



UN Doc A/35/PV.10

OCT 24 1980

UN/DA COLLECTION

FIRST COMMITTEE
10th meeting
held on
22 October 1980
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 10TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. NAIK (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49, AND 121 (continued)

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Komives (Hungary)
Mr. Korhonen (Finland)
Mr. Lai Yali (China)
Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia)
Mr. Kabia (Sierra Leone)
Mr. de la Fuente (Peru)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 66 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

10-63557

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/35/PV.10
22 October 1980

ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. KOMIVES (Hungary): First of all, Sir, I should like to congratulate you on your election as Chairman of this important Committee. My congratulations go also to the other officers of the Committee. It is a special pleasure for me to see you, with whom I enjoyed close co-operation in Geneva at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, in the Chair. In wishing you every success in carrying out your responsible task, I offer you the co-operation of the Hungarian delegation.

As some days ago the head of my delegation made a statement dealing with the item entitled "Urgent measures for reducing the danger of war", proposed by the Soviet Union, I would like to confine myself now mainly to the work of the Committee on Disarmament. At the same time I would like to reserve the right to take the floor again in the general debate in order to deal with other issues as well.

Disarmament negotiations in various international forums were conducted last year in an aggravated international situation caused by the leaders of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which were trying to upset the existing strategic balance between East and West and seeking military superiority. This has of course inevitably influenced the atmosphere and work in these disarmament forums, and that applies also to the Committee on Disarmament. In this generally unfavourable situation, my delegation takes note with great satisfaction of the positive results of the recent United Nations Conference on excessively injurious conventional weapons.

(Mr. Komives, Hungary)

This year the Geneva Committee has in some respects entered its new stage of development. With the joining of the People's Republic of China, its membership has been completed, and now all permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and all nuclear-weapon States are participating in the work of the Committee. This situation emphasizes the unique possibility and duty of all the nuclear-weapon States to discharge their special responsibilities.

During the last session the Committee made important steps in its structural and organizational development. Four working groups have been added. The activity of those groups has enhanced the negotiating character of the Committee and contributed to a deeper examination of the various questions, and the position has been further strengthened by the increased participation of experts. This development has significantly increased the workload of the Committee.

The first part of the session was characterized by political tension and by lengthy procedural and organizational debates, sometimes of a political nature, such as the question of participation of non-member States. Some delegations raised subjects obviously irrelevant to the work of the Committee, thus considerably hampering the normal functioning of the Committee. Fortunately, the second part of the session was characterized by a better atmosphere and businesslike negotiations. But we have to state again, as we did in 1979, that too much time was spent on procedural and organizational matters. Of the five months at its disposal, the Committee had to spend about three months on such exercises.

(Mr. Komives, Hungary)

Everything should be done to avoid repetition of such a situation. The Hungarian delegation is ready to work and co-operate for this purpose. This task seems all the more important and timely since there is the possibility of further organizational and structural sophistication of the Committee.

The delegations of the group of socialist countries consistently followed a course of constructive negotiations aimed at the conclusion of specific agreements on the cessation of the arms race and on disarmament, and introduced concrete businesslike proposals on many items on the agenda of the Committee.

Concerning the substantive issues before the Committee, the Hungarian delegation has to state with deep regret that the Committee on Disarmament was either unable to make headway or able only to take some timid steps. There were strenuous efforts by many delegations, among them those of the socialist countries, to focus the attention of the Committee and to concentrate its work on such highly important and urgent matters as a general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament or the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

In this connexion, efforts were made towards the establishment of the necessary framework. But the Committee was unable to establish a working group on a nuclear test ban, as proposed by the group of 21 and supported by the group of socialist countries. The Committee did not succeed in setting up a working group on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, as proposed by the socialist countries and supported by many delegations. The proposal of the Soviet delegation aimed at the establishment of a group of experts on the problem of new weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, which had received broad support in the Committee, was also blocked by some Western delegations. At the same time, the four ad hoc working groups of the Committee carried out active and useful work, although the results achieved in accordance with their respective mandates varied.

To sum up, the Geneva Committee, the single multilateral negotiating body for disarmament, during its 1980 session could not meet the expectations of the international community; it could not make headway on any important question of disarmament. The most striking feature of the present situation is the fact that

(Mr. Komives, Hungary)

the Committee has so far been unable to start substantive consideration of nuclear disarmament. This state of affairs calls for radical and positive change. Otherwise, despite all organizational or structural efforts, the authority of the Committee will be in jeopardy.

Under the present circumstances, when the results of the policy of détente are endangered, when the danger of war is growing, increased efforts should be made to curb the arms race, reduce the danger of war and achieve tangible results in the field of disarmament.

The task we are facing - that of reversing the present dangerous course - is an enormous one. No one can expect speedy and easy solutions. Cessation of the arms race and progress in the field of disarmament can be achieved only if we reinforce our commitment and redouble our efforts in pursuit of this. To change the present dangerous situation requires a constructive contribution by all States, first of all the nuclear-weapons States and the militarily significant Powers. In the field of nuclear disarmament my delegation feels it indispensable that all five nuclear-weapon Powers should show the same interest and responsibility. The task before us requires intensification of the work of all disarmament bodies - multilateral, regional, trilateral and bilateral - because the results reached in any body could favourably influence the activities of other bodies. Our efforts should be concentrated on maintaining the military balance of forces at a lower level, which requires renunciation of the search for military superiority and a reaffirmation of the principle of undiminished equal security.

In their Declaration adopted in Warsaw last May, the socialist States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, prompted by the general desire to strengthen international peace and security and to enhance disarmament, made a number of concrete proposals which have a direct bearing on our work. The Declaration assigned the highest priority to the cessation of the arms race. In the field of practical disarmament measures, parallel with the ratification of SALT II, it urged the earliest possible completion of negotiations on such outstanding items as the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, prohibition of chemical weapons, prohibition of radiological weapons and strengthening of security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States.

The memorandum entitled "Peace, disarmament and international security guarantees" submitted by the Soviet Union gives a comprehensive picture of the

(Mr. Komives, Hungary)

existing dangerous situation and contains proposals concerning all aspects of the main disarmament questions. The new item on the agenda of our session, initiated by the Soviet Union, on "urgent measures for reducing the danger of war", concentrates on only some tasks, but they are very important and extremely timely tasks which we think are realistic and could be carried out within a relatively short period of time.

By taking substantive steps to implement the proposals put forward by the Soviet delegation we would be able to halt the further deterioration that an accelerated arms race would inevitably cause and we could create a realistic pre-condition for embarking on the step-by-step realization of the longer-term objectives spelt out in the Final Document. Only in such circumstances could we reasonably expect a comprehensive programme of disarmament and an action plan to acquire meaningful potential within the framework of the Disarmament Decade.

The seriousness and efficiency manifested by the Committee on Disarmament next year in dealing with questions on its agenda, particularly in the nuclear field, will certainly be an indicator of the prospects ahead of us. The Geneva Committee has no more time to waste, and in order to prove its viability it should achieve substantive progress in negotiating these questions and must be able to report to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly and to the second special session of the General Assembly and to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in such a manner as will ensure the achievement of those objectives on which we agreed by consensus at the first special session.

In the opinion of the Hungarian delegation, the already existing ad hoc working groups of the Committee on Disarmament should start their work immediately after the opening of next year's session without waiting for agreement on other matters. The Committee has to deal with matters before it on their own merits, not linking them to progress in other questions. With all due respect to established priorities, the Committee on Disarmament should give appropriate attention to questions which are ripe for or close to solution, even though they might be considered by some delegations as less important and less urgent problems.

(Mr. Komives, Hungary)

One of our Committee's important tasks is to take appropriate action for the preparation of the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly to be devoted to disarmament, which is to take place in 1982. On this score my delegation would like to offer some preliminary remarks. In dealing with this we already have the experience of preparing and holding the first such session, and we have the Final Document. A Working Group of the Geneva Committee is already dealing with the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. These and other considerations prompt me to believe that the preparations made for the first special session on disarmament may not have to be repeated in every respect.

There is no doubt that a preparatory committee should be established with an appropriate mandate and a composition such as to ensure its efficiency and representative character. In this connexion my delegation considers necessary an enlarged participation by the socialist countries in that preparatory committee. The participation in it of all the members of the Geneva Committee appears still to be necessary and useful. But, taking into account the considerations already mentioned, it should be possible for the preparatory committee to hold fewer meetings than were held by the preparatory committee for the first session. Also a somewhat shorter duration could be considered for the second session.

In conclusion, I should like to express my delegation's hope that the Committee will accomplish successful work under the able guidance of its Chairman.

Mr. KORHONEN (Finland): First of all, I should like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and your colleagues in the Bureau on your unanimous election. The Finnish delegation wishes you continued success in your work.

Since the last general debate in this Committee the deterioration in international relations has made it clear that any progress in disarmament negotiations is more difficult than ever. The political realities make negotiations - and not only the negotiations but also the subject-matters - more complex. They present a new factor which cannot be ignored.

Yet there is no need for this Committee to spend its time drawing up a list of difficulties. Security issues are viewed with deep concern everywhere. Disturbing signs appear in all facets of international relations, many of them related to the arms race. The world is threatened by a combination of several factors: increase of tensions, increase of more sophisticated mass destruction weapons, increase of conventional weapons, and their flow in all parts of the world.

My Government continues to believe in the usefulness of disarmament and arms control talks. That is so because we believe in common sense and in a common purpose based on the self-interest of nations. The intensification of the arms race, which is already a fact, is decreasing the security of all nations instead of enhancing it. Today's weapons have already turned against themselves and against their owners.

There is only one way out: the way of negotiations, negotiations on all aspects of arms control and disarmament, including collateral and confidence-building measures. Despite - or perhaps because of - the present situation, it is in the interest of all nations to work together in order to come to grips with the crucial problems of disarmament. With determination and vigour we should sharpen the definition of our goals and resolve our differences over steps that we must take to achieve them.

In arms control, the significance of a regional approach is rapidly increasing. Disarmament is, of course, of global interest. Yet in many cases politico-geographical conditions call for a regional approach. The global approach can be usefully supplemented with unrelenting and systematic

(Mr. Korhonen, Finland)

efforts at the level of different regions and subregions. There is scope for independent action in each region. Lack of progress at the global level should not impede but, on the contrary, encourage this approach.

This emerges clearly from the study on all the aspects of regional disarmament, carried out by a group of governmental experts, contained in document A/35/416. We welcome this study, to which we had opportunity to contribute. It is comprehensive and objective; it provides a wide range of measures for States of a region wishing to promote regional disarmament.

The study points out that, in order to achieve real progress towards regional disarmament, there should be an ongoing process involving a multiplicity of efforts to set over-all goals, to determine the steps that might promote those goals, and to identify and negotiate specific measures. I also share the conclusion that a useful approach for the States of a region would be to seek agreement on over-all long-term disarmament objectives even if, at first, such objectives may be more of an identification of problems and aims than of solutions and means. In addition to agreeing on a framework for regional disarmament negotiations, there is also a need for strengthening or creating institutional arrangements at the regional level. Such arrangements would set the process in motion and allow initiatives to develop, concepts to be discussed and concrete measures to be negotiated.

The conclusions that I have just cited to from the study on all the aspects of regional disarmament apply to all regions, but they are particularly pertinent to Europe today. Speaking in this Committee a year ago, I referred to a situation in Europe. I said that Europe seemed to be on the verge of a new round of the arms race, both conventional and nuclear. The qualitative arms race had created new generations of nuclear weapons and was accompanied by new strategic doctrines which might lead to the acceptance of the concept of limited nuclear war. At the same time, disarmament negotiations in Europe were at a standstill. While new initiatives and proposals had been advanced, they had not led to their concrete consideration at a sufficiently multilateral level - let alone to negotiations. Unfortunately, these observations are even more valid today than they were a year ago.

(Mr. Korhonen, Finland)

Proceeding from the view that new approaches and new dynamics are urgently needed to stimulate the consideration of disarmament issues in Europe, on 19 October 1979 the Government of Finland presented an initiative for a disarmament programme for Europe. The objective of the initiative is that the States concerned, taking into account the existing and anticipated processes and proposals of disarmament concerning Europe and parts of Europe, should agree on a framework for a comprehensive approach to disarmament negotiations in Europe, as well as determining the principles that should guide the negotiations.

Subsequently, Finland has pursued the initiative further in consultations with other States responsible for European security. The consultations provided Finland with an opportunity to clarify further the ideas behind the initiative and to acquire the views of those Governments on it and on some other issues relating to disarmament in Europe. The reactions received can be considered encouraging. There seems to be wide agreement in principle on the need for multilateral negotiations on disarmament in Europe.

(Mr. Korhonen, Finland)

Consequently, the Government of Finland considers that the follow-up meeting in Madrid, to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which will begin its work on 11 November, offers a natural and suitable opportunity for preliminary multilateral deliberations on the Finnish initiative as well as on all other proposals for and aspects of disarmament in Europe and for agreeing on a forum in which to continue the deliberations. In this connexion, I should like to support the view presented recently by the Foreign Minister of Sweden, Mr. Ola Ullsten, that the mandate for negotiations to be worked out by the Madrid meeting "must not be ambiguous and must aim at concrete and substantive results rather than declaratory and propagandistic ones".

I should like to emphasize further that in pursuing its initiative it is not Finland's intention to disturb in any way the ongoing and planned negotiations and talks, to all of which we wish success. We are not trying to find a kind of patent medicine to solve the European disarmament problems. What we envisage is a multilateral discussion on all relevant aspects of disarmament in Europe in a comprehensive way in order to reach agreement on guidelines for the present and future disarmament negotiations in Europe and give the necessary thrust and continuity to such negotiations. We believe that there is indeed a need for such an approach. We also believe that, at a later stage of the process, there will be a need for assessing the European disarmament processes in a multilateral forum, as there is a constant need for surveying global disarmament questions in this very Committee of the United Nations General Assembly.

In disarmament in general, nuclear disarmament remains the first priority both in global and in regional terms. In this respect, my Government believes in a threefold maxim: there should be no new owners of nuclear arms, no new types of nuclear weapons should be developed and no new deployment or introduction of nuclear weapons should be undertaken in areas where they so far have not existed.

The development, production and deployment of new generations of most sophisticated weapons systems is arousing particular concern. It is the

(Mr. Korhonen, Finland)

conviction of my Government that in the region where my country is situated, the Nordic region of Europe, special arrangements for arms control would be both useful and conceivable. The goal of these arrangements, in conjunction with other measures concerning the whole of Europe and in accordance with the security needs of all Governments concerned, would be to alleviate, and if possible to do away with, the dangers evoked by nuclear weapons and especially by the new nuclear weapons technology.

It was with these ideas in mind that the President of Finland, Urho Kekkonen, suggested in May 1978 a Nordic arms control arrangement. This suggestion is a further elaboration of the idea of a Nordic nuclear-weapon-free zone.

In the present European situation, these ideas have not lost any of their significance.

It is clear that after two decades of disarmament negotiations the goal - concrete measures of nuclear disarmament - is still far away. Until now it has not been possible even to agree on a comprehensive nuclear test ban. The nuclear-weapon States routinely refer to their responsibility for their own security. This admitted, an equally valid argument remains: the nuclear-weapon States bear responsibility for the consequences of the nuclear arms race affecting the whole community of nations.

All nuclear-weapon States have recently made unilateral declarations describing the situations in which, and the States against which, they would not use nuclear weapons. These declarations differ from each other to a considerable extent and their amalgamation into one common statement has not, at least for the time being, proved possible. Nevertheless, the Committee on Disarmament has embarked on an effort to reach agreement on this question. In this context, we have noted the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union under agenda item 121. That draft resolution addresses itself to a number of questions relating, inter alia, to various measures of nuclear arms control and disarmament, including the question of security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States.

(Mr. Korhonen, Finland)

The question of security assurances to be given to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is a legitimate concern for all non-nuclear-weapon States. It is also closely linked with non-proliferation and nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Such assurances should be as binding as possible. In principle, there appears to be no objection to the idea of an international convention on the subject, although difficulties remain. A multilateral instrument would be possible if a common formula could be devised that would be acceptable to all nuclear-weapon States and satisfactory to non-nuclear-weapon States.

Finland, like most other non-nuclear-weapon States, has welcomed assurances given by nuclear-weapon States. As expressions of political commitments, they contribute to the further consideration of the question. Obviously, however, they fall short of the goal of effective international arrangements. It is only natural that these statements are functions of the respective military doctrines and based on different political perceptions.

They reflect much less the wishes of the non-nuclear-weapon States. While they are useful and could increase confidence that the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States is ruled out in the present state of international relations, they are diluted by political and legal reservations.

Recent developments in the field of nuclear weapons technology have given a new dimension to the question of security assurances. In view of this dimension, the minimum which must be achieved is that the nuclear Powers - either in unilateral declarations or through multilateral agreements - guarantee that non-nuclear-weapon countries will not be attacked or threatened with nuclear weapons and also that their territory or air space will not be violated when such weapons are delivered to their targets.

All approaches to achieving arrangements for non-use assurances should continue to be explored. All interested Governments should be involved in the process and have the opportunity to express their particular security concerns. As a measure in the direction of effective international arrangements, the Security Council could appropriately act upon the question, as a number of both nuclear and non-nuclear States have suggested.

(Mr. Korhonen, Finland)

This year neither the Committee on Disarmament nor other organized multilateral arms control and disarmament talks have produced the expected results. This fact should not discourage us from looking ahead with renewed hope. There is a consensus on what our priorities are. We should put our best efforts into them. All approaches must be explored and secondary considerations should be put aside. With this goal in mind, my delegation pledges its full support for all constructive initiatives aiming at regaining the lost momentum in disarmament negotiations.

It is the intention of my delegation, with your permission, to present views on some other specific disarmament questions at a later stage of this debate.

Mr. LAI Yali (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Allow me first of all to extend my warm congratulations to you, Ambassador Naik, on your assumption of the chairmanship of the First Committee at this session of the General Assembly. I am sure that, under your outstanding chairmanship and through the efforts and co-operation of delegations, progress will be made in the work of the First Committee.

During the past year the numerous small and medium-sized countries have made tremendous efforts to oppose super-Power arms expansion, war preparations, aggression and expansion, to strive for genuine disarmament and to defend international peace and security. At the meetings of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva and the United Nations Disarmament Commission many countries strongly condemned a super-Power for carrying out armed aggression and military occupation against sovereign States, either directly by sending its own troops or through its proxies. They clearly pointed out that the Soviet armed invasion of Afghanistan has heightened international tension, poisoned the atmosphere for disarmament negotiations and made progress in disarmament more difficult to achieve. At the meetings of the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean quite a number of countries accused the super-Powers of stepping up their rivalry for control of the Indian Ocean and pointed out, in particular, that, as a result of the military invasion and occupation of a land-locked hinterland State, there had been a serious breach of the peace in the Indian Ocean region. At the Second Review Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty held not long ago the non-nuclear States sharply attacked the super-Powers for their refusal to carry out obligations undertaken in the "treaty" concerning the implementation of nuclear disarmament and for attempting, under the banner of non-proliferation, to deprive the non-nuclear States of their right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy. They sternly and solemnly demanded that the super-Powers cease the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons and extend effective security guarantees to non-nuclear States. The just demands put forward at those conferences have also been strongly reflected in statements made during the general debate at the current session of the General Assembly. All this serves to demonstrate the profound concern of

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

the peoples of the world at the deterioration of the world situation and the intensification of the arms race, as well as their urgent wish for the defence of world peace and the independence, sovereignty and security of States. It also shows that the voices calling for checking aggression and ceasing arms expansion are gaining ground on the international scene.

However, quite contrary to the aspirations and demands of the peoples of the world, super-Power rivalry has intensified, the arms race has continued to be stepped up and international peace and security are seriously threatened. Despite repeated calls upon the super-Powers to stop the arms race and reduce military expenditures, their military expenditures have increased every year. Their enormous arsenals continue to expand, the quality of their weapons is continually improved and their destructive power augmented. In particular, that super-Power which emerged at a later stage has shown more vigorous momentum in its arms expansion. After having achieved rough military parity with its opponent in the 1970s, it is now striving for over-all military superiority. According to reports received, its military expenditures now account for 15 per cent of its gross national product. Its nuclear strength has been considerably increased by the possession of new types of medium-range missiles and strategic bombers. There has been a substantial increase in a whole new generation of tanks, artillery and combat aircraft. New aircraft carriers and nuclear-powered cruisers carrying missiles are being built at an accelerated pace and sent into the world's oceans. That super-Power makes an arrogant show of force everywhere and makes no secret of its intention to fight a full-scale or limited nuclear war. It relies upon its unprecedented military might to strengthen its global strategic deployment and step up its policy of southward expansion. The fact that it has gone from instigating proxy wars to sending its own troops to invade a sovereign third-world country is an important signal that its global activities in seeking hegemony have escalated to a new dangerous stage.

One cannot fail to notice that since the beginning of this year it is that very same super-Power which has been preaching the gospel of peace with even greater zeal, going on and on about "efforts to defend détente" and to build "durable peace". Is that not the greatest mockery? Member States of the United Nations are not unfamiliar with the Soviet Union's tactics of

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

using the rhetoric of "détente" and "disarmament" to cover up its acts of aggression and expansion. Everyone remembers that the Soviet Union's proposals on "the strengthening of international security" and "the non-use of force in international relations" were put forward in the United Nations after it had carried out armed aggression either directly or by supporting its proxies. After the Afghan incident, people predicted that it would launch a new "détente" offensive at this session of the General Assembly. Precisely as was expected, during his speech in the General Assembly the head of the Soviet delegation energetically trumpeted détente and disarmament, came up with an interminably long memorandum on 'peace and disarmament', and added a draft resolution on "reducing the war danger" for good measure. But how can people forget that the flames of war and aggression are blazing across Afghanistan and that innocent people are being butchered? One cannot help asking, if the Soviet Union truly wishes to "reduce the war danger" and "safeguard international security", why it does not first stop its own armed aggression against Afghanistan. Would that not be the most "urgent" and practical action for reducing the war threat at the present time? The Member States of the United Nations urgently demand that the Soviet Union implement the resolution of the sixth emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly and withdraw totally and immediately its troops which invaded Afghanistan. Ceaseless empty talk about 'peace and disarmament' cannot cover up its aggressive actions.

The Chinese Government and people have always been concerned about the cause of safeguarding world peace and have actively striven for genuine arms reduction. This year China participated for the first time in the work of the Committee on Disarmament. The Chinese delegation adopted a serious and conscientious attitude in discussing and exploring various issues in the field of disarmament together with other delegations. We advanced our views and some proposals on disarmament questions and carefully listened to and studied the reasonable views and proposals of many countries. We are pleased to see that, with the impetus given and the efforts made by participating medium and small-sized countries, the new negotiating body for disarmament has begun to engage in discussions and negotiations of a substantive nature. The medium and small-sized countries have begun to have more say in various issues and the control of disarmament negotiations by the big Powers has begun to be broken through. This is a positive development.

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

Now I should like to make a few observations on several disarmament issues of common concern to all.

I wish to start with some remarks on nuclear disarmament. Since the super-Powers are stepping up their nuclear arms race and strengthening their deployment and preparations for nuclear war, the peoples of the world are faced with an increasingly grave nuclear threat. It is therefore natural and right that the numerous small and medium-sized countries should demand that nuclear disarmament be dealt with as a priority issue. Everyone is concerned with the question as to where the first step towards nuclear disarmament should be taken. We are of the view that in a situation where the two super-Powers possess the most enormous nuclear arsenals, the correct first step should be for the super-Powers to take the lead, in reducing their nuclear weapons, thereby narrowing the tremendous gap between them and other nuclear States. That would in turn create conditions for the reduction and destruction of nuclear weapons jointly by all nuclear States.

Quite a number of peace-loving countries, proceeding from their opposition to the nuclear arms race and desire to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, hope for a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests at an early date. Such good intentions are quite understandable. However, a super-Power has been trumpeting the cessation of all nuclear tests, and has expressed so-called "concern" at the damage done to the natural environment and the endangering of the "animal and plant kingdom" as a result of the testing of nuclear and other weapons. This is nothing more than crocodile's tears. Everyone knows that it is precisely the two super-Powers which have been conducting more than a thousand nuclear tests of all kinds. Therefore, as far as the super-Powers are concerned, there is no reason whatsoever for them to continue nuclear tests. They should not only immediately cease the tests, but should also never conduct tests again. As for other nuclear States, after the super-Powers have ceased nuclear tests once and for all and have substantially reduced and destroyed their nuclear weapons, they will certainly reduce and destroy nuclear weapons and cease nuclear tests together with the super-Powers. If the super-Powers were genuinely concerned about the natural environment of mankind and willing to

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

shoulder their "historical responsibility" towards future generations, then there would be no reason for them to refuse to do the following: the permanent cessation of nuclear tests and the reduction and destruction of nuclear weapons.

The prohibition of chemical weapons has been the wish of the peoples of the world for a long time. But the merciless facts are that the chemical weapons of the super-Powers still continue to be increased and renewed and are moreover being used to massacre people who are victims of aggression. This adds to the importance and urgency of the question of the complete prohibition of chemical weapons. This year, as a result of the impetus given by the medium and small-sized countries, the Committee on Disarmament established a working group on the prohibition of chemical weapons, and useful discussions were carried out. This is a gratifying development. But it is necessary to point out that because of super-Power delaying tactics and obstruction the working group still has a very long way to go before a convention on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons can be concluded. We hope that the Committee on Disarmament will manage to eliminate the obstacles and proceed to the drawing up of a convention on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons at an early date.

Many news reports indicate that certain countries have been using chemical weapons in Afghanistan, Laos and Kampuchea. This has aroused the serious concern of the peoples of the world. In our view, the international community should take all effective measures firmly to curb any actions that violate the 1925 Geneva Protocol on the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare. I wish to point out that Democratic Kampuchea, as a victim of chemical weapons, is fully entitled to submit its complaint against the user of these weapons at the relevant meetings. But one super-Power tried by every means possible to obstruct the participation of Democratic Kampuchea in the meetings which carried out discussions on chemical weapons at the Committee on Disarmament. This only shows its overweening arrogance and its guilty conscience.

For many years, in order to defend their independence, sovereignty and security, the countries of the Indian Ocean region have been calling for the establishment of a zone of peace for the Indian Ocean. Many

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

obstacles have been encountered in efforts to realize the goal of a zone of peace, owing to the intense rivalry of the super-Powers in that important strategic region. The present armed invasion of Afghanistan has added to the turbulence of the Indian Ocean region and seriously threatens peace and security in that region and throughout the world. The development of the situation proves that the peace and security of the Indian Ocean itself is closely related to the independence and security of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean. Thus, in working towards the achievement of the goal of a zone of peace for the Indian Ocean, the super-Powers' military expansion and activities in quest of hegemony in the Indian Ocean region must be curbed. They must be called upon to cease their threats, interference, subversion and aggression towards that region, which includes all its littoral and hinterland States, and reduce and ultimately eliminate all forms of military presence in the region. The countries of the Indian Ocean region demand the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean to discuss the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. We support their legitimate demand and hope that the Conference will play a positive role in checking aggression and in safeguarding peace and security in the region.

The super-Powers possess the most enormous arsenals of conventional weapons, and a super-Power is using conventional forces to carry out armed interference and aggression. Conventional war is a real threat which people face at present. Conventional armaments account for a major portion of world military expenditures and consume huge amounts of resources. Therefore, in our view, conventional disarmament should be placed on a level of equal importance to that of nuclear disarmament. The Final Document adopted by the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament provides that

"States with the largest military arsenals have a special responsibility in pursuing the process of conventional armaments reductions". (General Assembly resolution S-10/2, para. 81)

This is quite correct. Conventional disarmament must be carried out in accordance with the spirit of this provision in order to be truly conducive to reducing the threat posed by the modern conventional weapons of the super-Powers against the peoples of the world.

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

People have noticed that the super-Powers frequently use the sale of arms to control other countries and to reap profits. According to statistics, the value of conventional arms sales of that super-Power which emerged at a later stage has been rising for a number of years, culminating last year in its accession to the throne as the world's biggest arms merchant. At present we should oppose the super-Power practice of interference in and control of other States through the sale of armaments and also oppose their getting rich through being merchants of death.

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

Recently, through the efforts of many small and medium-sized countries, the United Nations Conference on the prohibition of specific conventional weapons achieved some results. This is something which we welcome. Super-Powers, colonialists and racists must be prevented from using incendiary weapons and other conventional weapons which have indiscriminate effects to kill and harm people that are the victims of aggression and oppression.

Faced with the stark reality of accelerated arms expansion and intensified military expansion abroad by the super-Powers, many people predict that the 1980s will be a period of turbulence and insecurity, and that the middle of the 1980s will be the climax of this dangerous period. This is not a groundless prediction. The hegemonists will never lay down their butchers' knives and renounce their ambitions of aggression and expansion. They will see how the wind blows and wait for an opportune moment to start new adventures in order to achieve their strategic goal of global hegemony. At this critical juncture in the development of the international situation, the struggle for disarmament must be closely combined with the struggle against hegemonist aggression, expansion and war preparations if it is to be conducive to the defence of world peace. Historical experience has shown us that if we divorce ourselves from reality and indulge in empty rhetoric about disarmament, if we do not expose and condemn the frenzied arms expansion of the aggressors and vigorously hold back aggression, if we do not firmly strike back against war provocations, then such appeasement and retreat can only result in the imminent disaster of war. We should learn from previous experience and avoid the mistakes of the past. We are convinced that, provided that all peace-loving countries of the world join hands and struggle together, it is entirely possible to check the aggressive drive by the hegemonists, upset their global strategic plan and prevent their launching a new world war. Let us strengthen our solidarity, co-ordinate our actions and make joint efforts to oppose hegemonism, strive for genuine disarmament and safeguard world peace.

In his statement on 20 October, the Vietnamese representative, by his usual means of lies and vilification, levelled malicious attacks against China, slanderously accusing China time and again of practising hegemonism.

(Mr. Lai Yali, China)

But the iron-clad fact is that China does not have one single soldier stationed anywhere in the world outside its own territory, while the Soviet Union and Viet Nam have dispatched massive troops numbering hundreds of thousands of men to carry out frenzied aggression against and occupation of two sovereign States. The people of the world can be the judge as to who is practising hegemonism. The efforts on the part of the Vietnamese representative to fabricate all kinds of lies once again prove that the big-Power and small-Power hegemonists are engaged in mutual adulation and collusion. Such efforts are beneath refutation. The best reply to the fabrication of lies is to point out the following: the Vietnamese representative has lied through his teeth in a vain attempt to divert attention from the condemnation of the people of the world of Viet Nam's crime of aggression. Such attempts are utterly futile.

Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia): It gives me particular pleasure, Sir, to congratulate you on your election as Chairman of the First Committee. It is indeed encouraging that the representative of non-aligned Pakistan, a man of your diplomatic and political qualities, is guiding the proceedings of our Committee.

The debate on disarmament is taking place this year halfway between the first special session devoted to disarmament and the second such session, to be held in 1982. It is also evolving at the end of the First and the beginning of the Second Disarmament Decade. The Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was also held in the course of this year, while the Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects completed its work in Geneva recently. Among the large number of disarmament matters on our agenda the reports of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and of the Committee on Disarmament will also be examined.

We interpret the great number of agenda items or problems we are considering within the context of disarmament as an expression of the broad interest of the international community in tackling one of the most urgent problems of the present time. However, we must note once again that the results cannot give us cause for satisfaction.

(Mr. Komatina, Yugoslavia)

Not only has the process of negotiations, conducted at various levels, lagged behind the arms race, it has also, practically speaking, failed to have any serious impact on actual developments. The arms race continues to be a universal phenomenon which threatens to get out of control. The use of force tends to become a permanent practice and to impose itself upon the world as a durable system. The very dangerous deterioration in the international situation, intensified rivalry between blocs and great Powers aimed at attaining superiority or at preserving existing or conquering new spheres of interest, recourse to military intervention and failure to resolve crucial international issues have had the effect of multiplying the focal points of crisis, transforming many of them into open conflicts. Such a development threatens, in particular, the independence and security of small, militarily and economically weak countries and undermines the foundations of peace in the whole world. All this is taking place before our very eyes, although it is clear that the possession of a larger amount of weapons does not provide greater security, that a system of international relations based on force, balance and domination is not capable of guaranteeing lasting stability.

The arms race is the basic level of such a system and is both the cause and the effect of disturbed international relations, of the state of crisis in which détente finds itself and of the narrowing of the area of consultation and co-operation in the world. On the control and halting of the arms race will to a great extent depend the future development of relations in the world. Therefore the purpose of our debate, to our mind, is not merely to appraise critically the current extremely negative trends in the field of armaments but also to find the best ways and means to halt the arms race and to launch a process of genuine disarmament.

The fact that expenditures on armaments reached the figure of \$500 billion in 1979, with a tendency towards further growth, is bound to cause serious concern. At the same time, it is no longer possible to control the boundaries of further technological refinements. The tone and dynamics of the deadly arms race are determined by the leading Powers and military-political bloc alliances. However, some other regions and countries participate in this as well, especially in the areas of crisis.

(Mr. Komatina, Yugoslavia)

Although the major part of military budgets is spent on conventional armaments, nuclear weapons continue to pose the greatest threat to mankind. Nuclear arsenals are constantly growing. Systems of nuclear weapons are becoming ever more sophisticated. Nuclear weapons are becoming ever more "precise", "reliable" and "easy to handle". There is also a debate concerning the possibility of waging a limited nuclear war. If plans for the stationing of a new generation of Euro-strategic weapons became a reality it would considerably increase the risk of nuclear war in Europe. For that reason, we welcome the agreement between the United States of America and the USSR to start preliminary talks on weapons of this type in the near future. This will fill a significant gap in the negotiations between the two leading nuclear Powers, which, regrettably, are at a standstill.

The arms race is characterized not only by its vertical qualitative but also by its horizontal form of proliferation. There is an ever greater proliferation of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, in international waters, seas and oceans as well as in the territories of some non-nuclear-weapon States. Nor has the air or outer space been exempt from use for military purposes. This is illustrated by the launching of predominantly military satellites. Thus these spaces too, which should be used for peaceful purposes, are being increasingly transformed into areas of military rivalry.

Expenditure on armaments is in dramatic contradiction to the poverty in which two-thirds of mankind live today. We must constantly bear in mind that official development aid to developing countries amounts to only one-twentieth of the value of military expenditure. Obviously, mankind has never before possessed such vast material, scientific and technological resources; however, at the same time, the world has rarely been faced with such massive poverty, hunger and want. Evidently, the arms race is considerably slowing down the solution of problems of development and prosperity.

The world has never been more heavily armed than it is today, but it has not become more secure. Although a large-scale war has fortunately been avoided, we are all well acquainted with the statistics on the number of so-called minor wars fought between 1945 and 1980 and the number of their victims. The greatest

(Mr. Komatina, Yugoslavia)

responsibility for the present course of unsatisfactory developments in the field of the arms race is borne by the great military Powers. It is therefore incumbent upon them to take all steps likely to change that course and to embark upon the road of disarmament.

The First Disarmament Decade, proclaimed by the United Nations in 1969, unfortunately failed to achieve success. One of its primary objectives - namely, to reduce the huge expenditures on armaments and to use the resources thus freed for purposes of development, particularly of the developing countries - has not even begun to be attained. It is thus becoming increasingly clear that peace and security cannot be maintained for long in conditions of the existing economic inequalities. Some of the agreements achieved in that period have had no effect on halting the arms race or eliminating its consequences.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the implementation of measures of disarmament would release important financial resources and human potential in both the developed and the developing countries, thus rendering possible a reallocation of resources for development needs. It was therefore only appropriate that the Second Disarmament Decade was proclaimed simultaneously with the declaration of the 1980s as the third United Nations development decade and the launching of the global round of negotiations.

The tenth special session set in motion broad international action aimed at halting the arms race and launching a process of genuine disarmament. The Programme of Action adopted at that session provided for priority measures, the implementation of which is indispensable if even an initial step out of the present state of stagnation is to be made. The cessation of underground tests, the conclusion of SALT II and the urgent start of negotiations on SALT III were mentioned as the measures most urgently needed for halting the nuclear arms race. Furthermore, the tenth special session adopted measures - listed in particular in paragraph 50 of the Final Document - the implementation of which would result in halting the nuclear arms race. My delegation also attaches great importance to measures aimed at limiting and prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons.

We must take note of the appalling fact that very little, indeed practically nothing, has been done to implement the Programme of Action in the course of the last two years since the tenth special session.

(Mr. Komatina, Yugoslavia)

The completion of negotiations within the framework of SALT II was without doubt an important step. The early ratification of that agreement would contribute greatly to the continuation of the dialogue between the two leading nuclear Powers and pave the way to new negotiations and agreements on the reduction of nuclear arsenals.

The negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe between members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact, held in Vienna, have also stagnated for a number of years. We are undoubtedly faced with extremely complex negotiations in a region saturated with the conventional and the nuclear armaments of the two military-political blocs. The mere fact that these negotiations are taking place in the existing situation is not to be underestimated. Regardless of all the difficulties, however, no adequate political will and determination by all parties have so far been manifested with a view to overcoming them. We are convinced that disarmament negotiations in Europe should be approached as a unique process taking into account all its components and the whole territory, including the Mediterranean, with the participation of all European countries. We wish to express the hope that the Madrid meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe will devote due attention to these problems and that the participants will agree to adopt an appropriate recommendation in this regard.

The parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which held a Review Conference in August this year, could not agree with regard to the adoption by consensus of a final document embodying an appraisal of the implementation of the Treaty. Instead, a final document of a technical character was adopted. The differences between the nuclear and the non-nuclear-weapon States - the latter mostly non-aligned and developing countries - regarding the appraisal of the implementation of the Treaty mostly concerned the implementation of measures of disarmament. At that Conference also those countries noted that the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, was accelerating and that no concrete results had been achieved in the disarmament talks, while negotiations had not even started with regard to some major disarmament issues.

(Mr. Komatina, Yugoslavia)

They were also unanimous in their demand for the halting of the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons and international co-operation without discrimination in the use of nuclear technology and energy for peaceful purposes as prerequisites for making the Treaty a universal and firm instrument of nuclear non-proliferation.

If a lesson is to be drawn from that Conference it is that we should consider seriously whether an essentially very useful Treaty can be kept alive for any length of time unless all its adherents exert maximum efforts to abide by its letter and spirit.

I should like to express our satisfaction at the results achieved by the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects.

(Mr. Komatina, Yugoslavia)

The adoption of the General Convention and three Protocols on land mines, some incendiary weapons and non-detectable fragments represents a concretization and expansion of international humanitarian law on the basis of the Geneva Conventions. These agreements on the protection of civilian populations in time of war constitute the first step towards restricting or prohibiting certain conventional weapons. Although at the Conference it was not possible to reach agreement on all the issues under consideration - and we hope that those outstanding will be the subject of subsequent negotiations - we feel that the results achieved can also provide an incentive for more rapid progress in negotiations conducted within the context of the Committee on Disarmament.

The special session has provided a strong incentive for a broader opening up and acceleration of the disarmament process. It has confirmed the necessity of adopting new, bolder and more resolute approaches to the search for solutions to disarmament problems. The Programme of Action has provided, among other things, for the immediate start of negotiations on nuclear disarmament, as well as on concrete measures to halt the nuclear arms race. Further courses of action for the achievement of set objectives were also unanimously charted.

Having covered half the road leading to the next special session of the General Assembly, we must express our deep concern at the fact that many of our agreements have not been implemented, as well as at the over-all state of negotiations on various disarmament issues.

The special session has not been followed by resolute action to implement the adopted decisions, despite the insistence of a large majority of members of the international community and their readiness to contribute. Certain nuclear-weapon States bearing special responsibility for the starting of the process of negotiations on problems of nuclear disarmament still hesitate to fulfil their obligations. They reject proposals on concrete negotiations, but they fail to offer any adequate alternative solutions. As a result, it has not been possible to take even initial steps in this field.

(Mr. Komatina, Yugoslavia)

The negotiations conducted by some nuclear-weapon States over a number of years on a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests and the prohibition of chemical weapons have not yielded the expected results.

The question of the prohibition of nuclear weapons tests has been on our agenda for more than 20 years. We have accorded the highest order of priority to this matter because the cessation of tests is an essential prerequisite for checking the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, for halting the nuclear arms race and for preventing the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. We have adopted numerous resolutions on the urgency and significance of the adoption of a test-ban treaty and have addressed appeals to nuclear-weapon States calling upon them to make a maximum contribution towards that end.

All this has remained without a positive response. Nuclear weapons tests continue and their number has increased over the last few years. The tripartite negotiations have not been completed. This year again, the participants informed the Committee on Disarmament that they had made significant progress, but that no agreement regarding certain issues had yet been achieved.

We wish to commend their resolve to continue to search for solutions to the remaining problems. We must, at the same time, voice our concern at the absence of decisive progress in those negotiations and at the constant refusal by some of the participants also to accept multilateral negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban within the framework of the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation shares the view of the Secretary-General of our Organization, as well as of the group of experts which has, under his instructions, elaborated a study on this question, that there exist practically no obstacles impeding the solution of the remaining technical problems and that it is now primarily a question of political will and determination to achieve this. Such determination, however, has not been forthcoming.

(Mr. Komatina, Yugoslavia)

The international community has also accorded high priority to the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons, In this sphere too we are confronted with a situation which is, in our view, unsatisfactory. We do not underestimate the complexity of the problems arising here, particularly with regard to the establishment of an effective system for verifying the implementation of the agreed scope of the ban. On the other hand, however, in this case as well as in the previous one, it is necessary that the States involved in bilateral negotiations give proof of a higher degree of political will to find generally acceptable solutions and rapidly to go over to multilateral negotiations within the Committee on Disarmament on essential problems of the prohibition of chemical weapons.

The Committee on Disarmament has submitted to us this year its second report. We are pleased to note that the Committee has been able to achieve significant progress with respect to the improvement of its organization and methods of work. We attach appropriate significance to the setting up of four ad hoc groups for holding substantive talks on various disarmament issues. We believe that this represents an important forward step towards promoting the negotiating function and role of the Committee, as well as the effectiveness of its work. My country, together with other non-aligned and neutral countries members of the Group of 21, has consistently urged this.

At the same time, we must express our dissatisfaction at the fact that, despite the efforts of a large majority of countries, the Committee has been prevented from establishing working groups for negotiations on problems of nuclear disarmament and a comprehensive test-ban. It is inadmissible in our view to deny to the Committee on Disarmament, the only multilateral body in the field of disarmament, the right to conduct substantive negotiations on these two issues to which the international community has been devoting special attention. We hope that the Committee will be enabled by the beginning of its session next year to fulfil the tasks with which it has been entrusted.

(Mr. Komatina, Yugoslavia)

The position taken by some members of the Committee with regard to the participation of non-members in its work is also causing concern. It is inadmissible to deny to a Member State of the United Nations the right to contribute to the work the Committee in connexion with questions in which it is particularly interested. The application of special political criteria when deciding on the participation of United Nations Member States in the work of the Committee has the unavoidable effect of exacerbating political controversies, and this can only cause incalculable harm to the Committee.

The first experiences of the working groups are positive. They have proved, in our view, that working groups are suitable forums in which to conduct substantive negotiations on problems of disarmament. However, they also point to the need to exert constant efforts to improve their organization and methods of work so as to spare the Committee long procedural debates and to enable it to achieve optimal results. The Committee should always keep this task in mind.

From the foregoing, we can draw the conclusion that current unfavourable developments in the world call for the exertion of increased efforts and for a commitment to take a decisive step towards disarmament.

In the forthcoming period, we must do all in our power to make up for all that has been left undone so far. Peace, security and détente are indivisible. They will either exist for all peoples or they will always be unstable. In order to overcome this situation, it is indispensable to undertake the solving of the problems that have accumulated in all fields of international relations, including disarmament, focal points of crisis and economic development, for they all constitute an indivisible whole. Experience has clearly shown that none of them can be neglected without jeopardizing the foundations of peaceful development in the world.

(Mr. Komatina, Yugoslavia)

In the course of this session we are to examine the recommendations of the United Nations Disarmament Commission which embody, inter alia, elements of the Declaration of the 1980's at the Second Disarmament Decade. The essential purpose of these elements is the fulfilment of the basic requirements of the tenth special session, on which we have already agreed. Therefore in our approach to preparations for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, we have to consider what new content we should impart to that session. A mere reaffirmation of the Programme of Action adopted at the tenth special session cannot be the only aim towards which we should be tending. This would mean that we have reconciled ourselves to the state of stagnation prevailing in the field of disarmament and that we have accepted failure. In our demands we must be not only realistic but also sufficiently determined to change existing realities which, precisely in the name of preserving the existing system, are often imposed on us as values given once and for all. Our realism must not be static, but turned towards the future, as it has become clear that the existing system of balance of power and terror has not been able to ensure universal peace and security to all peoples. The main protagonists of this system have been more concerned with trying to upset the balance in order to achieve superiority than with maintaining it at constantly descending levels. Therefore, there has never before been a more dramatic need for effecting a decisive turnabout. Such a turnabout should be conducive to the establishment of a détente whose protagonists and beneficiaries would be all the countries and peoples of the world and which would create conditions propitious for dealing with problems of disarmament more resolutely and more boldly. All the conditions for such a policy exist, as an ever-growing number of countries are ready to get actively involved in the realization of this objective.

Mr. KABIA (Sierra Leone): Thirty-five years ago, the founding fathers of this Organization, their minds still fresh with knowledge of the death and damage wrought by the weapons of the Second World War, resolved "to save succeeding generations of mankind from the scourge of war". Today, however, mankind's very survival appears more threatened than ever before in view

(Mr. Kabia, Sierra Leone)

of the ever more awesome arsenals of death that symbolize the steady global militarization of the post-war era.

The international community is unanimous in its recognition of the dangers of the escalating arms race and in its verbal support for genuine disarmament, as was amply reflected in the Final Document of the tenth special session, wherein we all agreed that

"... the accumulation of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, today constitutes much more a threat than a protection for the future of mankind." (resolution S-10/2, para. 1)

The link between peace and security on the one hand and disarmament, on the other hand is self-evident. Generally, the maintenance of international peace and security is facilitated by the successful curbing of the development and acquisition of armaments. At the same time, the peaceful and successful settlement of disputes between States can promote mutual confidence and trust and thus help to reduce the urge for arms acquisition. In this connexion, it is important to emphasize, for example, that neither real peace and security nor disarmament in the continent of Africa is possible as long as the major problems of southern Africa, in particular South Africa's apartheid policies and its illegal control of Namibia, are unresolved.

The Government of Sierra Leone has always stood for arms restraint and the non-use of force in international relations. We note that the arms race, in the nuclear and conventional fields, is a global phenomenon the solution of which requires international consensus and co-operation. At the same time, we realize that the nuclear arms race poses the greatest threat to mankind and thus deserves to be treated as the priority disarmament concern. Herein lies the rationale for a special role in the disarmament process to be played by the nuclear-weapons Powers.

The ultimate goal of the United Nations, proclaimed more than 20 years ago by the General Assembly, is general and complete disarmament under effective international control. It is within this context that my delegation views the various disarmament efforts being made in various forums. In this connexion, we consider that the priorities in disarmament

(Mr. Kabia, Sierra Leone)

negotiations should be nuclear disarmament, chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, conventional weapons and disarmament and development.

The Sierra Leone delegation holds the view that efforts towards nuclear disarmament and a comprehensive nuclear test ban agreement are imperative. We therefore call upon the three nuclear Powers engaged in the trilateral negotiations on this issue to arrive at an early and successful conclusion of their efforts so that the Committee on Disarmament can begin to negotiate a ban agreement. In the meantime, we support the view that until a comprehensive test ban is achieved the nuclear-weapons powers should agree to a moratorium on nuclear-weapon testing in all environments. At the same time we urge ratification of SALT-II and continuation of the SALT process, which we hope would lead to more substantive and meaningful curbs and actual reductions in the nuclear arsenals of the two parties concerned.

Preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons, both horizontal and vertical, is one of the most crucial elements in efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament. We therefore continue to be concerned by the reasons for the failure of the recent second review Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). We share the view that the nuclear weapons Powers have not fulfilled their obligations under article VI of the Treaty to take effective measures towards nuclear disarmament and we emphasize our position that all countries should have uninterrupted access to peaceful nuclear technology, especially in an age of depleting or increasingly expensive natural energy resources. We hold firmly that non-proliferation obligations should be shared equally by both nuclear and non-nuclear weapon States, and thus Sierra Leone will continue to appeal for a non-proliferation régime that is effective, fair and non-discriminatory.

(Mr. Kabia, Sierra Leone)

An extremely ominous and disturbing example of the porosity of the current non-proliferation régime is represented by South Africa's apparent attainment of a nuclear-weapon capability. We wonder why certain nuclear-weapons Powers, parties to the NPT, continue to supply advanced nuclear technology, expertise and material to a nation like South Africa, which is not a party to the NPT and at the same time practises a heinous policy with mammoth potential for escalating into the use of nuclear weapons. We have noted with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General submitted to this Assembly on South Africa's plan and capability in the nuclear field and we shall comment on the report at a later date. We are gravely concerned about recent reports on alleged uses of chemical weapons in certain ongoing conflicts around the world. Whether they are true or not, these reports underline the urgent need for the international community to ban chemical weapons in an all-embracing manner. We therefore urge the Soviet Union and the United States successfully to finalize their bilateral efforts in this field to enable the Committee on Disarmament to begin elaborating an international agreement on the subject.

The Sierra Leone delegation also supports efforts to regulate the development, production, transfer and acquisition of conventional armaments, which consume an estimated 80 per cent of total military expenditures. We feel that in this field the producers and exporters of such weapons should co-operate with the recipient States in order to realize effective measures of restraint. We feel, furthermore, that conventional arms regulation can best be attained within a regional context which would take into account the various relevant factors among the countries of the region concerned.

(Mr. Kabia, Sierra Leone)

We wish to note with satisfaction the positive and encouraging efforts made at the recent conference on certain conventional weapons having indiscriminate effects and to thank the delegations involved for demonstrating a spirit of compromise for the good of mankind.

As a developing country, Sierra Leone attaches great importance to the socio-economic aspects of the arms race and disarmament. We are aware of the danger that the increasing diversion of limited resources to military uses can do to slow down the productive sectors of our development efforts and, therefore, we reiterate our appeals to all the major Powers, in particular the nuclear-weapon Powers, to reduce their military spending even by 10 per cent and to use portions of such savings to increase development assistance to the developing countries. We are also following with great interest the progress of the United Nations study on disarmament and development. We hope that when it is completed the study will make concrete and fair assessments and proposals, instead of repeating well-known facts.

A number of delegations have advanced the idea of using a regional approach towards disarmament. The Sierra Leone delegation accepts the regional approach on condition that the fundamental principle of general and complete disarmament is fully adhered to. We also believe that for regional disarmament to be effective and meaningful the States within the regions concerned must themselves decide upon the measures that best meet their particular situations. Therefore we would support the establishment of nuclear-free zones and zones of peace wherever the countries of the areas concerned so wish. In this connexion we are particularly disturbed by the obstruction by other States, especially South Africa's continuing obstructions of the efforts of African States to establish their continent as a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Sierra Leone also supports the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, and in this regard the President of Sierra Leone, Mr. Siaka Stevens, speaking in the General Assembly on 24 September of this year in his capacity as current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, pointed out that

(Mr. Kabia, Sierra Leone)

"Major blame for tension in the Indian Ocean region must be assigned to the big Powers, which have recently stepped up their military activities in the entire area, contrary to the principles and objectives of the Declaration making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace." (A/35/PV.8, p. 18)

We continue to hope that both Africa and the Indian Ocean will be regarded as nuclear-weapon-free zones.

The tenth special session devoted to disarmament revived the Committee on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission. The Sierra Leone delegation is of the opinion that the work in both bodies, even though productive, is rather slow. We hope that the breaking up of the Committee on Disarmament into working groups, as indicated in its report, will expedite its work and that the bilateral and multilateral negotiations that emanate therefrom will lead to a successful conclusion.

The Sierra Leone delegation is also aware of the fact that the United Nations Disarmament Commission is fulfilling its role as a deliberative body in considering the general guidelines and basic principles of disarmament. We thus support the call by the Commission for the General Assembly to approve the proposed study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons. As was stated earlier, it is only through the process of both nuclear and conventional disarmament that the world comes close to benefiting from general and complete disarmament.

In the view of the Sierra Leone delegation, the United Nations cannot expect to function on the basis of the Charter and international law unless we succeed in restraining the arms race and realizing genuine disarmament. It is only then that it would be possible to create a system of world order based on collective responsibility and a climate of international confidence and progress.

The Sierra Leone delegation would like to extend its sincerest sympathy and condolences to the Government and people of Algeria for the unfortunate disaster which has led to untold suffering and loss both in terms of human and property damage. We pledge our fullest co-operation with them.

(Mr. Kabia, Sierra Leone)

Finally, the Sierra Leone delegation would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and the other officers of the Committee on your unanimous elections. We pledge our fullest support and co-operation with you during your term of office.

Mr. de la FUENTE (Peru)(interpretation from Spanish): My delegation is happy to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of this Committee and is fully confident that, under your able guidance, we shall achieve the results expected of this Committee and so greatly aspired to by mankind.

The first speaker in this general debate, the Ambassador of Mexico, Alfonso Garcia Robles, accurately qualified the situation into which we have been driven by an unbridled irresponsible nuclear arms race. His lucid and implacable statement about the very frustrating lack of progress in the field of disarmament, barely two years after the convening of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on this subject, as well as his candid and clear description of the new theories about "limited nuclear wars", which reveal degrees of optimism that we can qualify only as macabre, constitute, in my delegation's view, masterly brush strokes applied to the surrealistic picture of contemporary reality.

If there is a higher life on some other planet in outer space and if those superior beings are looking down on us, there is no doubt that they must come to the conclusion that in the field of disarmament either those experts who have prepared hundreds of studies on the subject are super-intelligent human beings whose lessons are too elaborate to be understood by the average person, or else those to whom those studies are addressed, namely, the Governments, possess a very small degree of intelligence.

In fact, there are countless studies that establish comparisons between the existing number of nuclear warheads and the number that would suffice to destroy mankind, between disarmament and development, between disarmament and

(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

education, between military equivalences, between weapons and national gross product, between disarmament and per capita income; in fact, between disarmament and any of the areas of human endeavour - and all of this to no avail.

In our view, this is owing to the fact that, thanks to the staggering growth of nuclear arsenals and the continued qualitative improvement of such weapons, the statistics and studies relating to such blood-curdling realities have ceased to be the tangible and unobjectionable elements of an imminent self-destruction to become cold numerical elements of distasteful science fiction stories.

(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

Mankind, anguished by such devastating truth, has become an accomplice in a false kind of peace and tranquillity based on the obsolete doctrine of the balance of terror and, through a tragic process of collective self-deception, disregards such terrifying truths, such truths as those mentioned by the distinguished French physicist, Bertand Goldsmith in his book "Atomic Rivalries", when he said:

"The maintenance of peace in a world in which a growing number of countries possess the means of destroying life and civilization poses for man a fundamental problem which differs radically from all those he has confronted in the cause of his evolution, and on the solution of which the future of the species depends."

It could be thought that the simple presence of the representatives of all Member States of the United Nations in this special forum was sufficient testimony to the existence of a collective awareness of the urgent need to make greater efforts than ever before to find the political will to counteract this threat against all forms of life, because what we are speaking about is a decisive effort to halt the dynamic process of the most harmful and dangerous forms of destruction ever placed in man's hands by scientific imagination, which belie the creative, rational idealism of our human essence.

Unfortunately, we cannot allow ourselves to be deceived yet again by signs such as that mentioned earlier, of an alleged collective awareness, since everything seems to indicate - as so rightly stated by Ambassador Garcia Robles - that the wind has carried away the words of alarm at the threat to the very survival of mankind posed by the existence of nuclear weapons.

For this reason, the delegation of Peru considers that it is imperative to awaken the political imagination of a world that remains unnerved and indolent in the face of violence. To this end, it is necessary to adopt realistic, pragmatic bases for international agreement on which to construct an alternative form of international security: that is to say, new means of control and balance first to halt and then to reverse modernization of weapons, in accordance with mutually acceptable programmes and balanced policies of defence and security.

(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

As a non-nuclear State Peru reiterates once again its total rejection of dependency on a doctrine of strategic nuclear balance, which combines doses of détente and deterrence with change in unknown proportions, because the perpetuation of the balance of terror leads speedily and with ruinous results for the world economy to the suffocating intensification of an atmosphere of international insecurity in which the non-nuclear States become theoretical objectives - and very often the real objectives - of strategic rivalries, thus inhibiting various processes of peaceful agreement, which are very often the fruit of sincere and lengthy attempts to achieve diplomatic understanding and friendly conciliation.

It is for this reason that we affirm that in the idealistic and also realistic deliberations that should take place in this forum there should not be lacking the imagination, the voice or the right of the non-nuclear States, especially the non-aligned States, since in an interdependent world there can be no fruitful result without the participation of all countries, regardless of their strength, position or experience.

In order to achieve these goals we must combine the efforts of the great Powers and of the non-nuclear States in a balanced manner because, let me say yet again, the suggested division of responsibilities, which attributes the responsibility for nuclear disarmament to the nuclear-weapon States and that for conventional disarmament to the non-nuclear-weapon States, is not acceptable, for it is an irrefutable fact that it is the nuclear-weapon States that also stockpile the most impressive and sophisticated arsenals of conventional weapons; and, because the disarmament process can only be gradual, we must ensure an adequate balance of responsibility among all States so that at its different stages an appropriate level of security will be retained for all States.

The Foreign Minister of Peru, Mr. Javier Arias Stella, head of the Peruvian delegation to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, already mentioned this fact when he said:

(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

"Peru considers that it is necessary to accelerate the nuclear disarmament negotiations among the great Powers and will continue to promote the already advanced efforts to establish the status of Latin America as a zone effectively free of nuclear weapons." (A/35/PV.5, p. 56)

In this context, it would appear only natural to affirm that only when significant progress is made as regards the central aspects of strategic nuclear disarmament will the progress of efforts at the regional and bilateral level concerning conventional weapons make sufficient supplementary impact to lead to the replacement of the balance of terror by a new system of international security and a new era in international relations.

Of course, the careful construction of an effective international security alternative involves certain prerequisites which have been the object of a number of studies, since the search for the most effective formula to combine the partial attempts at weapons control, ranging from the strategy of the great Powers to those efforts relating to conventional weapons, must take account of certain shared priorities. Those priorities have already been mentioned by previous speakers, therefore I believe it is unnecessary for me to repeat them. At this stage we only wish to refer to the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union entitled "Urgent measures for reducing the danger of war", which undoubtedly is a positive step in that direction.

If the strategic concepts which profess to find in weapons of mass destruction a security guarantee are bankrupt, so to speak, if it is true that nuclear States are no more secure than the non-aligned States, then where should we direct our efforts? The only thing that comes to mind is a last alternative before the irreparable happens, and that is that we should combine our forces in the vital task of educating the world and helping it to become aware of the need to reformulate the concept of security in terms of coexistence parameters, while agreeing fully that it is not easy to coexist, and by clarifying the connotations of political, economic and strategic superiority, which as a rule are associated with an ill-understood security; and when we speak of security, we must bear in mind that its first and most important component is mutual confidence in international relations, as we shall see later.

(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

These are not new ideas as virtually nothing in this world is new. In his statement before the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, spoke of the need to strengthen education in the field of disarmament and to facilitate the flow of information on the subject. That same session incorporated in paragraph 105 of its Final Document an exhortation to that effect.

Although the specific treatment of confidence-building measures, which, in the view of the Peruvian delegation, constitute an element sine qua non for the proper appreciation of the question of the integral security of any State and hence for an effective solution of the question of general and complete disarmament, will be dealt with subsequently by this Committee when item 48 (g) of the agenda is discussed, we believe it only proper to put forward some of the views contained in the reply addressed by Peru to the Secretary-General in compliance with the mandate set forth in resolution 33/91 B of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly and resolution 34/87 B of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly:

"In a complex and varied world, mistrust is not the same for everyone and its causes are not the same. The possibility of nuclear war produces one kind of mistrust and the possibility of a bilateral conflict another. The mistrust that leads to the accumulation of military force and equipment is one thing; another is the response to acts of intervention, coercion or pressure. The mistrust grounded on ideological and political confrontation is one thing; that bred by under-development and international economic injustice another. One kind is based on armed frontier clashes; another on the policies of States not necessarily contiguous, towards each other: acts of terrorism, destabilization or intervention. Yet another kind of mistrust is that which causes unjust situations - general or specific, widespread or localized, long-standing or recent - to continue. Mistrust usually goes hand in hand with resentment and tension; it may build up to a crisis or be generalized in paralysis, be disguised or overt, but its effects are the same: difficulty in reaching reasonable and equitable agreements; acceleration of the arms

(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

race; ... absence or inadequacy of systems and programmes of international co-operation; intensification of military preparations and attitudes, and so on.

"In conclusion, the Government of Peru believes that the consideration and development of confidence-building measures should be a permanent process; that States should in good faith take advantage of all opportunities to explore, by legitimate means which are consistent with sane international coexistence, every avenue of confidence-building, ... through ... measures which, without aiming at this specific purpose, clearly result in building confidence.

"In present circumstances, confidence-building is a priority task of the international community which cannot ignore all that it has itself already agreed upon with a view to bringing about coexistence among the human species in general, mutual respect, tolerance and co-operation."

(A/35/397, pp. 8 and 12)

While I am speaking these concluding words, two neighbouring countries in the vicinity of the Persian Gulf are waging war mercilessly against each other. The international community and this world forum are making every effort to put an end to the loss of life, but without many results. The conflict will be known as a localized war, so long as the hostilities in question do not extend beyond the confines of the parties at war.

Let us imagine that "localized conflict" taking place in some other part of the world between two rivals that possess the means of carrying out the latest of the military-strategic innovations, that is to say, limited nuclear war. In such an event we should perhaps be at the very threshold of the destruction of mankind.

Finally, the peoples we represent demand that the lengthy road we have covered in our construction of a fundamental order of security and progress

(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

should not be cut short by fear and threats. Like Peru, many other countries have greatly contributed to making the human adventure something worth while. Today they firmly demand that this session of the General Assembly discard forever the ominous possibility that there may be no future generations.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.