

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION

*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE
15th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 26 October 1983
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

COPY
FOR REFERENCE
ONLY - DO NOT
CIRCULATE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 15TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)

UN LIBRARY

NOV 1983

UN/SA COLLECTION

Statements were made by:

- Mr. Murray (Trinidad and Tobago)
- Mr. Qian Jiadong (China)
- Mr. Kostov (Bulgaria)
- Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic)
- Mr. Martynenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)
- Mr. Kirca (Turkey)
- Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen)

*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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.1/38/PV.15
4 November 1983
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 43 to 63, 139 to 141, 143 and 144 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. MURRAY (Trinidad and Tobago): Mr. Chairman, my delegation extends to you its sincere congratulations on your election to preside over this important Committee. We also offer, through you, our congratulations to the Vice-Chairmen, Mr. Elfaki of Sudan and Mr. Tinca of Romania. As we embark on our work for this session, my delegation is only too well aware of the difficulties facing us, and we pledge our full support to you and the other officers of the Committee in our efforts on a matter which impinges directly on the very survival of mankind.

In addressing this Committee at the thirty-fifth session, my delegation observed:

"The goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control remains a basic commitment of the States members of the international community; yet little tangible progress has been made over the years towards the attainment of that goal. The prospects for any major improvement in this sad state of affairs in the immediate future appear to be even more evanescent than ever in the light of the rapidly deteriorating international situation brought about not only by the continuing existence of areas of tension in the Middle East and in southern Africa, but also by the opening up of new areas of tension in other regions of the globe where force has been used illegally to violate the territorial integrity of States and to undermine their sovereignty and national independence.

"In this worsening international climate of fear and distrust, and of growing insecurity and instability at both the regional and global levels, it is not surprising that States, be they militarily significant or

(Mr. Murray, Trinidad and Tobago)

insignificant, are finding increasing difficulty in agreeing on effective measures in the field of disarmament." (A/C.1/35/PV.26, pp. 24-25, 26)

It is a sad reflection on each of us Member States and on the United Nations as a whole that those words are no less pertinent now. The failure of last year's second special session on disarmament and the continuing Geneva talks to produce any concrete measures leading towards the goal of general and complete disarmament serves to reinforce the view of my delegation that we - that is, the international community - are bent on achieving our own destruction.

However, many States, particularly those small States, like ours, with no pretensions to military might, are being carried along on this path to destruction against their wishes. The principle that disarmament is in the individual interest of every member of the international community, as well as being the collective responsibility of all of us here, seems to be increasingly ignored, particularly by the nuclear-weapon Powers. My delegation wishes to reiterate that we non-military and non-nuclear States have a legitimate and vital interest in disarmament: while we recognize the special responsibility placed upon the military Powers, we do not regard them as having a monopoly in decisions relating to disarmament. Indeed, the active participation and agreement of all of us are required if we are to bring a halt to the arms race and reverse the trend towards the production and accumulation of weapons of greater and greater capabilities of destruction. Unless we are able to generate the necessary collective political will, we cannot hope to create the necessary climate in which international peace and security and social and economic development can flourish.

It is crucial that the Geneva talks on intermediate-range missiles continue and that substantive agreements be concluded. For this reason the suggestion by the Ambassador of Mexico in his statement before this Committee on 17 October concerning the participation of a personal representative of the Secretary-General

(Mr. Murray, Trinidad and Tobago)

of the United Nations in those bilateral negotiations is worthy of serious consideration. The outcome of those negotiations is vital not only to the two interlocutors but also to all citizens of this world; it is, therefore, imperative that our legitimate interests be protected.

In this context we wish to refer also to the Committee - soon to be the Conference - on Disarmament, the single multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament, and the need for that body to continue to strive to attain its objectives without being unduly prejudiced by the status of any bilateral negotiations.

During the general debate in the opening weeks of the General Assembly session and in the statements before this Committee various speakers have described the international situation in differing styles and in different languages, but the same picture has emerged: one of international tension and instability, one of fear and mistrust, one of deepening economic crisis and one in which the arms race continues unabated.

While we are here engaged in talks on disarmament, with the participation of all the military Powers, what the real world outside is experiencing can only be described as preparations for war. There is much talk about peace and disarmament, even by the military Powers themselves, while at the same time there continues to be a massive build-up of the world's store of arms: nuclear arms, conventional arms, chemical and bacteriological weapons - more than enough to destroy this planet - and signs that this build-up will now continue in outer space.

We are told that this build-up of arms is necessary in the interests of each participant's national security. We are told that maintaining some parity or equilibrium is essential in stabilizing international relations and preventing the outbreak of another general war. We are told that those possessing stores of arms do so for defence purposes. All this then leads us to deduce that the sum of

(Mr. Murray, Trinidad and Tobago)

measures taken to promote the individual national security of all nations equals international insecurity. Since that does not make sense to us, my delegation is left to conclude that words spoken in these hallowed halls do not mean what they appear to, and we are really faced with a build-up of arms not for deterrence or defence but with other motives.

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the atmosphere for international relations, and East-West relations in particular, is clouded by fear and mistrust to such an extent that confidence-building measures become a prerequisite for any meaningful negotiations on disarmament.

A great deal of emphasis has been placed on the commitment relating to the non-first-use of nuclear weapons, and my delegation, grateful for any crumbs in this desert of despair and frustration that is the disarmament effort, welcomes such declarations. We are even loath to question whether the second, or subsequent, use of nuclear weapons is likely to be any less deadly than the first; whether the effects of the use of nuclear weapons on this earth will be significantly different if they are used in attack or in defence. Pondering such things does nothing for one's confidence. What will send Trinidad and Tobago's confidence soaring, however, is an undertaking by these militarily mighty Powers of a commitment not to use nuclear weapons at all and then, by extension, their dismantling of those weapons, which they are then committed not to use. Trinidad and Tobago can think of no greater confidence-building measures at this juncture.

The world today stands on the brink of a nuclear holocaust, primarily because negotiations and discussions on disarmament are characterized by short-sightedness. All of us Members of the United Nations share a collective responsibility for disarmament, but two of our number bear a greater responsibility if only because of the power of the armaments they possess. Thus, on the one hand, short-sightedness is evident in the bilateral negotiations between those two, whose

(Mr. Murray, Trinidad and Tobago)

focus appears to be on establishing and/or maintaining some "superiority", and disarmament becomes, at best, a secondary issue. On the other hand, within this Organization, the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament has also become obscured by short-term aims and objectives: we create organs or sub-committees whose tasks become ends in themselves; we adopt resolutions which are unenforceable or which have little real impact on the fundamental problem. Some 60 resolutions on disarmament were adopted last year, and if anything the past year has seen us move even closer to nuclear war, primarily because those most keenly involved treat those resolutions with scant courtesy. It should be patently obvious now that what is needed is not a proliferation of resolutions designed primarily to score points over the other side but a consensus on a policy through which to achieve general and complete disarmament and establish and maintain international peace and security.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation welcomed your remarks at the opening of our session pertaining to the need to consolidate our resolutions, and we look forward to some meaningful agreements which will take us significantly closer to our ultimate goal. I wish to emphasize the view that we need not more resolution but a more meaningful resolution to disarm.

It may be worth the consideration of this Committee, the Committee on Disarmament and other relevant organs, and of States, that the optimum means of achieving the ultimate goal may be on a regional basis. Using the Treaty of Tlatelolco as a model, we could designate various regions as zones of peace: the Caribbean, then the Indian Ocean, then Europe, where even now there is the heaviest concentration of nuclear arms; and so on until the entire world and outer space form one total zone of peace. It is not simply the designation but the implementation of true peace that we need.

(Mr. Murray, Trinidad and Tobago)

The Government of Trinidad and Tobago considers that development can best be pursued in a climate of peace and security. During the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, on 22 June 1982, my delegation observed:

"... it is obvious that the diversion of even a small part of the resources spent on armaments could substantially improve the per capita gross domestic product, industrial employment and capital stock of developing countries. A recent United Nations report on disarmament and development has identified more than 70 possible alternative uses for military research and development capabilities which could be transferred quite easily to, for example, the development production and installation of solar energy devices, agricultural machinery, fishing technology, machinery for mining, manufacturing and construction, hydropower plants and equipment and personnel for education and health programmes." (A/S-12/PV.23)

Estimates put the amount spent on armaments over the last year at a minimum of \$650 billion and apart from this expenditure, there are also those resources, financial and human, which are channelled into the disarmament effort and are thus deflected from constructive developmental activities. My delegation is not so unrealistic as to expect that all resources diverted from military expenditure will automatically be allocated to the developing countries, but we are confident that even if they are mainly injected into supporting the economies of the industrialized countries, that in itself would create some increase in the demand for the products of the developing countries, thereby giving much-needed impetus to export-led growth in those countries. My delegation supports the contention that a more stable and more equitable international economic order is an essential

(Mr. Murray, Trinidad and Tobago)

prerequisite in nurturing the necessary political and economic climate in which all nations of the world could concentrate on dismantling the systems of mass destruction with which we have become so preoccupied. Just as economic stability is necessary for international peace and security, so too is disarmament a necessary factor in promoting economic welfare.

The massive peace demonstrations over the past weekend are further evidence that even if policy-makers have not recognized the grave danger of extinction facing us, public opinion has. Trinidad and Tobago shares the wish of these popular peace movements for a world free of the persistent danger of total self-destruction. It is the responsibility of each of us Member States to heed the cry of the world's population and to uphold the provisions of our own Charter "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war ... and to promote social progress and better standards of life". We need to act now.

Mr. QIAN Jiadong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I discussed the question of nuclear disarmament on 18 October. Today, I would like to speak on the Chinese position on conventional disarmament.

It is certainly not without reason that people often lay stress on nuclear disarmament when discussing the question of disarmament. However, whether judging from the present world situation or from its possible future development, we should in no case belittle the importance of conventional disarmament.

True, nuclear war will bring an unprecedented catastrophe to humanity. But conventional wars have already done great harm and are still doing so. Since the end of the Second World War, there have been hundreds of cases of armed conflicts and aggression in various parts of the world with the use of conventional weapons and millions of lives have thus been lost. There are even now a number of countries being subjected to armed aggression and occupation. And only yesterday

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

there occurred yet another armed invasion of a sovereign State by a super-Power with conventional weapons, an invasion which is a gross violation of the United Nations Charter and the basic norms governing relations between States. Therefore, it will not be possible for humanity to enjoy peace and security unless, while endeavouring to prevent a nuclear war, we remove the immediate threat of conventional wars launched by big and small hegemonists. The people of the world who have gone through two world wars certainly do not wish to see another happen again. But if such a war does break out one day, despite all our efforts to avert it, it will begin either in the form of nuclear war or in the form of a conventional war escalating into a nuclear one. There is no unbridgeable gulf between a nuclear war and a conventional war. In a sense, the prevention of conventional wars can help reduce the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war.

With these considerations in mind, we hold that while giving priority to nuclear disarmament we should pay due attention to conventional disarmament. Both are indispensable to the whole effort for disarmament. Paragraph 45 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament lists both nuclear and conventional weapons as priorities in disarmament negotiations. Paragraph 46 further states that nothing should preclude States from conducting negotiations on all priority items concurrently. These views are entirely right. We believe that, taken together, nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament will complement and promote each other.

Like nuclear disarmament, conventional disarmament should also proceed from the existing stock of various countries' armaments, with a view to maintaining international peace and security. From a global point of view, the conventional arms race is going on mainly between the two super-Powers. Spending most heavily for military purposes and utilizing tremendous resources, these two countries have

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

built up the biggest and most sophisticated conventional arsenals, with ever better quality and increasingly lethal and destructive power. They have widespread networks of military bases both at home and abroad and stationed large numbers of occupation troops and other military forces outside their borders. They are competing in the development of long-range offensive forces such as the rapid-deployment forces, the air-borne shock brigades, the long-range air forces and the ocean-going naval fleet. They are not only the largest weapon-producing countries, but also the leading arms dealers in the world. Conventional armaments have always been an important component of the super-Powers' arsenals. These weapons far exceed, in power and number, any reasonable need for self-defence and security and have become instruments for pursuing their policies of foreign expansion and interference.

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

Facts have shown that in conventional disarmament, just as in nuclear disarmament, it is the two super-Powers that should take the lead. Paragraph 81 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament justly stresses that

"... States with the largest military arsenals have a special responsibility in pursuing the process of conventional armaments reductions".

(resolution, S-10/2, para. 81)

This is entirely correct. For conventional disarmament, the other militarily significant States also have their share of responsibilities to shoulder, but compared with those of the super-Powers, their responsibilities cannot but be of secondary importance. As for the numerous peace-loving small and medium-sized countries, it is absolutely necessary for them to maintain the limited defence forces which are needed for their national safety and security. This has nothing to do with the arms race. It is obviously unfair to hold that all countries in the world should bear the same responsibility for conventional disarmament.

China fully agrees that conventional disarmament should be carried out in conjunction with nuclear disarmament. At the second special session on disarmament the Chinese delegation made the following concrete proposal. All States should undertake not to use conventional forces to commit armed intervention or aggression against or military occupation of any other State. As a first step towards conventional disarmament, all foreign occupation troops must be withdrawn without delay. In the meantime, the Soviet Union and the United States should proceed to reduce substantially their heavy and new-type conventional weapons and equipment, especially those for offensive purposes. After this, the other militarily-significant States should join them in reducing their respective conventional armaments according to a reasonable proportion and procedure to be agreed upon. This proposal is entirely in accord with the realities of

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

international relations and the state of various countries' armaments, and constitutes a reasonable and practicable approach to conventional disarmament.

Authorized by the General Assembly, the Secretary-General has appointed a Group of Experts to make a study of the conventional arms race in all its aspects and of the reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces. This reflects the concern of the international community over conventional disarmament. In the past two years this Group of Experts has held five sessions and has made an extensive in-depth study of the problem, doing a lot of hard and useful work. However, we cannot help feeling somewhat disappointed at its failure to complete the report on schedule. We have no objection to extending the mandate of this Group for one more year, and we hope that by intensifying its efforts it will be able to submit its final report to the thirty-ninth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): In my statement I should like to express the views of the Bulgarian delegation on several disarmament agenda items, beginning with agenda item 143 entitled "Condemnation of nuclear war".

The question of the growing risk of the outbreak of a nuclear war continues to worry millions of people on our planet. It is a significant fact that during the general debate at this session more than 100 Heads of State or Government and other high-ranking officials stressed that today there is no more important task facing humanity than that of averting nuclear catastrophe. Last week's demonstrations against the deployment of new United States nuclear missiles in Western Europe, unprecedented in their scope and intensity in the whole of post-war history, have been the strongest indication of the anxieties troubling ordinary people throughout the world. Ever wider social strata have come to realize the simple truth referred

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

to in the report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, namely, that "such a war would be the ultimate negation of all human endeavour" (A/38/1, p. 5).

Many speakers pointed out the reasons for the critical predicament of the world today. I would further point out that the concepts and doctrines concerning the role of nuclear weapons in the military strategy of the United States testify to their extremely dangerous evolution towards the massive use of nuclear weapons in various options, such as a first pre-emptive or decapitating nuclear strike, a so-called limited, protracted or all-out nuclear war, and so on. Some may object to this, referring to the statement in the General Assembly by President Reagan, in which he said that if a nuclear war broke out today there would be no winners. The question arises, however, as to whether this statement of President Reagan revokes official United States documents in force concerning the goals and doctrines of the United States in a possible nuclear war. I am afraid it does not. To confirm this it would suffice to take a look at a document entitled "Fiscal Year 1984-1988 Defence Guidance", as described in The New York Times of 30 May 1982. This document, with terrifying candour, shows the gravity of the military threat and points, beyond controversy, to its very origin.

Although the consequences of a nuclear conflict cannot be predicted with certainty, the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, together with various experiments and computations, have enabled us to paint as faithful a picture as possible of the unprecedented calamity which a full or partial implementation of the document I have mentioned could bring to mankind. It has now been scientifically proved that after a nuclear exchange the delicate balance of the earth's biosphere could be irreparably impaired and the very genetic basis of life destroyed.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

All these facts are no revelations. They have long been known to the public. Nevertheless, they are still disregarded by those leaders and circles that continue to whip up the arms race with the goal of obtaining military superiority. Official declarations are still made and plans have been elaborated for fighting a global war against the Soviet Union and other nations.

What gives a particularly threatening tone to the various doctrines and official declarations are the multi-billion-dollar programmes, now gaining momentum for bolstering the United States war potential, as well as the plans for setting up new nuclear-missile encampments in close proximity to the borders of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

The danger of nuclear war is many-sided. None the less, if we are to discuss the most immediate factors contributing to the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war, three factors should be pointed out: first, the readiness for the first use of nuclear weapons; secondly, the view in favour of the legitimacy, admissibility and practicability of nuclear war; and, thirdly, the practical actions themselves, leading to an unfettered growth of nuclear arsenals, which are being stocked with newer types of nuclear weapons specifically designed for launching a devastating first strike and achieving strategic surprise.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

The sum total of all these factors has a destabilizing impact on the international situation and fatally undermines the entire structure of international relations. These factors are the backbone of the policy of preparing for nuclear war which poses the gravest challenge to humanity in its millennial history. The attempts to justify this policy by pointing to some values and positive goals are a most blatant affront to common sense.

If certain Heads of Government are really not guided only by pre-election considerations and recognize instead the truth that there can be no winners in a nuclear war, then people throughout the world are entitled to expect practical steps to ease the antagonism and tensions and to resume the policies of peaceful dialogue and détente upon which the hopes of all mankind are placed.

Unfortunately, the United States aggression against sovereign Grenada is the latest confirmation of the legitimacy of the reservations with which such declarations have been greeted. The invasion of this tiny independent State by United States marines cannot be viewed otherwise than as a gross violation of the basic norms of international law and as the latest demonstration of brutal imperialist violence directed against the freedom and independence of peoples.

The latest initiative of the Soviet Union concerning the condemnation of nuclear war in document A/C.1/38/L.1 provides an important opportunity for the world Organization to express the universal sentiment on the most urgent and immediate problem of the present day, namely, the threat of nuclear war. The resolute, unconditional condemnation for all time of nuclear war as being contrary to human conscience and reason, as the most monstrous crime against peoples and as a violation of the foremost human right - the right to life - would be an important moral and political tenet in the struggle to strengthen world security and for disarmament and would contribute to rallying world public opinion on behalf of this

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

struggle. The outlawing of the propaganda of militarist doctrines and concepts legitimizing the first use of nuclear weapons and the admissibility of unleashing nuclear war would have a wide-ranging preventive character. The condemnation of nuclear war would help define the common denominator of the most vital interests of States, irrespective of their social systems, and would further underline the watershed between the endeavours of the international community as a whole and the aspirations of some to preparation and justification of nuclear war.

If the condemnation of nuclear war is a very important task in itself, the need to put an immediate end to the nuclear arms race is at the very heart of the problem in its entire complexity. Another Soviet proposal, in document A/C.1/38/L.2, is devoted to this need, namely, the proposal for a qualitative and quantitative freeze of the nuclear arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States.

The idea of a weapons freeze has quite an instructive history. At the present stage the idea has begun to take root as a practical and effective instrument for the halting of the arms race. This has been prompted by the fact that the escalating stockpiling of nuclear weapons of every type has reached a certain limit, threatening to make this process irreversible and also by the objective fact of military and strategic parity. In this connection, the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session adopted two resolutions on the initiative of India, Mexico and Sweden. The overwhelming majority of Member States voted in favour of them.

The present Soviet initiative contains a clear-cut concept of how to end the nuclear arms race in all its manifestations. Its major merits are realism, practicality and comprehensiveness. It does not envisage a selective approach towards the different types and systems of nuclear weapons, nor does it propose complex quantitative combinations virtually ensuring a growth in military arsenals to new higher levels. What it proposes is the immediate freezing of the

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

production, testing and deployment of new nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles. Thus all channels of the nuclear arms race would be effectively blocked in conformity with the principles of equality and equal security, and the necessary conditions would be furnished for radical reductions of nuclear weapons with a view to their complete elimination as the ultimate goal.

It should also be noted that the nuclear-weapon freeze proposal is not an end in itself, but should be viewed as the starting point for proceeding to mutual nuclear disarmament. It should become the impetus, starting a chain reaction designed to rid the world once and for all of the threat of nuclear death. At the same time, the freeze as an idea and concrete action offers the only opportunity to avoid failure and remove the obstacles to future disarmament agreements which will inevitably arise with the continuing introduction of ever more sophisticated weapons based on new technologies and on so far unknown qualities of matter.

I should like to emphasize, for the sake of those delegations which stressed in particular the need for confidence-building measures, that the halting of the huge war machines will no doubt provide a powerful impetus to the vital process of improving the international climate. As far as the problem of verification of the proposal's implementation is concerned, it should be substantially facilitated by the comprehensive nature of the proposed measure. The problem of verification would be easy to resolve, given a clear mutual goal and practical readiness on the part of the States concerned to work out its realization.

I should like to recall further that the idea of the freeze, as a first stage of genuine and large-scale nuclear disarmament, has almost simultaneously taken shape in various government, political and social circles. The idea of the freeze was conceived as an all-human reaction against the unprecedented nuclear threat, based on common sense and the instinct of self-preservation of people. The

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

powerful support it has received throughout the world is a testimony of its vitality and durability.

The significance which the Bulgarian delegation attaches to the proposal for the nuclear-weapon freeze is of particular urgency in view of the growing efforts to spread the nuclear arms race into other spheres, including the militarization of outer space.

The consequences of the militarization of outer space and its employment as a field of aggressive military preparations are impossible to calculate and predict. The transformation of space into a springboard for nuclear attacks, the deployment into outer space of most powerful and sophisticated weapons and military facilities and the elaboration of plans for space and star wars would lead directly to a further aggravation of world tensions and distrust among States. Insurmountable roadblocks would be raised on the road to international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space. Even larger financial resources would be redirected to armament. But the greatest harm caused by such a development would be its unpredictable effect on the strategic balance of forces and the increased chances of an outbreak of nuclear war.

Over the last several years the problem of stopping the arms race in space has been repeatedly discussed in various forums. However, nothing positive has come out of this. The Committee on Disarmament even failed to set up a working group to deal with that matter. The reason for that outcome was the position of the United States and its Western allies which plan to use outer space as a vehicle to gain a decisive military superiority over the Soviet Union and other socialist States.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

This view was expressed in concise form in an article in Business Week, which pointed out that whoever controlled space would be in a position to make a radical change in the balance of forces, which in turn would be tantamount to imposing global domination. This is the true meaning of the frantic activities of the Pentagon in outer space, which pose a direct threat not only to the security of States but also to all positive results achieved thus far in the field of disarmament.

The proposal of the Soviet Union for the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the use of force in outer space and from space against the earth (A/38/194) is designed to nip in the bud the use of space for military purposes and to guarantee for mankind the peaceful exploration and use of outer space. An outstanding element of this draft treaty is the combination of legal and political obligations on States parties not to use force in space with practical measures designed to prevent the militarization of outer space. The draft treaty provides a cardinal solution of the problem of anti-satellite systems which meets the interests of a number of countries in respect of that issue. The sincere intentions of the Soviet Union in this respect have been underscored by its unilateral assumption of an obligation not to launch into space any anti-satellite weapons.

Today there still exists an opportunity to avert the impending catastrophe. Tomorrow the tempestuous development of military space technology could drag the world into a position of no return. The Soviet proposal is a timely reminder of that menace, and the General Assembly must voice its considered view in favour of keeping outer space as the common heritage of mankind, free of weapons, as set forth in the 1967 outer space Treaty.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

The question of the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons is still high on the agenda of the United Nations. The concern of the international community is aroused by the fact that while the negotiations on this subject continue in the Disarmament Committee in Geneva, certain countries have adopted plans for the qualitative and quantitative upgrading of their stockpiles of chemical weapons. It is a well-known fact that in early 1982 the United States Administration announced its decision on accelerated chemical rearmament, at a cost of \$10 billion, the pillar of this programme being the so-called binary ammunition.

The talks on the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons have been going on for some 20 years, and their ups and downs are familiar to everyone in this hall. A number of States, sincerely interested in removing the danger of chemical weapons, have put forward proposals for their prohibition and total elimination. A comprehensive and detailed proposal to this effect is contained in the Soviet draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their elimination, submitted to the Committee on Disarmament in 1982. A number of other constructive ideas have also been put forward in that Committee in Geneva. At the same time one cannot but be dismayed at the stubbornness and arrogance with which well-known slanderous assertions are being repeated time and again of some alleged use of Soviet chemical weapons in Afghanistan and South-east Asia, assertions which have long been refuted in most convincing and unequivocal terms by experts from various countries. There is no doubt in our mind that these false accusations are meant to serve as a smoke-screen for the continuous build-up of chemical weapons.

The danger of chemical warfare cannot be removed through unsubstantiated recriminations, confrontation or revision of agreements already in force. It will

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

be removed only by the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and their elimination. Extensive experience and much material have been accumulated in dealing with this matter in the Committee on Disarmament, and also in the Committee's working and contact groups, experience and material which should be used at the Committee's next session in drafting the text of a future convention. The decision of the General Assembly on this subject should be along the same lines.

My delegation would like to reiterate the crucial importance it attaches to the problem of the immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. We consider the conclusion of a treaty on this matter as one of the most substantive and urgent steps in the whole complex of measures to end the arms race, particularly the qualitative arms race, to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear weapons, and to eliminate the threat of nuclear war.

This problem has long been ripe for a solution. In the course of a quarter of a century all its aspects have been studied in depth and in great detail. All technical issues relating to verification of the treaty's implementation have been solved to a considerable degree. The vast majority of Member States have resolutely upheld, in the General Assembly as well as in the Committee on Disarmament, the position that it is high time that these efforts were embodied in the drafting and conclusion of a relevant treaty. All these facts notwithstanding, it has not been possible so far to reach an agreement. The reason for this state of affairs is known. One of the nuclear-weapon Powers has invariably stated that it considers the conclusion of a nuclear-weapon test-ban treaty to be a long-term task and not an immediate goal. With the support of certain other countries it continues to block the reaching of such an agreement. The motivation underlying

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

this position is no secret, as it has been reflected in the large-scale programmes for accelerated modernization of nuclear weapons now under way. All these actions are completely at variance with the aspirations of the entire international community, and have aroused legitimate concern.

We wholeheartedly support the widely-held and oft-repeated position that it is high time for the United States to display political will and revise its negative stand, with a view to starting, in the Committee on Disarmament, serious and businesslike negotiations aimed at drafting a generally acceptable treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

The working group of the Committee on Disarmament on this question should be entrusted with a mandate which would enable it to proceed to meaningful negotiations. We are convinced that there is a good chance that the treaty would become a reality. The working group has at its disposal a number of important documents and concrete proposals in this regard. In our opinion, a solid basis for its further work is provided by the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union during the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly on the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-weapon test-ban treaty. Another interesting proposal in this respect was submitted by the delegation of Sweden. The conclusion of such a treaty is long overdue. The People's Republic of Bulgaria will continue to contribute most actively to the attainment of this goal of overriding importance for the international community.

Those are the items which at this stage of our discussion I wished to dwell upon in my statement.

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation has already had occasion to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. We did this at the time of the commemoration of Disarmament Week. We are convinced that, thanks to your experience in the field of disarmament and to your wisdom, you will guide the work of the Committee to a successful conclusion. We wish also to congratulate the other Committee officers on their unanimous elections.

Again this year the First Committee is meeting with a very full agenda which contains many of the same items which were considered thoroughly in past years. It is our strong belief that no progress has been made in the field of disarmament. Our debates are repetitious, and our resolutions are practically the same from one year to the next; there has been no substantive improvement in the situation.

We are not advocating the adoption of a large number of resolutions, nor are we discussing the substance of the issues or their universal nature. What we wish to point out is that what is missing now is political will on the part of States, in particular the nuclear super-Powers and those countries which have developed a significant military potential. Also missing is a sincere desire on the part of those States to halt the arms race.

In the present international situation we may discern the harbingers of imminent danger. Our times are characterized by unprecedented dangers, and are reminiscent of the cold war period. This situation, and the concern it has brought about in States and peoples, impelled some 40 Heads of State, most of them from developing countries, to come to this thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly. Most Heads of State or Government are in agreement that there is a very serious crisis in the world and that the international situation is constantly

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

deteriorating. They have all expressed their grave concern over this situation, which was created by mistrust and doubt in relations among States, by the intensification of the conventional and nuclear arms race, and by the threat of nuclear war, which jeopardizes the future of mankind.

The explosive international situation is a threat to international peace and security. The peoples of the world, including the peoples of countries which possess a great nuclear capability, have a feeling of insecurity and instability, and fear the outbreak of a nuclear war. Such a war could certainly not be limited, and would unquestionably spare no region of the world. If such a war should take place, it would be a veritable cataclysm.

On many occasions, the peoples of the world have expressed their desire to see détente in the world, to eliminate tensions and to do away with all weapons - not only weapons of war, but also weapons of mass destruction. The question of disarmament is closely related to the desire of the international community to produce a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

The second special session devoted to disarmament, held in 1982, met with failure in that effort. The establishment of a comprehensive programme of disarmament requires a reversal of the arms race, and we believe that States have an important role to play in this area.

Another factor in the deterioration of the international climate is the recourse to violence, force and aggression in attempts to settle disputes. The need to curb the hegemonistic desires of certain States is a further direct cause of the tension in the world.

Yet another important factor is the existence of certain States which promote a doctrine of expansion and racial superiority, and which do not recognize the right of self-determination.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

In this connection I might refer to the conduct of the United States and to the invasion by that country of Grenada. This poses a threat to international peace and security. The United States is a super-Power and a permanent member of the Security Council, and thus bears a heavy burden of responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security throughout the world.

With their conduct, States can poison the international climate, by creating zones of tension and by waging war. I would mention two striking examples of this: the racist régime in South Africa and the racist régime in occupied Palestine. Those two régimes could not exist in a normal world in which peace prevailed. I remind members of the Committee that those two régimes could not survive without the full support of international imperialism, headed by the United States and its Western allies.

The racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine could not survive without the military, economic and financial support of the United States. That régime's arrogance and cynicism and its establishment of settlements in the occupied territory could not continue without the encouragement of the United States. We need only consider the arms build-up in Israel - which results from arms shipments from the United States - to understand the commitment of the United States to that artificially-created entity. Furthermore, stockpiles of United States weapons in Israel could be used for purposes having nothing to do with Israel's security.

In our approach to questions of disarmament, we base ourselves on a principle which has been borne out by history, a principle supported by non-aligned and other peace-loving countries, namely that there is a close relationship between disarmament and true peace. Peace cannot come about without complete disarmament, and the arms race threatens international peace and security.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic

That is why we believe that peace through disarmament should be an integral part of the fight against colonialism and for the elimination of colonialism, apartheid, zionism and racism in all its forms. These are causes of serious tension throughout the world and pose a threat to peace. The Syrian Arab Republic is unswerving in its desire for peace, and it joins with other peace-loving countries in the building of a better world.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

The peoples of the world should never resign themselves, give way to despair, await or concede that they are powerless to prevent the outbreak of war. On the contrary, they should strive to maintain peace and security throughout the world; but peace and security cannot be achieved in the world without putting an end to tyranny and foreign interference. My delegation therefore wishes to stress that international peace and security cannot be guaranteed without first eliminating sources of tension created by the Zionist régime in occupied Palestine and the apartheid régime in South Africa.

Part of our country is occupied by an alien régime, Israel, which enjoys the full support of the United States. Without American weapons and America's air cover, Israel could not have occupied and annexed part of our territory. In this connection, I should like to refer to the statement by the Foreign Minister of Syria, Mr. Khaddam, in the General Assembly on 28 September of this year, in which he said that the attainment of a just peace requires:

"the maintenance of a strategic balance in the region between the parties to the conflict, since, under the shadow of military superiority, the superior party would remain intransigent while the weaker party would become more adamant in its attitudes. In this respect we call on the United States to halt all types of aid and support to Israel, especially in the military field." (A/38/PV.9, p. 81)

He also stated:

"The gravity of the situation in our region, with all the dangers of increased involvement by the United States and some of its allies, makes it incumbent on the world Organization to take positive decisions, not only in the interests of security and of Member States, but also to safeguard the security and interests of all countries in the world." (Ibid., p. 82)

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

We are deeply concerned over the incredible sums of money being devoted to armaments. According to recent figures, over \$800 billion will be spent on armaments this year. With those figures in mind, we would point out that tens of millions of human beings are dying of hunger throughout the world, that millions are living in conditions that could be described as indecent, that illiteracy is widespread throughout the world, and that the diseases suffered by the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America are an insult to mankind which lives in fear of the danger represented by the ever-swelling military budgets of an increasing number of countries. There is a constant dynamic relationship between disarmament and development, since the more spent on arms, the less spent on development.

The problem is all the more complex because it is the countries of the third world that suffer the most from this increase in military budgets. Those countries are obliged to buy arms to defend their independence and to protect their natural resources. They are forced to allocate increasingly large sums to buying arms at the cost of the well-being of their peoples. We call upon all the countries of the world, above all the nuclear-weapon States, to reduce their military budgets, and to allocate the money thus saved to development, particularly in the third world.

In past years we have stated the position of the Syrian Arab Republic on the subject of disarmament. We should like to reaffirm that position with regard to the most important questions. If other matters have not been referred to in this statement, it is not from any lack of interest on our part, but merely because we feel that such questions have already been sufficiently considered. What we need today is that all countries should demonstrate their good intentions and political will, so that we can carry out our disarmament plans.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

My delegation would, however, like to say that in the light of our total commitment to support the principle of disarmament and the declared aims of disarmament, the Syrian Arab Republic has acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We would call upon all States to take specific steps to ban the use of nuclear weapons and appropriate action to safeguard the security of non-nuclear States. My delegation also calls on all States to ban the use of chemical weapons and to put an end to their manufacture. We call the nuclear-weapon States to abandon the arms race and to devote the funds thus released to the economic and social development of the developing countries. We also call for the demilitarization of outer space, which is the common heritage of mankind.

My delegation supports any action directed to an arms freeze and to ending the development and manufacture of weapons of mass destruction. We also support any action to put an end to the manufacture of nuclear weapons. My delegation would also like to stress the importance of confidence-building measures, and considers that interference in the internal affairs of other States and annexation are factors for insecurity that threaten international peace and security. In addition, my delegation supports nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Indian Ocean, in Latin America, in Africa and in the Middle East and believes that the creation of such zones would help to strengthen international peace and security.

With regard to Africa and the Middle East, my delegation feels that the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in those regions, would truly reflect the wishes of the peoples of those areas, in the light of the policy of hegemonism, domination and expansion of some States. The peoples of those regions are facing the serious threat that nuclear weapons will be introduced into those parts of the world through the co-operation of the Western allies of Israel and South Africa. The introduction of nuclear weapons into Africa and the Middle East and the nuclear co-operation between the two racist régimes are sources of great concern to the

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

Arab and African peoples, who feel that such actions are violations of international law. The creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East has been supported by the Syrian Arab Republic and by all the Arab countries. Israel is alone in not supporting the creation of such a zone, for Israel has its own ideas about that proposal. Year after year in the First Committee Israel attempts to put over its own proposals. We consider that this amounts to lies and blackmail on the part of a State which has a nuclear capacity. Today, the whole world is well aware of what Israel is today, and knows that it possesses nuclear weapons, since it refuses to submit its nuclear facilities to international inspection and control and that it persists in its refusal to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Israel's machinations and manoeuvres have been exposed. Its claim that it wants peace is basically a propaganda ploy designed to cover up its acquisition of nuclear weapons and its aggression against the countries of the region.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic

The aggression against Syria emphasizes the need for all countries, including the Zionist régime in Israel, to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The question of Israel's nuclear weapons is one that appears on our agenda each year, and is a source of great concern to the peoples of the region and to the international community as a whole. A report submitted by the Secretary-General to the United Nations General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session contained the following statement:

"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 would 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 and with Assembly resolution 35/147, through accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, or by unilaterally accepting such safeguards." (A/36/431, para. 83)

We would appeal to the international community to condemn Israel's nuclear weapons, and we believe that our Committee has a special responsibility to invite all States to end all forms of nuclear co-operation with Israel.

I should like to remind members of the First Committee of Israel's aggression against the Iraqi nuclear facility. That facility had been created for peaceful purposes and for the purposes of economic development. Today, the bombing of the

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

Iraqi nuclear facility can be seen to have set a very dangerous precedent in inter-State relations, and we would invite all the countries of the world to act to put an end to Israel's arrogance.

Convinced as we are of the need to respect the United Nations Charter, my delegation believes that this Organization has a very special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. We believe that it must play a fundamental role in disarmament, and for that reason we have supported the expansion of the Disarmament Committee. My delegation would like to thank the Committee for its efforts in the disarmament field, for we believe that it is the only valid negotiating body for disarmament matters and the only forum that can act to ward off the total destruction of mankind.

Mr. MARTYNYENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Before beginning my statement, I should like, on behalf of the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, to congratulate you, Sir, upon your election as Chairman of the First Committee and to wish you all success in your work. Our good wishes go also to the other officers of the Committee.

Today the world is struck by the monstrous acts of the United States of America, which has launched a bandit-like attack on defenceless Grenada, a sovereign State in the Caribbean that has been pursuing a policy of non-alignment. Grenada has been attacked from both land and sea with all the advanced weaponry of the twentieth century, and an attempt has been made to impose an American-style democracy upon it. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic decisively condemns that act of banditry; it demands the immediate cessation of the military invasion of Grenada and the immediate withdrawal of the invasion forces from the island. Our sympathies and feelings of solidarity go to the heroic people of Grenada.

The tenor of the general debate during the current session of the General Assembly and the discussions of issues relating to the limitation of the arms race and disarmament in the First Committee are evidence of the profound concern of the overwhelming majority of States at the existing situation with respect to this issue of such vital interest to all peoples. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic fully shares that concern. The expected progress towards the solution of this major task of our era - the halting of the arms race - has yet to be realized. Moreover, the further intensification of the arms race, and in particular the nuclear arms race, is constantly aggravating the international situation and increasing the threat of a nuclear war. This dangerous situation can and should be corrected by arriving at a just and honourable agreement on the key issues of war and peace, instead of seeking military advantage over the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the countries of the socialist group, which is what the United States is striving to do.

In the present circumstances it is necessary to take urgent measures that can eliminate the threat of war and redirect the course of world events towards détente and a healthier climate for international relations. This was the appeal contained in the joint communiqué issued by the leading party and State officials of seven socialist countries at their meeting held at Moscow on 28 June of this year. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic feels that in order to achieve a practical solution to this problem of such vital importance for all of humanity, decisive measures must be taken immediately. We believe that a constructive measure in the direction of preventing a nuclear war would be the conclusion of an agreement on specific measures to halt the nuclear arms race. Such an agreement could be achieved in Geneva at the Soviet-American discussions on the limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear weapons and on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe, but to achieve such an agreement the desire of one party

(Mr. Martynenko, Ukrainian SSR)

is not enough. It is necessary for both parties to wish to reach a decision acceptable to both sides, that would avoid a further escalation of the arms race. There is no other solution to this problem.

The question of what to do with medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe is one of the central problems in world's political life. Unfortunately, in the Geneva discussions we find two fundamentally different approaches taken to the solution of this problem. The Soviet Union is in favour of there being no nuclear weapons, either medium-range or tactical, on the European continent. Europe and European security could only gain from such a situation. However, inasmuch as the United States and its allies are not willing to accept such a radical solution to the problem, the Soviet Union has proposed that each side proceed to a three-stage reduction of the number of medium-range weapons. The USSR has agreed to maintain the same number of missiles as those now maintained by Great Britain and France and has also agreed to an equal number of medium-range aircraft capable of delivering nuclear weapons on each side. The remaining weapons could be reduced on an agreed basis. Such an approach would make possible a genuine equality of forces.

(Mr. Martynenko, Ukrainian SSR)

However, the United States has not agreed to this. The arms race which it is imposing is overtaking the discussions. In order to create favourable conditions for such negotiations, the USSR proposes a temporary freeze on medium-range and strategic nuclear weapons on both sides. This would be the most sensible way of seeking a solution. But the United States does not want to seek a solution that would meet the principle of equality and equal security and be genuinely designed to improve the situation in Europe.

Washington continues stubbornly to insist on its deliberately unacceptable conditions, obviously in order to gain time and drag out the negotiations so that at all costs it can site its nuclear weapons in Western Europe. It is perfectly understandable that if things get to that stage the Warsaw Pact countries will be obliged to undertake counter-measures to ensure their own security, as stated by the Ministry of Defence of the USSR on 24 October; yet we do not want a military solution. That is being imposed by the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). We are convinced that such an agreement is just as necessary for the United States of America as it is for the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist commonwealth.

In their communiqué, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Warsaw Treaty countries who took part in the meeting held at Sofia on 13 and 14 October of this year came out firmly in favour of an early agreement in the Geneva negotiations on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe, and have expressed the conviction that the possibility of achieving such agreement still exists.

From the very beginning of negotiations on strategic weapons, the Soviet Union has been in favour of working towards the preparation of a mutually acceptable agreement based on the principle of equality and equal security.

(Mr. Martynenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Everyone knows that the USSR has made far-ranging proposals that as an initial stage the strategic arsenals of both sides should be subject to a freeze and then reduced by more than one quarter of the total number of strategic vehicles, without any exception. The number of nuclear warheads would also be reduced to equal levels. There would be a prohibition on the installation of long-range cruise missiles and other types of strategic weapon.

The Soviet side has also made a number of proposals aimed at increasing stability and confidence between the USSR and the United States. Unfortunately, the United States line in these negotiations is aimed not at reducing strategic weapons but, rather, at legalizing the arms race in order to obtain unilateral advantage. Let us take any component of the strategic defensive weapons of the United States and we will see that each of them is to be improved and upgraded. For this purpose MX strategic missiles, the Midgetman and Trident-2 are being prepared, as well as new strategic bombers; there is mass production of long-range and sea-based cruise missiles. In the negotiations the Soviet Union has proposed the elimination of the greater part of its intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM). The United States side would then maintain a great advantage in heavy bombers armed with long-range cruise missiles and contemporary submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBM).

We feel that in negotiations on strategic weapons, too, we must have an agreement based on strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security, and not on attempts to get round that principle to obtain unilateral military advantage. Our delegation has already discussed the essence of those proposals in the general debate of the plenary Assembly.

The Ukrainian SSR considers that, under conditions of an intensified nuclear threat, it is essential immediately to work out jointly such practical measures for the prohibition of nuclear war as have already obtained broad international

(Mr. Martynenko, Ukrainian SSR)

support, and for whose implementation only the political will of the States concerned is necessary. Above all, we are talking of the commitment by all States which possess nuclear weapons not to be the first to use them. This question was dealt with broadly in the discussion on the subject.

The USSR, having undertaken a unilateral obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, once again confirms that its concern about the elimination of the threat of war is a principal line of its policy. The United Nations has called upon other nuclear-weapon States to follow this example, and has the right to expect similar steps by the United States and its nuclear partners. However, the Western States which possess nuclear weapons have not only ignored the Soviet Union's appeal but are also trying to cast doubts on the obligation undertaken by the USSR and belittling its significance. They are advancing a rather peculiar argument to the effect that the Soviet Union retains its freedom to use conventional weapons.

The socialist countries have given a specific answer to that assertion in the political declaration adopted at the beginning of 1983 by the Warsaw Treaty States - they propose to conclude an agreement between the States parties to the Warsaw Pact and NATO that would contain the mutual obligation not to use any weapon, nuclear or conventional; in other words, not to use force at all in their relations. What prevents the Western countries from accepting the proposal of the socialist countries to conclude such an agreement? The absence of any answer to this proposal which is so important for the fate of Europe and the world speaks for itself. Neither the United States of America nor its nuclear allies want to give up their right to be the first to use nuclear weapons or their doctrine of nuclear war. In that light their argumentation seems totally devoid of substance.

(Mr. Martynenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The creation of a moral and political climate in the world that would substantially reduce the threat of a nuclear war, improve confidence among States and promote more favourable prospects for reaching agreement on nuclear disarmament would be assisted if the General Assembly were to condemn nuclear war. In the draft declaration to that effect submitted by the Soviet Union for examination at the present session, it is proposed that the General Assembly shall resolutely, unconditionally and for all time condemn nuclear war as the most hideous crime against the peoples of the world and as a violation of the foremost human right - the right to life. The Ukrainian SSR is decisively in favour of the United Nations adoption of that important document.

A sensible alternative to the threat of a nuclear catastrophe would be urgent measures designed to hinder any increase in the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction and subjecting them to a quantitative and qualitative freeze. Not only the United Nations but also many other international forums, as well as the social and political leaders of various countries of the world, have recently discussed this idea and see in it a real possibility for reducing the threshold of military operations - the first step towards a genuine measure to reduce nuclear weapons and ultimately to eliminate them completely. That is the aim of the USSR proposal contained in the draft resolution entitled "Nuclear arms freeze", submitted for adoption at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly. We express the hope that this important proposal, which is in the interests of peace and international security, will find broad support among States Members of the United Nations.

(Mr. Martynenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Naturally, a simultaneous quantitative and qualitative freeze of nuclear weapons by all nuclear-weapon States - and above all by the USSR and the United States of America - is not an end in itself; but that important measure would hinder the development of the arms race, improve stability and confidence among States, reduce the threat of a nuclear war, and would be a step towards the normalization of the international situation. It would ensure the beginning of the specific working out of a programme of nuclear disarmament directed to the total liquidation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Martynenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The socialist and many non-aligned countries have long favoured the immediate elaboration of such a programme. However, despite certain decisions of the General Assembly at its last session and the broad support for this by public opinion in many continents, this question has not yet moved from dead centre. The obstructionist position of the United States of America has prevented the Committee on Disarmament from even creating a special working group to conduct the necessary discussions. Whatever arguments are advanced on behalf of this, their refusal to begin such negotiations which would lead to the certain liberation of humanity from the threat of nuclear war can hardly be evaluated in any way other than that of making the vital interests of humanity the victim of militarist plans which threaten the very existence of world civilization.

One of the most important trends in the achievement of world peace and international security and the limitation of the arms race and disarmament is the struggle for a peaceful outer space. Today as never before scientific and technical achievements can be used unfortunately not only to benefit humanity but also to harm it. How serious this threat is can be seen from recent communications on the elaboration by the Pentagon of an anti-missile system based in space and of plans to allocate \$27 billion for this purpose during the next five years. The United States of America has thus demonstrated a total disregard not only for the fate of peace but also for the obligations it has undertaken and is crudely violating the relevant Soviet-United States agreement of 1972. This step by the Pentagon opens up another dangerous round in the arms race which may go entirely out of control. On 18 October of this year, the Washington Post wrote "In this respect, very soon - the precise date is a secret - the United States of America will undertake to test this weapons system, which will be the beginning of a threat

(Mr. Martynenko, Ukrainian SSR)

of a military advantage and superiority in outer space. This competition will become unbelievably expensive and it will be practically impossible to stop it if it ever gets started".

The Ukrainian SSR has consistently opposed transforming outer space into an arena of the arms race. This position corresponds to the adoption of the proposal submitted at the present session by the Soviet Union, "Conclusion of an agreement on the prohibition of the use of force in outer space and from space against the earth". A very important characteristic of this is the combination of political and legal obligations of States not to permit the use of force against one another in space or from space through concrete measures designed to prevent the militarization of outer space. We have in mind, in particular, the complete prohibition of testing or deployment in outer space of any type of land-based weapon for attacking objectives on earth, in the air or in space. It also provides for total refusal by States to create new anti-satellite systems as well as the liquidation of the ones that already exist.

We consider that in the light of the attempts by military circles to transform outer space into one more arena of the arms race, including the nuclear-arms race, the adoption of such measures is extremely timely. Of great importance in this connection is the obligation assumed by the Soviet Union not to be the first to station any kind of anti-satellite weapon in outer space, thereby introducing a unilateral moratorium on such launchings so long as other States, including the United States of America, refrain from launching into space any anti-satellite weapons of any type. By so doing, we are hoping to create a firm base once and for all to end discussion of the question of anti-satellite weapons.

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR supports those who feel it very necessary and of primary importance to undertake at the beginning of 1984 agreement on a text

(Mr. Martynenko, Ukrainian SSR)

prohibiting the use of force in outer space and from space against earth. The Moscow agreement on the prohibition of the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere signed 20 years ago was a major step towards a limitation of the arms race.

However, we have not succeeded in achieving this goal primarily because the United States has broken off trilateral agreements on this question and is blocking its discussion in the Committee on Disarmament. Despite the demands of the General Assembly, the United States openly declares that it will continue its tests of nuclear weapons in order to improve and stockpile them. Being in favour of the immediate cessation by all States of nuclear-weapon tests, the Soviet Union submitted for discussion at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly basic provisions for an agreement on general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and is proposing that there be a moratorium in the meantime on all types of nuclear tests.

The Ukrainian SSR feels that such questions as the creation of nuclear-free zones in various regions of the world is a very timely issue, as well as the consolidation of the non-proliferation régime of nuclear weapons, particularly in light of the nuclear preparations by Israel and South Africa and also for strengthening the security of non-nuclear States. The attention of the Assembly should be directed to questions of meeting the threat from other types of weapons of mass destruction, in particular neutron weapons.

We feel that in light of certain resolutions of the United Nations, it is necessary immediately to undertake concrete negotiations to draw up a convention prohibiting the production, stockpiling, deployment or use of the neutron weapon. Of very great importance in present conditions is the elaboration and conclusion of

(Mr. Martynenko, Ukrainian SSR)

a general agreement on the non-use of force in international relations. We feel that the General Assembly at its present session could further rapid realization of the Soviet proposal on concluding such an agreement in order that rejection of the use of force or the threat to use any kind of weapon, whether it be nuclear or conventional, would become part of international law.

Today the Ukrainian delegation has laid stress on questions of preventing nuclear war and limiting the nuclear-arms race, which threatens the existence of humanity. We do this out of our conviction that these are vital issues which can and should be resolved jointly by the States, regardless of differences in their social and political systems. To do this all we need is goodwill, observance of the principle of equal security and the refusal to resort to a policy of confrontation or to attempt to seek unilateral advantages.

The Ukrainian SSR, like all socialist countries, will not fail to display the necessary political will and readiness to take all necessary steps to prevent the nuclear threat

Mr. KIRCA (Turkey): Permit me to state at the outset how pleased the Turkish delegation is to see you, Ambassador Vraalsen of Norway, in the Chair this year, along with Ambassador Elfaki of the Sudan and Mr. Tinca of Romania as your able assistants.

The distinguished qualities you have amply demonstrated will most assuredly lay the ground for a realistic, balanced and, we hope, productive exchange of views on security. My delegation takes further pleasure in noting that the officers of the Committee come from countries with which Turkey enjoys particularly good relations.

(Mr. Kirca, Turkey)

As almost all speakers have seemed to acknowledge, once again we are meeting this year in an atmosphere of anxiety, in which paradoxical situations seem to be commonplace, one in which annual spending on armaments has reached the shocking level of \$800 billion in contrast to an absolute and relative decline in levels of resource transfers from the developed world to the developing countries, one in which countries which have renounced and rejected possession of nuclear weapons are frustrated in their efforts to acquire satisfactory guarantees against their becoming victims of weapons of such terrifying potential.

(Mr. Kirca, Turkey)

Thus, there must be other factors, beyond the visible irritations offered by the security scene, that call for close scrutiny. Singling out specific cases from a truly complex mesh of paradoxical situations and pointing accusatory fingers at selected addresses is, at best, nothing more than isolating a burning building from a burning neighbourhood.

Last year in this Committee we said that, in determining our expectations from our present and future efforts in the field of disarmament, it would be essential to focus on those elements and dynamics that define the state of affairs among nations. We ventured to suggest that the single remedy for the apparently undesirable current dynamics would be the maximum exertion of efforts to build mutual trust among nations and thus gradually establish a feeling of confidence.

If we do not do so, while tension and, in not a few cases, actual confrontation are on the gallop around the globe, it does not seem to my delegation, for one, that it is exactly realistic to congregate in this room or elsewhere and challenge each other's tactical abilities in order to work out resolutions, reports, working papers and other sorts of documents that would reflect our own individual views of methodologies tailored to making the world a safer place in which to live.

From the Turkish viewpoint, a safe course of action to follow would be to forego intellectual romanticism and, at times, linguistic deception in favour of simple, sheer realism.

That is exactly why we fail when we approve a certain tendency to negotiate bargains on a certain stratum of disarmament in isolation from all the other strata. Just as security is indivisible, just as détente is indivisible, so too is disarmament indivisible. To put it another way, we do not believe that the world community can achieve much in either nuclear or conventional disarmament when one is highly deficient as compared with the other.

(Mr. Kirca, Turkey)

Unless the minimum essential degree of confidence and mutual trust among nations is achieved and unless the attitudes of nations vis-à-vis one another are reformulated within the context of such confidence, it will be pointless and, to say the least, naive to envisage the concepts, distinctly pluralist, of both nuclear and conventional disarmament. Can one think of, or even philosophize about, any set of documents that would deter a determined chooser from moving up from the lesser of the two evils to the greater?

Last year we stated that, if at the final session of the follow-up meeting to the Madrid Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe a mandate could be drawn up in connection with a European disarmament conference with a view to negotiating militarily significant, binding and verifiable confidence-building measures that would be applicable to the entire continent of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, that would indeed be a most outstanding achievement.

Despite our wide-ranging pessimism, I venture to suggest that we should not let it go unnoticed that this most outstanding objective has now been achieved. It is only fair to commend the highly diversified participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe - diversified not only economically, politically and ideologically, but also in terms of their security-related affiliations.

The Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe is due to commence in mid-January in Stockholm, which is undoubtedly a well-chosen venue for a highly significant initiative that will have as its underlying motive the relief of tensions in a continent that is often charged with being the powder-keg of military arsenals, however much that accusation may be contradicted by its record of being virtually the only area of the globe lucky enough not to have experienced actual confrontation in almost four decades.

(Mr. Kirca, Turkey)

The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey, Mr. Turkman, declared from the General Assembly rostrum just a few weeks ago that the establishment of confidence among States is a prerequisite for the success of any disarmament initiative, and that in the attempt to determine, in its first stage, a set of confidence-building and security measures - the parameters of which are very much welcomed by the Turkish Government - the Stockholm Conference will essentially be the first comprehensive endeavour in the initiation of a gradual process of realistic disarmament.

It would be prudent to underline at this stage the prospects of what are perhaps more rational, productive and well-intentioned negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions in Central Europe, in which Turkey is intimately involved. We are hopeful and confident that the Stockholm negotiations, with their wider context, will have a positive effect on the apparent bottlenecks in Vienna.

At this point I wish to restate once again Turkey's long-standing position, in a regional perspective, concerning zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones. We have always firmly supported the establishment of such zones wherever and whenever possible and practically feasible. That, of course, means that certain conditions have to be met prior to the establishment of such zones and that, in turn, calls for an adequate level of co-operation, understanding and confidence between the parties involved. In our view, only after each and every party concludes from its own assessment that such a stage has been reached will it be prudent to get involved in serious undertakings.

At an earlier stage in my statement I said that we believe that disarmament is indivisible. In other words, one initiative cannot remain unaffected by the developments in another. That premise holds true particularly when the two initiatives pertain to the same area of the world.

(Mr. Kirca, Turkey)

The United States of America, Turkey's ally, and the USSR, Turkey's neighbour, are engaged in two sets of negotiations in Geneva. Those pertaining to intermediate-range nuclear missiles seem to attract relatively much stronger popular interest. These negotiations have a vital significance for all of us. Both negotiating parties are undoubtedly aware of this fact. Co-operation and consultation have been meticulously pursued at all stages leading to the present-day situation within the defensive alliance to which my country is party. Most unambiguously, and at certain points very admirably, a common political will has been demonstrated in order to help achieve the consensus so earnestly desired by, we believe, practically the whole world.

My Government welcomed the fact that the latest attempt at compromise was advanced by no less than the President of the United States of America just recently, in this very building. The Government of Turkey sincerely believes that at this moment the world community anticipates a bold and exemplary utilization of these offers aimed at the elaboration of a fair and equitable solution.

In negotiations on another category of nuclear weapons, the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START), there is now on the negotiating table a fresh proposal termed the build-down concept. The ultimate aim of these negotiations is to reduce as much as possible the size of the strategic nuclear arsenals of the two negotiating parties, while maintaining a stable and durable balance.

(Mr. Kirca, Turkey)

In that respect, the build-down concept seems to us to be a very functional one. Not only would it bring about actual reductions and maintain balance while doing so, but, much more significantly, it would represent a continuous and steady process, contributing to confidence-building at each increment of implementation. This, we believe, is exactly where the true cumulative value of the build-down proposal lies. In these times of inflated tension, could it possibly be at all convincing to disregard this cumulative effect?

In expectation of tangible developments in the intermediate-range nuclear forces and the START negotiations, and in anticipation of the Stockholm Conference, we are now about to embark on a preparatory process with regard to the Third Review Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). While observing the situation in one way might unfortunately, but again undeniably, be leading a good number of us into pessimism in the absence of credible successive interim benefits, perhaps an alternative optimistic approach would be to note that a variety of important things, such as the ones I have just mentioned, are and will be going on which will provide us with an opportunity to demonstrate effectively the earnest goodwill of our Governments that we so often pledge. We sincerely hope that this Committee's work at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly will provide a good starting base for the Third Review Conference, with a view to further enhancing the NPT régime.

Undoubtedly, the NPT régime has been efficiently instrumental in restraining the proliferation of nuclear weapons. However, it is only fair to note not only that proliferation has more than a single dimension, but also that the NPT régime has an aspect that is complementary to the renunciation by non-nuclear signatories of attempts to acquire nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Kirca, Turkey)

In dealing with these two problem issues, a highly effective tool would be a comprehensive test-ban treaty. A treaty that would encompass all types of nuclear explosions, in all environments, for all time would certainly be of significant value in checking horizontal and, equally important, vertical proliferation. For as long as such developments cannot be brought about for one reason or the other, nations that earnestly anticipate acquiring nuclear technology for truly peaceful purposes will have to wait. In that respect, it is a matter of concern to the Government of Turkey that well-intentioned attempts in the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva have been stalled by less than constructive arguments concerning the mandate of the relevant Working Group, which we here in New York had believed to have been unanimously agreed on as early as last year.

Another area in which chances of future progress in the Committee on Disarmament have gone down the drain owing to mandate-related questions is the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

On the question of radiological weapons we observe a paradoxical situation. Certain expectations, legitimate though they may be in appropriate contexts, seem to us to be extraneous to the spirit of a future treaty banning such weapons and to constitute the current impediments to the effective prevention of a whole class of weapons of mass destruction from overshadowing the future of mankind.

A short review of the work of the Committee on Disarmament at its 1983 sessions, fortunately reveals an area in which somewhat more promising developments have taken place. With regard to chemical weapons, the Committee - or rather the Conference - will have to embark in its next round of negotiations on such central issues as the destruction of existing stocks and facilities and verification of such processes. The Government of Turkey sincerely hopes that the exemplary workshops to be offered very soon in Utah, and next year in the Federal Republic of

(Mr. Kirca, Turkey)

Germany, will be instrumental in developing more co-operative attitudes on the part of all the parties concerned.

Regardless of our perceptions of the degree of achievement or lack of achievement by the Committee on Disarmament this year, one judgement remains valid. That Committee is a unique instrument which the international community has devised, and it provides a significant forum in which the security perceptions of member countries are exposed to interaction, with a view to probing any and all possibilities of achieving progress in matters of disarmament. That is one interpretation of the essence of the work conducted by that body and the only *raison d'etre* we can think of for its existence. If that were not so, it would be a futile and unconscionable effort to exploit our academic talents for a gradual immersion in technicalities.

In full cognizance of our posture, on the security scene and the particularities of south-eastern Europe, which, in the most realistic sense, call for a balanced - I repeat, balanced - representation in the Committee on Disarmament, the Turkish Government has pursued successive efforts to contribute to bringing about an expansion of this body. We are pleased to observe that the present members of the Committee have now agreed on the admission of new members. We bring to the attention of the parties concerned that our firm candidacy will be maintained.

The Turkish Government remains confident that appropriate consultations will be conducted in a spirit of impartiality, as so explicitly pledged by its Chairman, Ambassador Morelli Pando of Peru.

The delegation of Turkey intends to speak, whenever appropriate, on issues that will be taken up later in the session. Meanwhile it pledges to you, Mr. Chairman, that it will display a spirit of co-operation and constructiveness.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): On behalf of my delegation, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of our Committee. I take this opportunity also to congratulate the other officers of the Committee. I reaffirm our intention to collaborate wholeheartedly with you in order to ensure the success of the Committee's work and serve the interests of our peoples by the achievement of our common objectives.

The significance of the debate on the question of disarmament at this thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly derives from the considerable importance which most States attach to disarmament efforts and their real objectives: that is, the preservation of peace and the achievement of general and complete disarmament. The fact that the international community has called for general and complete disarmament indicates the priority to be accorded to this question and the need to deal rapidly with it, particularly at a time when international relations are steadily deteriorating, and in view of the ever-increasing tension and danger of war, including nuclear war, which is a threat to the very survival of civilization and mankind.

A large number of countries and peoples are confronted with the danger of aggression and flagrant interference in their internal affairs by imperialist forces. The military potential of the imperialists, the escalation of the armaments race, both nuclear and conventional and the creation of sources of tension in different regions of the world inhibit the collective efforts to bring about total disarmament. The nuclear doctrines of the American Administration and its North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies are based upon the concept of nuclear superiority, which in fact provides the idea of a nuclear war. From this point of view, new military programmes have been adopted, new weapons of mass destruction are being developed and efforts are being made to impose extremely dangerous theories on the peoples of the world concerning nuclear war or the possibility of an unlimited conventional war.

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

In this connection, we should mention the aggression of the imperialist forces against independent and sovereign States. The behaviour of these forces, which stirs up conflicts among States, is thus an obstacle to the realization of the just aspirations of the peoples of the world for political and economic independence and constitutes a threat to national sovereignty and the security of borders, thereby posing a threat to international peace and security.

The most flagrant example of this policy of aggression practised by the forces of imperialism headed by the United States was the military invasion of the sovereign island of Grenada yesterday morning. This invasion against the peace-loving people of Grenada, in which the most sophisticated United States weapons were used like invasions perpetrated by the United States in other regions of the world, constitutes a threat to the international community and is contrary to the principles of international law as well as the Charter of the United Nations. At a time when we firmly condemn this blatant invasion of the island of Grenada by the United States, we once again stress the responsibility of the international community to stop this policy of interference and intervention by the United States in the internal affairs of other countries, which threatens the security of peoples which have selected their own independent path of economic and social development.

We recommend that measures be taken to stop this military invasion of Grenada and to obtain the immediate withdrawal of United States troops from that territory.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs of my country, in his statement at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, said:

"Today, we are a long way from achieving the basic objective of the United Nations Charter, namely the peace for which the peoples of the world are struggling." (A/38/PV.26, p. 38-40)

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

The Secretary-General of the United Nations, in his report on the work of the Organization, also stressed this sad reality. He said:

"In no area is the need for a recommitment to the principles of the Charter more important and more closely tied to the survival of humanity than in the field of disarmament and arms limitation. The prevention of nuclear war remains the unique challenge of our time, since such a war would be the ultimate negation of all human endeavour." (A/38/1, pp. 4-5)

This very serious situation with which humanity as a whole is faced is caused by the belligerent policy of the forces of imperialism, which is designed to augment the sources of tension and destabilize peace in the world, thereby defying world public opinion. Imperialist policy threatens the world with a catastrophe, and our task is to unite our efforts to prevent such a cataclysm occurring. That is why we would stress once again our devotion to the common objective of peace, our determination to stop the political and military escalation and to create an international climate beneficial to all the peoples of the world.

Different regions of the world are victims of the aggressive policy of the United States, in particular the Middle East and southern Africa. This imperialist policy of the United States Administration contributes to increasing international tension by seeking to terrorize progressive régimes in these regions, using pressure to expand the zone of imperialist influence and to impose imperialist domination on them, the idea being to exploit their resources for the benefit of its multinational companies and to increase its military and economic potential, using its rapid deployment forces as a means of intervention in order to achieve this aim, in addition to providing military, political and economic aid on an unlimited basis to the present régimes in Tel Aviv and Pretoria.

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

" Thanks to the mutual co-operation between the United States and certain other Western countries, the racist régimes of Tel Aviv and Pretoria have become arsenals of sophisticated weapons supplied by the United States and have even been able to acquire nuclear weapons, which represents an even greater risk, not only to the African and Arab countries, but also to world peace and security in general. This co-operation undermines any effort to create nuclear-free zones.

The plots and designs of the imperialists to liquidate the nationalist forces and progressive régimes in the region and to deny the legitimate rights of the Palestinian and Namibian peoples, have made the Near East and southern Africa the most explosive regions in the world. The United States Government strives to compel these peoples to abandon their struggle and to submit to its desires.

United States military intervention in Lebanon shows the danger to the Arab countries of the United States military presence there, which is reminiscent of the colonial era.

Democratic Yemen is on the Indian Ocean and is therefore deeply concerned by the danger threatening the region, where the United States Government is trying to strengthen its military bases, in particular Diego Garcia, and to reinforce its fleet, and in so doing is using provocative military manoeuvres off our coast, after having set up the rapid deployment forces, the operations of which are aimed at a certain number of non-aligned countries and for which a central body has been created. The manoeuvres carried out by United States forces in this region constitute a form of pressure, a threat and an attempt to intimidate the peoples of the region, contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and to the principles of international law and non-alignment.

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

Democratic Yemen has declared on more than one occasion its constant desire and determination to make every effort to bring stability in the region, to preserve peace and to face up to the imperialist danger there.

In this context we feel that urgent measures must be taken to eliminate all obstacles placed by the United States and its allies with a view to obstructing the proposed conference on the Indian Ocean, scheduled for the first part of 1984 under the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

The principal idea in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament was that the task of nuclear disarmament had first priority. The text of the Final Document of that session remains a suitable basis for the preparation of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. We have yet to adopt measures to ensure the effective implementation of the resolutions adopted at the first special session to meet the aspirations of our peoples to peace and security.

The non-aligned countries have made persistent efforts to bring about the achievement of the objectives of disarmament. They have put forward a number of ideas and proposals, the latest being the proposal in the final document of the seventh summit conference of non-aligned countries. However, all those efforts have come up against the stubbornness and obstinacy of the forces of imperialism.

At its thirty-seventh session the General Assembly adopted a large number of resolutions. These have not yet been implemented owing to the absence of the political will on the part of the imperialist forces. This makes it necessary for us to take steps to overcome the delaying tactics of the United States and its allies, designed to prevent the initiation of serious negotiation, on disarmament, and their insistence on increasing their military budgets in order to achieve superiority.

In this connection, we attach great importance to the constructive initiatives of the Soviet Union concerning the curbing of the arms race and the preservation of the policy of détente and peaceful coexistence, in the interest of the maintenance of peace in all regions of the world. The Soviet initiatives include its declared commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and other proposals stressing the peaceful character of that country's foreign policy.

Disarmament, peace and development are intimately linked and cannot be separated. Peace is a common aspiration of all peoples, and the struggle to achieve it requires that we put an end to the arms race, achieve complete

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

disarmament and use the funds released by disarmament for the economic development of the developing countries. The escalation of the arms race and the growth of military expenditures by the imperialist forces only increase tensions in the world and are an obstacle to efforts to achieve economic and social development, above all in the developing countries.

In this context, we must stress the importance of the United Nations role in the search for solutions to the problems confronting the world. We shall spare no effort to work with the peace-loving countries of the world to achieve that objective. We reject any attempt to isolate the United Nations and prevent its fulfilling its role in connection with disarmament.

My delegation expresses its gratitude to the United Nations and the non-governmental organizations for the part they are playing in mobilizing international public opinion in favour of the implementation of resolutions on disarmament. We stress the importance of international public opinion in bringing about the implementation of resolutions on disarmament and helping to achieve the goals of disarmament - hence the importance of the peaceful demonstrations in Western countries against the use of nuclear weapons and on behalf of peace. Thus we support the World Disarmament Campaign.

Our peoples aspire to peace and security and in order that their aspirations may be realized it is incumbent on us to work together to adopt collective measures prohibiting the testing, manufacture or deployment of nuclear weapons.

We attach great importance to the participation by all States in negotiations on general and complete disarmament and to the adoption of measures guaranteeing

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

non-nuclear-weapon States against the use of nuclear weapons and of treaties prohibiting chemical weapons, the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction, and an arms race in outer space. The achievement of those disarmament objectives and the reduction of international tension necessitates the political will of the United States and its allies to work seriously, in co-operation with other Members of the United Nations, to overcome the obstacles that have so far prevented that.

In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm once again our complete readiness to co-operate with you, Mr. Chairman.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.