

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records*



FIRST COMMITTEE
12th meeting
held on
Monday, 24 October 1983
at 3 p.m.
New York

COPY
FOR REFERENCE
ONLY - DO NOT
CIRCULATE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 12th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)

UN LIBRARY

CONTENTS

NOV 0 1983

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)

UN/SA COLLECTION

Statements were made by:

- Mr. Berg (Norway)
- Mr. Butler (Australia)
- Mr. Natorf (Poland)
- Mr. Burwin (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)
- Mr. Elfaki (Sudan)
- Mr. Kor Bun Heng (Democratic Kampuchea)
- Mr. Blanco (Uruguay)

*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.12
3 November 1983
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

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

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. BERG (Norway): I wish at the outset to express the great shock felt by my Government and the people of Norway following the tragic and senseless events in Beirut this weekend. Our deeply felt sympathy goes first of all to the bereaved families of the victims. Through you, Mr. Chairman, I should like to convey my sincere condolences to the families and to the American and French Governments, through their representatives in this Committee.

Disarmament and arms control are today the subject of increasing attention, not only in an East-West context, but in the world at large. All over the world a strong public opinion is demanding an end to the arms build-up, conventional as well as nuclear. I see no other way to deal effectively with this major challenge than to redouble our efforts to achieve disarmament and arms control agreements which are balanced, equitable and verifiable. Especially on this United Nations Day, I should like to express my sincere hope that the untiring efforts of this Committee will assist us in this respect.

The corner-stone in the process of halting the arms build-up and reducing armaments should be full adherence by all States to the obligation under the United Nations Charter to refrain from the threat of use of force. In our view this obligation is unequivocal and binding. It must remain a fundamental code of conduct in international relations. Nothing can add to or detract from our Charter in this respect. It was fully in keeping with this basic provision of our Charter, therefore, when the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) summit meeting in Bonn last year solemnly declared that NATO weapons, be they conventional or nuclear, would never be used except in response to attack.

In the years ahead, it seems to me, we must increasingly seek agreements that clearly assist us in building more stable relationships among States, while seeking undiminished security at the lowest possible levels of armaments.

In this context and in a global perspective, the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) - the negotiations on strategic nuclear weapons between the United States and the Soviet Union - are of particular significance. These talks may well

(Mr. Berg, Norway)

lay the foundation for the strategic arms posture as we approach the next century. We have noted with satisfaction that both parties, in their proposals, have listed significant reductions as their objective. We consider that the latest United States proposals contain new and significant elements of flexibility, aiming at a substantial build-down of the most destabilizing weapons. It is our hope that this approach will be reciprocated, thus paving the way for real progress in START.

For the past two years a great deal of attention has been focused on the negotiations in Geneva on intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF). The United States, in close consultation with its allies, is now negotiating with a view to reaching an agreement that may obviate NATO's need to modernize its nuclear forces in Europe in response to Soviet deployment of long-range nuclear missiles that can reach Western Europe.

It is the view of my Government, as well as that of other NATO Governments, that the ideal outcome of the Geneva talks remains a total ban on this class of new weapons, as proposed by NATO countries. As this does not appear realistic for the time being, the United States, in full agreement with its European allies, has proposed an interim agreement and has recently introduced new compromise proposals in Geneva in an effort to meet Soviet concerns. In our opinion, all the important elements are now on the table for an agreement in Geneva which would take due account of the security concerns of the parties involved.

It is our sincere hope that the Soviet Union will now respond positively to the latest Western initiatives and engage in serious negotiations with a view to reaching concrete results before the end of this year. We feel confident that the USSR will not see it as in its interest to leave the negotiating table in Geneva as the INF talks are now entering what may well turn out to be the decisive stage. In this respect, it has not gone unnoticed by my Government that the Warsaw Treaty States, at their recent Sofia meeting, stated that possibilities do still exist for reaching an agreement in Geneva.

(Mr. Berg, Norway)

The NATO Governments, for their part, are quite prepared to spare no effort to reach an agreement and to continue the negotiations into 1984, if need be.

Last year this Committee took up the question of a nuclear freeze. I should like to state emphatically that my Government is not, in principle, opposed to this concept, which has been looked upon by many as a means of halting the nuclear arms race. On the other hand, it must be clearly stated that the most pressing need today is to obtain substantial reductions in the nuclear arsenals. In the longer run, however, I see no conflict between the need for reductions and a freeze. In fact, a freeze might at one stage be entered as a natural element in an effective disarmament and arms control process. While recognizing this, we must at the same time make certain that a call for a nuclear freeze does not actually complicate ongoing efforts to reduce and eliminate existing stocks of nuclear arms.

My Government believes that in our efforts to halt the nuclear arms build-up a comprehensive test ban must remain a priority measure. A comprehensive test ban would make a significant contribution to the objective of terminating the qualitative development of nuclear weapons and the introduction of new weapons. It would, furthermore, constitute a non-discriminatory instrument of direct relevance to the promotion of non-proliferation.

In our opinion, a comprehensive test ban should prohibit all nuclear test explosions in all environments on a permanent basis. Such a ban would necessarily have to include an efficient verification system. In this connection, great importance must be attached to the development of a global seismological network. Norway has participated actively in the Ad Hoc Working Group of seismological experts in the Committee on Disarmament since its establishment in 1976.

As an active observer in the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Nuclear Test Ban, of the Committee on Disarmament, Norway welcomed the agreement on a work programme for the Working Group's deliberations this year. We regret, however, that subsequent discussions have revealed differences of opinion, in particular concerning the mandate of the Working Group. It is still our hope that a formula can be found in order that the Ad Hoc Working Group may continue its efforts in a substantive way in this most important field during the next session of the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Berg, Norway)

The proliferation of nuclear weapons remains another major challenge of urgency. The Norwegian Government attaches great importance to the Third Review Conference on the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which is to be held in 1985. It is our hope that that Conference will not only preserve the status quo, but also strengthen the non-proliferation régime.

In our view, the vertical and the horizontal non-proliferation of nuclear weapons are of equal importance. The nuclear-weapon States have undertaken obligations concerning vertical proliferation under article VI of the NPT. Concrete results in this respect would provide a considerable impetus in terms of halting horizontal proliferation also. It is our view that full-scope safeguards should remain a precondition of all exports of relevant nuclear material, equipment and technology. Similarly, all non-nuclear-weapon States should accept full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards on all their nuclear activities. Finally, we should spare no effort in order to achieve an even broader adherence to the NPT.

Norway was honoured to preside over the Second Review Conference concerning the sea-bed Treaty, in Geneva in September this year. It is indeed significant that the Conference was able to adopt a final declaration by consensus reaffirming strong support for this arms-control Treaty. In line with past practices, we intend to present the results of the Conference to this Committee and to introduce a draft resolution on the Review Conference.

In our efforts to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms build-up, we should not and must not overlook the dangers inherent in the increasing conventional armaments. We should, in particular, bear in mind the possibility and the desirability of raising the nuclear threshold by means of achieving a stable balance in conventional forces.

This interrelationship is of particular relevance to Europe, given the conventional imbalance in that region. In the Vienna talks on conventional force reductions the Western participants have put forward proposals for reductions to equal and lower levels with a view to establishing increased stability in Europe and thus raising the nuclear threshold. Security in Europe would be enhanced and East-West relations improved if we could produce concrete progress in the Vienna talks.

(Mr. Berg, Norway)

The process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe complements the efforts which are under way in Vienna. The concluding document of the recent Madrid meeting strengthens the Helsinki Final Act in the field of contact, dialogue and negotiations between East and West in the present strained political circumstances.

My Government regards the convening of the Conference on disarmament in Europe as being a major achievement in East-West relations. It will be an important task of the Conference to come to grips with the danger of military and political destabilization resulting from the existing imbalance in conventional forces in Europe. Our aim must be to agree on concrete measures to restore confidence in each other's motives. This could, in fact, open up new prospects for progress in ongoing and future disarmament negotiations.

In our view, it is essential to prevent the Conference on disarmament in Europe from developing into fruitless exercise on general principles and declaratory proposals. We should start effective negotiations on concrete confidence-building and security-building measures as soon as possible, strictly respecting the criteria laid down and the mandate agreed upon in Madrid by the 35 States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. These measures should, in particular, be designed to create more transparency and predictability in the military field. In particular, they should aim at reducing the danger of surprise attacks and of the use of military forces for political purposes.

(Mr. Berg, Norway)

The confidence-building process should not, however, be restricted to Europe. My Government has therefore welcomed the initiative of the Federal Republic of Germany to have the global aspects of confidence-building measures dealt with by the United Nations and, this year, by the Disarmament Commission. We do not consider such measures a substitute for disarmament but rather a valuable contribution towards the enhancement of peace and security and the attainment of our objectives in the field of disarmament and arms control.

Greater transparency in military expenditures is another important means of creating increased confidence among States. Norway has actively supported the efforts of the United Nations at several sessions of the General Assembly to obtain more information on military budgets. In the hope that the ongoing work of the expert group will provide a new impetus to our endeavours in this field, we have expressed our willingness to assist further by putting a Norwegian expert at the disposal of the group. We are also ready to support other measures in this field, such as holding a conference on military expenditures.

The acceleration of technological innovations is an important element of the present arms build-up. Nowhere is this development felt more strongly than in our quest to prevent an arms race in outer space. The Norwegian Government welcomes the fact that this question has been included on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament. We sincerely hope that a consensus will be reached early next year on a mandate for a working group to start substantive discussions of the issues involved. In this context further measures are needed to ensure future strategic stability in outer space. With this objective in mind, we welcome all serious and realistic proposals. Emphasis must still be placed on prohibiting anti-satellite systems. Even though we are fully aware that these are complex matters, our efforts must aim at mutually agreed, balanced and verifiable measures of arms control.

Permit me also to mention the considerable importance that my Government attaches to the efforts to prohibit other weapons of mass destruction, in particular the work of the Committee on Disarmament to conclude a future chemical weapons convention. In our view, a ban on the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on the destruction of existing stocks represents one of the most important disarmament measures being negotiated today.

(Mr. Berg, Norway)

It seems to us that a certain momentum has recently been building up in Geneva in this respect, although not as speedily as we had hoped. Nevertheless, the record on substantive provisions to be included in a chemical weapons convention worked out in the Committee on Disarmament, under able Canadian chairmanship, is a significant development. It is our hope that the present momentum in the Committee on Disarmament can be successfully exploited in order to produce definite progress. Every effort should now be made to reach agreement on outstanding questions with a view to formulating a convention text.

In particular, this would apply to the question of verification. Over the years, the Norwegian Government has made efforts to contribute to the work of the Committee on Disarmament and has presented working papers based on research undertaken in Norway. During the forthcoming sessions we shall continue our research programme relating to verification issues under a comprehensive chemical weapons convention.

Before concluding my statement, permit me to make some comments on certain institutional questions. During the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, Norway took an active part in the endeavours aimed at streamlining institutional arrangements in the field of multilateral disarmament. In particular we had the honour to introduce the omnibus resolution A/37/99 K with its five operative parts, which was adopted without a vote.

In this connection I should like once again to welcome the establishment of the Department for Disarmament Affairs at the United Nations Secretariat under the very able leadership of the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Jan Martenson.

My Government has long actively supported efforts in the United Nations as well as in the Committee on Disarmament aimed at obtaining a limited expansion of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament. In our capacity as an active observer, we have participated in all working groups of the Committee on Disarmament and we have, as I have already mentioned, contributed to the Committee's work related to a chemical weapons convention and a comprehensive nuclear-test ban. Accordingly, we very much welcome the recent decisions of the Committee on Disarmament to redesignate itself the Conference on Disarmament and to expand the membership of the Committee by no more than four States. At this juncture, I should like to reiterate our firm interest in becoming a full member of

(Mr. Berg, Norway)

the Committee. At the same time, I would hope that consultations may be expedited with a view to implementing at an early date the recent decision by the Committee on expansion of its membership.

In resolution 37/99 K the General Assembly decided that the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) should function as an autonomous institute. We also welcome this decision as we welcome the re-establishment of the Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, which now also serves as the Board of Trustees of UNIDIR.

During this session the Norwegian delegation intends to submit a draft resolution concerning the draft statute of UNIDIR that was recently adopted by the Secretary-General's Advisory Board acting as UNIDIR's Board of Trustees. We hope that this draft resolution will be adopted without a vote in order to prepare a solid basis for the future work of the Institute. Norway has also supported UNIDIR by contributing financially in order to help it carry out independent research on disarmament and on related security issues and will endeavour to continue to do so.

Let me also mention that since its inception Norway has given its support to the World Disarmament Campaign. We believe that the United Nations has a vital role to play in the dissemination of information concerning disarmament in a balanced and objective manner and in all parts of the world. In our view, the Campaign should be based on as broad a base of data and knowledge as possible. For this reason my Government has recently granted \$25,000 to promote activities of relevance to the attainment of the objectives of the Campaign.

In concluding I should like again to stress the importance attached by the Norwegian Government to disarmament and arms control as an integral part of our security policy. Norway is a small country located in a strategically very sensitive area. Yet, in a world characterized by growing interdependence, our concerns and interests cannot be governed by national or even regional considerations alone. In fact, the vital interests of the international community as a whole are at stake when we address the need to control and reduce the role of armaments in the world. To achieve this fundamental objective, we need to engage actively in concrete negotiations rather than to indulge in abstract principles. We now need binding commitments rather than declarations of intent. It is in this spirit that the Government of Norway will continue to approach the important issues now before us in this Committee.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): I wish to begin by expressing on behalf of my Government to the delegations of the United States and France, Australia's deep sympathy in the awful losses they suffered in Beirut yesterday.

Seven months ago the Australian people elected a new Government. It is a Government formed by the Australian Labour Party. It is a social democratic Government. This present session of the General Assembly is the first to have taken place since that change of Government in Australia. It is appropriate therefore that this present statement of the Australian Government's policies and attitudes should be of a fundamental character.

The Government assumed office in an international climate which presented daunting challenges in the field of peace and security. It immediately took a series of decisions which elevated significantly arms control and disarmament goals within Australian foreign policy. Henceforth Australia will pursue those goals with unprecedented determination and vigour. The resources required for that work have been provided even though, for economic reasons, resources are scarce. These decisions reflected directly the wishes of the very substantial majority of the Australian people.

It is crystal clear that the Australian people want to see an end to the nuclear arms race. They are determined that nuclear weapons should not proliferate to yet further countries. They reject completely the notion that the arms race should extend from this planet into outer space and they deplore the \$700 billion spent each year on the arms race. They are deeply concerned that much of this expenditure breeds violence and they believe that the overall level of it constitutes a scandalous waste of human resources and ingenuity. Throughout Australia there are substantial organized community groups - the groups we call non-governmental organizations - which continue to work on and discuss the issues of peace and disarmament. Their work is vital. In a democracy such as ours it both informs and criticizes Government policy. Those groups are thoroughly heterogeneous. They include people of all political persuasions, all ages, both sexes and all occupations. This is very significant. The voice of these people is addressed to the Australian Government and beyond our Government to the world community. It calls for an end to the madness of the arms race. It asserts the belief that what all people desire, most centrally, is a decent standard of living worked out in a framework of peace. They reject any idea that our technological genius should be allowed to bring about the destruction of humankind.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

What is fundamentally at issue here is a view of the nature of life and of human history itself. That view rejects the notion that war and violence are in some way inevitable because, in some unstated way, war is seen to be an inherent part of human nature. It is also a profound cry in support of the principles for which the United Nations stands - freedom, independence, self-determination - and it is a warning that these principles and goals are the first victims of war and armaments.

This peace movement will not go away; it is not a passing phenomenon. It will remain as long as those basic human goals and desires are challenged by war and armaments. It will remain because it is a fundamental assertion of the value of life itself. This phenomenon is by no means unique to Australia. On the contrary it is universal, and we in the United Nations must respond to it. This is our responsibility and the exercise of that responsibility can be effective only if we seek arms control and disarmament agreements which are balanced, verifiable and consistent with the maintenance of security. Australia will follow that path.

We welcome the Secretary-General's call to us all to recommit ourselves to the application of the principles of the Charter. This, in our view, is one of the most urgent necessities within today's international relations, and we see a direct relationship between that recommitment and the urgent need for a reinvigoration of the arms control and disarmament process. It is only by this means that peace can be assured.

Australia is a Western country, sharing with those others which form the Western association of nations a commitment to democracy, freedom and the conduct of international relations on the basis of mutual respect between States and of the rule of law. On 15 September this year the Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Bill Hayden, made a statement to the Australian Parliament which was of fundamental importance for those who would seek to understand Australia, its place both within the West and in wider international relations, and the role which Australia can play and is determined to play in promoting the cause of peace and disarmament within the United Nations. That statement was on the conclusions of the review of the ANZUS Treaty, the Treaty which links Australia, New Zealand and the United States. Simply, that review led to an unequivocal reaffirmation of the ANZUS alliance as fundamental to Australia's national security and foreign and defence policies. It was also made clear, however, that Australian adherence to

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

the ANZUS Treaty does not in any way derogate from its right to make national decisions in foreign policy and defence matters.

In reporting to the Parliament on the ANZUS Treaty review the Minister for Foreign Affairs said this:

"I think it important to reiterate, for the record, that this Labour Government in matters of international relations presumes to be neither neutral nor non-aligned. We clearly have our commitments and our alignment is frequently and convincingly demonstrated. Our independence and national interests are served greatly by these associations but within them we exercise independence and judgement, are prepared to disagree with allies where it is in the best interests of our alliance and certainly where it is in the best interests of this nation. The fact that these things can be done and the alliance remain intact is an indication of the maturity of the relationship."

Finally, the Minister for Foreign Affairs said that one of our major policy roles within our position as a Western country would be to fulfil our moral obligation to work for nuclear and conventional arms reduction and disarmament. The task is urgent. The lives of all of us are overshadowed today by a nuclear arms race of dreadful proportions. None of us wants it, yet it seems to be proving increasingly difficult to stop.

Concrete action, such as in the intermediate-range and strategic arms reduction talks in Geneva must continue, but we must also seek to break the circle of mutual suspicion that is the source of the problem in the first place. In our view that circle is formed by the perceptions held of each other by the United States and the Soviet Union. We must ask those two great States to consider this and to seek to change it. It is clear that the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union is passing through a difficult phase. Both sides have acknowledged this fact and it is clear that neither seeks such a situation. Productive and co-operative relations between the United States and the Soviet Union must play an essential role in resolving problems afflicting the world community. Strained relations between the super-Powers affect the whole range of complex dealings which they have with one another and the consequences of such strains spill over into issues affecting all of us.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Most fundamentally we are affected as co-inhabitants of a world which could be destroyed by the nuclear weapons held by the super-Powers. We all have the most pressing interest in seeing reductions in these nuclear arsenals. The responsibility of ensuring that such reductions are achieved falls on the Powers which possess such weapons. Clearly, strains in relations between the United States and the Soviet Union do not contribute to creating a favourable atmosphere for negotiation and inevitably the will of the parties to make the hard choices required if we are to make progress in nuclear disarmament is affected.

The Australian Foreign Minister has called for efforts to encourage and assist the super-Powers to develop a new framework for constructive relations and for them to look again at the assumptions on which they approach one another. As he said in the general debate in the Assembly just a few weeks ago:

"Whatever judgement Soviet leaders may make about the system in the West, they have no justification for a view that it is bent on the destruction of the Soviet people's security and welfare. In their theoretical analysis of the world and their vision of the future, those Soviet leaders must concede a secure and lasting peace to the West and to the non-aligned and developing countries. It is not legitimate to seek their subversion and overthrow.

"In the West, as we also assess future prospects, we must concede a proper place for the Soviet Union - not only in terms of power but also as defined by the legitimate concerns and aspirations of the Soviet peoples.

"...

"... we [should] encourage and assist the super-Powers to moderate antagonisms, to obtain new understandings, perhaps to find new mechanisms for political action and consultation ..." (A/38/PV.17, p. 68)

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

The task that both the United States and the Soviet Union face is a task of historic magnitude and urgency.

There must be no over-simplification of the differences between these two great Powers, but their greatness calls for them to reshape their dialogue now, before it is too late for all of us, and then to play their unique part in strengthening this United Nations.

With regard to the current arms control and disarmament agenda, Australia is determined that there be an end to the nuclear arms race and a reduction in the number and kinds of nuclear weapons held by nuclear-weapon States. We are determined that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons be strengthened and adhered to universally.

Linking these two objectives, we seek an end to nuclear testing by all States in all environments for all time.

We shall seek an international agreement to ensure that the arms race does not extend to outer space.

Nuclear issues are central to the survival of mankind, but people die daily, and in alarming numbers, through the use of conventional weapons. Military budgets must be reduced. The arms race must be curbed. The question of military transfers, whether overt, covert, or illegal is obviously of importance.

Australia believes that these three areas are ideal subjects for negotiation by the United Nations. We shall be exploring, with others, the most effective means of taking such action.

Chemical weapons - the so-called "poor man's atomic bomb" - are abhorrent. Their effects are devastating and inhuman; they are cheap and easily stored; they are "ideally" suited for use in the developing world. Clearly they must be outlawed. Australia will continue to strive to see that an international convention, with this effect, is concluded as soon as possible.

In conclusion, I want to add Australia's voice to those who have already appealed for a new spirit of co-operation. The fact is that it is easier to express hostility, to form patterns of behaviour on the basis of existing prejudices, than it is to take the leap of the imagination and faith that is required in working out arms control and disarmament agreements.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Security is at stake - that is clear - and that can be a source of genuine anxiety. We must face this realistically, but if we pursue our common goals with determination and imagination we shall overcome that anxiety and each time we do that we shall grow in strength and confidence. We might then discover that it is true that there is nothing more fearful than fear itself, and we might also ensure our survival.

Mr. NATORF (Poland): Mr. Chairman, my delegation has already congratulated you on your election to the chair. It has also assured you that you can look forward to full and constructive co-operation on our side. Since I am speaking for the first time at this session of the Committee, may I, in my personal capacity, once again congratulate you warmly and wish you success in discharging your mandate. My congratulations and good wishes are also extended to other officers of the Committee.

The general debate at this session of the General Assembly that was concluded only two weeks ago, as well as the discussion at present being held in this Committee, have shown us the reflection as in a mirror of the grave concern of the overwhelming majority of the peoples in the world at the dangerous trends in the development of the international situation. Feelings of profound and legitimate anxiety have been forcefully expressed at the ominously stepped-up arms race, aimed at achieving military superiority and first-strike capability, undertaken by the military-industrial complex in the United States and incorporated in the policy of its Administration. In the aforesaid debates, the dangers stemming from the accelerated advancement of military technology and saturation of the globe with lethal weaponry have been demonstrated, with the simultaneous warning that the very survival of mankind is at stake.

In the address to the General Assembly of the Chairman of the Council of State of the Polish People's Republic, Professor Henryk Jablonski, and in the statement before this Committee by the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, Henryk Jaroszek, we presented our point of view on the negative phenomena existing in the political, military and economic spheres of the present international situation. We emphasized, inter alia, that the planned deployment in Western Europe of the

(Mr. Natorf, Poland)

newest American medium-range nuclear-weapon systems endangers world peace, jeopardizes the security of Europe, as well as threatening the national security of Poland and its most vital interests. We pointed out that mankind today is walking a tightrope, beneath which there is the abyss of nuclear catastrophe; with the nuclear arms race unchecked, with the permanent growth of nuclear stockpiles and development of deadly technology, its balance may be easily lost. We also expressed our hopes and outlined our actions.

The Chairman of the Council of State of the Polish People's Republic, Professor Jablonski, in his address to this session of the General Assembly said:

"Despite the unsatisfactory international situation, and in defiance of the activities of opponents of peaceful co-operation between nations and of instigators of tension, our aim remains a programme of positive action, hand-in-hand with all those who want the same. We have the perseverance and the goodwill to carry us along that road". (A/38/PV.13, pp. 13-15)

We have underlined that, difficulties in international relations notwithstanding, there exists a possibility of averting the danger of war and preventing the risk of an outbreak of world conflict, especially nuclear; there exists a possibility of containing the arms race and stopping the policy of confrontation.

On the agenda of the thirty-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly there are three new items, proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which were allocated to this Committee for consideration. They are all of great importance and of utmost urgency.

The Soviet proposal "Conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the use of force in outer space and from outer space against the Earth" deals with an issue that is becoming extremely topical. Being a progressive follow-up of the 1981 proposal for a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space, the present initiative provides for a comprehensive ban on testing and deployment in outer space of any space-based weapons designed to destroy targets on the earth, in the atmosphere or in outer space. Simultaneously, it makes provision for a complete denunciation of the development of new

(Mr. Natorf, Poland)

anti-satellite systems and the elimination of existing systems. It includes the clearly expressed readiness of the Soviet Union to conduct separate talks on anti-satellite systems, including talks with the United States on a bilateral basis. The unilateral moratorium declared by the Soviet Union on the placing of any kind of anti-satellite weapons in outer space is yet further evidence of its willingness not to allow the arms race to enter outer space.

(Mr. Natorf, Poland)

The Soviet proposal is being put forward at a time when the United States is getting ready, according to press reports, to begin testing new weapons designed to attack satellites, and when programmes to develop and deploy new weapons for fighting so-called star wars in outer space are being undertaken as a means of eventually acquiring a first-strike capability. This most timely initiative of the Soviet Union emphasizes very forcefully that the time to take up the issue constructively is now, and that tomorrow it might be too late. It is aimed not only at ensuring the peaceful use and exploration of outer space for future generations, but also at easing existing tensions on earth by showing, in a clear-cut way, the possibilities and perspectives of useful dialogue on even the most difficult subjects.

The item entitled "Condemnation of nuclear war" deals with an issue which is of top priority among the issues of our generation. The draft declaration submitted by the USSR, resolutely and unreservedly condemns and declares as criminal acts the formulation, enunciation, dissemination and propaganda of political and military doctrines and concepts designed to substantiate the "legitimacy" of the first use of nuclear weapons, and, generally, the "admissibility" of unleashing nuclear war.

There is no need to stress the timeliness and importance of this initiative. One can hardly fail to notice the continued discussion held in some United States and Western quarters on the possibility of the carrying on, and the winning, of limited nuclear warfare, on the feasibility of a pre-emptive first nuclear strike, and on the chances of surviving and winning a total, full-scale nuclear conflict.

At a time when certain circles are obsessed with gaining nuclear superiority, with pursuing a policy of interference in the internal affairs of others, and with influencing international relations by the policy of diktat, the adoption of the proposed declaration would be a major move showing the willingness of the international community to build a possible safety barrier against entering on the dangerous path towards nuclear catastrophe.

Because of its tragic experience in the past, Poland, on whose territory the Second World War started and whose losses and suffering were so great, has the special right and moral obligation to remind all nations of that holocaust, and to appeal to them to join in a condemnation of nuclear war. Let us hope that all countries - and particularly those countries of Europe in which two world wars were

(Mr. Natorf, Poland)

fought and which know full well the disastrous consequences of war - will answer this appeal affirmatively.

It is with concern that we have noted some statements expressing the belief that the Soviet draft resolution on the condemnation of nuclear war implies that a country would be denied the right to defend itself against an aggressor with all the means at its disposal, including nuclear weapons. First, these statements overlook the fact that it is the Soviet Union and its allies which have proposed concluding a treaty on the non-use of force between the States of the Warsaw Pact and of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Such a treaty would prohibit the use of any force, including that of conventional means. Secondly, in regard to the non-use of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union has stated unequivocally it will not be the first to use these weapons. And, thirdly, one might easily say that such statements are, in fact, very close to the theories of pre-emptive nuclear strike. Therefore, the arguments used in those statements are, to say the least, not convincing.

Instead of looking for alleged ill intentions on the part of the Soviet Union, and for the so-called hidden gaps in the draft resolution, it would be much better if, in the interest of improving the international atmosphere, the Soviet proposal were given the most serious consideration and support.

The proposal for a nuclear arms freeze to be undertaken by all nuclear-weapon States would make it evident that a means of moral and political character can be combined with a tangible measure which, if adopted, could have a tremendous positive impact on the international situation. The Soviet proposal for a cessation, subject to effective verification, of the build-up of all components of nuclear arsenals, including all kinds of both delivery systems and weapons; a renunciation of the deployment of new kinds and types of such weapons; a moratorium on all tests of nuclear weapons and of new kinds and types of their delivery systems; and cessation of the production of fissionable materials for the purpose of making nuclear weapons, would be a decisive factor in shaping the security situation in the world. It would rebuild and strengthen the mutual trust among the nuclear Powers that is so badly needed for improving the overall political climate in the world. It would lead towards further practical steps in nuclear disarmament. It would not permit a new spiral of the arms race to begin.

(Mr. Natorf, Poland)

The three new Soviet proposals derive from the previous initiatives. They are closely and logically linked with them and constitute their further development. They stem from the fact that nuclear war would be the greatest tragedy for mankind. This fact cannot be undermined by any theory, assumption or speculation, no matter from what source and place it originates. The proposals also proceed from the premise that putting an end to the nuclear arms build-up and preventing a further spiral of the nuclear arms race is one of the most pressing tasks for humanity.

These proposals are put forward at a time when there is a real danger of an outbreak of nuclear conflict, since the evolution of Western military doctrine has been approaching an essential change in assumptions. By creating an alternative of practical steps which do not diminish the security of either side, the Soviet proposals are of crucial importance under the existing circumstances.

Together with those proposals which have previously been put forward by the Soviet Union, the present initiatives constitute an integral component of the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union. Their main thrust is directed at averting a nuclear catastrophe. They have their basis and support in the broad-ranging programme of peace reflecting the co-ordinated approach of the countries of the socialist community. This programme is contained in the Declaration issued at the meeting of the political consultative Committee of States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, held in Prague last January; in the joint statement issued at the meeting of Party and State leaders of seven socialist States held in Moscow, last June, and, most recently, in the communiqué issued at the meeting of the Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty held in Sofia.

At that meeting, it was stated that the conviction of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty was that even in a complex and aggravated international situation it is possible to find, through dialogue, solutions for all problems in relations between States, if there is a political will to do so, if a well-balanced and constructive approach and spirit of co-operation are displayed; and if the vital interests of the peoples - the interests of peace and security - are taken into consideration.

(Mr. Natorf, Poland)

Poland welcomes the three new Soviet initiatives and gives them its full support. They are new and major milestones in the long record of the tangible steps and efforts of the Soviet Union undertaken in the cause of nuclear disarmament. These initiatives meet the expectations of the international community. They also fully coincide with the long-standing efforts of the non-aligned countries in the field of disarmament. They give a straightforward answer to some of the thoughts, ideas and concerns expressed, inter alia, at the summit Meeting of the leaders of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement.

(Mr. Natorf, Poland)

Furthermore, they also address directly Soviet-United States relations, that is the relations between the two Powers which bear a special responsibility for maintaining peace in the world and which, because of their potentials, play a particular role in international relations.

In his statement of 28 September 1983 the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Yuri V. Andropov, said inter alia:

"All who today raise their voice against the senseless arms race and in defence of peace can be sure that the policy of the Soviet Union and of other socialist countries is directed at attaining precisely these aims. The USSR wishes to live in peace with all countries, including the United States. It does not nurture aggressive plans, does not impose the arms race on anyone and does not impose its social systems on anyone."

The Soviet initiatives, with their constructive approach, constitute, in our opinion, important and feasible measures. It is the duty of this Committee to give the Soviet proposals the most serious consideration for there is no more important and vital task than averting the danger of a thermonuclear holocaust.

Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish, Sir, to first extend to you my congratulations on your election as Chairman of this important Committee. We are sure that, thanks to your efforts and your long experience, the work of this Committee will be crowned with success. I also congratulate the other officers of the Committee on their election.

Some days ago our Committee began its general debate on questions relating to disarmament and international security, which are matters of great concern to all the peoples of the world. Despite our recognition of their importance and the close links between them, however, the course that events have taken has been a source of profound disappointment and disillusionment as far as the achievement of our objectives is concerned. International relations have not improved. It could even be said that the international situation has deteriorated and has taken a very serious turn, which can only lead to a conflagration that risks leading to a nuclear war. This is due to a series of circumstances marked by very serious problems and complex international crises which the international bodies have not so far succeeded in resolving.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

Among these problems I would mention the armaments race, which still constitutes one of the most alarming problems confronting mankind. This is particularly true of the nuclear arms race, which since its appearance on the international scene has added a new dimension to the very concept of war and has become a source of serious concern, fear and terror threatening the survival of mankind. These dangers have been aggravated by the production and accumulation of nuclear weapons by certain countries, the improvement and sophistication of these weapons and their means of delivery, in addition to the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction and chemical and other no less destructive weapons.

The doctrines used to justify the nuclear arms race, which are based upon the balance of terror and deterrence, and the publicity concerning the possibility of a winnable limited nuclear war have been additional factors exacerbating the situation.

To examine the question of security from the military point of view and that of the balance of terror and mutual deterrence would be to subject the security of peoples to the decision of a limited number of countries possessing the power and the weapons - countries which consider only their own interests and those of their allies with no thought of the interests and the security of other peoples. The assurance of such security is a way of imposing trusteeship by the minority over the majority of peoples and constitutes a denial of the rights of peoples that have struggled for their freedom and independence, to throw off the domination of others and to live in peace and security. Security based upon force and the doctrine of deterrence and the balance of terror is contrary to internationally accepted principles and international instruments on the strengthening of international peace and security.

Furthermore, the security situation in the world shows quite clearly that security based upon force is extremely fragile security, for the accumulation of destructive weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States and their ability to destroy the world several times over has not provided real security. The accumulation of these weapons only creates a general feeling of insecurity.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

The Final Document adopted by consensus, stresses that the accumulation of weapons, which was in particular nuclear weapons, is a very serious threat to the survival of mankind rather than a protection of human civilization. The accumulation of these weapons in no way contributes to the strengthening of international security. The disturbances and the disorder that prevail everywhere in the world are proof of this.

The arms race has encouraged recourse to force or the threat of force in international relations. The phenomenon of the use or the threat of the use of force has become the basis of the policy of the forces of imperialism and the colonialist régimes in order to impose their rule by force. This has taken different forms, such as direct aggression, the use of colonialist military forces - above all those of the United States - in different regions of the world, and acts of provocation carried out by the fleet and military aircraft of the United States, not to mention acts of provocation off the shores of Libya and in its airspace, the fomenting of trouble within the country and of civil and regional wars, and intervention in the internal affairs of other countries by United States imperialism. These colonialist policies have transformed several regions of the world into theatres of conflict and zones of increased tension. These are particularly serious in the Middle East, on the Mediterranean shores, in Africa, in the Pacific Ocean region, in Europe and in the Caribbean, as well as in other regions. All of this constitutes a very serious threat to international peace and security.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

There can be no doubt that total disarmament is an objective which we should all pursue. The United Nations, in conformity with the Charter, should assume a major responsibility in respect of disarmament. In order to permit the United Nations to discharge its role, we have combined our efforts to eliminate the seeds of war and conflict which lead to international conflicts, above all by countries possessing nuclear weapons, which bear particular responsibility for the prevention of war. It is up to these countries to show signs of political will and a serious intent to overcome the obstacles which now block the road to the adoption of measures for general and complete disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament.

Among these obstacles, I have in mind the failure to respect resolutions and programmes adopted by the General Assembly, some of which were adopted by consensus. This fact constitutes an obstacle to the work of the Disarmament Commission, which is the only forum for multilateral negotiation in this area. The report submitted in document A/38/36 shows that very little progress has been made in respect of disarmament and, above all, as concerns matters of great importance for the peoples of the world, such as the ban on nuclear tests and the refusal to use the threat of nuclear force.

We have a very negative picture of the situation as it exists in the world. When we look at all of this, when we consider our collective responsibilities in respect of disarmament, my country supports the efforts made by the United Nations and would appeal to all Members of the United Nations responsible for disarmament and security to discharge the tasks incumbent upon them by virtue of the Charter and in respect of the maintenance of international peace and security, and to contribute to a successful outcome of the negotiations on disarmament. In order to achieve this, my country will support every bilateral and multilateral effort being made which reflects the aspirations of the peoples, as expressed in resolutions and in the peace movements which we are witnessing these days, since all countries are threatened.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

History shows that this is the case. History since the last two wars shows that the threat of war is still with us and that the destruction and devastation caused by these wars continues to have an effect on the peoples, above all for the Libyan people, whose territory was a theatre of the Second World War where large stretches of Libyan territory have never been cleared of the mines that were sown there in the war, and every year these mines cause hundreds of victims. The consequences of these wars are there to show us, still today, what would be the outcome of another war, especially a nuclear war.

There will be no sense in talking about disarmament at a time when certain countries are declaring their intention to station nuclear missiles in Europe and thus to increase the tension and the confrontation between the two great Powers. In view of the negative consequences of this, the bilateral negotiations on such strategic weapons have not yet had any outcome, despite the declarations of intention and despite the initiatives taken by the great Powers. This is because of the absence of any will for disarmament in this particular area and in particular because of the mistrust among the super-Powers and the lack of interest in other factors of disarmament. The decisions adopted to instal weapons of mass destruction in various parts of the world and the militarization of outer space will result in a new cycle of the arms race.

Among the factors which increase the danger of nuclear weapons, I would cite the vertical proliferation and the acquisition of such weapons perfected by colonialism and, in particular, by the imperialist countries which are steadily developing weapons of mass destruction. In this connection, I would refer to the report which mentions the acquisition by the régime in South Africa and the Zionist régime in Palestine of nuclear weapons, which are not only a threat to peace and security in the Middle East and in the African countries, but to the peace and security of the world as a whole.

The acquisition of these arms by the two racist régimes was due to the support of Western imperialist régimes, in particular, the United States of America. Their co-operation in the exchange of expertise and the development of such weapons had been discussed in many reports, and I would limit myself to mentioning here document A/38/24, part III, which describes the co-operation between the two racist régimes in the development of strategic missiles, which could be installed on aircraft and which could fly over the territory of a State very rapidly and could easily cause destruction at a distance of 2,700 kilometres.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

In another document, we see that the United States and certain Western countries are encouraging these two racist régimes by their nuclear and military co-operation. The acquisition of nuclear weapons by these two racist régimes in South Africa and Palestine are violations of resolutions which make Africa and the Middle East nuclear-free zones, and are a threat to the peoples of the two regions because of the aggressive and bellicose nature of the Zionist entity.

To show our good faith in our struggle for disarmament, and in order to give force to the commitment which we have signed in the Charter, namely to preserve future generations from the scourge of war, we should adopt practical and tangible measures prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons. We should also develop a treaty on the overall prohibition of nuclear tests and against the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the liquidation of all weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons, the creation of nuclear-free zones, and the creation of zones of peace and security.

In this context, although we condemn nuclear weapons, we approve of nuclear energy in its peaceful uses for economic development.

My country, like all other States, has liquidated colonialism and has put an end to foreign domination. What is more, my country calls upon others to transform the Mediterranean into a zone of peace by eliminating all factors of instability caused by the existence of naval forces and colonial naval bases and the installation of nuclear weapons, which are a threat to peace and security in this zone. We also support the appeal that the Indian Ocean be made a nuclear-free zone, as well as a zone free of all foreign naval forces. These aims will never be realized as long as aggression is continued in the world and as long as injustice exists.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Thus, while we spend \$800 billion on armaments, millions of people are deprived of the most elementary necessities, 750 million persons throughout the world are the victims of hunger, more than 1.5 billion lack medical care and millions of others are illiterate. This is at a time when a single country spends \$240 billion every year on weapons and \$4.5 billion every year on its rapid deployment force. According to the strategic analysis review published by the Institute of Strategic and Defence Studies in New Delhi, if this military budget continues to the year 2000 nearly \$940 billion will be spent on armaments.

I think that we should free these resources and put them at the service of mankind and world peace and security.

Mr. ELFAKI (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): First of all, I wish to express our condolences to the delegations of the United States of America and France at the serious loss of life in Beirut.

This year the session of the First Committee of the General Assembly is taking place in a situation characterized by tension, anxiety and the increased threat to all mankind caused by the stepping-up of the arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race, which daily heightens international tension and impedes efforts to establish international relations based on peaceful coexistence, mutual trust and co-operation among States. That threat also impedes the application of the principles of the United Nations Charter, especially those concerning respect for the sovereignty of States, the non-use of force or the threat of force against the security of States, the political independence of States, and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Although responsibility for applying the principles of the United Nations Charter falls on all States Members of the United Nations, it is particularly incumbent upon the nuclear-weapon States, in particular the super-Powers, to protect mankind from the scourge of a war of mass destruction. The nuclear weapons that the major Powers have developed and acquired have radically changed the concept and the character of warfare. They have made the questions of halting the arms race and freeing the international community from the threat of war questions that pertain to the very survival of the human race and of civilization.

The stepping up of the arms race and the dangers inherent therein - that is, the deterioration of political relations among States and the greater risk of a nuclear or a conventional war - have made us more aware today than ever before that

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

international peace and security can only be guaranteed through general and complete disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament under effective international control. General and complete disarmament can come about only through an effective international institution in which the political will of States can be expressed and whose very basis is the principle of equality among States, objectivity and impartiality - elements which form an indivisible whole.

In considering the role of the existing disarmament agencies, I wish to refer to the sole international negotiating forum within the United Nations, that is, the Committee on Disarmament, which has recently come to be called the Conference on Disarmament. The creation of that body as the sole multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament was dictated by several considerations. By way of example, I shall mention: First the fact that disarmament has direct repercussions on the vital security interests of all States. Therefore all States must fulfil their duty by making effective contributions to the development of international measures designed to bring about disarmament and strengthen international security.

Secondly, nuclear disarmament constitutes the most important security guarantees for all States in the world, especially since nuclear-weapon technology has weakened the concept of national boundaries. Those boundaries were established in the past to prevent conventional types of warfare and guarantee the security of all States. However the security of any State will be diminished and will remain so without the elimination of nuclear weapons from the face of the earth.

Thirdly, the concept of the strengthening of security is the main concept underlying all disarmament measures.

We, therefore welcome the recommendations of the Committee on Disarmament concerning the review of its composition and the admission of new members in order to conserve equitable geographic distribution and the balance that must be maintained among all States.

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

I now wish to turn to the question of the mandate of the Disarmament Commission and the questions on its agenda. Concerning the cessation of the nuclear arms race, it is most regrettable that although the international community, in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, stressed the fact that the most important of the dangers threatening mankind was that posed by nuclear weaponry, nothing has been done in that connection. The Final Document stressed in particular that the accumulation of weapons, and in particular nuclear weapons, was now a threat to the survival of mankind rather than protection of civilization.

"Mankind today is confronted with an unprecedented threat of self-extinction arising from the massive and competitive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced. Existing arsenals of nuclear weapons alone are more than sufficient to destroy all life on Earth." (A/S-10/4, para. 11)

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

What is also deplorable is that the Disarmament Commission has not succeeded until now in establishing a working group on this important subject and for implementing effective measures to curb and reverse the arms race.

We hope that the Committee on Disarmament will intensify its efforts during its next session to adopt a joint approach so as to discharge the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly for nuclear disarmament.

As non-nuclear States have done, Sudan attaches special importance to the item concerning effective means of strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against them. We must unfortunately note that the Committee on Disarmament has not been able to make any headway in this field because of the adherence of nuclear-weapon States to their unilateral declarations that have been made concerning such assurances. We should like to assert once again the special responsibility incumbent upon nuclear-weapon States to give assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States not to use such weapons against them nor to threaten to use them.

The stubbornness of the nuclear-weapon States concerning the elimination of reservations and exceptions that were made in their unilateral declarations runs counter to their commitment to give sound guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States regarding the non-use of such weapons against them. While we demand these assurances from the nuclear-weapon States, we are aware of the fact that these will not stop us from demanding the most effective assurances against the threat or use of nuclear weapons, namely, nuclear disarmament and the prohibition of nuclear weapons under any circumstances. We follow very keenly the efforts of the Working Group on the comprehensive Programme of Disarmament under the chairmanship of Mr. Garcia-Robles. In this connection, we note with regret that, despite the efforts made by the Working Group, no agreement has been reached on the difficulties that prevented the full establishment of that programme in its final version. The programme calls for the acceleration of negotiations in order to smooth out difficulties and to reconcile views on those questions on which there is no agreement as yet. In Geneva at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Governments of Non-Aligned Countries placed emphasis on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, I should like to express our support for the proposal made by Mr. Garcia-Robles which is intended to smooth out difficulties and to reconcile

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

views on those questions on which there is as yet no agreement and to submit to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly of a revised Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament.

Sudan is also concerned over the question of the cessation of the arms race in outer space and attaches great importance to this issue in view of the repercussions of the arms race on international peace and security. With the rapid progress taking place in space technology, we are today in a position to know what the potential is for the peaceful technical, scientific, economic and cultural development for our countries. It is all the more regrettable, since the General Assembly has decided that outer space is the common heritage of mankind, that we see it becoming a new arena, a new laboratory so to speak, for anti-satellite weapons and intercontinental ballistic weapons and anti-ICBMs.

Today we are at the crossroads. Either we adopt urgent measures designed to put an end to the arms race in outer space so as to use that area, which has been termed the common heritage of mankind, for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of all, or else outer space will become a new theatre for the arms race.

Last year a meeting was held on this subject and deep concern was expressed over the possibility of extending the arms race to outer space, and the international community was called upon to adopt effective measures in order to put an end to this race and to the militarization of outer space. The forum for implementing that measure is the Conference on Disarmament, and the Assembly has asked it to establish a working group in order to re-examine this item. We hope that the Conference on Disarmament will be in a position, in pursuance of the mandate entrusted to it, to examine this question at its next session.

We have followed with some optimism the work being done by the Committee on Disarmament on chemical weapons and the measures necessary to ban such weapons. We are also closely following the progress achieved, which we hope will be increased, in drafting the treaty that we are all anxiously awaiting. We are also closely following the activities of the Working Group entrusted with drafting of a convention on chemical weapons and on verifying a ban on chemical weapons. We hope that fresh progress will be recorded in preparing a treaty that will not be discriminatory and can receive the support of the greatest number of States. We are convinced that the existing means of control, monitoring and verification are sufficient for a partial test-ban treaty to be prepared and implemented.

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

We do indeed attach great importance to the Committee on Disarmament as a multilateral negotiating body and as the body responsible for the work being done in Geneva. This year the Committee has made some progress, inter alia, in relation to confidence-building measures. We attach particular importance to these measures and their role in the field of general and complete disarmament. We think that at a time when the process of disarmament seems to have come to a halt, and the arms race is proceeding at a dizzying speed, particular attention should be given to these measures because they could lead to both nuclear and conventional disarmament and could further the cause of general and complete disarmament. Those confidence-building measures do not concern only the super-Powers. They could strengthen confidence among developing countries themselves, because confidence based on faith in the good will of States to co-operate is an essential element in the conduct of States, and could help to lower tension, strengthen confidence among States and avoid misunderstandings or wrong assessments of the state of affairs.

We are convinced that in order to perfect a positive concept of confidence-building measures, the question should be looked at as a whole, which would lead to the adoption of political, economic and social measures. Reduction of the danger of war will be impossible in the absence of a climate of confidence in international relations. This confidence must be based on respect for the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law, as well as on the principles in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. On the basis of this new idea we welcome the proposal by the Federal Republic of Germany, and we hope that the Committee on Disarmament will be able to examine those principles and guidelines, which could form the basis for confidence-building measures.

This year the General Assembly is to examine the proposals in the important report of the Independent Commission on Security and Disarmament under the title "Common Security: A Programme for Disarmament". We welcome the report of this body in the field of international efforts to bring about disarmament and the strengthening of international peace and security. Moreover, we support the recommendation of the Committee on Disarmament that this report should be taken into consideration in the context of current and future disarmament work.

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

Reduction of military budgets, which is one of the items on our Committee's agenda for this year, must be examined within the context of an international approach to disarmament which takes due account of the aims and principles of the United Nations Charter. My country, which has had the honour of being one of the first group of States to report the military expenditures of their countries to the Secretary-General, attaches particular importance to this question, and wishes to appeal to all States, particularly those with large military arsenals, to make every effort to reach international agreements on the reduction of military budgets which could later lead to a genuine reduction of forces and military budgets and thus to the strengthening of international peace and security.

The report adopted by the First Committee last year, which was prepared by a group of experts under the chairmanship of Mrs. Inga Thorsson and entitled "The Relationship between Disarmament and Development" provides a very constructive approach to the release of the human and financial resources now allocated to armaments for channelling into economic and social development. We support the recommendations in the report and should like countries to take account of them, particularly the countries with the largest military budgets and those which are spending the most on nuclear weapons.

In concluding this section of my statement, I should like to express my regret that the Committee on Disarmament was not able to adopt a report by consensus on the nuclear capacity of South Africa. That item has appeared on its agenda every year since 1979. It is clear that the racist régime of Pretoria resorted to the military option, and in particular the nuclear option, after its banishment from the international scene, and has made use of its weapons to persecute and oppress the peoples both within and outside its borders. The racist régime, in order to attain its military objectives and to develop nuclear weapons, has even co-operated with certain States Members of this Organization, in particular with Israel. The nuclear potential of the racist régime of South Africa, used to carry out its racist policies is a matter of deep concern to the African countries, which in 1964, at the first African summit meeting expressed their desire for Africa to be declared a nuclear-weapon-free zone. The Sudan, inspired by its commitment to abide by the resolution of the Organization of African States (OAU) to make Africa a nuclear-weapon-free zone, calls on the Committee to take steps to prevent the racist régime of South Africa from acquiring nuclear weapons and nuclear technology. It likewise calls on the General Assembly to adopt measures to end the

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

co-operation between South Africa and States providing it with nuclear technology. Sudan demands that Security Council resolutions relating to international security be complied with, in order to meet the danger represented by the nuclear power of South Africa and its effects on international peace and security.

Making the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone has proved impossible because of Israel's stubborn refusal to submit its nuclear installations to international control and to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We ask this Committee to make recommendations concerning the need for all States to respect their commitments to the United Nations Charter and to halt all nuclear co-operation with Israel likely to increase its nuclear potential, and requiring Israel to accept all non-proliferation measures, to place its nuclear installations under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and accept the Agency's safeguards system.

In conclusion, I wish to refer to the bilateral talks which are going on outside the United Nations. Mrs. Thorsson of Sweden said in her report that there was hope that these negotiations would lead to an improvement in the international climate. The absence of any progress in the negotiations on the reduction of strategic nuclear forces and of intermediate-range nuclear forces, the Geneva negotiations and the talks on force reductions that are also taking place in Geneva, is a source of deep concern and frustration. The failure of these negotiations could lead to a most dangerous escalation in the arms race, in both nuclear and conventional weapons. We appeal to both super-Powers to pursue their negotiations with more determination and sincerity, because we know now that any failure could have very serious consequences and grave repercussions on international peace and security.

Mr. KOR BUN HENG (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French): I should like to join with other delegations who have expressed their condolences to the delegations of the United States and France in connection with the events of yesterday in Beirut.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to address to you the sincere and warm congratulations of the delegation of Democratic Kampuchea on your unanimous election as Chairman of this Committee. This election is a well-earned homage to your personal qualities. It is an honour to your country, Norway, which has made a great contribution to the cause of international peace and security, as well as to that of the independence of countries. Your competence, wisdom and long experience which are well known to all of us are the surest guarantees of the success of our very complex deliberations here. My delegation would also like to congratulate the other officers of the Committee and assure you of our complete co-operation.

As in previous years, the General Assembly at its last session adopted a series of resolutions on disarmament. However, the list of items on the agenda of our Committee remains even longer and more impressive than ever. The arms race is increasingly unrestrained and the world situation is more distressing than ever. The International Institute of Strategic Studies in London emphasized in its last report that, while no tangible facts were available on the quantitative evolution of the arms race, qualitative competition makes control of armaments increasingly difficult.

However, this does not mean that we should be fatalistic about it. We think that, in this vital area for the survival of mankind, perseverance and a genuine determination to succeed are indispensable qualities and that, consequently, we should denounce and unequivocally condemn all rhetoric and any attempt to use the rostrum of the United Nations for propaganda designed to mask the arms race.

My delegation is ready to support any sincere or effective measure designed to prevent nuclear war, which is the supreme challenge of our time. However, we should like to discuss in more detail the question of conventional weapons. Although they do not have the destructive power of nuclear weapons, conventional weapons are becoming increasingly sophisticated, and extremely deadly and destructive. What is more, they absorb four fifths of the military budgets of the world. Moreover, since the end of the Second World War, the various wars which have been waged in many regions of the world - such as that which Kampuchea, my country, suffered five years ago - have all been fought with conventional weapons.

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng, Democratic
Kampuchea)

In his report on the activities of the Organization, the Secretary-General stated:

"The situation relating to conventional arms is a source of increasing concern. It is necessary to bear in mind that the many millions killed in war since Hiroshima and Nagasaki have all died from conventional weapons."

(A/38/1, p. 6)

During the general debate in the General Assembly, many countries echoed this concern. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, His Excellency, Mr. Uffe Ellemann-Jensen, stressed:

"We must not forget, however, that wars can be fought with fewer, or less deadly, weapons. It is not enough to look at the means of war; we must identify the causes and try to eliminate them." (A/38/PV.8, p. 96)

My delegation fully appreciates the wisdom of this approach to the problem, which contributes to the realization of the noble aim proclaimed almost four decades ago in our Charter of saving "succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

The tragedy of my country today, victim of a war of aggression and genocide conducted by Viet Nam, more than justifies my delegation's belief that it has a duty to participate in the international community's effort to identify and eliminate the causes of the wars now being waged in various regions of the world, and thus to help in curbing the arms race.

I should like to mention two striking events of recent years which continue to be a great source of concern to the international community because they undermine respect for the cardinal principles of the United Nations Charter and even the role of our Organization.

The first of these events took place in my own country, Democratic Kampuchea. I should point out that, scarcely three months after being admitted as a Member State of the United Nations in September 1977, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam launched the first of its present day invasions against my country, which was repulsed in January 1978. Scarcely five months after the adoption of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament in June 1978, that same Socialist Republic of Viet Nam on 3 November 1978 signed with the Soviet Union a veritable military alliance under the guise of a "treaty of friendship and co-operation". On

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng, Democratic
Kampuchea)

25 December 1978, with massive Soviet military assistance, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam launched its second invasion of Kampuchea, which has continued to this very day.

The second event occurred a year later. Two weeks after our General Assembly had adopted the resolution proposed by the Soviet Union on "inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations" (resolution 34/103), the Soviet Union itself invaded Afghanistan.

These two wars of aggression, committed in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and of international law against two sovereign States Members of the United Nations and of the Non-Aligned Movement, are being fought, under the slogans of, in Kampuchea, "friendship and special solidarity", now transformed into a "militant alliance", and in Afghanistan under the slogan of "fraternity and natural alliance". However, from the beginning the international community has clearly understood the real aims of those committing these acts of aggression: expansionism, and regional or world domination.

Exploiting the peoples' desire for peace, these expansionists continue to talk of "disarmament", "détente" and "peace", while their actions are the contrary of what they profess. They are using the rostrum of the United Nations, and of other international organizations, not for frank discussion based on a sincere desire to apply specific measures of disarmament, but rather for grandiloquent declamations to camouflage their accelerated arms race in both conventional and nuclear weapons.

In South-East Asia and in the Pacific, while its representatives are making their rhetorical flourishes on peace and disarmament, the Soviet Union continues to increase its nuclear and conventional armaments.

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng, Democratic
Kampuchea)

We have learnt that 108 Soviet missiles of the SS-20 type, with three nuclear warheads each, have been deployed near Lake Baikal, and that construction is in progress in order to double the number of these missiles, which, since their range is 4,800 kilometres, can thus easily reach targets in South-East Asia. Furthermore, 40 backfire bombers are deployed in the same area and in the Kamchatka Peninsula, and 30 more backfires are deployed on aircraft carriers of the Soviet fleet in the Indian Ocean.

We have also learnt that the Soviet air force in East Asia has increased from 300 aircraft in 1966 to more than 1,700 today, that is to say, almost six times. The Soviet navy in the Indian Ocean consists of 765 ships, including 220 nuclear submarines with ballistic missiles. It is the largest fleet of the Soviet navy and also the largest in the world. Furthermore, we know that the Soviet military presence in South-East Asia is eight times what it was 20 years ago.

As for Viet Nam itself, in exchange for military assistance and support of many kinds from the expansionist super-Power in carrying on their war of aggression and genocide in Kampuchea, the authorities in Hanoi have placed at its disposal the military bases of Cam Ranh and Danang. At the present time, 20 Soviet warships, including six submarines, of which three are nuclear, are cruising in the South China Sea and carrying out constant surveillance of the vital lines of communication between the Pacific Ocean and the Indian Ocean via the Malacca Straits, through which pass 50 per cent of all of the world's oil tankers. Soviet aircraft of the Bear D type based at Danang do reconnaissance flights on a regular basis over the South-East Asian countries and over northern Australia, while other aircraft of the Bear F type operate as far as the Indian Ocean. The Soviet Union has installed a vast network of electronic surveillance in Viet Nam and is in the process of transforming the ports of Kompong Som and Ream, in Kampuchea into aero-naval bases, thus enabling its ships to reach the Malacca Straits rapidly and become master of the Gulf of Thailand.

In order to provide itself with the means necessary for its expansionist policy, Viet Nam which since 1975 has proclaimed itself "the firm and sure advance-post of the socialist camp in South-East Asia," continues to maintain an army of 1.2 million men, to which should be added 2 million men and women in the militia and other para-military units. One Vietnamese in 16 is thus under arms. In proportion to its population, Viet Nam possesses the largest army in the world.

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng, Democratic
Kampuchea)

In absolute figures it is the third largest army in the world. In proportion to its population, Viet Nam maintains the largest number of soldiers in foreign territories - that is, more than 200,000 soldiers in Kampuchea and more than 60,000 in Laos.

In order to supply this army, which is in the service of Viet Nam's expansionist policy, the authorities in Hanoi devote more than 50 per cent of their national budget to military expenditure. It is obvious that Viet Nam could not maintain this impressive war machine without the enormous Soviet assistance, which is estimated at more than US \$2 billion a year. But today, with their war of aggression in Kampuchea bogged down, this Soviet assistance is no longer sufficient. That is why the Hanoi authorities are trying to entice certain countries, exploiting their humanitarian feelings, to provide economic assistance. But it is well known that every dollar of assistance to Viet Nam, even humanitarian assistance, is immediately transformed into a weapon with which to kill the people of Kampuchea and help Viet Nam pursue its policy of expansion in South-East Asia.

The expansionist Vietnamese policy is the direct cause of this frenzied over-armament. The powerful Vietnamese war machine has devastated Kampuchea and massacred several hundred thousand of my compatriots by means of famine or arms, conventional arms and by chemical and bacteriological arms, to which my delegation will revert in a subsequent statement. The maintenance of this war machine has led to a steady fall in the living standards of the people of Viet Nam, which are today worse than they were in 1975. The impoverishment of Viet Nam is general.

The draining of the human and economic resources of Viet Nam in the service of this policy of expansionism is explained by the 50-year-old dream of the Vietnamese Communist Party of creating an Indo-Chinese federation under Vietnamese domination, which would constitute a first step towards the establishment by the end of this century of a union of socialist republics of South-East Asia. This expansionist strategy is openly professed at the Ai Quoc Institute, which is the training school for the Vietnamese Communist Party in Hanoi.

We all know that there is a dynamic interaction between the arms race and wars of aggression or expansion, which destroy the independence of States and international security and prevent economic development. The Declaration of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament states explicitly that

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng, Democratic
Kampuchea)

"The arms race impedes the realization of the purposes, and is incompatible with the principles, of the Charter of the United Nations, especially respect for sovereignty, refraining from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, the peaceful settlement of disputes and non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States. It also adversely affects the right of peoples freely to determine their systems of social and economic development, and hinders the struggle for self-determination and the elimination of colonial rule, racial or foreign domination or occupation." (resolution S-10/2, para. 12)

This interaction is manifested in Kampuchea, Afghanistan, Lebanon and Chad - to mention only the most recent instances - where aggressive wars destroy the independence of States, threaten the security of peoples, endanger regional and international peace and security, and run the risk of leading to a generalized conflagration involving the use of nuclear weapons.

In this sense, the struggle against wars of aggression and expansion is an important contribution to the efforts of the international community to put an end to or at least curb the arms race. Only by stepping up the struggle, in close co-operation and with international support, will we compel the aggressors to end their war and withdraw their forces of aggression.

In the specific case of Kampuchea, my country, a prerequisite for the settlement of the problem generated by the Vietnamese war of aggression is the total and unconditional withdrawal of the Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea in conformity with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and the Declaration of the International Conference on Kampuchea. This would enable the people of Kampuchea to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination.

When this sine qua non has been fulfilled, the tragedy of the people and nation of Kampuchea will end. A zone of peace, freedom and neutrality can be established in South-East Asia, putting an end to the arms race in this region of the world, in the interest of the entire international community.

Mr. BLANCO (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): First of all, Mr. Chairman, I wish to extend to you my heartfelt congratulations upon your election to the post of Chairman of the First Committee. I am convinced that your skill and experience, together with the noble traditions of your country, Norway, will be very important factor in guiding the work of the First Committee to a successful conclusion. I also wish to greet the other officers of the Committee to whom, along with you, Sir, I offer the constructive and complete co-operation of my delegation. I should also like to extend our greetings to your predecessor, Mr. Gbeho of Ghana, for his efforts in guiding the work of the First Committee at the last session of the General Assembly.

Before beginning my statement, I should like to express my sincere condolences to the delegations of the United States of America and France for the tragic events which took place yesterday in Lebanon.

At the end of a major war, the authors of our Charter were guided by the overriding concern of preserving peace, and perhaps today, United Nations Day, it might be useful to recall one of the precepts that guided their efforts. They formed this Organization to carry out the task of preserving peace and made that its first objective, together with that of maintaining international peace and security. Recourse to force, or the mere threat of force, were banned. The Security Council had the monopoly of coercive measures, including the use of force. According to the Charter self-defence remained as a kind of extra option until the Security Council is in a position to act.

The Charter presupposes that Member States would place all means at their disposal at the service of the Council, including special contingents of their armed forces. It was envisaged that the General Assembly would establish principles for disarmament and for regulating weapons as part of the principles that were to govern international co-operation for maintaining peace and security. At the same time, the Security Council would also be responsible for preparing plans for the establishment of a system of arms regulation which it would submit to Member States.

Under the Charter system it was also assumed that the prohibition of the use of force and the control of coercive and enforcement measures by the Security Council would create appropriate conditions for establishing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, thereby consolidating peace.

(Mr. Blanco, Uruguay)

It was hoped that the political conditions that prevailed at the time would last, particularly the solidarity among major Powers and that there would be an understanding between them which would make it possible to act collectively if faced with common threats. With such an outlook, the right of veto appeared as a last resort, an exceptional measure for very few and extreme situations.

We all know full well that this is very far from the reality of today's world. Nobody can ignore the division of the world into blocs and alliances, the existence of strong antagonisms and conflicts, the growing arms race, the open manifestation of violence and terrorism and the recourse to force beyond the bounds of international legality.

We live in an insecure world in which peace is precarious, where the ability of small and medium-sized countries to develop their policies without the risk of external interferences has diminished and where the uncertainty of nuclear catastrophe prevails.

We should ask whether it is still possible to reconcile the principles of the Charter with the harsh realities of today and to deal with the excesses of the present situation within the United Nations system. The work of the First Committee is really at the centre of this matter. It would be futile to ignore the present. It would also be regrettable to accept the situation passively, but between one attitude and the other there is a broad area for creative effort and the delegation of Uruguay will act with this in mind.

General and complete disarmament must be the final objective of our efforts, but this objective cannot be pursued in a vacuum, disregarding tensions and conflicts. The accumulation of weapons cannot be dissociated from the context of political conditions; and at the same time, conflicts and tensions are aggravated by the accumulation of weapons.

It is therefore necessary to break this vicious circle in order to consolidate peace. I believe that in the first place the obvious point of departure is the political will of States to act in strict conformity with the rules of international law, in particular in strict observance of the principles of self-determination and non-intervention. The frequent reference to these in the most varied cases and circumstances sometimes leads us to forget about their real content, which is essential for the topic before us. Indeed, an important part of

(Mr. Blanco, Uruguay)

the tension is produced when one or more States do not agree with the political system or ideology of another or others, and then try to change it, directly or indirectly, to mold it to their own criterion and eventually to subject it to their domination or influence.

Destabilizing actions, support for terrorist and subversive activities, the promotion of adventurism by mercenaries, undercover intelligence work to promote changes in other countries are deplorable facts of daily occurrence which generate tension and violence. It is clear that in the midst of such a process of interference it is utopian to think of disarmament.

Therefore, we need to act in this field as a priority issue. Among other steps we should consider the renewal of the commitment of non-intervention, of respect for the political, economic and social processes of other States, and perhaps formulate certain basic rules of behaviour, certain guidelines of conduct, based on numerous existing international instruments on the subject, and then establish flexible mechanisms for evaluation.

In any event, it is essential to have an informed, alert and more and more demanding world public opinion, of respect for non-interference, which would be looked upon as a reciprocal and non-discriminatory mode of behaviour, applied across the board, both in similar as well as alien systems.

The strict observance of international law should be accompanied, in the second place, with confidence-building measures, that is to say, with positive acts which foster understanding and goodwill. From this perspective, precepts of good neighbourliness will play a very important role. It is also possible here again to agree on a series of guidelines and criteria which will serve to heighten friendship and constructive relations. This should also be supplemented by systems of assessment and follow-up.

Thirdly, the proper functioning of the United Nations is essential. Hence, my delegation attributes singular importance to the proposals of the Secretary-General concerning the development of United Nations operations for maintaining international peace and security through appropriate collective action. In this connection, the need to support and promote collectively the action of the Secretary-General and to try to adjust existing mechanisms for the peaceful settlement of disputes, rendering its application more systematic is essential. Uruguay, consistent with its long tradition on the subject, would like a

(Mr. Blanco, Uruguay)

jurisdictional approach to the settlement of disputes to be fully developed. It would be desirable if we could all unite in an appeal to all Member States to accept the automatic jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice pursuant to Article 36 of its statute. Likewise, it would help create an appropriate climate of confidence to include, in domestic law, rules at the highest level, making it compulsory for States, in their international relations, to use peaceful means in settling disputes, including arbitration and international jurisdiction.

Some of the aspects that I have indicated go beyond the agenda of the First Committee. Nevertheless, my delegation believed it necessary to refer to them as a whole because the possibility of creating a propitious environment for disarmament depends on all of them.

(Mr. Blanco, Uruguay)

It is obvious that it is necessary to make headway in the field of disarmament as such. It is clear that without specific steps in this direction confidence and international security will continue to deteriorate. Disarmament might have appeared to the drafters of the Charter to be a viable and not too remote objective, in the context of the political situation at that time. Nevertheless, the Organization was not given the juridical powers in order to impose it. The final decision remained in the hands of Member States. This implies, therefore, that in juridical terms disarmament is only possible through negotiation. This simple juridical fact coincides, furthermore with the present political reality. In the light of all this, the path of negotiation is the only possibility.

The nature of the question of disarmament generates negotiating mechanisms outside the Organization, and I suppose it is normal that this should be the case. Although the preference of my Government is that negotiations be within the context of the United Nations, the use of other courses might be necessary in the present circumstances. The present pattern of political and military forces, as well as the concentration of the biggest arsenals of the most destructive weapons, underscores the very serious responsibility of the major military Powers in seeking satisfactory formulas for disarmament. Although the present scenario is not encouraging, the very nature of the question, which is vital for the entire world, should prevail over any other consideration. This is why we must hope and wish that the talks in Geneva and Vienna, as well as the bilateral dialogues, will have positive results. Any headway made in these forums would undoubtedly contribute to reducing tensions. Moreover, it would give a very strong impetus towards disarmament everywhere not least in the United Nations.

I think that in this sense we should reaffirm our support for the letter and the spirit of the resolution adopted at the thirty-seventh session concerning the talks between the United States and the Soviet Union in Geneva, which urged the parties to seek significant results. A similar appeal is made in connection with other negotiations.

The method of negotiation should prevail also in the work of this Committee and that of the General Assembly. The search for a broad-based and genuinely accepted consensus provides the political basis necessary for resolutions to make the greatest impact and become operative and effective instruments for peace.

(Mr. Blanco, Uruguay)

My delegation considers, therefore, that progress in the disarmament process must be sought in parallel in the various forums by means of realistic negotiations conducted in good faith. In the final analysis these would complement each other and lead to the objective of general and complete disarmament.

The context of existing political and military conditions shows clearly that disarmament not only must be achieved through negotiations, but also must be balanced and mutual, and the agreements which are reached must be verifiable to the satisfaction of all parties. Measures or programmes which do not confirm to these conditions will be ineffectual and will lack political support. Disarmament cannot be imposed; nor could disarmament that involved any imbalance of forces or imposed duties on one party only be accepted.

The present situation, dominated in practically all its facets by strategic equilibrium, is not a satisfactory solution as a formula for peaceful coexistence. Being in itself a precarious situation, it entails risks with universal repercussions. To envisage a state of permanent tension and fear in major areas of the world is a serious mistake. Peace through terror cannot be the aim of our efforts. We must work for peace and security under the rule of law.

Although since the Second World War the industrialized nations have enjoyed prolonged periods of peace, this has not been the situation for many developing countries. It would appear, tragically, that here too the same differences exist between one group of countries and others.

Therefore an order in which it would be possible, selectively, to admit external influences - the drafting of mercenaries, destabilizing activities from outside, including subversion and terrorism for many countries - is unsuitable. These are for most of those represented here the daily threats which are most tangible and are the reason for increasing armament.

In the so-called regional crises or conflicts - which some call "peripheral" - there are very often local characteristics and factors. But it is clear that in general these are exacerbated and used, if not created, by foreign and alien forces and interests.

This wide zone of instability and tension should be analysed; otherwise, the exercise of the inherent right of self-defence will inevitably lead to an increase in the arsenals of these countries as their sole form of preserving their national

(Mr. Blanco, Uruguay)

integrity. This process has a negative impact on the development process, generating an inappropriate diversion of the meagre resources that are available.

The limited results of the special sessions devoted to disarmament and the impossibility so far of adopting a comprehensive programme of disarmament leaves the initiative with the General Assembly. As I have said before, Uruguay aspires to general and complete disarmament, achieved or consolidated through the United Nations and enshrined in international instruments of a treaty character. Recognizing realistically the difficulties that exist in attaining this objective totally and simultaneously, my delegation resolutely supports measures towards this end, even if they are only partial.

Accordingly, we believe that measures should be adopted limiting or prohibiting the testing or use of nuclear weapons and other particularly cruel weapons of indiscriminate scope and with especially injurious effects. I wish to stress the importance of, among other things, a convention on chemical weapons as well as assurances of the control of nuclear proliferation.

Nuclear-weapon-free zones should be strengthened and expanded along the lines of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

The military use of given areas, such as the sea-bed, Antarctica and outer space should be prohibited.

Special mention should also be made of the need for a system of guarantees for States which have voluntarily renounced nuclear weaponry.

My delegation considers that agreements reached on specific subjects or with regard to specific geographic areas constitute positive steps in the right direction. The sum total of these partial agreements could result in a growing network of firm disarmament commitments. The General Assembly could give a bigger impetus to this trend, which has existed for some time.

Among other actions, we should consider a resolution which would reflect the set of subjects and areas in which there are agreements, as a form of the expression of the political will of the international community. A document of this type could facilitate assessment of progress and the difficulties. Perhaps, because of its political impact, it would encourage decisions in those areas in which least has been done. It could provide a means of negotiating measures of disarmament which preserve the necessary balance and reciprocity.

(Mr. Blanco, Uruguay)

In the past, the General Assembly has adopted a very large number of resolutions on disarmament. The terms of these, taken as a whole, eloquently express the horror of war and the general will to remove the threat of it by disarmament.

Hence, I believe that this strong political thrust, which deserves emphasis and support, should not be distorted or transformed into an indirect attempt to influence the balance of power between the great Powers. This, besides being ineffective, would drive a wedge between the collective efforts of the nations and its fundamental aim of promoting peace and disarmament. Uruguay will continue to support, through the United Nations, this manifestation of political will by the majority of the international community.

In the view of my delegation, however, it is necessary to tackle the rationalization of these drafts, which very often duplicate and repeat, by focusing on clear-cut, central themes on basic principles. In this way they would gain political thrust.

In this connection, we support the comments of Mr. Imre Hollai of Hungary, in his statement as the outgoing President of the General Assembly, as well as those made by you, Mr. Chairman.

I believe, furthermore, that in the interest of rationalization, we must endeavour to ensure that the drafts are action-oriented and practical. It might also be appropriate to consider a simple means of carrying out assessments and providing information.

(Mr. Blanco, Uruguay)

Concomitant with what I have said, I should like to express support for the strengthening of the means available to the United Nations for verification and compliance and, in general, for peace-keeping operations.

In this context, the delegation of Uruguay is prepared to work actively and constructively in the collective task of strengthening international peace and promoting disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: The representatives of France and of the United States have asked for the floor at this time.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the French delegation, I want to express our most sincere thanks to the delegations which have expressed their condolences during this meeting on the deaths of the French soldiers killed in Beirut in the discharge of their mission on behalf of peace. The French delegation was particularly moved by their expressions of sympathy and friendship.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): My delegation wishes to convey the heartfelt condolences of the United States to the delegation of France and to the grieving families on the tragic loss of life among its soldiers in Beirut yesterday.

The United States delegation also expresses its deep and sincere appreciation of the expressions of condolence that have been extended to my Government and to the families of the United States marines and sailors killed and injured as a result of a similar heinous act in that city.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second.

Mr. TARI (Israel) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, as this is the first time I am speaking here, I have great pleasure in congratulating you, Sir, upon your election to the chairmanship of this Committee. Your moral authority is an invaluable support for us in our difficult and complex deliberations.

Some statements made today oblige me to exercise my right of reply. My delegation does not wish to lend itself to the transformation of this Committee into a new arena where questions of the Middle East would be discussed yet again in a hollow and empty fashion to the detriment of the very serious tasks that have been assigned to our Committee. I am convinced that this is not at all the wish of most delegations here, concerned by dramatic and perhaps approaching deadlines.

I shall therefore confine myself at this stage to speaking out against the falsehoods and outrageous statements, some of which are an offence to history, directed against Israel. It is not surprising either that it is precisely the delegations of Syria and Libya that have indulged in this exercise today, with the special authority that is given to them by their countries' constant support of international aggression and terrorism, the consequences of which, as we see every day, are increasingly tragic.

The delegation of Israel would like to reserve the right to reply in greater detail on the substance of the matter at a later stage.

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation has no intention of responding to the false allegations by the representative of Israel, who is trying to distract the attention of the representatives from the true realities of Israel's aggressive and warlike intentions. This morning we talked about the true facts of Israeli nuclear armament. They are a matter of common knowledge. The report of the Secretary-General, which we have every year, offers the most convincing proof of this fact. What is more, the collaboration of that régime with the isolated régime of South Africa is another incontrovertible reality and a fact deserving of condemnation by the world community as a whole. I do not know why the Zionist representative condemns us for throwing light on Israeli intentions and for showing the reality of its intentions to all representatives here. All Israel's statements are falsehoods, an act of hypocrisy designed to camouflage the warlike and

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab
Republic)

aggressive nature of that entity. Today, on the occasion of the celebration of United Nations Day, it is incumbent upon us as States Members of the United Nations to compel Israel to respect the United Nations Charter and to comply with all resolutions adopted by our Organization. It is high time that State ceased violating international laws because the violation of international law should be condemned and punished.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to draw the attention of members of the Committee to the fact that to date three draft resolutions have been presented and are now available to members, namely, the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/38/L.1, A/C.1/38/L.2 and A/C.1/38/L.3, under agenda items 143, 144 and 50 respectively.

(The Chairman)

I should like also, for the benefit of those who might not have been here last Friday, to call their attention to the fact that the Committee took a decision at that time on how to deal with the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament. The decision was that two afternoon meetings would be set aside on Monday, 31 October, and Tuesday, 1 November, for consideration of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament. It was decided that on those two days priority would be given to delegations wishing to make statements concerning the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament. However, to the extent that time remains available to the Committee after having heard those statements, other delegations would be free to speak on any of the items designated for consideration during phase II of our Programme of Work, but I should like to repeat that priority will be given to those delegations wishing to make comments or statements on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament.

The list of the speakers for the two meetings I mentioned is open and I would invite members of the Committee to inscribe their names on it as early as possible in order to enable the Committee fully to utilize the time and resources available to it.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.