

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records*



COPY:
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
L 201 (VANDER)

FIRST COMMITTEE
21st meeting
held on
Tuesday, 2 November 1982
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

COPY:
FOR REFERENCE
ONLY - DO NOT
CIRCULATE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 21ST MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)
(Vice-Chairman)

UN LIBRARY

NOV 9 1982

UN/SA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 57, 133, 136, 138 AND 139 (continued)

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Al-Sahaf (Iraq)
Mr. Lusaka (Zambia)
Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen)
Mr. Lehne (Austria)
Mr. Dorr (Ireland)
Mr. Al-Qasimi (United Arab Emirates)
Mr. Prandler (Hungary)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/37/PV.21
6 November 1982

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 57, 133, 136, 138 and 139 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. AL-SAHAF (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, I am happy to extend to you the congratulations of the delegation of Iraq on your election to guide the work of the Committee. May I also congratulate the two Vice-Chairmen and the other officers. We wish you all every success in the fulfilment of your tasks as you conduct the work at this session with the wisdom and perspicacity that are characteristic of you. I should like to assure you of the readiness of the delegation of Iraq to co-operate fully with you for the purpose of achieving the goals that the Assembly has set for itself.

The work of the First Committee at this session is taking place in a climate of concern and disappointment. International relations are suffering from the exacerbation of tensions, the escalation of the cold war and the possibilities of confrontation, which constitute a real threat to the peoples of the world, with all that this involves in terms of harmful consequences which expose the security of all to unlimited dangers. We have the impression that those that are exacerbating tensions are trying to increase polarization and enlarge their spheres of influence throughout the world for the sake of their own narrow interests, at the expense of the peace of the entire world and the security of its peoples.

Successive developments on the international scene in the course of the past few years have worsened and added to the complexity of the areas of tension and instability throughout the world, with the result that détente is being reversed and we are now returning to the climate of the cold war, during which the majority of the regions of the world were exposed to serious dangers. We thus see the hopes of nations for peace and prosperity evaporating. In this situation the principles of peaceful coexistence have been compromised, and the measures aimed at building confidence and developing mutual co-operation in all fields have been endangered. Similarly,

(Mr. Al-Sahaf, Iraq)

the situation has a negative impact on the unrelenting efforts to find solutions to international problems, foremost among which is the problem of the cessation of the arms race and of disarmament.

The problem of the arms race, particularly with regard to nuclear weapons, is one of the elements which most clearly increase tension throughout the world, and widen the gap between the two opposing camps. This increasingly undermines the confidence between them and spurs them to greater rivalry, thus wasting resources and energies that could be directed to remedying the deteriorating economic situation throughout the world and especially in the developing countries, instead of being used to increase the war potential of the two super-Powers and their capacity for destruction and annihilation.

(Mr. Al-Sahaf, Iraq)

Various adverse factors have resulted from the tense international situation. It has led to the developing countries being caught up by the armaments policy and being obliged to devote an important proportion of their natural resources to exorbitant militant expenditures for purposes of self-defence. This has undoubtedly given rise to unfortunate consequences, hampering the economic progress of the people of those countries and hindering their social development, and entangling them in the situation of tension and struggle between the two super-Powers. During this period we have seen a serious escalation of the policies of concentrating and building-up military forces, the deployment of nuclear weapons, the establishment of significant rapid deployment forces and the escalation of the arms race. We have also seen the promotion of dangerous theories such as that of a limited nuclear war. All these policies expose various regions of the world to many risks and imperils the aspirations of their peoples to peace and prosperity.

Among the reasons for major concern is the fact that the super-Powers have failed to arrive at a practical acceptable formula for limiting armaments and halting the arms race between them. They are building up their war machines, stockpiling equipment, and are making use of technological progress to increase the effectiveness of their infernal engines of war, whose victims will be the whole of mankind. The two super-Powers have the major responsibility for the cessation and reversal of the arms race. They are called upon by the international community to stop the accumulation of weapons of mass destruction and the development of new weapons systems. The two super-Powers are being asked to stop all production and stockpiling of bacteriological weapons and to destroy the existing stockpiles of such weapons. There is an urgent need to agree on a new international instrument prohibiting the use of bacteriological and chemical weapons.

It is truly regrettable that so far it has not been possible to conclude a convention or treaty for the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, in spite of the many resolutions to that effect that have been adopted both in the United Nations and the Non-Aligned Movement. All the technical aspects of the question seem to have been debated at length, and all that is required now is a political decision. Our international Organization must take the appropriate decisions to expedite the conclusion of such a convention in

(Mr. Al-Sahaf, Iraq)

view of the terrible danger to which mankind as a whole is exposed as a result of these tests.

The stagnation of the talks on strategic disarmament between the United States and the Soviet Union and the lack of any further progress towards a new treaty for the limitation of strategic arms - and such a treaty would certainly contribute to halting the arms race and ensuring a favourable climate for the achievement of the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament - has had very harmful effects on the efforts being made to reduce tensions and pave the way for the disarmament process. Iraq wishes to associate itself with the overwhelming majority of the countries of the world in urging the two super-Powers to undertake serious negotiations for the purpose of halting the arms race and reducing their nuclear arsenals.

The delegation of Iraq wishes to reaffirm the importance of the establishment of zones of peace and denuclearized areas throughout the world, and we call on all countries, particularly those which possess nuclear weapons, to respect the status of such regions and to refrain from the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against countries located in such regions.

As regards the Middle East region, the delegation of Iraq feels that the situation in that sensitive region constitutes a serious and permanent threat to world peace and security as a result of the aggressive and expansionist policies of Israel directed against the Palestinian people and the Arab countries, and also of the frenzied nuclear arming being carried out by that entity. Perhaps the report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations containing the report of the Group of Experts to Prepare a Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament, as set forth in document A/36/431, might shed considerable light on some of the aspects of this dangerous question.

(Mr. Al-Sahaf, Iraq)

In paragraph 83 he states:

"The Group of Experts considers that the possession of nuclear weapons by Israel would be a seriously destabilizing factor in the already tense situation prevailing in the Middle East, in addition to being a serious danger to the cause of non-proliferation in general. However, they wish to add the final observation that it would, in their view, contribute to avoiding the danger of a nuclear arms race in the region of the Middle East if Israel should renounce, without delay, the possession of or any intention to possess nuclear weapons, submitting all its nuclear activities to international safeguards, through adherence to a nuclear-weapon-free zone in accordance with paragraphs 60 to 63 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2) and with Assembly resolution 35/157...through accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, or by unilaterally accepting such safeguards."

(A/36/431 para. 83)

The declaration converting the Middle East into a nuclear-weapon-free zone requires, in the first instance, the prohibition of Israeli use of nuclear threats and that the region be denuclearized and made free of nuclear weapons, which Israel in fact possesses. The implementation of the proposals mentioned in paragraph 83 of the study of the Group of Experts appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations and which I have just read out might constitute a first step on this path.

However, Israel does not only reject the resolutions of the international community concerning its nuclear armament, but goes further still in collaborating with the apartheid régime of South Africa in the military and nuclear fields.

(Mr. Al-Sahaf, Iraq)

Paragraph 12 of document A/37/22/Add.1 says:

"Sunday Times, London, reported in May 1982 that, according to a book to be published in Israel by three Israeli authors, Israel and South Africa were developing a cruise missile with a range of 1,500 miles, a neutron bomb and various nuclear delivery systems. The three authors were said to be very well known established figures in Israel with excellent connections in the military and Government. One of them, Mr. Amos Perlmutter, who worked for four years at the Israeli nuclear centre at Dimona, was then a professor at the American University."

The Israeli raid was carried out on the nuclear facilities of Iraq, which were exclusively devoted to peaceful purposes. This bombing raid turned a lamentable page in the history of armed aggression. The raid was not a military operation in any bilateral conflict and did not constitute a partial action in the context of the aggression constantly perpetrated by Israel against the Arab nation. It is not a mere isolated act of terrorism on the part of Israel which violated the United Nations Charter and threatened world peace and security. It was not simply that. The harm which arose from the bombing has extended its limits beyond the Iraqi nuclear installations themselves, and has acquired more dangerous far-reaching dimensions.

The aggressive act by Israel against the Iraqi nuclear installations constitutes a dangerous precedent in history, a deed which increases the possibilities of a nuclear war and of the use of radiological weapons. Thus, the Zionist entity has given to the world a new model of international anarchy and of its destructive tendencies. The aggressive action by Israel has dealt a decisive blow to the International Atomic Energy Agency and to the system of international safeguards as well as to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the established international principles concerning the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

(Mr. Al-Sahaf, Iraq)

The Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency as well as the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations have all condemned the act of aggression committed by Israel against the Iraqi facilities. The international community as a whole has condemned this act. But in spite of this, Israel is repeating its threats and states that it intends to repeat its action and carry out further attacks against the Iraqi nuclear facilities or any others in the area whenever it deems it necessary.

(Mr. Al-Sahaf, Iraq)

Israel was not concerned with any defence aims, as it claims, or with safeguarding its security when it attacked the Iraqi nuclear installations. The Israeli concept of defence is only the interpretation of a Zionist dream of regional expansion from the Nile to the Euphrates. Israel has developed its own atomic bomb in the Negev desert, has refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty and is basing its policy on the principle of not allowing the Arabs to achieve technical progress. Israeli machinations aim at assuring their hegemony and domination in the region with the support of Western technology, in particular that technology which is given to Israel by the United States of America, and at perpetuating the state of backwardness of the Arabs.

Iraq has not been and will not be content with seeing the international community condemn Israel's act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations; rather, Iraq would like to see the international community, represented by the United Nations and its specialized agencies, take the necessary firm measures capable of deterring Israel from any criminal aggression against Iraq and the Arab nation. On that basis, item 24, entitled "Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security", has been placed on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly.

A group of countries has introduced a draft resolution asking Israel immediately to renounce its proclaimed policy of repeating its military attacks against nuclear installations, requesting the Security Council to adopt the necessary measures to prevent Israel from repeating such

(Mr. Al-Sahaf, Iraq)

attacks, and calling upon all States to pursue their consideration of legal measures to be adopted at the international level to prohibit armed attacks against nuclear installations or any threat of resorting to such attacks. The draft resolution also request the Secretary-General to carry out, with the assistance of a group of experts, a comprehensive study of the consequences of the Israeli armed attack against nuclear installations devoted to peaceful purposes. Israel's aggression is considered to be a "violation and denial" of the sovereign inalienable right of all States to achieve technical and scientific progress for the purpose of achieving social and economic development, with a view to raising the standard of living of their peoples and assuring the dignity of man. Such an act would also be considered a "violation and denial" of inalienable human rights and of the sovereign right of States to achieve scientific and technical progress.

The Iraqi delegation is convinced that it is essential that the international community act urgently to develop an international instrument prohibiting attacks against nuclear installations, particularly those which are devoted to peaceful purposes. Failure to realize that objective will expose the international community to serious dangers, no less serious in their destructive effect than the use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia): It gives me distinct pleasure to extend to our Chairman, Mr. Gbeho, the representative of a sister African State, Ghana, the sincere congratulations of the delegation of Zambia on his election to the chairmanship of the First Committee at its present session. We are confident that under his able guidance the deliberations of this Committee will constitute an important contribution to the thought and action at the United Nations during the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly. Our sincere congratulations also go to the other officers of the Committee. The Zambian delegation pledges its full support and co-operation to Mr. Gbeho and the other officers in the discharge of their important responsibilities.

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

It was with great sadness that we received the news of the untimely passing of a world leader in the field of international peace and disarmament. I am referring to the world-famous British personality, Lord Noel-Baker. We mourn his death as a great loss to the lofty causes for which the United Nations stands.

May I also, on behalf of Zambia, express our rejoicing at the international recognition, in the form of the Nobel Peace Prize for 1982, accorded to two most notable devotees of disarmament, Mr. Alfonso Garcia Robles of Mexico, the current Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament, and Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden.

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

Two days ago I was reading a striking book, recently published in the United States, entitled The Day After Midnight, which deals with the effects of nuclear war. Its predictions - based on a report by the United States Congressional Office of Technology Assessment - of millions of dead, societies in upheaval and unknown long-term effects are enough to cause all of us to pause and ask where humanity is heading. In our deliberations we must keep alive this basic question, for the Charter of the United Nations has proclaimed that "We, the peoples of the United Nations" are "determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", which, as the Charter States, has brought untold sorrow to mankind".

In the face of these awesome potentialities for nuclear war and the destruction of our planet, we in the United Nations must be frank as we ponder our meagre achievements in the field of disarmament. The second special session devoted to disarmament was a disappointment, especially to the non-nuclear States. The failure of that session to adopt a document on a comprehensive programme of disarmament was, indeed, a setback. Nevertheless, it should spur renewed efforts aimed at the formulation of specific measures of disarmament which should be implemented over the next few years, including preparations for future negotiations regarding general and complete disarmament. Within this context, my delegation fully endorses the proposition advanced by those who have addressed this Committee before us, namely, that this universal Organization, the United Nations, should play a more active role in the field of disarmament. The United Nations should be enabled to implement all the disarmament measures agreed upon so far. With this central purpose in mind, there is an urgent need to review the purposes or roles of the Committee on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission and the United Nations Centre for Disarmament. Such a review should aim at strengthening the United Nations disarmament machinery to make it better able to carry out its responsibilities by enforcing the agreements reached within its framework.

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

In seeking the implementation of these measures, the delegation of Zambia is, in effect, expressing two basic concerns which are universally felt: first, concern over the deteriorating international situation with regard to global peace and security resulting from the inexorable nuclear arms race, which threatens the security of every nation; and secondly, concern over the senseless diversion of massive resources which are sorely needed for global economic and social development to the armament and military fields in the mistaken belief that the road to security is through massive armament. This fallacy has been eloquently exposed by the words of a retired United States Admiral, Eugene J. Carroll, Jr., Deputy Director of the Center for Defense Information in Washington. In an article under the title "Nuclear Freeze: Yes", he wrote the following about the vicious cycle of continuous nuclear arms escalation between the two super-Powers:

"We are, in fact, merely witnessing one more dreary round in the history of arms control in which each side attempts to 'win' the negotiations. If we are to reverse this process, we must accept the concept of mutual security and work to increase the safety of each other instead of increasing the threats against each other.

"This principle is easier to state than to realize. ... A freeze would constitute a historic first step". (The New York Times, 31 October 1982, p. E19)

What I am about to state now are known international facts, from which we shall have to draw basic conclusions:

First, there exists today a massive and competitive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced, which are capable of annihilating the entire human race, civilization and the total environment, not just once but many times, as if once were not enough for total extinction.

Secondly, military budgets are continuously on the rise owing to the vast build-up of arms and armed forces and the brutal competition in qualitative refinement of weaponry.

Thirdly, action by the countries with the heaviest responsibility for this state of affairs, especially the nuclear-Powers, through either bilateral or multilateral negotiations, has so far proved inadequate and, in fact,

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

incapable of coping with this global dilemma. This is due to many factors, not the least of which is the continuous evolution of science and technology, which are placed in the service of the arms race, including the race affecting outer space, and the competition in closing the continuously occurring gaps between the two super-Powers.

Fourthly, an ever increasing number of Member States in the United Nations, especially the non-nuclear States, have been expressing concern not only about the policies of the nuclear Powers, but also about the countries which are on the threshold of becoming nuclear Powers, especially South Africa and Israel.

Fifthly, at a time when two thirds of the inhabitants of this planet live in poverty and want, massive resources are being diverted from the economic and social development partnership which is embodied in the principles of the United Nations Charter.

From all of this we must reach conclusions which take these realities into account: that there is a direct relationship between disarmament and the enhancement of international security; that a balanced and generally acceptable pattern of global economic and social development is inextricably related to disarmament; and that international peace and security and the promotion of world economic and social development, which are the twin objectives of the United Nations, can only be served by effective agreements on all aspects of disarmament. These, we submit, must include the cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons; the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons; the prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons; the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space; the prohibition of the use of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects; the reduction of military budgets; and last, but by no means least, the non-use

of force in international relations, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly and, indeed, of the Security Council.

As the representative of an African State, my delegation is directly interested in the question of effective action on the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, and the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace in both the Middle East and South Asia. In this regard, we are fully mindful of our commitments under the resolutions of both the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity. We believe that now is the time to give the utmost attention to these questions relating to disarmament as they affect the third world and the non-aligned countries, of which Africa is a constituent and fully interactive region.

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

At this Assembly session the call must go out in the name of the international community as here represented to warn against South Africa's plans and capabilities in the nuclear field, as well as in the field of conventional armaments. South Africa is an apartheid régime. South Africa is illegally occupying Namibia. South Africa is the primary source of the destabilization of independent and sovereign African States in southern Africa. South Africa maintains unholy alliances with certain States, especially Israel, in the military and nuclear fields and in the suppression of the human freedoms and inalienable rights of the Namibians and the Palestinians. This is South Africa as we see its régime, as it is seen by the United Nations, as it is seen by the Organization of African Unity, as it is seen by reasonable people everywhere. We should like here to call on the Security Council to shoulder its responsibilities with regard to taking appropriate but effective measures against that régime, a régime which is in perpetual rebellion against international law and justice.

Acting on the recommendations made by the United Nations Council for Namibia - of which I have the honour to be President - in its capacity as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence the General Assembly, in its resolution 36/121 A of 10 December 1981, inter alia, strongly condemned South Africa, as in previous resolutions, for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia, its ever-increasing military build-up in Namibia, its recruitment and training of Namibians for tribal armies and its use of mercenaries to carry out its policy of military attacks against independent African States. By its resolution 36/121 B of the same date, the Assembly, inter alia, requested all States to cease forthwith any provision to South Africa of arms and related matériel of all types. More than two years ago, the Security Council adopted its resolution 473 (1980) of 13 June 1980, which, inter alia, requested the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) of 9 December 1977 to redouble its efforts to secure full implementation of the arms embargo against South Africa.

Not only do all these resolutions need to be reiterated and effectively applied in the context of enhancing international peace and security in Africa and the rest of the world; they also need to be supplemented by whatever the Assembly deems appropriate and relevant to the general question of disarmament.

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

In conclusion I should like to state that general and complete disarmament is a global human quest. It is more than a transient policy; it is a firm and global aspiration of the kind that produced this very Organization in 1945. This aspiration must be fulfilled. Otherwise, the terrible price of its neglect will be shared by us all - that is, if we as a civilization are still around to pay it.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): One of the political and security items of this general discussion is the subject of the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. As a littoral State of that Ocean, Democratic Yemen attaches particular importance to the implementation of that Declaration, because of the dangers to which the Indian Ocean region is exposed as a result of the consolidation of imperialist military presence and bases in that region. That is incompatible with the Declaration, which makes the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, and it threatens the security and stability of the States and peoples of the region and endangers international peace and security.

At its twenty-sixth session the General Assembly adopted resolution 2832 (XXVI), in which it officially declared the Indian Ocean region to be a zone of peace. That resolution set forth the objectives of the Declaration, objectives that may be summarized as follows: the halting of the extension of the military presence of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean region, the elimination of all military bases and installations from the region and the elimination of all nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and of any other aspect of the rivalries of the great Powers in the region.

More than 10 years have elapsed since the establishment, under General Assembly resolution 2992 (XXVII) of 15 December 1972, of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, of which my country is a member. Moreover, the General Assembly, in its resolution 34/80 of 11 December 1979, expressed the hope that the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace would be implemented soon and decided to convene a conference on the Indian Ocean

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

during 1981 at Colombo for the implementation of the Declaration; it also requested the Ad Hoc Committee to undertake the preparatory work for the convening of the Conference. Nevertheless, the Ad Hoc Committee has been confronted by flagrant obstruction and procrastination on the part of the United States and some other Western Powers in regard to the implementation of its mandate. This hinders the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace and the halting of the arms race, and thereby delays the attainment of peace and security in the region.

The escalation resulting from the pursuit of war preparations by the United States and its allies in the Indian Ocean region has exacerbated military and political tension in the area. The United States Government has consolidated its military bases there, especially the Diego Garcia base, and has earmarked hundreds of millions of dollars for the purpose of increasing its development and extension. The United States Government has also declared its intention to maintain the permanent military presence in the Indian Ocean of forces of the United States Navy, of which Diego Garcia constitutes a principal bridgehead. Moreover, the United States is attempting to secure long-term strongholds in order to reinforce the military operations of the rapid deployment force of the United States, which was created to threaten the security and stability of the peoples of the region, after it had been declared a region vital to American interests. The independence and sovereignty of the States of the region have not been taken into account, and the legitimate interests of the countries there have been ignored, as have the contents of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. That Declaration provides that warships and military aircraft may not use the Indian Ocean for any threat or use of force against any littoral or hinterland State of the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

The Foreign Minister of my country, in his statement before the General Assembly at this session, expressed our concern about the dangers to which the Indian Ocean region is being exposed. My country believes that the United States policy, designed to increase tension in the region, was escalated after the United States of America unilaterally, without justification, broke off negotiations with the USSR in 1978 on the limitation of military activities in the Indian Ocean region. These negotiations had begun that very year. The United States and its allies prevented the holding of the international conference on the Indian Ocean in Colombo in 1981. It persists in its attitude toward the conference, the convening of which is now set for the first half of 1983.

We wish to express our deep concern about the dangers flowing from the developments in the region. There is an imperialist American attack designed to ensure complete United States domination of the region, to plunder its resources and undermine and abort national progressive régimes that are hostile to United States aggressive policies and practices. The increasing American presence, the expansion of military bases and provocative military manoeuvres in the region, with the use of the most sophisticated weapons, the escalation of the arms race at the regional level: all this imposes unequal conditions on our peoples and threatens their stability and security. It obliges us to take the measures necessary to safeguard our independence and sovereignty. Moreover, our development plans to improve the living standards of our peoples are affected.

We call upon the United States and its allies to show the necessary political will to ensure the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. We stress the conviction expressed by the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session that concrete action for the implementation of the Declaration would be a substantial contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security.

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

My country emphasizes the need to turn the Indian Ocean and its natural extensions into a zone of peace. Motivated by our concern for peace in our region, which is a vital issue on which the development and growth of our peoples depend, we transmitted President Ali Nasser Mohammed's call, in 1981, for the convening of a summit conference of the States of the Gulf and the Arabian Peninsula and of other parties concerned, with a view to examining the complete liquidation of foreign military bases in the region. We have also supported the Soviet Union proposal to declare the Arabian Gulf and the Indian Ocean a zone free of foreign military presence and foreign military bases.

We ask this thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly to take a decision fixing the date for the convening of the conference on the Indian Ocean during the first half of 1983 and asking the Ad Hoc Committee to make the necessary preparations for the conference. We hope that the conference will mark the end of the deterioration of peace, security and stability in the region.

Mr. LEHNE (Austria): In its second statement in the general debate, the Austrian delegation wishes to comment on the relationship between disarmament and development, on the issue of the ban on chemical weapons, on conventional disarmament and on some of the institutional questions before this Committee.

The traditional approach to the relationship between disarmament and development focused on the contrast between the vast resources used for military purposes and the unmet needs of large segments of the world's population. The level of military expenditures was compared to that of development aid; the costs of tanks and warships were contrasted with those of schools and hospitals. From the stark discrepancies revealed by these comparisons arose a strong moral appeal for a reordering of priorities and a reallocation of resources. This approach has lost nothing of its validity. On the contrary, the contrast between our efforts to improve the life of the people on this planet and our efforts to enhance our capacity to kill them is more acute and terrifying today than ever before. But in recent years, not least thanks to the United Nations study on this issue, additional dimensions of the relationship between disarmament

(Mr. Lehne, Austria)

and development have come to light. We are becoming aware of the increasingly competitive nature of this relationship at a time of declining economic growth rates, resource scarcities and a growing world population. The myth of the alleged positive effects of military spending on economic development has been destroyed. Military outlays were found to be relatively inefficient compared to civilian expenditures in terms of creating employment and maintaining monetary stability. The negative consequences of the prevailing concentration of research and development in the area of military technology and the particularly high opportunity costs of the arms race in developing countries have been demonstrated and analysed. Our economically interdependent and ecologically strained world is confronted today with new threats against which huge military establishments can provide no security. Underdevelopment, with its consequences of social turmoil and regional crises, is becoming itself a major threat to peace.

The conclusions to be drawn from this new perspective of the relationship between disarmament and development have been summed up well in the United Nations study: the world can either continue to pursue the arms race or move towards a more stable and balanced social and economic development. It cannot do both. The way from stating this fact to action is not an easy one. Fortunately, the authors of the United Nations study have in their recommendations provided a valuable basis for first practical follow-up measures. In particular, Austria supports the Group's recommendation for a fuller and more systematic compilation and dissemination of data on the military uses of human and material resources and on military transfers. We believe that an increased flow of information on these matters is needed to enhance public awareness of the social and economic costs of the arms race and to strengthen support for disarmament. The United Nations should in our view assume a central role in the collection, analysis and distribution of such information. For the same reasons, we support the widest possible publication of the study's findings and the carrying out of additional research on both the national and international level. We further share the view that the disarmament-development perspective should be incorporated in the programmes and activities

(Mr. Lehne, Austria)

of the United Nations system. Austria welcomes the inclusion of an item on this subject in the agenda of the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly and hopes that the General Assembly will take concrete and practical action to implement the study's recommendations.

(Mr. Lehne, Austria)

Austria has already, in the State Treaty of 1955, renounced the possession of chemical weapons. Since then we have for many years followed with some impatience the slow progress of negotiations on a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. The especially cruel and insidious character of chemical warfare, its severe ecological implications and the fact that nowadays it threatens primarily the unprotected civilian population make a ban on these weapons a matter of the highest priority. The use of chemical weapons has been prohibited for more than half a century, and their military value has greatly declined under the conditions of modern warfare. In view of these facts it becomes evident that the high level of mistrust is the only remaining reason why huge stockpiles of these weapons still exist in the arsenals of several States.

Austria has noted with great satisfaction that in recent years chances have improved for the conclusion of a ban on chemical weapons which would free the world once and for all from the threat of chemical warfare. In its last two sessions the Committee on Disarmament has again made progress towards drawing up a draft convention. We are particularly pleased with the advances in respect of the provisions for the verification of the treaty. Effective verification procedures are, of course, crucial for eliminating the mistrust that has so far prevented a ban on chemical weapons. We welcome the imaginative and practical working methods developed by the Ad Hoc Working Group and the constructive atmosphere and high intensity of the negotiations. We are conscious of the important remaining differences of opinion. But the achievements of the past year make us hopeful that these problems can be solved and that a ban on chemical weapons is within reach. Apart from the supreme importance of the issue itself, we feel that the Committee on Disarmament's work on the subject of chemical weapons confirms the validity of the multilateral approach itself and provides an example for efforts concerning other disarmament measures.

In the present circumstances it appears essential that all States abstain from measures to upgrade their chemical warfare capabilities and from any other

(Mr. Lehne, Austria)

activities which would be incompatible with the endeavours to reach an agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons. In this connection the Austrian delegation awaits with great interest the final report of the Expert Group charged with the investigation of reports concerning the alleged use of chemical weapons in recent military conflicts. The experience of the first year of the Group's work has demonstrated the great difficulty of establishing the truth or falsity of such allegations in the absence of a verification system providing for immediate on-site investigation of any reported use of chemical or bacteriological weapons. In view of the central importance of reducing the suspicion and fear between States, Austria supports the proposals to set up appropriate mechanisms to monitor compliance with the Geneva Protocol and the Convention on the prohibition of bacteriological weapons.

The threat to human survival posed by nuclear weapons has in recent decades absorbed the attention of the international community and overshadowed the dangerous developments in the area of conventional weaponry. Technological progress has multiplied the destructiveness and range of these weapons, at times blurring the division between conventional and nuclear warfare. The growing effectiveness of conventional forces poses new problems for the defence of small and medium-sized countries which do not possess the latest military technology. The gigantic cost of the rapid succession of ever-more sophisticated conventional weapons systems is a key factor in the spiralling rise of military expenditures. Of the \$600 billion of global military outlays a year, up to 85 per cent are spent on conventional forces. The greatest part of the conventional arms build-up still takes place in the States of the two major military alliances. But in recent years the East-West confrontation has increasingly spilled over to the third world, often in the form of competitive arms transfers. This tendency causes regional arms races, and further darkens the prospects for economic development in the countries and regions concerned.

(Mr. Lehne, Austria)

Averting the danger of nuclear war remains our paramount concern. But the Austrian delegation strongly believes that in the future attention should also be directed to the non-nuclear aspects of disarmament. The United Nations study on all aspects of conventional disarmament, which was initiated a few months ago, in our view constitutes an important step in this direction.

The great differences between the levels of military forces in various parts of the world make the regional approach appear particularly suitable for conventional disarmament. The massive concentration of armed forces in Central Europe has for many years been a matter of serious concern to Austria. It is in the interest of all countries in the region to achieve a reduction of these forces and to establish a genuine balance at a lower level. We therefore regret that the Vienna negotiations on the mutual reduction of forces and armaments and associated measures in Central Europe have in almost 10 years not produced tangible results. An enormous amount of work has been invested in these talks, and progress has been achieved on a number of difficult issues. We are convinced that, with common efforts and a willingness for compromise on all sides, the remaining obstacles could be overcome and a first-phase agreement could be achieved in the near future.

Austria considers the Final Act of Helsinki as a most valuable basis for co-operation and coexistence for States of different social and economic systems in Europe. The continuation of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe process is essential to Europe and to the world. The benefits which the participating States derive from this process must be preserved and consolidated. The Madrid follow-up meeting will enter a decisive stage in a few days. We hope that a constructive attitude on all sides and a spirit of compromise will enable the Madrid conference to reach a successful conclusion. The Austrian delegation will do everything in its power to contribute to such an outcome. Together with the other neutral and non-aligned States of Europe, Austria has submitted a draft for a final document which constitutes a good basis for a substantive and balanced outcome of the Madrid meeting. We are convinced that the convening of a conference on confidence and security-building measures, as envisaged in this document, would open new perspectives for increasing confidence on this basis, for subsequent disarmament on our continent.

(Mr. Lehne, Austria)

In conclusion, I wish to say a few words about Austria's position on some of the institutional matters before this Committee. We regret that at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament it proved impossible to examine these issues thoroughly and to reach appropriate decisions. The present session of the First Committee will, we hope, fare better in this regard.

In spite of its growing work load and the already strained resources, the Centre for Disarmament in the United Nations Secretariat continues to perform its functions in a highly satisfactory manner. As the Secretariat's role and tasks in the area of disarmament will, without doubt, continue to grow in the future, Austria supports the strengthening of the Centre with an appropriate number of additional staff. We also feel that the Centre's co-ordinating functions for the various disarmament-related activities in the United Nations system should be enhanced.

In deciding on the future status of the Institute for Disarmament Research, the General Assembly should bear in mind the need for a clear division of work between the Centre and the Institute in order to facilitate an optimal utilization of existing resources. The Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies ought to be restructured and given a wider mandate, enabling it to play a more productive role in the disarmament process.

The Committee on Disarmament is today, four years after its reorganization at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the focus of multilateral co-operation to promote the cause of disarmament. While its efforts have yet to produce tangible results, the Committee has nevertheless, through concrete work on several issues, demonstrated its potential as a negotiating body. The key factor to enhance the productivity of the Committee on Disarmament would be an increased willingness by the major Powers to enter into serious negotiations on the priority items of the disarmament agenda. But institutional measures can also play a role in improving the functioning of this body. The establishment of working groups was a highly successful step in this respect. We believe that giving the working

(Mr. Lehne, Austria)

groups greater flexibility in organizing their work and extending the duration of the sessions would add to the effectiveness of the Committee on Disarmament.

With regard to the composition of the Committee on Disarmament, the Austrian delegation has noted with satisfaction that neither at the second special session nor at the summer session of the Committee on Disarmament itself was there any objection to a limited expansion of the membership. We regret, however, that the Committee on Disarmament has so far been unable to reach a decision on such an expansion. As a candidate for membership of Committee on Disarmament, Austria hopes that active consideration of this matter during 1983 will lead to a positive solution before the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

The rather mixed record of the Disarmament Commission in the past four years underscores the need for a review of its mandate in order to maximize its usefulness. Austria believes that as an organ with universal membership working on the basis of consensus, the Commission should focus on the thorough consideration of a limited number of major disarmament items.

(Mr. Lehne, Austria)

The division of work between the First Committee and the Commission should be defined as precisely as possible. If, due to lack of time, agreement on a revised mandate for the Commission cannot be achieved at the present session of the General Assembly, we might wish to ask the Commission to devote part of its 1983 session to a substantive discussion of its future role.

As several speakers have already pointed out, our own proceedings here in the First Committee also call for some reflection. Developments in this body since 1978 show the increasing interest and involvement of a growing number of States in disarmament matters. While this trend is highly welcome, it has at the same time led to a proliferation of often repetitive and overlapping resolutions and to a debate that sometimes lacks focus and structure. Every year the pressure of time becomes a greater obstacle to our work. The Austrian delegation believes that the Committee should therefore consider measures to strengthen its deliberative functions. Greater efforts should be made to harmonize the views of delegations so as to avoid the adoption of several resolutions at the same time. The reintroduction of texts already adopted in previous years should be limited as much as possible. The list of agenda items on disarmament and international security issues should be consolidated and streamlined.

While it may be too late this year to effect major changes in the First Committee's working methods, the Austrian delegation feels that next year we should make a concerted effort to change course from the constant quantitative expansion of our output of resolutions towards enhancing their quality and political weight.

In this connection my delegation fully supports the proposal of the Australian delegation that as a first step towards such an effort there should be conducted an exchange of views on our methods of work at the present session of the First Committee. A short report of the Secretary-General following up on that discussion could then in turn provide a valuable basis for the consideration of the subject at the next session of the General Assembly.

Mr. DORR (Ireland): I would begin by congratulating our Chairman and you, Sir, and the other officers of the Committee. I believe I can say that I know both you and our Chairman well as colleagues and friends. I extend to you my warm good wishes for your work, and, knowing you both as I do, I can assure the Committee that its work is in very good hands.

I also thank last year's Chairman, Ambassador Golob of Yugoslavia, who has since come here to join us as Permanent Representative of his country. He was an excellent Chairman of the Committee, and he is a very good colleague.

I am also happy to extend warm congratulations to two distinguished persons who share the Nobel Peace Prize this year for their devoted work for many years on disarmament. One of them, Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico, is here with us in this Committee lending his support. I congratulate him directly. I would ask my colleagues on the Swedish delegation to convey our good wishes to his fellow recipient, Alva Myrdal of Sweden. I also congratulate those who awarded the Nobel Peace Prize this year on their excellent choice.

In speaking of disarmament issues today it is difficult not to yield to anger - anger at the reality of what is happening in the world outside, and anger at the unreality and lack of effect of what we can do here, in the closed world of the Committee, to change it.

Listen to a voice from outside this body tell us frankly where we now stand. I quote from the very first page of the authoritative and respected Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) Yearbook published earlier this year:

"Since the first United Nations special session on disarmament four years ago things have got worse. Expenditure on military research and development is rising fast; the spread of modern weapons around the world continues unchecked. There is little impetus at the moment behind any moves for arms control, let alone disarmament. The pressure against the few arms control barriers which have been set up in the post-war period is getting stronger. It is a sign of the times that some people are beginning to talk of the present as a pre-war rather than a post-war period."

But was there perhaps some progress during 1981 in arms control and disarmament? Again the Yearbook is short and to the point: "No progress was made. There is a long list of negotiations which lie dormant (or possibly dead)."

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

Since the Yearbook appeared some five months ago, the START and INF talks in Geneva have got under way. That at least is positive. But look at the publicly stated positions of the participants. One super-Power speaks of adding thousands of additional strategic warheads; the other vows, as it has always done, that it will not be left behind at any stage. To say the least, it is difficult in the face of this to be hopeful of an early agreement.

All of this is chilling. But is it perhaps too pessimistic? Listen to another voice - that of our distinguished Secretary-General, dealing with another aspect of international life in his annual report:

"We are perilously near to a new international anarchy.

"I believe that we are at present embarked on an exceedingly dangerous course, one symptom of which is the crisis in the multilateral approach in international affairs ...". (A/37/1, p. 3)

The truth is that in every major area of international life things are worse now than they were one year ago. World military expenditure is higher than ever in human history, and it is rising steadily; relations between the super-Powers have deteriorated sharply; a new build-up of nuclear weapons is in prospect; trade in conventional weapons is higher than ever; the world economy is in deep trouble, and many poorer countries face disaster; international institutions, and particularly the United Nations and its Security Council, are suffering a serious erosion of authority and effectiveness; and the second special session on disarmament was largely a failure.

What is particularly disturbing is that these separate crises are not unrelated. They overlap, and each interacts with and reinforces the others. That is why the Palme report on disarmament and security issued in May last speaks more generally of a "deterioration in the fabric of international relations". That report says flatly:

"... for several years the trends have been moving in the wrong direction, towards a growing risk of war. ... The threat of war - even nuclear war - is more ominous today than it has been for many years."

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

Is all of this inexorable and out of human control? What if anything could any small country do to shout stop? And how can our debates and resolutions be brought into such direct relation with reality that they will actually achieve change? These are questions which seem vitally urgent to delegations such as mine at the present moment.

In honesty I have to accept that there are limits to what any small country can do. Our individual voices do not carry very far. But we will continue to raise them loudly, and we must hope desperately that many weak voices raised continuously will at last make themselves heard.

As far as Ireland is concerned, there are four basic points which guide our approach to disarmament issues, and which will determine our attitude to the work of this Committee.

First, we believe that we can contribute best by plain speaking, by pointing continually to the present frightening reality, by insisting that it has to change, and by trying to suggest practical first steps to that end. We are small, militarily insignificant and outside any alliance, and we have acknowledged our own vulnerability. Our armed forces are about the same size, and serve the same peace-keeping and other purposes, as those which every country would be allowed to maintain even in a disarmed world. Having learned to live for so long with the reality of our own vulnerability, we may be understood if we say that others, even the major Powers, must now learn to accept vulnerability too in this new world which they brought into being.

Secondly, in an otherwise sombre situation, we think that there has been at least one hopeful development since last year. There is now an increasingly strong popular feeling about armaments, and nuclear weapons in particular, an increasing public demand that something be done. This is already challenging political leaders and making itself felt in many countries. concerned Governments represented here should try to respond to that ground swell and to channel it so as to achieve real and practical change. It simply must not be allowed to ebb away in time with no real or lasting consequence, as so many other popular peace movements based on common human feelings have done in the past.

Thirdly, we refuse to accept that the dangerous developments of the past year and of recent years in general can be attributed to a process or a trend. These words are too impersonal. What is now happening is that the already serious dangers of the nuclear age are being made steadily worse. Whatever the intention or the motivation behind specific decisions, these decisions are contributing seriously, through their cumulative effect, to our common danger.

Fourthly, we believe that dangers increased by one set of human decisions can be reduced by other human decisions. We want to join with others here so as to exert the strongest possible pressure for such change and we want us to add our voices here as representatives of States to the increasingly insistent voices of the public outside demanding change.

The two areas of immediate priority which are of concern to this Committee are disarmament and international security. On these questions, if anywhere, we have need of plain speaking, a willingness to face reality and an urgent need for immediate concrete and practicable steps towards improvement. I will refer first to disarmament and then relate those issues to the overriding question of international security.

Why is it that disarmament debates with a history beginning as far back as 1899 have achieved so little? How is it that the build-up of armaments has continued, despite all the debate, to a point where it could destroy most life on the planet?

We have got to where we are because ours is a world of independent sovereign States, with no overall authority at world level and with limited and fragile structures of international co-operation which still lag far behind human competitive instincts. States and Governments committed to an ideology or pursuing national interests still compete as always for resources, for territory and for power. So the strong build up arms to maintain their power; and weak and strong alike believe that they must be ready, alone or with allies, to fight in their own defence.

There is nothing new about all this. Nations feel they must prepare for conflict because the world is as it is; and the world is as it is because nations prepare for conflict. But what is new is modern technology. It has completely outrun the slow development of international political institutions designed to reduce mistrust through co-operation and to maintain peace; and it has produced weapons which are such that their use, whether in attack or defence, would virtually annihilate mankind.

There are, of course, some who argue that it is precisely the extraordinary destructive power of these new weapons which has preserved the peace since 1945. It is true that major global war has been avoided - though there have been many other conflicts over that period. But, if deterrence has indeed achieved this, it has done so at the cost of such an increase in the stakes that war, if it should come, would now destroy the human species and most other life on this planet. When disaster is at all times less than 30 minutes away, when the survival of humanity has come to depend on the continuing reliability of various instruments and the continuing sanity and cool judgement of an ever larger number of human beings, it is time to ask how long this can continue month after month? Year after year? Perhaps. But decade after decade? Is there anything in all of human history so far to suggest that our luck will hold?

We all recognize, of course, in varying degrees, that this is unlikely; and so we all tell each other that the old idealistic goal of disarmament has today a new and dramatic urgency. But still in our debates, here and elsewhere, we seem unable to break with the standard and so far futile pattern.

Smaller countries like my own that are not militarily significant tend to fulminate in general terms against the arms race as if it were an impersonal evil force which oppresses mankind; or else we continue to condemn the nuclear Powers alone, as though they were a different species, acting by wholly different standards from ourselves.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

The major Powers and their allies, on the other hand, approach debates such as this warily at best. They continue to make the futile effort to obtain complete security for their own populations through armaments an absolute goal and they tend to see our debates here as part of the contest with their military antagonists for support from world public opinion. So debate about arms control and disarmament is often for them a continuation of military policy by other means. Accordingly, they sometimes put forward proposals for purely tactical reasons - to wrong-foot an opponent before world public opinion. Or one side will propose restraint in areas where it is weak and the other strong - as did the birds and animals that discussed disarmament in Salvador de Madariaga's fable in the 1930s. You may remember that each animal or bird wanted to eliminate the claws or beaks or jaws or arms which were the strong point of the other.

That kind of approach has been the bane of disarmament debate for decades. It has meant that since disarmament first became a matter for international negotiations at the Hague Conference of 1899 -- two major wars ago -- there has seldom been much practical linkage between what nations say about disarmament and what they do about armaments. But that approach is no longer adequate to our present dangers. It is simply not possible to continue like this in this new world, where the destruction of another major war would be total and not partial only; where an accident or a miscalculation could start such a war in minutes; and where armaments are now such that, for example, one missile submarine brought into commission last November carries thermonuclear warheads equivalent to one thousand times the Hiroshima bomb, that is, five times the total power of all the explosives used in the Second World War. We simply have to have a new approach.

What would a new approach mean? It would mean, to start with, that all would come to see that what threatens us is not some impersonal force or irresistible trend but our own human creation, which has diverted human energies and which now threatens to destroy us. It would also mean that, though the weight of responsibility varies, each would accept some responsibility for the

present human predicament; and all would accept that a common effort to extricate ourselves from it must be given not just a high, but an absolute, priority.

I believe there are two different areas where that common effort must be pursued simultaneously if it is to have success. One is the control and reduction of the armaments which threaten to destroy us. The other is the development of the international institutions which can replace mistrust by collective action and co-operation and thus make armaments less and less necessary. Responsibility for action in the first area - that of armaments - lies heavily on those who have built up armaments, developed and developing alike. All of us have some part to play in the second area - the strengthening of those fragile institutions through which greater justice, order and collective security will gradually replace anarchy in international life. In both areas we may look to an ambitious ideal as the ultimate goal: general and complete disarmament in the one case and a universal and fully effective system of international security in the other. But the better must not be the enemy of the good. The ideal in each case gives us an aim and sets a direction for our efforts, but what matters most for the moment is that some practical first steps be actually taken now towards those distant goals.

While maintaining our support for these general aims, therefore I should like on behalf of Ireland to try to focus on some specific areas and to set out some immediately practicable steps which we would hope to see taken on both aspects of the problem as a matter of urgency. I will concentrate on steps which, though only a beginning, would do something to lessen present dangers and help to restore the fabric of international life, referred to in the Palme report. Because the issue of nuclear weapons is of such overriding importance for humanity's survival, I will concentrate on that in speaking about disarmament, although of course we recognize the urgent importance of action also in other fields, such as chemical weapons, conventional armaments and the increasing militarization of outer space.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

Nuclear weapons have existed since 1945. Since then, no Power which has acquired them has ever reduced its stock. On the contrary each, according to its means and capacity, has tried to increase and develop its arsenal. Efforts to negotiate limits, as in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, may have slowed the growth slightly, but still, over a decade, nuclear warheads have more than doubled in number.

Naturally we should like to see these weapons completely abolished, but it is only realistic to accept that it may be extremely hard now to put the genie back in the bottle. What we have always been insistent on, however, is that, bad as the present situation is, every step should be taken not to make it worse. What does this mean in practice?

Firstly, it means trying to ensure in every possible way that nuclear weapons do not spread to more and more countries. We have therefore always argued for the Non-Proliferation Treaty and we believe it should be supported and strengthened.

Secondly, it means a complete end to nuclear testing. The nuclear Powers which signed that Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963 have at least stopped tests in the atmosphere and that is something. But since 1963 they have engaged in far more tests underground than all of the tests which they conducted before that date. Nor is it sensible for the major nuclear Powers to expect the non-nuclear States to show restraint by not acquiring nuclear weapons if they themselves continue to pile up new weapons, despite the commitment they undertook in article 6 of the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968. We therefore need a comprehensive test-ban treaty as a matter of urgency. The prospects for progress on this question at the moment in the Committee on Disarmament are poor, to say the very least. Pending the negotiation of a treaty, we want to see a moratorium which will ensure an immediate end to all nuclear test explosions.

Thirdly, there is an urgent need for serious negotiations in good faith between the major nuclear Powers on all aspects of the present competition between them. I repeat "serious" and "in good faith". I do not wish to suggest or imply that those involved in current or recent negotiations have been in any way dishonest, but I do not think it is unfair to say that to an outside observer, they often seem to be more concerned with gaining the ear of world public opinion

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

or wrong-footing an opponent than achieving a genuine negotiation.

We now hear almost every day, it seems, new speeches and statements by one side or the other promising increased spending and a readiness to match the other side in kind in its build-up if necessary. As outsiders, we find it difficult to judge in detail the case made by each side for its position. But we have had more than enough from both sides of cogent but self-serving reasoning which leads by apparently rational argument to intolerable conclusions; the conclusion we have now reached - that is, the present total world stockpile of 50,000 nuclear warheads, which is equivalent to 1 million Hiroshimas - is intolerable. It must not be made more so.

Fourthly, the constant competition, even while talks go on, to develop and deploy new weapons and delivery systems makes it even more difficult to get an agreement on a limit and then a reduction in the number of these weapons. It was for this reason - to allow a breathing space for serious negotiations on reductions - that the Irish Prime Minister Mr. Haughey, at the second special session, and subsequently the Irish Foreign Minister, Mr. Collins, in the general debate, put forward the idea of a freeze or moratorium on the introduction of new strategic warheads and delivery vehicles for, say, an initial two-year period. This Irish proposal had a somewhat more limited aim than other freeze proposals put forward at the special session, the essential aims of which we, of course, also support. But we considered that our rather more limited aim was indeed the strength of our approach; and we believed that if it were accepted by both sides there would be every chance that it could be extended in time and developed further as trust increased with experience.

Objections have been raised by some to any proposals for a freeze on the grounds that the result would be simply to freeze an existing imbalance between the two super-Powers. But we cannot see the logic or sense of arguments which say, in effect, "we must increase now in order to reduce later". If this is accepted, there will never be an end to the competition.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

But is it fair to freeze the imbalance to the disadvantage of one side? There are several good answers to this objection. One is that there is no real imbalance. It can be argued that there is now a rough parity between the two sides. This requires, of course, that one count total nuclear warheads and delivery systems on each side and not simply look for equality in each component of those forces. A second answer is that in any case the amount, if any, by which one side exceeds the other makes no significant difference to the power of each to wipe out its opponent in all foreseeable circumstances. If there is parity in the sense of equal assurance on each side that it can destroy the other, why then should it matter whether or not there is an arithmetic equivalent in the weaponry which does this?

On the other hand, the best argument for some kind of halt - call it a freeze or a moratorium - seems to us, inexpert as we are, to be the absolutely unassailable proposition that if one is to reverse direction, one must first stop going forward. We cannot see how some people can argue that they want a reduction rather than a freeze, as if the two ideas were somehow in conflict. A reduction is not an alternative to a freeze but a further step beyond it. We would like to see both. And we believe that a helpful first step would be an agreed two-year freeze or moratorium on the lines we have proposed.

Fifthly, we want to see the firebreak which now exists between the use of nuclear weapons and that of any other kind of weapons strengthened in every way possible, because we consider that the use of nuclear weapons in any circumstances would be the ultimate madness. How can this be done? Declaratory statements or agreements are not enough in themselves, because in extremity a nuclear Power which still retained its weapons could easily be driven to disregard its declaration. But even a declaration or an agreement accepted by the nuclear Powers themselves can still be of some help in creating a general climate where nuclear weapons, instead of proliferating out of control, are gradually contained to a greater extent until they can eventually be eliminated, if that day should ever come.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

I should therefore like to repeat here the suggestion made by the Irish Prime Minister in his speech to the second special session. That was

"...that the nuclear Powers need to consider seriously what methods or agreements they might work out providing against the first use by any of them of nuclear weapons."(A/S-12/PV.8 p. 12)

I have listed five specific areas where we feel it urgent for the nuclear Powers to take action: strengthening the Non-Proliferation Treaty, a complete ban on all nuclear tests, serious negotiations on the lines of the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, a two-year freeze to give those negotiations a better chance of success and an effort to work out agreements providing against the first use of nuclear weapons. These steps would not make the world safe, but they would make it safer. That much, at least, would be a beginning.

But in considering how Governments could now work to increase the chances of human survival, there is another important area where action in parallel will be urgently necessary. We need to work to increase collective security by strengthening the international organizations such as the United Nations which were designed to provide it. Our attention was focused on this problem two months ago by a courageous document, the annual report of our Secretary-General. He warns of a "new international anarchy" and he says clearly that

"...our most urgent goal is to reconstruct the Charter concept of collective action for peace and security". (A/37/1 p. 5)

This is a timely warning, because it is clear that in the absence of effective means of collective action to maintain peace, individual States, according to their resources, will always argue that they must continue to build up their national capacity to defend themselves if necessary in war. And it is precisely that which has got us where we are now.

What can be done? The first thing is to recognize that the institutions and the structures established by the Charter do provide in principle a framework for a system of collective security. It may not be perfect in all respects, but it could achieve a great deal if it were adequately used.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

Why has it not worked as well as it was intended to? There are, I suggest, three main reasons. First, there is much less agreement between the permanent members of the Security Council than those who drafted the Charter expected; secondly, there is a failure so far to adjust to the inevitable problems which arise when an organization of limited membership based on a war-time alliance has now grown to become universal; thirdly, the Members of the United Nations in general - largely, perhaps, because of the two foregoing reasons - do not use the Organization as it should be used but tend increasingly to look elsewhere for a solution to world problems and conflicts. I should like to touch briefly on each of these problems.

First there are the problems arising from lack of co-operation between the permanent members of the Security Council. The Council was clearly intended to be the core of the Charter system for the maintenance of international peace and security and the basic premise built into it was that the five permanent members would work together to that end.

In a world divided by ideology and cold war that hope for concerted action has unfortunately too often proved to be illusory. The five permanent members, having retained a special role for themselves, have not co-operated adequately in carrying out that role. Indeed, the major fault line in world affairs - the East-West split - runs right through the permanent membership of the Security Council.

It follows that to achieve some improvement and make the United Nations system and the Council more effective, the five permanent members must be willing to co-operate in using the Council to a greater extent. At a minimum, there should be such co-operation in dealing with crises in particular regions which do not involve the permanent members directly but which threaten if allowed to develop unchecked, to draw them in. Ideally, of course, such co-operation should go much beyond this, and questions involving the direct relationship of the major Powers themselves could be addressed at some stage within the Security Council framework.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

Even disarmament issues, on which such little progress is now being made in multilateral bodies, could conceivably be addressed at some future stage. After all, as it happens the five permanent members of the Council are also the five main nuclear Powers and Article 26 of the Charter, which of course is so far a dead letter, does provide that:

"... the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating ... plans to be submitted to the Members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments."

Furthermore, there is even a body called the Military Staff Committee, which under Article 47 of the Charter consists of the Chiefs of Staff of the five permanent members or their representatives. Under Articles 26 and 47, this Committee was to have a role in such planning for the regulation of armaments. It has met regularly - once a month, I believe - for many years. But has anyone ever heard just what it does, besides deciding on the exact date of next month's meeting?

A second important reason for present problems is that the United Nations, which began as an Organization of 51 Member countries united for the most vital of common purposes - the defeat of an enemy in war - has since grown to become almost universal. This is welcome. But because the United Nations is now virtually universal, all the world's conflicts and quarrels are now inside the Organization itself. One can say that the United Nations now truly mirrors the world and faithfully reflects its conflicts and its divisions.

Obviously, this creates many new problems. Agreement on common purposes and concerted action can no longer be achieved so easily as it was between allies in war. Adversaries and potential adversaries now often face each other across the table at the United Nations and collective action must now often be a matter to be worked out in difficult negotiations rather than a starting assumption, as it would be in a more limited organization of like-minded countries.

(Mr. Dorri, Ireland)

It is therefore particularly important that when agreement has at last been reached in the Security Council, for example, on common action in relation to a conflict, there should be a willingness by all concerned in that decision to follow through and ensure that it is fully implemented. Nothing contributes more to the public impression that the Council is ineffective than failure by it to follow through on its own decisions.

It follows, also, I think, that we need to develop new methods, systems and procedures appropriate to conflict resolution within a universal organization, where by definition, all parties to any conflict are within the organization itself. A successful example of what I have in mind is the evolution of peace-keeping since 1956. We need more such imaginative innovations.

The third major problem is in part - though in part only - a consequence of the other two. It is the erosion in effectiveness and relevance which comes from the increasing tendency of important Member States to ignore the United Nations or to look outside it for solutions to world problems. It is vital to understand that the structures and institutions of the Charter do not work by themselves in some automatic way, but only to the extent that Members of the Organization use them and thereby give them life. Every time Members - and particularly the larger and more powerful Members - turn to the United Nations in the first instance in their efforts to resolve conflict and maintain peace, it is further strengthened. Every time they brush it aside or rely on their own military means in the first instance to assert their rights, without even trying to use the United Nations to the full, they make it weaker and less relevant.

The real answer to the Secretary-General's warning to all of us must therefore come not by way of some general resolution or formula but through a greater willingness in concrete cases to take the United Nations and its Charter seriously and to make them work. That is a process which will not be dramatic but incremental, in character.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

But while accepting this, is there any more immediate way in which Member States can show how seriously they take the Secretary-General's warning? I suggest that there are, as it were, three concentric circles where action to consider the Secretary-General's report and its proposals is desirable even now, and the closer to the centre such action can be taken, the more effective it is likely to be.

In the first circle are the five permanent members of the Council. These countries retain for themselves a special position through the veto. If they wish to preserve and strengthen the Organization which they played such a large part in founding, it is they in the first instance who, whatever the state of their general relations, must now consult together about how to respond with concrete action to the Secretary-General's report.

In the second circle, as it were, the membership of the Security Council as a whole has a responsibility to consider how to improve its working. Ireland would feel that the Security Council should address itself collectively to the proposals for improvement made by the Secretary-General as a matter of some urgency. The Irish Foreign Minister, Mr. Collins, has already publicly endorsed the idea of an early meeting of the Council at a high political level to this end.

The third and, as it were, outer circle is the whole membership of the United Nations. There is a need to mobilize wide support among the membership as a whole so as to bring steady pressure to bear on the Security Council, which after all is supposed to act on behalf of all Members, to ensure that it will do so in fact as well as in theory and formally.

I asked earlier if it was Utopian to look for a perfect and fully effective universal system of collective security. The answer may be yes. But what we must do is to work steadily towards it as an ideal. The first step is to make the United Nations and its Security Council work more nearly as they were intended to by those who devised the United Nations as an international

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

instrument "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". Arms control and disarmament cannot wait until we have a perfectly functioning international security system, but each step towards that goal will make disarmament measures somewhat easier to achieve. Certainly the steady erosion of the credibility of our present institutions appreciably increases the dangerous drift towards the actual use of those monstrous weapons which human folly and mistrust have brought into being and which, if they are not soon brought under control, could one day destroy mankind.

Mr. Al-Qasimi (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic):

First of all, on behalf of the delegation of the United Arab Emirates and on my own behalf, I wish to express our great happiness at the election of Mr. Gbeho as Chairman of this important Committee. His election to that post is an honour conferred not only upon his friendly country but also upon all the countries of the third world, which attach vital importance to the debates in this Committee on the important questions of such significance for international peace and security.

My delegation also wishes to congratulate Mr. Garcia Robles of Mexico and Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden, who have just been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in appreciation of their efforts in the cause of disarmament, a cause which the entire world considers of vital importance for the establishment of international peace and security.

The world today is witnessing an acute and dangerous competition in the field of the arms race, in particular between the super-Powers. That arms race is being accompanied by a deterioration in the climate of confidence in international relations. This, in turn, has increased the feeling of insecurity among both the small and the big Powers.

As far as the major Powers are concerned, their feeling of insecurity has led them to arm themselves far beyond the needs of self-defence, to the point where competition has led them to the inevitable result that there is a danger of certain mutual destruction.

As for the small Powers, their feelings of insecurity derive from the fact that they have been dragged against their will into these international rivalries, because of either their strategic or their economic importance, and this has upset their economic and social development plans.

(Mr. Al-Qasimi, United Arab Emirates)

This feeling of the two categories of Powers will be justified as long as the arms race is at its peak.

The present situation in the Security Council illustrates that, in spite of the terrible arsenals of weapons accumulated in certain countries, which could destroy the world several times over, the concept of security not only is still inaccessible but seems to retreat from day to day as we increase the stockpiling and development of nuclear and other weapons.

Past experience has shown that the attempts of certain countries to defend their own national interests and their belief that they can achieve security at the expense of others are vain. This concept has been proved wrong. Perhaps the best way to achieve peace and security would be to abide by the principle of collective security embodied in the United Nations Charter and to give this Organization greater scope so that it may prove a successful forum for disarmament negotiations.

My delegation very much regrets the negative results of the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, which was a disappointment because of the positions adopted by the great Powers, which rejected any modification of their decisions with regard to armaments, as if the appeals of and the demonstrations organized by millions of people to protest at the arms race found no favourable echo among such countries.

The creative intelligence of man is being devoted to the production of weapons of destruction, and this has led to the wastage of human potential and new burdens on the peoples of the world. This has had serious economic and social consequences, particularly for countries with chronic economic problems, because the expenditure by those countries on military equipment exhaust the resources that should have been used to improve the well-being and increase the prosperity of the societies concerned.

Suffice it to point out that military expenditures for this year will exceed \$650 billion, which is more than the total income of 1,500 million persons living in 50 poor countries. In many developing countries the price of military security is more poverty and human suffering. Although the total volume of world military expenditures have increased twelvefold compared to 50 years ago, these expenditures have not achieved their objective, which is security.

(Mr. Al-Qasimi, United Arab
Emirates)

My delegation urges the great Powers to reconsider both their military and their security policies and to embark seriously upon action in the field of disarmament. The first step in this direction should be the freezing of military budgets and their reduction, in order to arrive ultimately at general and complete disarmament. This should be accompanied by a similar freeze on the development of weapons of mass destruction, both quantitatively and qualitatively. These are measures which the great Powers must undertake.

As regards the commitment made by certain countries that they would not be the first to launch a nuclear war, such promises, although they appear laudable, are only dead letters, because if a nuclear war were to be unleashed it would be difficult to detect exactly who started it since the attack and the counter-attack would seem to have been made at the same time because of the speed with which they would take place. Bearing in mind that the entire world could be swept into a nuclear war against its will, no one would be able to ask who had started the attack.

In the Middle East region and in Africa we are facing a similar danger because of the introduction of nuclear weapons into these regions by Israel and the racist Government of South Africa, in defiance of General Assembly resolutions which have formally declared the need to consider those regions nuclear-weapon-free zones, and this constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security and hampers the efforts to turn the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean into zones of peace.

(Mr. Al-Qasimi, United Arab Emirates)

We have no doubt that South Africa and Israel will continue to terrorize the peoples of Africa and the Middle East with those weapons, and that they will not hesitate to use them should they deem it appropriate. As evidence of this, we would cite Israel's criminal behaviour in our region: its destruction of the Iraqi nuclear power plant, which was devoted to peaceful purpose, as well as its aggression against Lebanon, its murdering of many innocent people or their expulsion from their homes and the carnage committed by Israel are all proof of its intention of terrorizing the Arab peoples and dispersing them, so as to ensure the grip of Israeli hegemony over the entire Middle Eastern region.

That region has become the theatre of Israeli military manoeuvres and experiments. The dispersal of the elderly, and of women and children, has become an essential feature of Israeli military strategy. On its television screens the world has watched the horrible facts of the brutality and barbarity of Israel against civilians, against homes, against shelters, against schools, against hospitals, and against diplomatic missions, none of which were spared Israel's brutality. And after all that, Israel pretends that it will not be the first to introduce nuclear weapons into the Middle Eastern region, thereby adding yet another to the list of its lies on that subject.

In this connection, we would refer to the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/37/434, regarding Israeli nuclear armament.

Because of its location in the Middle East and its proximity to the Indian Ocean, my country calls on all countries - the major Powers in particular - to respect General Assembly resolutions concerning those two regions, to refrain from introducing any nuclear weapons into those regions, and to respect the sovereignty, independence and right of self-determination of their peoples. My country also belongs to the group of developing countries, and relies on a single source of revenue whose volume is constantly decreasing. Thus, it has an overriding need to use those resources for its economic and social development, instead of squandering them on military expenditures imposed on us by the requirements of national security, exposed as we are to the constant threat represented by great-Power rivalry in nearby regions.

(Mr. Al-Qasimi, United
Arab Emirates)

For all those reasons we consider that it is necessary for all States to participate on an equal footing in multilateral disarmament negotiations. The major Powers must make headway in their disarmament negotiations in order to put an end to the qualitative development of weapons and the development of new weapons of mass destruction. Those States must implement the collective security provisions of the Charter and find a new way of settling international disputes, since thus far the resort to force has never succeeded in ensuring security.

Mr. PRANDLER (Hungary): In today's statement, the Hungarian delegation would like to deal with some questions related to the prohibition of chemical weapons and with the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

In our view, the drafting and adoption of an international convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction has become a matter of increased importance and urgency because of the plans for the production of new, more sophisticated, types of chemical weapons, among them binary weapons, and the deployment of these weapons in foreign countries. The Committee on Disarmament has been dealing with the drafting of such a convention for three years with the aid of a Working Group. This year the Working Group on chemical weapons was the Committee on Disarmament's most active subsidiary body and made some progress, with the participation of experts and under the able and dynamic chairmanship of Ambassador Sujka of Poland. The submission of the basic provisions of a convention on chemical weapons by the Soviet Union played an important role in stimulating the work of the Committee on Disarmament in this field.

In the opinion of the Hungarian delegation, the existing alarming situation calls for urgent and resolute action. My delegation considers it necessary that this session of the General Assembly adopt a resolution on this very important question designed to speed up the drafting and adoption of a convention banning chemical weapons. Such a development would also require the abandonment of the delaying tactics used by some delegations.

(Mr. Prandler, Hungary)

Turning to the other subject of my statement, the prevention of an arms race in outer space, I have to begin with the fact that this year the world is celebrating the 25th anniversary of the launching of the first man-made object into outer space: the pioneer flight of the first Soviet SPUTNIK. That event of 25 years ago opened for mankind the gate of the space age, the way to the exploration and use of outer space.

The peaceful use of that new boundless area has already brought significant benefits to mankind in the fields of meteorology, navigation, telecommunications and the remote sensing of natural resources, to mention only a few domains. Taking into account the rapid progress of science and technology, we can expect in the future a further rich flow of new results which can serve to benefit mankind as a whole. In fact, that general desire was also expressed by the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, held at Vienna last summer.

Unfortunately, the dawn of the space age was very soon clouded by the sombre possibilities of using outer space for hostile purposes also. When the existence of that threat was grasped, steps were quickly taken to avoid such a development. The first important step was the adoption of the Outer Space Treaty of 1967, which prohibits the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in outer space. The growing danger of a new wave of the arms race and the urgent necessity of preventing it are clearly reflected in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament which states that

"In order to prevent an arms race in outer space, further measures should be taken and appropriate international negotiations held in accordance with the spirit of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies". (resolution S-10/2, para. 80)

The growing danger of outer space becoming an arena for the arms race prompted the Soviet Union last year at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly to submit a draft treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. In the view of my delegation that was the right step in the right direction at the right time, aimed at the complete demilitarization of outer space by banning, apart from nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space.

(Mr. Prandler, Hungary)

At its last session the General Assembly adopted two resolutions concerning the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Resolution 36/99, referring to the draft treaty which I have just mentioned, requests the Committee on Disarmament to start negotiations aimed at achieving agreement on the text of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. Resolution 36/97 C also requests the Committee to conduct negotiations on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, but concentrating on the prohibition of anti-satellite systems.

The two resolutions have charged the Geneva Committee with a new responsibility and additional tasks. In heeding these resolutions, the Committee on Disarmament included in its agenda for 1982 a new item entitled 'Prevention of an arms race in outer space'. During the first part of the session, informal meetings were held on the issue, while during the second half the Committee dealt with this question in the framework of its programme of work. In order to give an organized framework to the solution of this problem, the delegations of the socialist States and other delegations proposed the establishment of an appropriate working group. But unfortunately, due to the position taken by the United States and some other Western countries, this initiative did not materialize.

The consideration of this item in the Committee on Disarmament showed two different approaches this year. The majority of delegations, including the delegations of the socialist States, preferred a comprehensive approach aiming at the prohibition of weapons of any kind in outer space. The delegations of the Western countries, on the other hand, concentrated only on one aspect of the prevention of an arms race in outer space, namely, the prevention or prohibition of anti-satellite systems.

The Hungarian delegation does not want to deny the importance of this question. Nevertheless, it submits that this is only one of the many aspects of the prevention of an arms race in outer space and considers further that this problem could be solved, together with other questions, in the framework of a comprehensive treaty. My delegation continues to believe that the

(Mr. Prandler, Hungary)

establishment of an appropriate working group, with a properly worded mandate, would be the best framework for dealing with this important and timely question.

What is needed now for the First Committee is to take action, in order not to lose momentum, to induce the Geneva Committee to speedier progress in the elaboration, in the framework of a working group, of a draft treaty banning the emplacement of weapons of any kind in outer space. Guided by this consideration, the Hungarian delegation lends its full support to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.8 and expresses its readiness to join it as a sponsor.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.