

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records\*

UN/SA COLLECTION

001 27 1977



FIRST COMMITTEE  
10th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 24 October 1977  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 10TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 33: ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ARMAMENTS RACE AND ITS EXTREMELY HARMFUL EFFECTS ON WORLD PEACE AND SECURITY: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 34: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 3473 (XXX) CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL I OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLATELOLCO): REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 38: INCENDIARY AND OTHER SPECIFIC CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE THE SUBJECT OF PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS OF USE FOR HUMANITARIAN REASONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 39: CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 40: URGENT NEED FOR CESSATION OF NUCLEAR AND THERMONUCLEAR TESTS AND CONCLUSION OF A TREATY DESIGNED TO ACHIEVE A COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 41: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 31/67 CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL II OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLATELOLCO) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 42: EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO IMPLEMENT THE PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DISARMAMENT DECADE (continued):

(a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 43: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE DENUCLEARIZATION OF AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 44: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN THE REGION OF THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 45: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH ASIA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

/...

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent within one week of the date of publication to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A 3550

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/32/PV.10  
25 October 1977

ENGLISH

AGENDA ITEM 46: PROHIBITION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND MANUFACTURE OF NEW TYPES OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND NEW SYSTEMS OF SUCH WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 47: REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 48: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A ZONE OF PEACE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 49: CONCLUSION OF A TREATY ON THE COMPLETE AND GENERAL PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR-WEAPON TESTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 51: GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (continued):

(a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;

(b) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY;

(c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 52: SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT: REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 53: WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 33, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45  
46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52 and 53 (continued)

U MAUNG MAUNG GYEE (Burma): Mr. Chairman, since this the first time that I have spoken, I should like to offer you and the other officers of the Committee my heartiest congratulations.

The United Nations emerged from the bitter ashes of the Second World War, which marred the history of mankind by the tragic death and maiming of millions and incomputable material losses. It was therefore only natural that much effort should have been devoted to the question of disarmament. However, despite the many years devoted to such effort, it is indeed regrettable that satisfactory progress has yet to be achieved.

Burma has all along striven for general and complete disarmament within the framework of its independent foreign policy and on the basis of objectivity.

With regard to disarmament, the following guidelines have been laid down by the Burma Socialist Programme Party, and I quote:

"Burma firmly believes that world peace and security cannot be achieved except through general and complete disarmament. We desire the complete halt to nuclear-weapons tests, the elimination of chemical, biological and toxic weapons which hold a threat to uncountable millions. The proliferation of nuclear weapons also goes against the desires of humanity as a whole. We therefore support unreservedly the achievement of general and complete disarmament, which remains the goal of all efforts in the disarmament sphere".

Furthermore, our Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the plenary meeting of the Assembly on 7 October, dealt at great length with the subject now under discussion, reflecting our views and stands on the various issues. Therefore, in order to save time, I shall not go into details.

Disarmament is a crucial prerequisite if we are to avoid another holocaust. It is, however, unfortunate that, despite our joint endeavours towards achieving general and complete disarmament, a satisfactory outcome still continues to be elusive. The world is still threatened by the spectre of the arms race and is still forced to coexist with the ever present danger of nuclear annihilation.

(U Maung Maung Gye, Burma)

The dialogue between the great Powers continues, and in this connexion some recent proposals may perhaps be described as "positive". But so far there has been no actual agreement on reducing the number and power of nuclear weapons. The agreements reached so far are only on ceilings, which means, in effect, how many more may be produced or deployed. In other words, much ground remains to be covered.

With regard to non-proliferation, it is unfortunate that the great nuclear Powers, while striving to limit the spread of nuclear weapons, do not at the same time offer adequate guarantees to preclude the use of such weapons against non-nuclear countries. Burma firmly believes that a viable, universally acceptable agreement on non-proliferation cannot be achieved without adequate guarantees to ensure that the non-nuclear States, which comprise the majority, are not faced with nuclear threats by the comparatively few Powers in possession of nuclear weapons.

On the other hand, the developing countries should not be denied access to nuclear technology and should be able to benefit, without discrimination, from the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, if they so desire.

In a nutshell, the world remains far from achieving general and complete disarmament, but a little optimism is, perhaps, permissible if we take into consideration the fact that all people of the world ardently desire peace and to live in a world free from the threat of war.

To this end, Burma believes that the nuclear Powers have a primary responsibility together with the United Nations and the Member States. What is required is the political will to ensure the maintenance of peace and security and to promote the adoption of effective collective measures for the prevention of war and the removal of threats to peace.

Burma will, accordingly, continue to support actively all measures likely to lead to the achievement of general and complete disarmament.

We welcome the forthcoming United Nations special session on disarmament, and we do hope that all parties directly involved will come with a realistic approach and arrive at constructive and satisfactory solutions. We wish the Conference all success.

Mr. DOMOKOS (Hungary) (interpretation from French): First of all, Mr. Chairman, may I extend to you our congratulations on your election as Chairman of our Committee. I also congratulate the other officers. I wish you every success in guiding our work.

For a long time disarmament items have been becoming more important in the work of the General Assembly. The seriousness of the unresolved problems of halting the arms race and the fact that disarmament in the strict sense has not yet begun both weigh heavily on the conscience of the General Assembly and of other organs dealing with disarmament. We maintain the view, with many other delegations here, that it is high time to take decisive measures that will really remove the dangers inherent in the arms race. We believe that this session can make a more effective contribution than previous sessions to a speedy solution of the complex problems of disarmament. The need to accelerate disarmament negotiations is generally recognized. But are conditions really favourable? My delegation asserts that they are.

Despite the temporary resumption of activity by the enemies of détente, it is increasingly recognized that understanding, and not confrontation, is the only option at the military level and that with the present international situation and military balance of forces, all negotiators must in the end accept the principle of the equal security of the parties, and the application of that principle could be the guarantor of lasting conventions, as well as being of major importance for disarmament.

During the period that has elapsed since the last session of the General Assembly there have been some specific results which are gratifying, even though these results did not relate to questions of immediate priority. I refer, for example, to the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques. We consider that instrument as a preventive body of rules which could block further development of the arms race in a given field. My country is among those which signed it at an early date. We note with satisfaction that

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

more than 40 countries have already by their signature declared their intention to become parties to the Treaty. We express the hope that in the near future the first ratifications will be registered, thus accelerating implementation of the Convention.

We could present a positive balance sheet of the outcome of the Conference on the review of the convention, commonly known as the Convention on the Law of the Sea. This treaty has proved to be effective and its provisions are intended to prevent an arms race in that environment which, precisely because of its size, is of particular importance. It is encouraging that the Conference endorsed the commitment included in article V of the Treaty and called on the Committee on Disarmament speedily to pursue a study of further measures to prevent an arms race on the sea-bed, the ocean floor and the subsoil. Despite the undeniable results of the Conference, we find it necessary for this General Assembly to invite the Member States which have not yet done so to accede to the Treaty and to call on the Committee on Disarmament, for its part, to take as soon as possible the measures provided for in the final document of the Conference.

Despite these specific developments in regard to disarmament, we can describe the past year simply as a preparatory period, and the hopes it has aroused must be confirmed by the future. We welcome the accelerated negotiations which the representatives of the Soviet Union and of the United States of America are pursuing on disarmament at different levels. They have set up several Working Groups which are considering the details of specific questions and are preparing the way for new disarmament conventions. We consider that understanding between the two great Powers, which have special responsibility in regard to disarmament, as a decisive factor for a general agreement.

We are following with the utmost attention the negotiations on SALT II. We express our hope, and our wish too, that this dialogue will be concluded in the near future. A satisfactory outcome would mean not only genuine disarmament by the two great Powers through a reduction of their strategic arms, but would

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

also help to limit the arms race in the future, and thus contribute to the strengthening of world security and to the improvement of the present atmosphere of trust. Agreement between the two great Powers would facilitate the progress of negotiations at Vienna on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe where military presence is most intense.

At its 1977 session the Committee on Disarmament continued consideration of all the disarmament items to which the General Assembly had attached priority. The Committee devoted most of its attention to the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction. We consider that to have been warranted. Today I should like to state my delegation's position on some of the nuclear disarmament problems, leaving until later our views on other items on our agenda.

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

The most dangerous area of armaments is undoubtedly the quantitative accumulation and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, including the perfecting of their delivery systems. Accordingly, we believe that in the present circumstances the most urgent task is the complete and general halting of nuclear-weapon tests and the prevention of the proliferation of such weapons.

During this year some developments have occurred which have once again raised hopes of the conclusion of a treaty on the subject in the relatively near future. The Soviet Union has submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament an expanded draft treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests which, in the interest of tangible progress, has taken into account the possibility of on-site inspection. The expanded draft constitutes a good basis for the speedy preparation of a draft treaty.

The other draft on the same subject, submitted by Sweden, also contains valuable elements, and it too helped to stimulate discussion. It is an encouraging sign that three of the five nuclear Powers have already begun negotiations on the future halting of nuclear tests. On the basis of recent developments one can reasonably expect that the Committee on Disarmament will in the near future be able to prepare the text of a draft treaty on the subject which, if acceded to by the nuclear and quasi-nuclear Powers, would constitute a disarmament convention of a scope unequalled in our time and a decisive step towards general and complete disarmament.

We believe that the parties concerned must take prompt decisions to remove such obstacles as still exist. For example, it seems to us to be unreasonable that artificial exaggeration of the problem of verification should still bar the way to the conclusion of such a convention. In view of the results of the work of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts entrusted by the Committee with considering international co-operative measures to detect and identify seismic events - even though that Group has not yet prepared its conclusions - we consider



(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

that our position is well-founded, when we consider that national means of verification, supplemented by an exchange of seismological data will be sufficient for adequate verification of compliance with a complete ban on nuclear-weapon tests.

The provision of the Soviet draft envisaging the possibility of on-site inspection on a voluntary basis represents an additional guarantee of compliance with the prohibitions in a future convention. We believe that an adequate balance must be established between an appropriate verification system and respect for national sovereignty, while ensuring the exclusion of inspections motivated by suspicion or other unacceptable reasons. We doubt whether the establishment of a body with excessive powers would prove generally acceptable in the case of disarmament conventions. Such a solution might considerably lessen willingness to accede to such conventions even among the militarily powerful countries. It must be added that even the most elaborate and complex system of control cannot be a substitute for a country's sovereign political decision, based on consideration of national interests, to accede to a treaty and comply with its provisions.

As regards explosions for peaceful purposes, the position of my delegation is that the solution of this problem must not be deferred, and above all it must not be used to block the signing of a treaty banning nuclear-weapon tests. All countries that have suitable conditions for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes must benefit from the advantages of such explosions. The solution of this problem on the basis of international commitments should also be encouraged.

We all agree that nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes should not contribute to the acquisition of military know-how. We believe that the provisions on the verification of explosions of this kind in the bilateral agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States, which provide for both the application of national means and, in certain cases and certain conditions, on-site inspections, could assist in solving the problem of verification itself where there is a complete test ban.

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

The Soviet Union's declaration that it is prepared to sign a treaty banning nuclear-weapon tests and to reach an agreement with the United States and the United Kingdom on a moratorium for a stated period pending the accession of other nuclear countries is a far-reaching sovereign decision which brings the possibility of nuclear disarmament considerably closer.

We warmly welcome that decision. At the same time, we believe that the General Assembly must again redouble its efforts and see that its earlier decisions are implemented so that all nuclear Powers participate in nuclear disarmament, because only thus can we hope for a lasting arrangement, the real removal of the danger of an atomic war and the effective halting of the arms race. As long as the commitment to cease the testing of nuclear weapons is only partial, certain nuclear countries will want to have a free hand and, above all, if they continue experimental explosions and the accumulation of arms, the danger of the resumption and even the proliferation of nuclear-weapon tests will continue to exist. We must therefore make further efforts within and outside the General Assembly to ensure that the cessation of tests is really complete and general and that it extends throughout the whole world.

While we concentrate our attention on achieving a general cessation of tests we must not overlook the importance of preventing the dissemination of nuclear weapons. Observance of the provisions of the 1968 Treaty and the extension of that Treaty towards universality are a paramount duty. We believe that there is a close correlation between the complete cessation of nuclear-weapon tests and the prevention of the proliferation of those weapons. The abandonment of tests would strengthen the non-proliferation system.

At the same time, it is true that accession to the Treaty by all nuclear States and those already on the nuclear threshold, and the extension to universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons would make the commitment to the total cessation of tests of countries participating in such an arrangement more reassuring and more lasting.

17/33

A/C.1/32/PV.10  
14-15

(Mr. Domokos, Hungary)

We consider that until nuclear disarmament is fully achieved every possible means must be used to remove the danger of a nuclear war. To this end every opportunity must be firmly seized even if it offers only a partial or regional arrangement.

(Mr. Demokos, Hungary)

In this context, in the opinion of my delegation, acceptance of the proposal made in November of last year at Bucharest by the Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty whereby the signatories to the Final Act of Helsinki would assume the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against another would be of particular importance from the point of view of the limitation of the arms race and from that of strengthening confidence.

Among the measures for the consolidation of security, we might mention again the idea in the statement made last year by our Minister for Foreign Affairs, namely, that to prevent the accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons all nuclear States should sign agreements to that effect among themselves. We note with satisfaction that that idea has been incorporated in the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union in document A/C.1/32/L.2.

When we insist on the urgent need for disarmament and more specifically nuclear disarmament, we reiterate the absolute importance of taking decisive measures to halt the arms race which would constitute the first step towards genuine disarmament. We are convinced that every day it will become more difficult to come to a halt, to turn back or to leave the course into which arms escalation is leading us. Negotiations under way at various levels revive our hope and somewhat strengthen our patience.

Every opportunity must be used so that the General Assembly can, by its own means, promote the speediest possible implementation of these positive steps through disarmament conventions of major importance.

Mr. CHEN (China) (interpretation from Chinese): First of all, I wish to congratulate you, Sir, most warmly on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee.

The question of disarmament is not an isolated one, but a question closely related with the general international situation, particularly with the over-all question of war and peace.

The current international situation is excellent. All the contradictions in the world are further sharpening and the factors for revolution continue to grow. Countries want independence, nations want liberation and the people want revolution - this has become the irresistible historical trend. The international united front against hegemonism and against the super-Power policies of aggression and war is broadening, a united front in which the third-world countries and people are the main force. But, at the same time, it can be seen that the two super-Powers are stepping up their rivalry for world hegemony and that the frenzied arms expansion and war preparations on both sides have reached a scale unprecedented in history. The current international situation is definitely not characterized by "détente having developed into a new phase", as claimed by one super-Power; instead, the danger of a new war is visibly growing.

The two super-Powers are the source of a new world war. Their rivalry extends to every corner of the world, but strategically the focus of their rivalry is still in Europe where they are locked in acute military confrontation. The Soviet Union is stationing heavy troops in Europe, deploying three fourths of its ground, naval and air forces and most of its medium and short range nuclear missiles on the land and seas of Europe. The United States is also making constant readjustment in its strategic deployment. Over the past year, the two antagonistic military blocs conducted a number of large-scale war manoeuvres. The security illusions spread by the "European Security Conference" are being shattered. The Soviet Union not only maintains a posture of readiness to break through at the centre in Europe, but strives to create a situation in which it can outflank Europe from the north and the south. It wants to seize the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Sea in the east, block the strategic routes of the Atlantic Ocean in the west and thrust round the

(Mr. Chen, China)

Cape of Good Hope in the south so as to encircle Europe from the flanks by devious means. As a result, the Middle East and Africa have become "new hot spots" of the intensified rivalry between the two hegemonic Powers. The Soviet Union even flagrantly organized and sent mercenaries for outright military invasions of independent African States. In a word, where there is super-Power rivalry there are turbulence and unrest, and peace and security there are threatened and undermined. Their continued rivalry is bound to lead to war some day. This is an objective law independent of man's will. In saying so, we are not making a conjecture or raising a false alarm. So long as one respects and faces up to the objective reality, it will not be difficult to perceive the real state of affairs.

Despite the innumerable rounds of disarmament talks between the Soviet Union and the United States and the so-called disarmament agreements that have been reached under a great variety of names, the arms race between them is growing more and more intense and the new-type nuclear weapons in their possession are snowballing. While possessing thousands of strategic weapons, each of them is constantly manufacturing and deploying strategic weapons of newer types. Each of them possesses tens of thousands of military aircraft, hundreds of major war vessels and huge quantities of other conventional weapons. The strength of Soviet armed forces has now reached over 4 million, and that of the United States armed forces over 2 million; whereas in 1938 on the eve of the Second World War the total strength of the conventional forces of Germany, Italy and Japan put together was only 2 million. The war machinery at the disposal of the two super-Powers in peacetime has already reached a scale unprecedented in human history. According to an analysis based on various materials, the Soviet Union has been increasing its defence budget at an average rate of 4 to 5 per cent in recent years, spending some 20 per cent of its gross national income on military expenditures. The Soviet defence budget for 1977 is about 40 per cent more than the United States defence budget for the same period.

(Mr. Chen, China)

The United States is stationing a force over 400,000 strong on foreign soil, whereas the strength of Soviet forces stationed in other countries is as high as some 700,000. Although Mr. Gromyko had to admit in his statement at the current General Assembly session that:

"In the post-war period the arms race has been spiralling upwards continuously" (A/32/PV.8, p. 42),

yet in the next breath he said:

"but we were not the ones to cause this." (*ibid*).

The first part of the above statement may be closer to the fact, but the latter is apparently too "modest". It would be more truthful to change the latter part to read: "The Soviet Union and the United States are the ones to cause this, particularly the Soviet Union in recent years."

Some say that the Soviet Union merely wants to seek strategic "equilibrium" or "balance of power" vis-à-vis the United States. Those who think so have lagged far behind the development of the situation, to say the least. The present strength of Soviet armed forces has doubled that of the United States. On top of that, its strategic missiles have exceeded those of the United States by over 700, the number of its tanks is four times that of the United States, the quantity of other conventional arms has also greatly exceeded that of the United States, and it has built up an "offensive navy" that can match the United States'. In fact, the Soviet Union has by and large caught up with the United States in nuclear weaponry, and is far ahead of the United States in conventional armaments. What the USSR is desperately seeking is not a so-called "equilibrium" with the United States but an over-all strategic "superiority", including nuclear superiority, in order to achieve its goal of sole domination of the globe by its military strength.

Mr. Brezhnev openly declared that the Soviet Union would successfully carry out an active "offensive" in the international arena. The military occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union, its flagrant intervention in the Indian-Pakistani war, the presence of its navy in the Mediterranean Sea and in the oceans, the establishment of its military or paramilitary bases along the coasts of the Caribbean, the Mediterranean, the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean, its infiltration and expansion in Asia and Latin America and its large-scale armed intervention in African States, etc. - all these shocking events have fully revealed the hideous features of social-imperialism and its insatiable greed and ambition. And the

(Mr. Chen, China)

facts have indisputably shown that, in the current over-all situation of the rivalry between the two hegemonic Powers, the United States is on the defensive, while the Soviet Union is on the offensive.

It can thus be seen that when we say the Soviet Union is more dangerous and is the most dangerous source of world war, we are observing and judging things not from partial conditions or temporary factors but from the over-all situation and the inevitable and logical conclusion to be drawn from the entire historical conditions that have led to the degeneration of the Soviet Union into social-imperialism. There are profound political and economic reasons why social-imperialism has become the most dangerous source of war. In a nutshell, being a late-comer among the imperialist Powers, it must grab spheres of influence from United States imperialism in order to dominate the world. It bears a close resemblance to Germany during the reign of Emperor William II before the First World War, Germany under Hitler's rule before the Second World War and the United States shortly after the Second World War, which wanted to grab spheres of influence from the other old-line imperialist Powers. Furthermore, owing to its relatively inadequate economic strength, it cannot but rely mainly on military strength and threats of war in pursuing aggression and expansion. Its highly-concentrated state-monopoly capitalist economy and its political régime of fascist dictatorship make it easier to militarize its national economy and state apparatus. Besides, it dons the cloak of "socialism" and flaunts the signboard of "détente and disarmament", which can deceive people to a certain extent, and this also makes it more dangerous. Its use of the United Nations and other international forums to peddle its fraud of sham détente and sham disarmament constitutes an important aspect of its effort to deceive the public under the said cloak and signboard.

Bearing in mind the foregoing points, it is not difficult to understand why the super-Powers, which are frenziedly engaged in an arms build-up and war preparations and in aggression and expansion everywhere, are singing the tune of "disarmament" and "détente" at the top of their voices. They prate about "détente" and "disarmament" precisely for the purpose of covering up their intensified arms build-up and war preparations, aggression and expansion. In this respect, the Soviet Union's performance is the most remarkable, though the United States has, of course, also joined the chorus. As is known to all, the so-called Strategic Arms "Limitation" Talks between the Soviet Union and the United States are but a



(Mr. Chen, China)

synonym for "stimulating" and "promoting" the strategic arms race between them. Each agreement reached in such talks marks the beginning of a new round of the strategic arms race. The conclusion of the so-called Vladivostok Agreement was followed immediately by the successive emergence of a great variety of new generations of strategic weapons, such as the "Backfire" aircraft, MIRV mobile missiles with more accurate guidance systems, Hunter satellites, cruise missiles, etc. It was then followed by clamours for a new round of talks for further "limitation".

Thus it goes on and on, forming an endless circle, with "the boat floating high when the river rises". Yet they have the impudence to assert that such "talks" and "agreements" are conducive to the prevention of nuclear war and the strengthening of international security. How can these clumsy lies and tactics pull the wool over the eyes of the world public? While the Soviet Union has brazenly pushed the militarization of its national economy to a climax and openly declared its readiness to shift its national economy on to a wartime footing at any time, it has come to the United Nations forum to prate about the "reduction of military expenditures by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries". While the Soviet Union has been audaciously using force or threats of force for aggression and expansion everywhere and has even gone out of its way to organize mercenaries for armed invasion of other countries, it keeps on putting forward boringly a series of "proposals" and a "draft treaty" on the so-called "non-use of force in international relations". While the Soviet Union has been aggravating international tension, pursuing the policy of nuclear monopoly and nuclear blackmail and frenziedly preparing for a nuclear war, it has submitted a "draft declaration on the deepening and consolidation of international détente", and a "draft resolution on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war".

This year, the Soviet representative has once again concocted a so-called "new item" by putting together that long-discredited and worn-out trash of sham détente and sham disarmament. In his letter introducing the so-called "new item", Mr. Gromyko even described détente as "a prerequisite for the solution of the problems of utmost importance to all mankind". Is this not asking the people of the world to abandon their just struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism and leave themselves entirely to the mercy of the super-Powers? All

(Mr. Chen, China)

the more glaring is the sinister intention in putting forward the new item - that is, to practise nuclear monopoly and nuclear blackmail under the cover of "prevention of the danger of nuclear war".

If the Soviet Union were really concerned about peace and the "prevention of the danger of nuclear war", why could it not agree straightforwardly to take practical actions for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of the nuclear weapons in its possession? Why does it refuse to take even the first step for achieving this goal as repeatedly proposed by China? Since it is so zealous about the "non-use of force or threat of force in international relations", why does it not first withdraw its huge armed forces and military installations from abroad, or even "lessen" a bit its threat of force against other countries? The littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean and the numerous non-aligned countries strongly demand the withdrawal by the two super-Powers of all their "military presence" from the Indian Ocean zone.

(Mr. Chen, China)

However, after repeated discussions, the two finally agreed only to "stabilize" their existing "military presence" in the Indian Ocean. By "stabilizing" their presence, do they not mean that they will hang on there and refuse to withdraw? Furthermore, they have not abandoned their intentions and activities for continually increasing their military strength and carrying out aggression and expansion in that area under the cover of so-called "stabilization".

Is not the Soviet Union, which talks daily about "sympathy" and "support" for the establishment of nuclear-free zones in Latin America, still adamantly refusing to sign the Additional Protocol II to the Treaty of Tlatelolco? Under the aforesaid circumstances, is it not clear that in advocating the turning of the special United Nations session on disarmament next year into an "interim" or "intermediate phase" for the "world disarmament conference", the purpose of the Soviet Union is to bring this special session into its own orbit and make this session a part of its fraud of sham détente and sham disarmament?

After some reflection, it will not be difficult to see that the strange phenomenon of duplicity in words and deeds not only reveals this super-Power's utter hypocrisy but fully shows the truth that imperialist "pacifism" has never been an instrument for peace, but is an instrument for the preparation of war and for disguising this preparation by hypocritical talk of peace. At present, this is particularly true of social-imperialism. The arch culprits who unleashed the two world wars all spared no effort to sing "disarmament" and "peace" on the eve of war. This cannot but alert people to the fact that today the super-Powers are also taking advantage of people's desire for peace to create peace illusions so as to lull the people and make it easy for them to launch war some day and realize their ambition for world domination.

(Mr. Chen, China)

We have noticed that the numerous third world countries and a number of small and medium-sized countries have forcefully exposed and condemned the super-Powers' acts of intensified arms expansion and war preparations in their rivalry for world hegemony. They increasingly resent the super-Powers' hoax of sham détente and sham disarmament. The representatives of these countries have rightly pointed out that the super-Powers are only using "détente" to achieve their own narrow purposes, that what they seek is hegemony, that the aim of the super-Powers' arms race and monopoly of nuclear weapons is to dominate international affairs, that many treaties and resolutions on disarmament do not belong to the category of genuine disarmament but are mere scraps of paper; that in concluding treaties, each of them wants to exert pressure on the other in the first place, and then to befuddle the world public; that among the total world military expenditures of over \$300 billion, the United States and the USSR account for the lion's share and they monopolize the most powerful weapons of mass destruction; and that, therefore, it is first and foremost their responsibility to reduce military expenditures and carry out disarmament and it is impermissible for them to shift the responsibility onto the small and medium-sized countries.

Quite a number of third world countries have demanded that the super-Powers should undertake not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear countries, and to withdraw their forces from foreign territories and dismantle their military bases abroad. In order to oppose super-Power aggression and interference, some countries stand for insulation from super-Power conflicts and rivalry and propose the establishment of peace zones, nuclear-free zones and security zones in their regions. These reasonable proposals reflect the legitimate desire of these countries for combating the super-Powers' aggression and expansion and their rivalry for hegemony and for safeguarding world peace and security. We appreciate and support all this. We are always against sham disarmament and for genuine disarmament. We stand for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Chen, China)

As the first step, all nuclear countries, particularly the Soviet Union and the United States, must first undertake the obligation that they will not be the first to use nuclear weapons at any time and in any circumstances, and in particular will not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones, and that they must dismantle all their nuclear bases on foreign soil and withdraw all their nuclear armed forces from abroad. We firmly support the demands of the countries and peoples in the regions of the Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, and in the Middle East, South-East Asia, South Asia, Africa and Latin America for the establishment of peace zones, security zones or nuclear-free zones. We maintain that the super-Powers must undertake unequivocal obligations to this end and put them into effect. We strongly oppose the super-Powers' policies of nuclear monopoly and nuclear blackmail and their disarmament fraud.

The Chinese people and the people of the whole world firmly want peace and oppose a new world war. The question now is that it is the super-Powers, and not the Chinese people and the people of the world, who want war. What policies should be taken and how one should deal with the situation of intensified super-Power rivalry and increasing danger of a world war is a very serious political issue before the people of the world.

China's attitude with regard to a world war has always been: "First, we are against it; second, we are not afraid of it." When we say we are not afraid of war, it does not mean that we like it, but because to be afraid gets us nowhere. The dialectics of history tells us that the aggressors always bully the weak and fear the tough and will try for a yard if given an inch. The more one is afraid of them and takes the attitude of appeasement towards them, the more one encourages their aggressive arrogance and ambition. In the end, it will only hasten the outbreak of war. What calls for attention is that there now exists a strong trend towards appeasement in the West. Some hope to gain temporary ease by making compromises and concessions. Some imagine that they can restrain the aggressive and expansionist activities of social-imperialism

(Mr. Chen, China)

by concluding treaties and agreements. All these are sheer illusions. In the eyes of the aggressors, all treaties and agreements are mere scraps of paper which they are ready to sign at any time and will not hesitate to tear up when necessary. It is only those who have blind faith in negotiations and agreements that will be duped and suffer. Did Hitler not initiate the war to invade Czechoslovakia and Poland when the ink on the Munich Agreement he personally signed was hardly dry? In the three decades and more after the Second World War, a motley variety of declarations, treaties and resolutions on disarmament was adopted both inside and outside the United Nations.

(Mr. Chen, China)

The multitude of documents may be "enough to fill the roof and heavy enough to cause the beasts of burden to perspire" and may even stop the flow of water if thrown into the East River, but they will not stem the runaway trend of arms expansion and war preparations on the part of social-imperialism. Some people even seek to divert this peril towards the east in order to preserve themselves at the expense of others. Some keep on producing the so-called "Sonnenfeldt doctrines" and their refurbished versions and sequels. These people have forgotten the lessons of history. They would only follow in the footsteps of Neville Chamberlain and end in harming themselves while seeking profit at others' expense.

In our opinion, in order to oppose the super-Powers' preparations for and launching of a new world war, the people of the world should be informed fully and completely about the danger of war, so that they will be fully aware and vigilant about it. And on this basis, the people of the world should be mobilized to form the broadest united front, including the Soviet and American people, against the super-Power policies of aggression and war and for putting off the outbreak of a world war. Meanwhile, every effort should be made to gain time to get fully prepared mentally and materially, so that in case the super-Powers impose the war on the people, the people will abolish the unjust war of aggression by means of a just war against aggression and finally bury all aggressors and win genuine peace.

It is gratifying to see that the people of the world are daily awakening. The true features of the super-Powers, particularly of social-imperialism, and their paper-tiger essence are being seen through ever more clearly. They have been seriously frustrated in their acts of aggression and expansion all over the world. Earlier, the African States of Egypt, the Sudan and Zaire and some other third world countries waged valiant struggles in a dauntless spirit in firm opposition to social-imperialism's infiltration, subversion and aggression, and they have won brilliant victories in these struggles. In so doing, they have not only effectively defended their respective hard-won national independence and sovereignty but greatly deflated the aggressive arrogance of social-imperialism and made positive contributions to upsetting the war plans of the super-Powers.

(Mr. Chen, China)

At present, the united struggle of the third world is being steadily strengthened, and there is further growth in the tendency of the second world towards unity against hegemonism. Before us is a new historical period of struggle against super-Power hegemonism by uniting with all the forces that can be united, in which the third world is the main force. The broader the international united front against hegemonism, the more serious the isolation of the super-Powers, and the greater the benefit to the just cause of the people of various countries. And every victory won by the people of various countries in their struggle against hegemonism will help to weaken the strength of the super-Powers, thwart their aggressive and expansionist designs, upset their war plans and deployments, and put off the outbreak of a new world war. If the super-Powers should dare to provoke a world war, they will be doomed to complete destruction in the face of the joint struggle of the world's people.

Under the leadership of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party headed by Chairman Hua Kuo-feng, the Chinese Government and people are resolved to hold high the great banner of Chairman Mao Tsetung, steadfastly adhere to the revolutionary line and policies in foreign affairs which were formulated by Chairman Mao and creatively implemented by Premier Chou En-lai. We will, as always, firmly oppose the policies of aggression and war pursued by super-Power hegemonism. We will always bear in mind Chairman Mao's teaching, "Dig tunnels deep, store grain everywhere, and never seek hegemony". We will maintain high vigilance and make all preparations against the imperialist and social-imperialist machinations to launch a new world war. "We will not attack unless we are attacked; if we are attacked, we will certainly counterattack". We will be ready at all times to wipe out any enemy that dares to invade China. We shall work to strengthen our unity with the world proletariat and all the oppressed nations and people, strengthen our unity with the other third world countries and ally with all the countries subjected to aggression, interference or threats by the super-Powers, and win continued new victories in the struggle against super-Power hegemonism and their policies of aggression and war.



The CHAIRMAN: There are no more speakers on my list for this meeting. I should like to say that, according to the decision taken by the Committee at its seventh meeting, the list of speakers in the general debate on disarmament items will be closed tomorrow, 25 October, at 5 p.m.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.