in South-East Asia and throughout the world, a goal that all of us seek to attain in these debates.

Mr. ANDERSON (Australia): May I at the outset offer my warmest congratulations and those of my delegation to Mr. Golob on his election as Chairman of the Committee and assure him of our full support and co-operation in the Committee's work. May I add my personal congratulations also to the other officers of the Committee upon their election.

In my address to this Committee at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, I commented that while no great strides had been made in recent years in the disarmament field, significant progress had been registered in a number of areas. I suggested that we should not hope for sudden or miraculous breakthroughs but that, given continued political will to achieve results, progress could and should be made.

It is a matter of deep regret that even this modest objective has not been reached during the last year. Indeed, it is difficult to identify one area where any substantive progress has been made. It is true that there has been some movement in the various disarmament forums, particularly the Committee on Disarmament and the Preparatory Committee for the second special session, but on substantive matters we have witnessed an almost complete standstill in arms control negotiations. This alone would be reason for the utmost concern, but the situation is in fact still worse. We are witnessing not simply a continuation of the arms build-up but its rapid escalation, and this not only between the super-Powers but throughout an increasingly unstable world, with both conventional and nuclear weapons involved. We are on a treadmill. As the international political climate continues to deteriorate, States which feel insecure resort to an increase in arms. This in turn fuels the insecurity felt by other nations - and so it goes on. If this process continues, it can only be a matter of time before instability degenerates into conflict. In the meantime, the world lives in fear and precious resources are devoted to increasing the capacity for destruction.

The need for effective arms control negotiations has always been urgent, but never so urgent as it is today. We cannot expect a sudden reversal in the situation, but we must press for the resumption of significant movement. We are looking for genuine efforts leading to concrete and verifiable guarantees for control of the development and deployment of additional weapons and for

(Mr. Anderson, Australia)

their eventual reduction. This aim can best be realized by ensuring that the various disarmament forums, including this body, are able to concentrate their attention on substantive issues and are not side-tracked by items of an essentially propagandistic character.

Australia is again adding its voice to the growing plea for all countries to participate and help to put the disarmament machinery back in motion and then keep it moving steadily ahead.

Let me now turn to the machinery with which we have to work. Our multilateral disarmament negotiations are built around the results of the first special session devoted to disarmament and the Final Document emerging from that session. This Document represents a delicately balanced consensus. We have all been careful not to upset that consensus and thereby unravel the work of the first special session. Next year we have the second special session, preparations for which are proceeding steadily and satisfactorily, for the slowness of pace reflects the seriousness which we all attach to setting the stage for a successful session and not a lack of willingness to move purposefully forward. The draft agenda which has now been agreed upon is a significant step and we are confident that the next and final meeting of the Preparatory Committee will see the completion of preparations for the session.

From the first special session emerged the two chief multilateral disarmament bodies: the Committee on Disarmament and the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Both have met throughout the year as planned and in the case of the Committee on Disarmament some positive developments have taken place. The work of that Committee is crucial to future arms control negotiations, and the will of all Member States to advance these negotiations is necessary if it is to play its designed role. No one believes that the Committee on Disarmament should or could take over the role of all bilateral negotiations nor certain other important arms control matters. But just as bilateral negotiations complement and are a necessary adjunct to multilateral negotiations, so the Committee on Disarmament should be permitted to contribute to disarmament considerations in other crucial areas.

(Mr. Anderson, Australia)

The United Nations Disarmament Commission, on the other hand, did not have a particularly successful session this year. Care should be taken to ensure that the Commission does not become just another defunct United Nations body, meeting year after year without achievement or even purpose.

After a disturbingly unproductive year in the field of bilateral arms control negotiations, we are encouraged to see a renewed willingness on the part of both super-Powers to re-enter negotiations. We look to a resumption of serious negotiations resulting in the early conclusion of a series of agreements aimed at halting the arms race, reducing armaments and thus creating a climate of optimism and confidence necessary for the advancement of further action in both bilateral and multilateral negotiations.

I turn now to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). It is an encouraging fact that over two-thirds of the Member States of the United Nations have undertaken voluntarily to renounce the acquisition of nuclear weapons by acceding to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, a Treaty which for over a decade has made a substantial contribution to international security and to co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

Australia regards the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which is essentially a security Treaty, as the cornerstone of the international non-proliferation régime. The régime established by the NPT, including in particular full-scope safeguards administered by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), provides assurance of the peaceful intent of nuclear activities which is essential to the establishment of the climate of confidence needed for successful co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Australia is concerned that some States outside the NPT may be developing programmes, including the construction of unsafeguarded facilities, for the development of a nuclear explosive capability. The detonation of a nuclear explosive device by any such State would clearly jeopardize regional and international security.

But the threat to international security from the spread of nuclear weapons goes in both directions. We look not only to the non-nuclear-weapon States to contain this danger, but also to the nuclear-weapon States. Among the most

MLG/am

A/C.1/36/PV.16
79-30

(Mr. Anderson, Australia)

important of the agreements necessary for all nuclear-weapon States to accept is a comprehensive test-ban treaty. My Government has long been active in pursuing the objective of an agreement on such a test ban as a further restraint on existing nuclear arsenals and as a barrier to the further spread of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Anderson, Australia)

Such a treaty would, of course, end all nuclear explosions for its duration and, indeed, we would hope, for all time. It would apply to all explosions for both military and peaceful purposes and thus limit and perhaps even stop the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons by the parties to the treaty. The development of new nuclear weapons and the improvement of existing ones would be made considerably more difficult. Such results would help strengthen the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), lead to the fuller implementation of that Treaty and help overcome the objections of those States that see the NPT as discriminating in favour of the existing nuclear-weapon States.

The objective is, of course, a universally accepted treaty under which States which today do not have nuclear weapons would not go on to acquire them, thus preventing horizontal proliferation. States not party to the NPT could become party to a comprehensive test-ban treaty and thus provide assurance that they would not become nuclear-weapon States.

The existence of a comprehensive test-ban treaty would also provide of restraint on States not party to either the NPT or the comprehensive test-ban treaty. Any such State which engaged in nuclear testing after a comprehensive test-ban treaty had been concluded would come under increasing pressure to explain and justify the reasons for its action to international public opinion.

At last year's session of this Committee, we stressed the urgency of action to complete a comprehensive test-ban treaty and we called on the three negotiating nuclear-weapon States to conclude their negotiations in 1981. Such a result, coupled with their co-operation in the Committee on Disarmament on this matter, would have permitted that Committee to proceed swiftly with the negotiation of a treaty. We are deeply disappointed that this has not been the case. We can but repeat our plea for the earliest possible resumption of the trilateral negotiations. As in past years, Australia will play a constructive and active role at this session in preparing a resolution on the question of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

(Mr. Anderson, Australia)

A comprehensive test-ban treaty, while an integral part of the over-all plan for nuclear non-proliferation, is not an end in itself. Looking ahead, there would be an important further brake on proliferation if, at an appropriate stage, an agreement on the cessation of the production of fissionable material for nuclear-weapon purposes - the so-called cut-off - were negotiated. This would help to restrict the continued production of existing types of nuclear weapons, limit existing nuclear arsenals to approximately their present size and so contribute to the scaling down of the arms race. It would also prevent the emergence of new States with nuclear explosive capabilities.

There exists in the international community a broad consensus for the conclusion of a convention covering chemical weapons. The Australian Government attaches high importance to the early conclusion of such a convention. The working groups which were established in the Committee on Disarmament over the past two years have made some encouraging progress. We are hopeful that the time is not too distant when the elaboration of a convention can begin. It is important that the momentum generated in these working groups, thanks largely to the activities of Ambassadors Okawa of Japan and Lidgard of Sweden, be maintained next year.

We are looking for a truly comprehensive convention, one that would eliminate completely the possibility of any form of warfare intended to kill or injure human beings through the use of chemical weapons. It must contain a comprehensive ban on the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapon agents and their means of delivery without hampering the proper uses of chemicals for peaceful purposes. A vital element in the conclusion of such a convention, and one where much further work is necessary, is verification. Verification arrangements are needed which take full account of the military potential of chemical weapons. Disturbing reports which have been circulating in recent years of the use of chemical weapons in several current conflicts bring home to us the difficulties of effective verification procedures, particularly where there is a lack of willingness by States involved to co-operate with the international community. We need established procedures for verifying the use of chemical weapons and for exposing those that use them to the international community.

(Mr. Anderson, Australia)

In this connexion, the work of the Group of Experts established last year proceeded under something of a handicap. We are pleased to have learnt that some States to which requests for on-site investigations were addressed have complied with the wishes of the Group of Experts. It is difficult to understand why other States so requested have declined the opportunity to disprove charges of the use of chemical weapons. It is clearly necessary for international machinery to be established whereby allegations of the use of chemical weapons can be speedily investigated and denials of such use speedily tested or confirmed.

Turning to the Indian Ocean, while Australia has long supported the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace, we have always maintained that the creation of these zones is primarily a matter for the States of the region concerned and should be based on intra-regional agreement. We also believe that one of the more effective methods of creating an effectively nuclear-weapon-free zone is the adherence by all States in the region to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

As an active member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean since its inception, Australia fully supports the concept of the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

It is no secret that the Ad Hoc Committee has this year been a troubled committee - a fact that has caused justifiable concern among the States of the region, including Australia. It must be recognized, however, that in the current highly unstable political and security climate in the region, the present is not a propitious time for holding a conference for the implementation of a zone of peace. Indeed, it is difficult to envisage how such a conference could succeed when a hinterland State of the region has been invaded and continues to be occupied by the military forces of a major Power, a Power whose sincere co-operation would be essential to the creation of an effective zone of peace. I shall not dwell on the other troubled areas in the region, but all of them would certainly be closely scrutinized at a conference, and this would make the success of a conference most unlikely. An unsuccessful conference would be more likely to aggravate the present unsatisfactory situation in the region of the Indian Ocean than to improve it.

(Mr. Anderson, Australia)

Australia remains committed, nevertheless, to the concept of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. We believe that, given a more stable political climate, and given a greater degree of harmonization of views on the issues involved, an international conference would eventually offer the most likely way of achieving the goal of the establishment of such a zone of peace.

We are now in the second year of the Second Disarmament Decade, and 1982 will see the convening of the second special session of this Assembly devoted to disarmament. The first two years of this decade and the three years since the first special session have been marked, as I mentioned at the outset, by an alarming deterioration in the world security situation and by a dangerous acceleration in the arms build-up, both nuclear and conventional. Unless these trends are first halted and then reversed, the future cannot be viewed with optimism. We look to a renewed commitment by all States to work towards positive arms control and disarmament measures. My Government will do its utmost to contribute to those objectives.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Two representatives have asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. Before calling on them, I should like to remind them that in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements made in exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. ADELIAN (United States of America): Some statements do not warrant the dignity of extensive reply. Nor, however, can they be left to stand without any reply. Hence I will be brief.

Yesterday Cuba and Viet Nam issued strident and vituperative attacks on the United States which went beyond even what we have come to expect from such quarters. They accused my country of engaging in chemical and biological warfare -- essentially of causing every illness in their countries to which the flesh is heir.

Should either have one shred of evidence to substantiate such outlandish accusations, it should present such evidence in a responsible manner.

I presume neither has, since yesterday's were not the first charges of this kind that the Castro Government has made against the United States. I spoke to those charges in the General Assembly on 25 September 1981. I will not take up the Committee's valuable time by repeating that statement here.

I feel obligated to state for the record, however, that these allegations are totally false and without foundation. They are nothing more than malicious lies.

The fact is that the United States destroyed all its biological weapon stocks and ceased all production some five years before the entry into force of the biological weapons Convention, to which the United States is a party and with which the United States fully complies. My Government condemns the use of biological and chemical weapons anywhere and at any time.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

Unfortunately, there is strong evidence that this is not universally the case and that such weapons are being used against desperate people in small non-aligned countries in Asia in situations of enormous human suffering.

This raises serious questions concerning compliance with arms control agreements in general and with the biological weapons Convention and the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and customary international law.

The manner in which the accusations were levelled yesterday brings discredit to the countries making such charges and, indeed, to the seriousness of this body.

Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): In connexion with the reply of the representative of the United States, we want to point out that we have always been clear and emphatic in this situation.

First of all, it has been clearly demonstrated by Cuban and foreign scientists that the dengue 2 virus was deliberately introduced into our territory. That type of virus does not exist in the Caribbean. In the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America with which Cuba maintains relations, the dengue 2 virus is unknown, as has been reported by the World Health Organization (WHO). Who but the Government of the United States could want to damage the economy and people of Cuba?

The United States Government has at all times in the past 22 years denied Cuba's various accusations. It will be recalled that in this very hall on the occasion of the mercenary invasion of the Bay of Pigs, as it is called in the United States, the United States representative to the General Assembly denied any kind of involvements and precisely two days after the mercenary defeat the President of the United States himself acknowledged his Government's guilt.

(Mr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

The United States Government has always denied attempts to assassinate Cuban leaders although subsequently, in the Senate of the United States during the investigation of Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) activities, such assassination plots against our leaders were revealed. The Senate of the United States also discovered plans for biological warfare against our country as a part of those same CIA activities against Cuba.

Time and the facts have always proved us correct. How sad it would be if, in the very near future, in some memoir by a general or State Department official, the representative of the United States were discredited and Cuba vindicated.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.