



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 19TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. NAIK (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

- General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Mweu (Kenya)
Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda (Zaire)
Mr. Garcia Robles (Mexico)
Mr. Krutzsch (German Democratic Republic)
Mr. Handl (Czechoslovakia)

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/35/PV.19
29 October 1980

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. MWEU (Kenya): Mr. Chairman, permit me on behalf of my delegation to congratulate you on your election as Chairman of the First Committee. You bring to your assignment wide and tested experience. We feel confident that the work of the Committee is in competent hands.

Once again we are assembled in New York to go carefully through the agenda items assigned to this Committee and to pass resolutions that call for comprehensive disarmament, confidence-building measures, reduction of military budgets, the declaration of the 1980s as the second disarmament decade and so forth. Having wasted the 1970s as the first Disarmament Decade, one would have expected us to have stopped and critically examined the factors that led to the dismal failure to heed the timely warning of our common peril and to have done something about it. It was during that first Disarmament Decade that the momentum for improvement in the quality and the increase in the quantity of weapons really picked up. It was during that decade that global expenditure on arms rose from \$180 billion in 1970 to \$500 billion at the end of that decade. It was during that decade that the number of unemployed globally rose more rapidly than at any time in recent years, increasing and deepening world poverty in the process.

(Mr. Mweu, Kenya)

This in turn increased the sense of danger, causing fear, mistrust and tension. Hardest hit, with ever increasing poverty, is the developing world. It is forced to undersell its raw material to the developed world, which in turn sells back to them exorbitantly over-priced manufactured capital goods, including conventional weapons. The developing world absorbs two thirds of the world's trade in weapons.

The 1978 United Nations study on the economic and social consequences of the arms race, which examined the relationship between military expenditure and current problems of recession, inflation and low growth demonstrated -- and I quote from the speech of Mr. Shridath S. Ramphal, Commonwealth Secretary General, on rationality without reason --

"that large military expenditure contributed to the depletion of natural resources, to the aggravation of inflationary tendencies and to the worsening of balance of payments problems. Inflation in particular is a seldom acknowledged by-product of militarization, which overheats the civilian economy, depresses productive investment and thwarts economic growth. When for so many industrialized societies the fight against inflation is proclaimed as the most urgent priority, it is well to remember that armaments expenditure prolongs inflationary pressures. Today, all these economic consequences are in evidence."

For these reasons and for others that are becoming increasingly obvious, the number of victims of famine is rapidly increasing. It is now believed that 28 people are dying per minute as a result of hunger.

General Assembly resolution 34/73, adopted at the thirty-fourth session, states, in part, that the General Assembly

"Reaffirms its conviction that a treaty to achieve the prohibition of all nuclear test explosions by all States for all time is a matter of the highest priority;"

and

(Mr. Mweu, Kenya)

"Requests the Committee on Disarmament to initiate negotiations on such a treaty as a matter of the highest priority."

The Committee on Disarmament has not started negotiations. It has not even agreed on the formation of an ad hoc working group to examine the salient points that would form a basis for future negotiations. There are powerful voices blocking the formation of such an ad hoc working group. The Group of 21, representing non-aligned and neutral States within the Committee, has been pressing for the formation of this ad hoc working group, to no avail. In its statement of 4 March 1980 contained in document CD/72, the Group of 21 urged the Committee to establish a working group to fulfil the requirement of the General Assembly resolution. The 1980 session of the Committee ended without attending to the top priority item on its agenda. Meanwhile, recorded nuclear-weapon tests for last year, according to the report of the Secretary-General in document A/35/257 of 23 May 1980, clearly show an increase - however slight - over the previous year. In 1979, the USSR led the list with 28, followed by the United States with 15, France with 9 and the United Kingdom with one, and China came out without a single nuclear test.

We urge all nuclear-weapon States to heed the call for a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty leading to the halting of the arms race and to nuclear disarmament. There is no alternative; mutual deterrent poses the real danger of mutual destruction. Scorpions have been known to sting each other accidentally. The shadow of the Hiroshima experience will never fade from the memories of humanity. In describing that nightmare, a Japanese journalist wrote:

"Suddenly a glaring, whitish-pinkish light appeared in the sky, accompanied by an unnatural tremor which was followed almost immediately by a wave of suffocating heat and a wind which swept away everything in its path. Within a few seconds, the thousands of people in the streets

(Mr. Mweu, Kenya)

in the centre of the town were scorched by a wave of searing heat. Many were killed instantly; others lay writhing on the ground screaming in agony from the intolerable pain of their burns. Everything standing upright in the way of the blast - walls, houses, factories and other buildings - was annihilated. ... Hiroshima had ceased to exist."

By that single act, humanity was given a horrifying foretaste of things to come that will be a million times worse if we do not heed the persistent and consistent voice of reason. In spite of all these warnings, the arms race has picked up momentum. To call for a halt to this race to extinction is to speak with the voice of reason; not to heed it is reckless, foolish and unwise. This race is not only dangerous in terms of the real threat it poses; it is also expensive. It takes bread from the mouths of millions who eventually die of hunger and starvation. Humanity must learn an important lesson from the honey bee: as long as it continues to work hard making honey, it lives on, but when it becomes aggressive and uses its ultimate weapon, the sting, it dies soon after. We are faced with the ultimate weapons of instant mass obliteration. Talking about limited use of those weapons clearly underrates the retaliatory capacity of the aggrieved or provoked party, who may choose to silence the aggressor once and for all.

Our delegation welcomes the initiative being taken in the Committee on Disarmament towards the elaboration of conventions to ban the development and manufacture of chemical weapons and radiological weapons. We look forward to a more concerted effort by all members of the Committee on Disarmament to come up with a treaty that will ban these horrifying weapons.

In 1964 the Organization of Africa Unity (OAU) declared Africa a nuclear-weapon-free zone and General Assembly resolution 34/76 confirms that wish.

There is growing evidence of South Africa's co-operation and collaboration with its Western allies in the field of nuclear technology. South Africa admits that and I quote from the Secretary-General's report contained in document A/35/402 dated 9 September 1980:

'We can ascribe our degree of advancement today in large measure to the training and assistance so willingly provided by the United States of America during the early years of our nuclear program when several of the Western world's nations co-operated in initiating our scientists and engineers into nuclear science.' (A/35/402, para. 31)

That is the collaboration that has put South Africa on the road to becoming a nuclear-weapon State.

The recent reputed explosion in South African waters is really no longer a mystery. The way South Africa reacted to the news left it suspect. We shall state our position once again: no amount of dynamite will silence a people determined to be free. History is full of examples of tyrants who were brought down by the determined will of the oppressed. The Roman Empire exploited and brutalized the rest of Europe: a few determined men from the north brought it down. The seeds of the destruction of the South African régime have been sown by that country itself and cultivated and nourished by the blood of its own victims who cry out against it. It could not use nuclear weapons within its borders. The régime of the late Shah was better armed than South Africa, yet when the anger of the brutalized spilled over neither tanks nor bullets could quell the determined will of the oppressed. Let South Africa and its allies take their lesson from that fact of history; if they do not they will be condemned to see history repeat itself. This is the immutable law of nature; the oppressor cannot win in the long run.

(Mr. Mweu, Kenya)

It was sad to come away from the Second Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty without a final document. The centre-piece of the Treaty in our opinion is article VI which calls on the Parties to undertake to:

...pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control." (2373 (XXII) Annex, Article VI)

Not only has there been unwillingness to even share in multilateral negotiations to end nuclear tests, but there has been feverish vertical proliferation of nuclear-weapon tests. The critical part is not only to contain any further horizontal proliferation; it is surely the halting and containing of any further vertical proliferation. Without any evidence of a willingness to participate in meaningful negotiations to end vertical proliferation it was therefore right and proper that the Second Review Conference should have recorded its dissatisfaction at that state of affairs; not to have done so would have been tantamount to having endorsed vertical proliferation.

No sane person would turn a blind eye to the item on the agenda before this Committee regarding urgent measures for reducing the danger of war. Such dangers are evident everywhere. We have ourselves referred to them in the course of our statement. We very much hope that we can bring honest and sincere endeavour to bear on this subject so that we can lessen the dangers of war by exposing the aggressors and those who collaborate with them.

Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, I should like at the outset to express my most sincere congratulations to you on your unanimous election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. My congratulations go likewise to the other elected officers of the Committee. Your personal experience combined with your eminent qualities as a diplomat and statesman are the surest guarantee of the successful outcome of our deliberations.

The Republic of Zaire had pinned great hopes on the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, and particularly on the implementation of the Final Document of that special session. The various reports of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at the tenth special session emphasize that very little progress has been made in that field.

The head of the Zairian delegation, in the statement he made to the General Assembly on 26 September 1980 recalled that according to some statistics \$500 billion will be spent on arms in 1980, that is 10 per cent more than in 1979, and that exactly ten years ago, in 1970, that figure was nearly \$370 billion.

Thus from year to year, notwithstanding proclamations of intent to halt and reverse the arms race and in favour of general and complete disarmament and of the recommendations contained in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, military expenditures caused by the arms race and the balance of terror are increasing, reducing ever further the funds that the world could harness for development and for improving the living conditions of millions of human beings on our planet, particularly in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The nuclear-arms race has even entered upon a very active phase. Hotbeds of tension are increasing or flaring up again and the new phenomenon of war by proxy that the great Powers of this world indulge in on the territory of others, preferably in the southern hemisphere of the globe, are becoming more marked and are increasing threats to peace, international security and the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination and the free choice of their destiny and the form of their Government.

Any clear-minded observer will see that a return to the cold war has the immediate effect of causing an escalation of the arms race, as the protagonists say that they care so much about rebalancing their relations or re-establishing the balance of forces in the world.

Not only does the implementation of the recommendations contained in the Final Document of the tenth special session record a slow rate of progress that reflects the real reluctance to disarm by those countries most concerned, but in addition General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV) of 16 December 1969, which declared the first Disarmament Decade, is far from having achieved its desired objectives.

(Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, Zaire)

And we are already talking about the Second United Nations Disarmament Decade. We made our official comments on that on an earlier occasion. Here, as elsewhere, we have very little that is concrete and of substance to show for it as long as the great Powers and the arms-producing countries, in particular the nuclear-arms-producing countries, are not exerting all their political will to contribute to halting and reversing the arms race.

As we have already stated, the question here is whether all the States of the world, and in particular the great Powers, the nuclear Powers which proclaim and reaffirm here their will to disarm, are really in earnest about disarmament: whether the countries that thrive on the arms industry and those on which the possession of the most sophisticated destructive weapons confers a position of pre-eminence in international relations as well as extremely important de facto privileges in their relations with other States are really prepared to deprive themselves of those sources of revenue and means of growth on the one hand and the exorbitant de facto privileges which they enjoy on the other.

The Republic of Zaire, which is a developing country, has always approached the question of general and complete disarmament from the point of view of, first, the development and progress of peoples which should enjoy a better quality of life; secondly, the security indispensable to the organization of progress and development; and thirdly and finally, the absolute need to restore confidence in international relations, in order to ensure a world of peace, harmony and concord.

It is with legitimate satisfaction, therefore, that we have seen the General Assembly of the United Nations adopt resolutions regarding the definition of the link that exists, and must exist, between disarmament and development, between disarmament and security and between disarmament and measures likely to increase confidence in international relations.

We welcomed on the same lines the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and the principle of the non-use of force in international relations.

But in the light of experience we have seen that the developing countries and the developed and industrialized countries, in particular the great Powers and

(Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, Zaire)

the nuclear Powers, do not have the same ideas about development, security and measures likely to increase or build confidence in international relations. For the developed and industrialized countries the problem of disarmament is seen in terms of maintaining and protecting the quality of life which they have attained and to this end the accumulation of military arsenals, the increase of military forces, the possession and production of ever more sophisticated weapons of mass destruction are not goals or actions that run counter to their idea of development. On the contrary, it seems that the possession of these powers is likely to increase their bargaining power, the strong pieces they have on the international chessboard that could enable them to preserve the enormous privileges they enjoy. Blackmail here, intimidation there - surely everyone understands that the possession of such power gives rise to the temptation among those who possess it to use it against those whom they wish to act in accordance with their interests.

For the developed and industrialized countries, and in particular for the great Powers and the nuclear Powers, it seems that the problem of international security is seen in terms of the balance of power, the equivalence of relations of force, a balanced division of spheres of influence in the world, so that one party does not arrogate to itself more approbation than the other, because it seems that the question is that of the division of world approval. The consequence of this is the very careful vigilance they display in spying on each other so as to know as precisely as possible the volume, quality and level of armaments, troops and arsenals the other possesses. If it appears that one party has one more nuclear carrier than the other, a new type of fighter aeroplane or military transport carrier, an additional aircraft carrier or submarine, a new type of radiological, bacteriological or chemical weapon, one more nuclear bomb, then the other side immediately thinks that its security is being threatened and, in the name of this balance of force, it gets embroiled in a new arms race, and so on.

On the one hand these countries are blinded by the spirit of competition and military or nuclear confrontation, which is incompatible with the spirit of disarmament, and on the other hand they identify their own security too simply with international security.

(Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, Zaire)

The idea that we want to see developed among all States of the world so as to support general and complete disarmament, through which the States can realize their political, economic, social and cultural goals, apart from or without the arms race and the spirit of military or nuclear competition, does not yet seem to have been appreciated by them.

Does this mean that peace is not a suitable condition for the attainment of their political, economic, social and cultural objectives and aspirations? I do not know.

For the developed and industrialized countries, and in particular the great Powers and the nuclear Powers, confidence-building measures are only military in nature. They would contend that the resumption of the SALT negotiations and of other limited negotiations is sufficient to re-establish confidence in international relations. In this context, détente for those countries appears more and more as a modus vivendi which enables the big Powers in this world to pursue their goals of supremacy and hegemony without bothering about the other side. So it is this idea of détente which is, in fact, the real threat to peace and international security, which maintains the climate of threat to peace and international security, because it amply proves that the great Powers have not given up their plans for world supremacy. If the Great Powers continue to be involved in the race to conquer the world, to exercise their supremacy, and if one imagines a scenario in which the whole world and all the States which comprise it are divided into two camps, each led by a great Power dreaming of imposing its law, its views and its vision of the world on humanity at large, who can deny or contradict the fact that there can be no doubt that the day will come when that scenario will become a reality and we shall have to survive the holocaust, that is, the third world war, which everyone is so pleased has been avoided, thanks to the United Nations, since 1945?

Thus, the emergence, in the wake of the new awareness which marked the work of the Afro-Asian Conference at Bandung in 1955, of a group of States in the world determined to pursue a policy of independence vis-à-vis the political-military blocs and preferring non-alignment, or as it used to be called positive neutrality, becomes extremely important; for we are the ones who will prevent the next war, the third world war, in the interests of the world because we have a different idea of development, progress, international security and measures capable of building or increasing confidence and détente.

(Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, Zaire)

We say that Africa and the third world will not be independent as long as one part of Africa or the third world continues to suffer the unjust law of colonialism, racism and the desire for domination, power and hegemony. We say that our development in Zaire will not be possible or will be precarious as long as our neighbours are suffering the direst poverty. We say that Zaire will not enjoy security if the security of those which surround it is only hypothetical. We say that all the causes of tension and conflict throughout the world, which produce the greatest distrust in relations between States and peoples, which give rise to instability and insecurity, are not military only.

(Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, Zaire)

We say, finally, that our survival as human beings, as peoples, and as races is threatened not merely by the massive accumulation of ever-more sophisticated weapons, in particular nuclear weapons, and weapons of mass and indiscriminatory destruction but also by the disdain for or ignorance of the precarious living conditions of the millions of people who form the majority on earth and by the insensitivity and inaction and, indeed, hypocrisy and subterfuges manifested with regard to the measures advocated to improve their well-being.

In addition to disarmament measures, strict compliance with the Declaration on the principles of international law relating to friendly relations and co-operation among States and the joint accession, without hypocrisy or reticence, to the restructuring of international economic relations, the democratization of those relations and the establishment of the New International Economic Order are confidence-building measures in international relations, doubtless more so than those envisaged in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, which are not necessarily all adapted to the conditions prevailing in Africa, Asia, Latin America and elsewhere.

It is this fundamental difference of approach regarding the elements which I have just mentioned - disarmament and development, disarmament and international security, disarmament and confidence-building measures, and disarmament and détente - which has led to the lack of significant progress regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the tenth special session. That is why we are going around in circles. We have examined carefully the reports submitted by the Secretary-General on these issues, and we sincerely hope that the expert groups or committees set up to examine the link between disarmament and these various questions will be able to arrive at clear definitions, thereby enabling every one to join in a unanimous and consistent approach to the disarmament question.

(Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, Zaire)

Disarmament, with which the majority of the States of the world are little concerned, has become the ideal theatre of verbal confrontation, speculation and propaganda. We think that the hypocrisy of the great Powers is the main reason for the absence of notable progress in the field of disarmament, which frustrates the realization of the aspirations of numerous peoples of the earth for peace and separates us ever further from the day on which the United Nations will implement the ideal contained in the Charter of the United Nations

"... to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind ..."

I should now like to address another problem which is on our agenda. It is an extremely important question, that of "Urgent measures to reduce the danger of war".

Three elements in the formulation of this question have particularly attracted our attention: first, "urgent measures"; secondly, "... to reduce ..."; thirdly, "... danger of war".

Concerning "urgent measures", we believe that a hypothetical war which either is unforeseeable, has not been foreseen for the immediate future or is impossible to predict in time and space should by no means give rise to the need for urgent measures to be taken for its prevention. As to the term "reduce", it seems to suggest that it is not a question of preventing war but reducing the danger of war. But then if this war, which has not been defined and the nature of which has not been spelt out, were imminent - because we are called upon to take urgent measures - why are we being asked to reduce the danger of it instead of preventing it purely and simply? Since, as we feel, the danger of imminent war cannot, in all honesty, be reduced, one should make haste to eliminate it and to prevent it by all appropriate means. The term "reduce" implies, as I said, accepting the inevitability of war, and this disturbs us all the more because we do not know exactly what war we are talking about.

(Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, Zaire)

As to the "danger of war", we should like to know what war this is exactly. Is it an immediate war? Is it imminent or far off? Is it a nuclear or a conventional war? Is it a generalized world war or a localized and limited war? And, in this last instance, what would be the future theatre of operations?

The excellent explanatory memorandum that has been presented to us on this subject proposes four urgent measures to reduce the danger of a war the degree of urgency of which is not stated. They are, first, renunciation of the division of the world into military groupings; secondly, cessation of any increase of armed forces and conventional weapons as a first step towards their subsequent reduction; thirdly, the granting of negative guarantees to States which do not produce nuclear weapons, have renounced their manufacture and acquisition and do not possess such weapons on their territory; fourthly, renunciation of the conduct of nuclear tests or explosions for a period of one year, in the framework of the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

It is not only that the question of nuclear disarmament, which for us and many countries of the third world is of highest priority, has been ignored but it will be easily seen that the last three measures concern only the military and nuclear Powers and that they are not new, if one refers to the recommendations of the Final Act of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament.

Regarding the first measure, it has been a long time since the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement made it a basic principle in their behaviour and attitude in international relations, because that movement, as I said, started to pursue a policy of independence vis-a-vis all political-military blocs and prohibits accession to any bloc military pacts or alliances. It may be said that nothing new is being proposed to the members of the Non-Aligned Movement, the majority of which belong to the group of countries of the third world.

(Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, Zaire)

Greater stress should have been placed upon the renunciation by the great Powers and the nuclear Powers of their policies of hegemonism and domination which lead to the division of the world into spheres of influence and military groupings.

The Republic of Zaire is party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and considers that the aim pursued by the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territory of States that do not have them at the present time is a noble one and that the granting of negative guarantees to States which do not produce nuclear weapons and particularly those that have undertaken to renounce their manufacture and acquisition is essential.

But what is the real scope of these recommendations, while certain Member States are aiding régimes such as the illegal racist minority régime of South Africa, to acquire nuclear capability? Once South Africa is being assisted and is acquiring such a capability, by what right can one ask African States situated in the region not to acquire nuclear capability themselves or to believe in the pious vows of South Africa? How credible or serious can any declaration be from the Pretoria régime - criminal to its very roots, hostile to all the populations of the African States and therefore belligerent in its approach - relating to the granting of negative guarantees to African States which do not produce and do not possess nuclear weapons and with whom they are in a dispute with regard to the liberation and decolonization of southern Africa?

That is why the delegation of Zaire associates itself with the idea that one of the obligations of nuclear States should be to withdraw these weapons from the territory of States which do not produce them and do not possess them and where their presence constitutes an obvious and permanent threat to peace and security, so as not to endorse the present status quo, particularly in South Africa, and to absolve the nuclear States from the obligation to withdraw their weapons from the territory of certain States.

(Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, Zaire)

We should define the real status of the nuclear and the non-nuclear States in order to avoid an amalgamation which would encourage the designs of the great Powers for conquest.

My delegation considers that the non-stationing of nuclear weapons should also deal with zones or areas where they have not been found, that is, in particular, in the atmosphere, in the air, on land, sea and under water.

Renunciation of nuclear tests and explosions for a period of one year, within the framework of the general and complete ban on nuclear tests is extremely attractive. But can it prevent an increased arms race and further nuclear tests immediately after such a short period. Would it not give a respite to certain Powers so that they could accumulate a greater number of nuclear weapons that they would be called upon to test at the expiration of this deadline? In examining the report of the Secretary-General (A/35/257) on the application of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, a report which deals in particular with the complete ban on nuclear-weapons tests, we read, from paragraph 149:

"Resumption of tests upon the expiration of a short-lived comprehensive test ban might be a serious setback to the cause of arms limitation and disarmament." (A/35/527, para. 149)

Further on, in the same report, we read in paragraph 160:

"To achieve its purpose, the comprehensive test ban must be such as to endure." (ibid., para. 60)

This is from a report of experts commissioned by the United Nations.

(Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, Zaire)

We can therefore seriously ask ourselves about the timeliness of this question of urgent measures to be taken to reduce the danger of war and its practical value. We have taken note of the assurances given by the Soviet Union when it says that it relates to the minimum of measures directed towards general and complete disarmament that could have beneficial effects if all States adhered to them. We agree with that.

But that question has another dimension when it is placed in the context of the race for supremacy throughout the world, which is engaged in by the super-Powers. And I should like, at this stage, to say that we believe that no Member State, large or small, powerful or weak, has the right to use the United Nations as a shield or as a forum for settling accounts. That is why the Republic of Zaire, while sharing the concern of humanity at large regarding the maintenance of international peace and security and determined to make its modest contribution to the promotion of disarmament efforts for the future of a world of peace, concord and understanding among nations and peoples, does not feel particularly concerned - and I have no hesitation in saying so - by the question before us in its present form. If the inclusion of this item in the agenda means that the great Powers will be more aware than heretofore of the responsibilities incumbent on them with respect to general and complete disarmament, the maintenance of international peace and security and respect for the right of peoples to self-determination, we have every reason to be glad and we express our sincere hope that after this session they will take effective and urgent measures to eliminate the danger of war so as to protect the world from fear, insecurity, anguish, conflict and mistrust. For it is to them and to them alone that this question is addressed essentially.

If that were not the case, it would be difficult for the delegation of Zaire to associate itself with any dilatory action to try to lull the vigilance of States and to involve us in sterile debates which were not supported by a real desire for peace and disarmament but which would, on the contrary, provide a pretext to open up further hostilities, escalations of conflicts and war.

(Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, Zaire)

Our States are today quite rightly preoccupied with the question of the maintenance of international peace and security - and this is my last point.

What a paradox that the attitude of those States which declare that they are preoccupied by the question of the maintenance of international peace and security are, at the same time and for various reasons, opposed to or at least seriously reluctant about efforts being undertaken by the international community to strengthen the principle of the non-use of force in international relations and to formulate a draft code on crimes against the peace and security of humanity and to draft an international convention against the recruitment, use, financing and training of mercenaries. Those are only a few examples, and all those who are taking part in the debate in the Sixth Committee can bear me out.

What a paradox there is also in the attitude of those States that are making enormous efforts to submit to the United Nations General Assembly various topics for discussion, resolutions and declarations on present world problems but whose practical actions run exactly counter to the theoretical proposals they make to other States.

Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter of the United Nations consecrates the principle of the non-use of force in international relations. More than 20 articles of the Charter refer to the question of the maintenance of international peace and security. That concern has pride of place in the conduct of international affairs, and the question is of such great importance that it has been consecrated by many international instruments, particularly the Charter of the Organization of American States, the Covenant of the League of Arab States, the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, the Bogotá Pact, the Treaty of Rio, the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference and so forth.

But in the light of experience, it is daily demonstrated that it is those countries on which the Charter of the United Nations confers particular responsibilities with regard to maintaining international peace and security that are violating the principle of the non-use of force in international relations.

(Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, Zaire)

In view of this situation, some countries have doubted the seriousness of any proposal dealing with the maintenance of international peace and security which stems from those States, even when the idea is good. They do not dare go along with it because of the opinion they have of the sponsor of the draft. So we come to this paradoxical conclusion that the development of international co-operation with regard to respect for one of the most important provisions of the Charter has been blocked. The extremely inconsistent attitude of those who are members of a body whose primary mission is to look to the maintenance of international peace and security, but who, in practice, are not so concerned about it when their interests and egoistic plans are at stake, is extremely serious and betrays the primary mission pursued by the United Nations.

States, institutions and individuals can jeopardize the peace and security of States and of the world. The need to suppress such actions already became apparent at the end of the great war, when the principal war criminals were apprehended and judged, on the basis of the London and Tokyo Agreements, by the Nuremberg and Tokyo Tribunals. Today a number of States, by proxy, continue to threaten the peace and security of States, if not humanity at large, but the theatre of operation is not essentially in the northern hemisphere of the globe but in the southern hemisphere. Some States, among them the largest and the most developed, do not recognize today the responsibility of States in such cases and are opposed to the drafting and the adoption of a code of crimes against the peace and security of humanity, which could highlight their active or passive responsibility.

The matter does not rest there. Some States go further and make feverish efforts to see to it that the mercenaries who kill, pillage and sow desolation in certain countries and attack their security are not prosecuted, and that there shall not be even regulations at the international level to put down their actions against the peace and security of nations and peoples. As for domestic laws, they are not applied against mercenaries in some developed countries and cannot function against mercenaries in some developing countries, so great are the political, economic and other pressures exerted by the strong countries over the weaker ones.

(Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, Zaire)

These are strange times when paradox and duplicity seem to have been raised to the status of governmental doctrine. The era we are living through will record for future generations the opposition of several States present here to the drawing up of an international convention against the recruitment, use, financing and training of mercenaries. And they are the same States that try to convince us of their wish for disarmament, their concern for respecting the provisions of the Charter on non-intervention, non-interference in the domestic affairs of States and respect for human rights, and for the advent of a world of justice, peace and harmony.

To conclude, I should like to say that as long as the great Powers and the nuclear Powers do not abandon that attitude, general and complete disarmament, and in particular nuclear disarmament, will remain a pure illusion.

But the Republic of Zaire, devoted to respect for the principles of the Charter and firm in its support of the recommendations of the tenth special session, will continue to make its modest contribution to the implementation of that important ideal, hoping that other nations of the world - in particular the most powerful, the most developed and the most richly endowed - will live up to the lofty responsibilities incumbent upon them under the Charter and that their actions will be more in conformity with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Today I should like to discuss briefly two of the many subjects dealt with in the report of the Committee on Disarmament. Although they are primarily procedural, they are unquestionably of great substantive importance because of their potential consequences.

The first of those subjects is the creation of ad hoc working groups. Although over the past five years there have been three separate cases of groups being set up - two by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in 1975 and 1976, respectively, and one by the Committee on Disarmament in 1979 - it is only this year that the idea seems to have gained ground that the multilateral negotiating body on disarmament needs to have at its disposal, on a regular and not merely sporadic basis, subsidiary bodies to enable it to carry out its important functions effectively. For that reason, the delegation of Mexico, which for more than five years has taken a similar stand in Geneva, hailed as "historic" the decision that was adopted by the Committee on Disarmament on 17 March 1980. That Committee created simultaneously four ad hoc working groups to carry out the tasks entrusted to the Committee on certain subjects, such as chemical weapons, radiological weapons, so-called negative guarantees and, last but not least, the comprehensive disarmament programme.

On that occasion, we said that our assessment of that decision was based both on its intrinsic importance and on the fact that it had created a precedent. We said that it was necessary to adopt "a similar decision to establish a fifth working group to deal with the item entitled 'Prohibition of nuclear weapons tests'". Later, in our statement of 26 June, we added to our proposal a reminder that the Group of 21 had concluded that "working groups are the best available mechanism for holding negotiations on specific subjects in the Committee on Disarmament" and on the basis of that conclusion, we said that we thought it desirable also to set up an ad hoc working group which might concern itself with that most important item on the Committee's agenda entitled "The cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The delegation of Mexico is far from being alone in promoting this approach. It is the same approach that we took in our statements of 15 and 22 October. Here I might just mention the following examples.

First, the Group of 21, in the working document of 6 August last, CD/134, said:

"The Group of 21 expresses the hope that a Working Group on the complete cessation of nuclear weapons testing in all environments will be set up without any further delay and undertake substantive negotiations at the beginning of the Committee's 1981 spring session." (CD/134, p. 3)

In that same document, the Group reiterated the proposal that it had made a month earlier in document CD/116 of 9 July that an ad hoc working group be set up to take up, among other things, "the elaboration of the stages of nuclear disarmament envisaged in paragraph 50 of the Final Document" (ibid.).

The second example that I should like to mention is this. At the Second Review Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty, held very recently in Geneva, member States of the Group of 77 which were participants drew attention to the fact that "the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, which has consistently been held to be a task requiring maximum priority", required that multilateral negotiations on the treaty be initiated in the Committee on Disarmament at the beginning of the 1981 session and toward that end, that "the three States possessing nuclear weapons which are parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty" should pledge "to support the creation of an ad hoc working group of the Committee" which would carry out those multilateral negotiations.

In the consideration in the same working document - NPT/CONF.II/C.I/2, dated 26 August 1980 - of how Article VI of the Treaty to curb the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons has in practice been implemented, the group of States to which I have referred stated their view in the following unequivocal terms:

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

"In its consideration of this article - to which preambular paragraphs 8 to 12 are an appropriate introduction - the Group reached the conclusion that its provisions had not been carried out and had remained largely a dead letter ... Instead of a halt, there had been an intensification of the nuclear arms race." (NPT/CONF.II/C.1/2, p. 3)

These conclusions, the result of an objective analysis of the operation of the Treaty, prompted those participants that were members of the Group of 77 to make the following recommendations, among others:

"Multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament, to which reference is made in paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, should begin immediately. In this connexion, the Committee on Disarmament is the most appropriate body, and the three nuclear-weapon States Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty should make a joint commitment at the Second Review Conference to support the creation of an ad hoc working group of the Committee." (ibid., p. 7)

Without doubt, the States members of the Group of 77 in issuing those exhortations, which are like those issued earlier in very similar terms by the members of the Group of 21, including Mexico, wished to stress the need to take seriously the commitment implicit in participation in the adoption by consensus of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. As members know, in fact, in that Document the Assembly, after stressing the urgency of concluding and implementing agreements on genuine measures of disarmament - and it is worth emphasizing that these are to be measures of disarmament, and not of arms control - went on to set out the following priorities which, unfortunately, some Members of the United Nations have a tendency to forget:

"Among such measures, effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war have the highest priority. To this end, it is imperative to remove the threat of nuclear weapons, to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race until the total elimination of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems has been achieved, and to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. At the same time, other measures designed to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war and to lessen the danger of the threat or use of nuclear weapons should be taken." (resolution S-10/2, para. 20)

These priorities are later restressed in paragraphs 45 and 47 of the Final Document.

In the light of provisions like those I have just quoted, to which all States represented here gave their approval in June 1978 - that is, only a little more than two years ago - we are firmly convinced that if an attempt were now made radically and unilaterally to change them, as, for example, by taking the position that the possession of nuclear weapons was an essential element for the security of the State possessing them, that would be, among other things, the coup de grâce for the already ill-treated Non-Proliferation Treaty, for it would imply not merely the right but one might almost say the obligation of every State to do everything in its power to acquire nuclear weapons. This was seen and stated with utmost clarity by the authors of the recent "Comprehensive study on nuclear weapons" issued by the Secretary-General on 12 September 1980 in document A/35/392:

"Even if the balance of deterrence was an entirely stable phenomenon, there are strong moral and political arguments against a continued reliance on this balance. It is inadmissible that the prospect of the annihilation of human civilization is used by some States to promote their security. The future of mankind is then made hostage to the perceived security of a few nuclear-weapons States and most notably that of the two super-Powers. It is furthermore not acceptable to establish, for the indefinite future, a world system of nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States. This very system carries within it the seed of nuclear-weapon proliferation. In the long run, therefore, it is a system that contains the origins of its own destruction." (A/35/392, annex, para. 497)

While the simultaneous establishment of four ad hoc working groups and the precedent which that sets for the future is one of the most positive elements of the 1980 session of the Committee on Disarmament, the same can certainly not be said of the second topic which I should now like to take up: participation by States non-members of the Committee in the work of the negotiating body.

Indeed, the lengthy debates brought about in the Committee this year by the consideration of requests for participation received from States non-members of the Committee caused a deplorable loss of time greatly to the detriment of the

substantive negotiations, which should be the primary function of the multilateral negotiating body for disarmament. The problem arose early in the session, during the month of March, but at the end of the session, in August, it had been only partly resolved.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The delegation of Mexico has recognized from the outset that the participation by non-member States in the work of the Committee, as provided for in the relevant paragraphs of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is of major importance. It was not in vain that, when in 1979, articles 33 and 34 of the rules of procedure were adopted, we stated for the record that we felt that these provisions were binding and could not be contravened. When the first differences of opinion on the subject began to crop up this year, my delegation considered the various views on the subject in a calm, impartial spirit, wishing, to safeguard the unrestricted right of non-members of the Committee to participate in the work of the Committee without any conditions other than those set out in the Final Document. We wanted to prevent the deliberations of the Committee extending into areas which did not fall within its agenda and perhaps not even within its competence.

The results of our efforts, which were made without any undue haste and calmly and impartially, were the conclusions which I described at the 77th meeting of the Committee on 10 April 1980. In that statement I said, inter alia:

"The case of two or more groups or régimes, each of which claims to be the legitimate Government of a State, is not provided for in the rules of procedure...my delegation considers that it would be highly desirable to add a rule which would settle, once and for all, those cases which may arise again in the future in which two or more groups or régimes each claim to be the legitimate Government of a State."

(CD/PV.77,p. 20)

Between the date when I made that statement and the period directly after the Committee's session we considered the matter further and reached the conclusion that it would be useful to prepare a working document containing draft amendments which, in our opinion, should be entitled: "Participation by States not members of the Committee" and should go into section IX of the rules of procedure of the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

Such amendments were in fact submitted to the Committee and now appear in working document CD/129 dated 31 July 1980, which is among the documents annexed to the Committee's report. Their objective, which I believe everyone wishes to be attained, is ultimately to guarantee the legitimate rights of States not members of the Committee whose international representation is not contested. In special cases, where representation is contested, there is a procedure whereby the States in question can put forward their opinions to the Committee on matters included in the Committee's agenda.

I think it can safely be said that the text is self-explanatory, particularly in view of the brief comment that has been added to the text. Consequently I should like to confine myself to a mere statement of my delegation's opinion that special rules of procedure to be applied automatically, must be adopted for the contested cases to which I have just referred. The need, therefore, should be obvious to anyone who has thought about the waste of time caused this year in the Committee by the absence of provisions of this kind, and to anyone who bears in mind that the decisions of the negotiating body, as provided for in the Final Document of the Assembly and in its own rules of procedure, can be adopted only by consensus.

Consequently we would venture to hope that the meditations of the States Members of the Committee pertaining to this subject during the long recess that will extend until early February and the opinions that other Members of the United Nations will put forward during the present session of the General Assembly will make it possible to resolve early in the 1981 session the serious problem which was before the Committee in 1980. The delegation of Mexico will feel that its efforts have been fully rewarded if working document CD/129, which we have prepared, proves to be at least a modest contribution to the attainment of that objective.

Mr. KRUTZSCH (German Democratic Republic): At the outset of my statement, I should like to add my personal congratulations and good wishes to you and the other officers of the Committee to those of my delegation.

In its first statement the delegation of the German Democratic Republic pointed to the aggravation of the international situation brought about by the armament drive of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). At the same time, it expressed its conviction that in order to call a halt to this dangerous development urgent measures were necessary, such as those put forward in the draft resolution of the USSR contained in document A/C.1/35/L.1

(Mr. Krutzsch, German Democratic Republic)

The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, declared that the most important objective of the German Democratic Republic's foreign policy is the cessation of the arms race. He said:

"The most important items on the agenda of world politics are today, first and foremost, to halt the arms race and to complement political détente by disarmament in the interest of peace. That is of greater topical importance than ever before. In order to improve the international situation, it is necessary to bring about a turn in that field, particularly in the 1980s. A waste of time in doing so could only be welcomed by those who intend - through their imperialist policy of confrontation - to maintain tensions, to heat them up and to take the risk that humanity could be plunged into a nuclear inferno."

It can be stated without exaggeration that the concern about the aggravation of the situation, about the rising danger of war, has been expressed in an equally illustrative way by the majority of representatives who have spoken so far.

To cite facts also means to recognize the following: preparations for psychological warfare go hand in hand with preparations for material warfare. Parallel to the implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) long-term armament programme, the decisions on the introduction of MX missiles, the deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western Europe, the declaration of the new nuclear strategy and the creation of the rapid deployment force, one can ever more clearly distinguish the policy of confrontation, disregard for sovereignty and interference in the internal affairs of other States.

(Mr. Krutzsch, German Democratic Republic)

That policy is also carried out in the organs where deliberations and negotiations are held. This could clearly be noticed in several statements during the general debate in this Committee which were marked by strong restraint in connexion with concrete questions of disarmament. Let us hope that the disregard of the sovereignty of other States and attempts at interference in their internal affairs, together with an increased destructive attitude towards disarmament questions, will not become the predominant principle of those States' policy.

Considering the aforementioned situation, my delegation would like to call attention to two problems that are of decisive importance for the success of the Second Disarmament Decade.

First, it is imperative to direct activities to measures which actually lead to curbing and halting the arms race and which, in the end, help reduce and eliminate stockpiles of weapons.

Secondly, it is absolutely necessary to improve dispassionate dialogue with the aim of initiating constructive negotiations. The change that has to be brought about in the 1980s will not be realised by making studies or inquiries and compiling international statistics on armament levels. Only the elaboration and the conclusion of agreements on concrete measures binding under the terms of international law can bring about a change and contribute to securing a peaceful life for the peoples.

At its thirty-fourth session the United Nations General Assembly in resolution 34/83 C emphasized the urgent necessity to intensify negotiations on disarmament. All told, the status of the implementation of that resolution does not give grounds for satisfaction. However, it is to be noted as a positive element that, despite the complicated international situation, it has been possible to continue the work of the Committee on Disarmament, the United Nations Disarmament Commission and other organs and to record certain

(Mr. Krutzsch, German Democratic Republic)

progress. Considering the intensified disruptive actions of certain circles, this attests to the strength of the policy of détente. It is also encouraging that the United Nations Conference on specific conventional weapons could be concluded with a positive result. This reaffirms that, given the required political will, even complicated issues can be resolved.

As a matter of course, nuclear disarmament stands at the centre of general attention. It constitutes the basic question for the work of the Committee on Disarmament. This Committee provides suitable conditions for reaching generally acceptable solutions. For the first time, all the five nuclear-weapon Powers are members of that representative organ.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic has already pointed to the great impact that a comprehensive ban on all nuclear-weapons tests would have on taking decisive steps towards nuclear disarmament. The reaching of an agreement on the strengthening of security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States would likewise be a great success. We hope that the fresh impetus given by the USSR initiative will lead to the achievement of concrete results.

At the same time, it is necessary to move from a general exchange of views to concrete negotiations on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and disarmament. On behalf of the socialist countries, the German Democratic Republic proposed in the Committee on Disarmament that a working group be established to that effect. Relevant projects have also been submitted by non-aligned countries.

In line with the Final Document of the tenth special session, those negotiations should deal with the entire complex of nuclear disarmament. That purpose will not be served when one question, namely, the termination of the production of fissionable material, is singled out and treated separately from that of the termination of nuclear arms production.

(Mr. Krutzsch, German Democratic
Republic)

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic advocates that the General Assembly request the Committee on Disarmament to initiate, as a matter of utmost urgency, negotiations on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. All nuclear-weapon States should be urged to participate constructively in such negotiations.

The strengthening of the régime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is still of topical importance. The German Democratic Republic deems it a positive result of the recent second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) that all participating States declared themselves in favour of the major objective of that Treaty, that is, to prevent the emergence of further nuclear-weapon States. The importance of the Treaty for guaranteeing a trustful international co-operation in the peaceful use of nuclear energy was also emphasized at that Conference.

(Mr. Krutzsch, German Democratic Republic)

The Conference revealed different views as regards some provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Proceeding from the German Democratic Republic's policy of principle in the field of disarmament and the peaceful use of nuclear energy, we should like to outline in particular the following three aspects of our approach towards the attainment of the objectives set forth in the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

First, what matters is to make the Non-Proliferation Treaty universal in character. There are still two nuclear-weapon States and a number of countries and have the economic and scientific potential for the production of nuclear weapons that have not acceded to the Treaty. Especially disturbing in that respect are the positions of the South African racist régime and Israel. Abstract manifestations here no longer suffice. Any form of nuclear collaboration with Pretoria or Tel Aviv must be stopped.

Secondly, efforts to promote international co-operation with regard to the peaceful use of nuclear energy must be intensified. We attach particular importance to the United Nations conference on that subject scheduled for 1983.

Thirdly, we hold the view that in pursuance of article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, major political action is urgently required to ensure the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in the longer-term perspective. What is meant here is above all effective measures of nuclear disarmament. We have already outlined the fundamental position of the German Democratic Republic in this forum.

The Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Biological Weapons, held this spring, again underscored the need for the speedy conclusion of an agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons. My delegation welcomes the fact that it has been possible this year to make certain headway, in the framework of a working group within the Committee on Disarmament, towards resolving some questions connected with the drafting of such a Convention. The speedy conclusion of the Soviet-American negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons, held with the goal of submitting a joint initiative, is urgently required here.

(Mr. Krutzsch, German Democratic Republic)

Attempts to strengthen existing chemical warfare capabilities, especially through the introduction of new types of chemical weapons such as binary weapons, are, however, contrary to that approach. Recent news according to which the United States has already appropriated \$1.5 billion for relevant activities in the forthcoming five years illustrates that such plans are already well advanced.

Attempts to shift responsibility for those dangerous arms projects to others, such as the spreading of fabricated news on the alleged use of chemical weapons in recent times, are obviously part of those programmes of action. They can, however, fool nobody. It is a fact that the United States used agents of chemical warfare in Viet Nam and that it is now intensifying its production of particularly dangerous agents.

A suitable step in the direction of curbing and ending the qualitative arms race would be the conclusion of a comprehensive agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and systems of such weapons. That would not be tantamount to hampering the development of science and technology, as is often argued. The goal is rather to exclude the military application of at least certain results of research and development.

When in 1975 the USSR proposed the drafting of such an agreement a number of objections were raised concerning the need for and the scope of such a prohibition.

Who can preclude the possibility that in five or 10 years' time we shall have to face the fact that new types of weapons of mass destruction are being introduced into arsenals or are already there; that another chance to safeguard peace and stability and to achieve disarmament has been wasted? That is the reason why it is urgently necessary to begin negotiations. Scientific experts could render substantial assistance in that process. We therefore back the proposal to establish a working group of governmental experts to examine questions related to the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction within the Committee on Disarmament. They could deal with the preparation of a comprehensive agreement on the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction and at the same time look into the question whether the prohibition of specific types of weapons has become a topical issue.

(Mr. Krutzsch, German
Democratic Republic)

Let me just remind the Committee that in recent years representatives of Western countries have advocated the inclusion of governmental experts in the treatment of such questions.

Another essential step in order to prevent the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction is the prohibition of the neutron weapon. The broadest sectors of the population in many countries of Europe expect measures to be taken in that respect. A relevant draft convention was submitted to the Committee on Disarmament by the socialist States in 1978.

A draft convention prohibiting radiological weapons has been the subject of factual negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament over the last year. In the view of the German Democratic Republic, the joint Soviet-American proposal on the main elements in the negotiation of a treaty prohibiting radiological weapons contains the essential aspects of such an agreement. The elaboration of a relevant draft convention, therefore, should not cause insurmountable difficulties. If achieved, such a convention would give a fresh momentum to other disarmament negotiations under way. The Committee on Disarmament should be invited to submit a draft convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons to the next session of the General Assembly.

Less than two years remain before the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will be held. The remaining time should be used for intense preparations. The German Democratic Republic is ready to take an active part in them. The preparation and holding of the second special session should give a new impetus to the struggle for disarmament and détente.

At the special session particular attention should be devoted to the preparation of a world disarmament conference. The demand that such a world conference be held after the second special session has our whole-hearted support. Invested with an appropriate mandate, the world disarmament conference would be in a position to adopt binding decisions. Thus the conference could become a genuine highlight of the Second Disarmament Decade.

(Mr. Krutzsch, German Democratic Republic)

Pursuant to the relevant document of the last session of the General Assembly, the resolution to be adopted by this session should extend the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference by requesting that body to make preparations so that such a conference can convene after the second special session devoted to disarmament.

The German Democratic Republic attaches great importance to the questions of regional détente and disarmament. It supports the efforts for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace in various regions of the world. This applies in particular to the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. As a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, the German Democratic Republic is making its contribution towards reaching this goal.

The activities of the United States and other States in expanding existing military bases and creating new ones, as well as the concentration of its naval contingents deployed in this region, are opposed to the legitimate interests of the littoral and hinterland States in the region of the Indian Ocean. The German Democratic Republic backs the latter countries' efforts to convene a conference on the Indian Ocean in the coming year. The resumption of the Soviet-United States negotiations on the limitation and reduction of military activities in the Indian Ocean would undoubtedly serve the Conference's objective.

A number of speakers have, with good reason, pointed to the positive influence that military détente and disarmament in Europe would have on the international climate in general. Situated at the borderline between the two military coalitions, the German Democratic Republic is particularly interested in concrete measures to be taken in this field. However, NATO's seeking to gain military superiority has been counter-productive in this respect.

We should like to recall here that the idea of deploying nuclear weapons of a strategic character in western Europe has been developed and advanced by influential west European statesmen at a time when not a single SS-20 has yet been deployed by the Soviet Union. In adopting the Brussels decision on the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, NATO has brusquely rejected the far-reaching proposals of the USSR and has jeopardized stability and confidence in Europe.

(Mr. Krutzsch, German Democratic Republic)

The Federal Republic of Germany's daily, Frankfurter Rundschau, of 20 October 1980 stated correctly on the subject:

"An offer by the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty contained in the Moscow Declaration of 23 November 1978 to negotiate also on the gray-zone weapons has been simply ignored by NATO, including the Federal Government" - that is, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany - "as well as some offers made later, such as are contained in the Budapest Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty of 15 May 1979 and, above all, Moscow's earlier proposal to include the (so-called) Euro-strategic weapons, including the United States forward-based systems in Europe in the Salt II agreement".

We welcome the fact that the USSR and the United States have begun to talk about the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe. Naturally, the results of such talks could be implemented only after SALT II had gone into operation. This is one more reason for the United Nations General Assembly vigorously to demand ratification of the SALT II treaty at the earliest possible date.

Like the other socialist States, the German Democratic Republic strives for progress in the Vienna talks. In order to overcome the stalemate and achieve first results, the USSR has submitted new proposals on behalf of the participating socialist States. The proposals foresee as a first stage the withdrawal of 20,000 Soviet and 13,000 United States troops, taking account of the numerical strength of their forces stationed in central Europe. On the Soviet side, this reduction would be made in addition to the Soviet troops, tanks and other military equipment already withdrawn unilaterally from the territory of the German Democratic Republic. One would expect the other side to respond to this position and to reciprocate in a constructive spirit. However, we note the absence of such an attitude from the statements made by certain representatives of NATO countries in this Committee. Claims concerning their striving for military superiority cannot possibly be expected to be regarded as an acceptable basis for negotiation.

The security interests of the European peoples can be served only if, by disarmament measures, the existing approximate military equilibrium is maintained at a lower level.

(Mr. Krutzsch, German Democratic Republic)

The States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty have presented a wide-ranging programme concerning questions of military détente in Europe. Their goal is to reduce military confrontation, to build confidence in relations among all European States and to achieve effective measures towards disarmament. An essential part would be the holding of a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe.

The Committee of the Foreign Ministers of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, which held its regular session in Warsaw on 19 and 20 October this year, has again expressed the firm readiness of the countries of the socialist community to realize these aims. The importance in this context of the Madrid meeting of representatives of States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe was underlined at the aforementioned meeting. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic is convinced that a positive political climate and practical agreements on the questions to be dealt with at the forum in Madrid would have an extremely favourable influence on solving the global problems of arms limitation and disarmament.

Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia): The complicated development of international events in recent times caused by the sharp turn in the policies of the United States and other member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), made in an effort to change the existing approximate balance of military power between East and West in their favour, demonstrates ever more clearly the necessity of exerting yet greater endeavours in order to halt the arms race, to extend the process of international détente to the military sphere and to concentrate all efforts on the achievement of real progress in the field of disarmament.

The current campaign directed against the process of international détente, in which the so-called question of Afghanistan continues to be misused, the myth of an alleged Soviet threat is being unearthed and a return to the policy from the position of strength is being openly called for, is in its implications also aimed directly against progress in the field of disarmament. The current policies of the United States and some other Western countries contain quite obvious and documented evidence of efforts to aggravate international tensions and to increase the arms race. This is clearly expressed in the NATO decision of May 1978 on systematically increasing the military budgets of its Member States up to the year 2000, in yet another NATO decision of last December on the deployment in Western Europe of American medium-range missiles targeted at the Soviet Union, in the recent announcement of the so-called new and still more dangerous nuclear strategy of the United States and in a number of other steps conducive to the growth of political and military tensions.

That is why we consider it all the more necessary to revive as soon as possible all the ongoing disarmament talks and to make them as concrete as possible, to initiate negotiations also on those issues which, despite their urgency, are not as yet being negotiated, to achieve the universality of the already-existing disarmament measures and, above all, to conclude new practical agreements on disarmament.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

We see a growing urgency for this session of the United Nations General Assembly to concentrate wholly on the creation of conditions for a more effective implementation of the purposes and principles set forth in the Final Document of the tenth special session in 1978 devoted to disarmament, as well as in other United Nations policy documents relating to disarmament. The memorandum submitted by the Soviet Union, entitled "Peace, disarmament and international security guarantees", outlining a comprehensive collection of proposals relating to all aspects of the main disarmament problems, constitutes a very concrete contribution in this direction.

In the current situation it is imperative, in our view, to reach agreement on certain effective and immediate measures that would stave off the threatening danger of war created by reactionary forces in the West and that would reliably prevent its further growth. The Czechoslovak delegation has therefore warmly welcomed the important initiative submitted at this session by the Soviet Union concerning urgent measures for the reduction of the danger of war, such as the prevention of any further expansion of military groupings or the establishment of new ones, a decision not to increase the present levels of armed forces and armaments, the provision of effective guarantees of the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-States having no such weapons on their territories, the speedy conclusion of a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and the proclamation of a one-year moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

My delegation already explained its basic position on these important and urgent questions at the beginning of our debate. On the basis of the discussion in the First Committee up to now, we note with satisfaction that the Soviet proposals are meeting with the deserved positive response from those countries that have truly at heart the task of strengthening peace and averting the danger of war. It would, indeed, be not only irresponsible but also very dangerous to ignore the growing danger of war and to close

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

our eyes to the pressing need for prompt measures for its elimination. We trust that both our Committee and the United Nations General Assembly will resolutely reject the tendentious endeavours by certain countries to play down or to dismiss those important proposals, using for that purpose even a peculiar illegal interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter, and that they will unequivocally encourage the adoption of such measures without delay.

The agenda of our deliberations contains numerous other disarmament issues deserving the special attention of all Member States. Czechoslovakia's position of principle in respect of those issues is well known. It was fully reflected in the Warsaw Declaration of the Political Consultative Committee of the States Members of the Warsaw Treaty, issued on 15 May 1980, which contains a broad programme of timely proposals for the strengthening of peace and international security and the achievement of tangible progress in the field of disarmament.

Czechoslovakia, as is known, is a direct participant in a number of current international negotiations on various aspects of disarmament, both within and outside the United Nations, and, for its part, has always consistently striven and continues to strive for the achievement of concrete positive results and for a honest implementation of the commitments adopted.

Together with all peace-loving States, we are deeply concerned by the unfounded and, moreover, extremely risky delays caused for more than a year by the United States in the ratification of the Soviet-American SALT II treaty which are reducing the prospects for progress in a number of other disarmament efforts also, while at the same time creating a climate of uncertainty and tension in international relations. It is quite obvious that, had that treaty been ratified in time, we too could have advanced substantially in our deliberations here in the United Nations. We therefore fully join in the emphatic appeal for the speedy ratification of that exceptionally important treaty and hope that the next stage, that is, talks on a SALT III treaty, will be opened as soon as possible on that basis.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

The complexity of the current international situation made itself felt this year also in the work of the principal negotiating body, the Geneva Committee on Disarmament. As a member of that Committee and as one of its Chairmen, this year, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic cannot evaluate as positive the fact that the Committee had to devote a major part of the time allocated to overcoming organizational and procedural problems, most of which were erected artificially and for rather obvious purposes. That, in our view, is one of the reasons why, despite great efforts by many delegations, including the Czechoslovak delegation, the Committee has as yet not achieved the needed substantive progress. On the other hand, we are not losing sight of the fact that this year's session of the Committee also brought certain positive results, notably the establishment and the start of the work of the four working groups dealing with the questions of the prohibition of chemical weapons, the drafting of the final text of the agreement banning radiological weapons, security safeguards for non-nuclear States and the drafting of a general programme of disarmament. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic approaches all those questions actively and believes that the deliberations of the working groups will make a positive contribution to their solution.

This can only be achieved, however, provided that they are not disturbed by renewed attempts to create complications such as we have witnessed, for instance, in connexion with the spreading of invented and unfounded reports concerning the alleged use of chemical weapons. We believe that, with the prerequisite of political goodwill, there are ample possibilities of reaching a comprehensive agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons, including the creation of an effective verification system, and that all due attention must be devoted to this very task.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

The joint Soviet-American draft of the treaty on the prohibition of radiological weapons, submitted this year to the Committee on Disarmament, represents, in our view, a balanced basis for the speedy elaboration of the final text. We are convinced that this question, too, must be tackled in a constructive and realistic spirit and without unnecessary delays.

We furthermore advocate continued negotiations on the substance of an international agreement on the strengthening of security safeguards for non-nuclear States, while not losing sight at the same time of yet other ways of resolving this matter. In this context, we fully support the proposal that, as a first step towards concluding such an agreement, all nuclear States should make the relevant solemn declarations that could be reinforced by the approval of the Security Council.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

Czechoslovakia has devoted considerable attention to the question of the drafting of a general programme of disarmament and, as is known, it submitted on behalf of the group of the socialist countries a draft of the main elements of such a programme to the Geneva Committee on Disarmament. We trust that the continued deliberations of both the working group and the Committee on this issue will bring about realistic and useful results and will create a fruitful basis for the work of the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which is to be held in 1982. We furthermore advocate that the continued work on this programme should take into account the results of the UNESCO World Congress on Disarmament Education held in June this year and that some of the principal postulates of its final document should be included in the draft programme.

We deem it necessary for the Committee on Disarmament, from the very outset of its session next year, to embark on intensive deliberations on the aforementioned questions in the working groups established and to make purposeful and effective use of its allocated time, while considering and drafting specific international agreements.

An even greater effort by the Geneva Committee is needed in relation to the urgent question of measures to halt nuclear armament and to start a transition to the gradual reduction of the stockpiles of nuclear weapons to the point of their complete liquidation. In our view, it is a regrettable shortcoming that, in view of the lack of constructive positions on the part of certain countries, the Committee has as yet not started substantive deliberations on the over-all question of nuclear disarmament and on all aspects of nuclear weapons, despite the proposals submitted. We believe that a working group should be established within the Committee that could embark without delay on the substantive consideration of this principal element of the disarmament effort.

It is equally necessary, in our view, to establish a working group in the Committee for the preparation of a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, in whose work all nuclear States could participate. This group could proceed in its activities on the basis of the results

(Mr. Handl. Czechoslovakia)

achieved in the course of the preparatory Soviet-American-British talks as well as of much other background material, including the results of the expert negotiations on co-operation in the detection and identification of seismic phenomena, which has so far been compiled by the Committee. We are firmly convinced that as far as the substance of the matter is concerned, there are no real obstacles in the way of preparing such a treaty in the near future -- especially if the deliberations could be held in conditions of a moratorium on nuclear explosions, as proposed by the Soviet Union. The necessity of the earliest possible elaboration of a comprehensive test-ban treaty has been underlined by the recent Chinese atmospheric test, the harmful effects of the radioactive residue of which have yet to be assessed.

We deem it necessary to intensify the work of the Geneva Committee on the question of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. In order to prepare a draft of a corresponding international agreement, as well as to consider the possibilities of concluding individual specific agreements, it would be very useful, in our view, to establish an authoritative group of experts that would follow and, at the same time, evaluate the developments in that field.

We trust that the current session of the United Nations General Assembly will adopt such decisions as will enable the Geneva Committee on Disarmament to embark next year on intensive, constructive and fruitful work.

This year we are entering the Second Disarmament Decade, the policy-setting ideas and objectives of which we shall approve at the current session. Also already within sight is the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament from which all the peace-loving countries and peoples expect practical results and concrete progress in the decisive direction of efforts for halting the arms race and for disarmament.

We believe that the best way to ensure the success of that session lies, first of all, in the effective utilization of the remaining time for intensive and fruitful negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament and in the United Nations Disarmament Commission, as well as in other international bodies dealing with questions of disarmament. And it is here, as we have already indicated, that the greatest reserves exist.

(Mr. Handl - Czechoslovakia)

We furthermore advocate the highest possible quality of organizational as well as substantive preparation for that session, in which we are prepared to take an immediate and active part. We believe that all States which so desire should be enabled to participate in the preparatory work. Without anticipating the development of events, we should like to submit the view that the attention of the second special session should focus on the mapping of concrete ways and means of achieving practical progress in the field of disarmament, while fully respecting the already agreed and existing principles. Especially with regard to the machinery of disarmament negotiations, the special session should, in our view, constitute the first step towards convening a world conference on disarmament with the participation of all States and should initiate its practical preparation.

In our opinion, the special session should fully reflect the spirit of constructive, purposeful and fruitful international co-operation called for in the United Nations Declaration on International Co-operation for Disarmament, adopted last year on the Czechoslovak initiative.

We, of course, fully understand that the achievement of those objectives is wholly dependent on the political will of all the participants in the deliberations and, above all, on the course of action taken by the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and on their determination honestly to fulfil their special responsibility for world peace, security and disarmament. However, should that be lacking, then the real danger arises that we shall have to face a situation in which our deliberations will increasingly lag behind the progress of the arms race. And should we permit the developments to proceed in that direction, it will hardly be possible to release the means necessary for economic and social development or to prevent the advancing devastation of the earth and its natural resources which could be exhausted by the continued arms race.

For these reasons, we emphatically call for the responsible consideration and adoption of the well-known proposals for the immediate practical reduction of military budgets, especially those of the great Powers, and we welcome the proposal of the Soviet Union to consider the question of the historical responsibility of States for the preservation of nature for both present and future generations.

(Mr. Handl. Czechoslovakia)

We furthermore support the elaboration and adoption of a world-wide treaty on the non-use of force in international relations which would, in our view, considerably strengthen peace and security throughout the world and would, at the same time, create much more favourable conditions for progress in disarmament negotiations.

Of perpetual timeliness - a timeliness enhanced by, among other things, the continuing dangerous activities of South Africa, Israel and some other countries - is the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, which was considered in detail this year by the Second Review Conference of States Parties of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, held recently in Geneva. We believe that the Conference has once again reaffirmed the exceptional importance of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the necessity of the systematic strengthening of its régime. The deliberations of the Conference also confirmed the irreplaceable role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in the application of the system of nuclear safeguards and in developing international co-operation in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

Czechoslovakia continues to be a staunch supporter of the idea of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world as an important means of strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation régime as well as regional and international security.

We also support the efforts of the States in the area of the Indian Ocean to establish a zone of peace and to eliminate foreign military bases in their region and we welcome the convening of an international Conference on that question in the coming year.

In our opinion, it is also important that an agreement be reached on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.

The Czechoslovak delegation welcomed the positive results of the Conference on the prohibition or limitation for humanitarian reasons of the use of certain types of conventional weapons, which ended in Geneva two weeks ago. We regard the agreements that were reached, in the elaboration of which we participated, as a new and important contribution to the efforts aimed at halting the arms race and extending the process of détente to the military sphere.

As a European country located in the centre of the strongest military concentration in the world, Czechoslovakia, together with other member countries of the Warsaw Treaty, is exerting all-round intensive efforts aimed at halting the arms race and creating military détente in Europe.

The Communiqué adopted at the recent session of the Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Warsaw Treaty countries in Warsaw on 19 October 1980 once again fully reaffirms all the initiatives and proposals aimed at strengthening peace, détente and co-operation in Europe. It emphasizes that

"there are no types of weapons the limitation and reduction of which could not be agreed upon on the basis of reciprocity, while strictly observing the principle of equality and the undiminished security of all States".

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

Our approach fully applies also to the burning issue of the deployment of 572 new American medium-range missiles carrying nuclear weapons on the territories of Western European States members of NATO, which was decided upon contrary to the interests of European and world peace. We fully support the Soviet proposals for the solution of that pressing problem concurrently and in organic interrelationship with the question of the United States forward-based systems. We trust that the opening of Soviet-American talks will bring positive results in that respect.

It may also be recalled that the socialist countries had already proposed earlier that the States participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe should conclude a treaty among themselves on the non-first-use of either nuclear or conventional arms: in other words, that a de facto non-aggression pact be concluded in Europe with the participation of the United States and Canada.

In the current complicated international situation we attach growing importance to the meeting of representatives of the States participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe which is to open in Madrid on 11 November of this year.

We are convinced that the Madrid meeting must pay due attention to consideration of the military aspects of European security and of specific measures that may be adopted to that end. It is of paramount importance to us that a decision be reached at the Madrid meeting to convene a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe. As representatives know, the socialist countries propose that in the first stage the conference should consider the question of confidence-building measures and should concentrate subsequently on the co-ordination of measures to reduce the level and concentration of military confrontation in Europe, including the limitation of military activities and the reduction of armed forces and armaments.

Czechoslovakia also attaches particular importance to the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe, a matter on which,

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

along with the other socialist countries, we strive untiringly for the achievement of progress. Suffice it to recall one of the most recent proposals, submitted by the socialist countries on 10 July 1980. In substance, it proposes that in the first stage the United States should withdraw 13,000 soldiers from the agreed area of reduction and the Soviet Union another 20,000 soldiers, in addition to the 20,000 men who were unilaterally withdrawn from the territory of the German Democratic Republic along with 1,000 tanks and other military equipment. We believe that, if our partners in Vienna really wish to reach agreement, this and other constructive proposals by the socialist countries should provide them with ample opportunity to do so. Surely there is a way to resolve this issue.

In concluding my statement I should like to assure the Chairman that the Czechoslovak delegation is ready to co-operate with all delegations in the interest of the positive and successful consideration of the disarmament issues on the agenda of our Committee and to exert all-round efforts so that a maximum degree of progress in that direction may be made at the current session.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.