

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION
*Official Records**



COPY:
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
L-201 (NW/82)

FIRST COMMITTEE
26th meeting
held on
Thursday, 4 November 1982
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 26TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. CARSALES (Argentina)
(Vice-Chairman)

UN LIBRARY

CONTENTS

NOV 11 1982

UN/SA COLLECTION

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 57, 133, 136 AND 139 (continued)

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Cabello Sarubbi (Paraguay)
Mr. Petrovsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Mr. Gayama (Congo)
Mr. Badawi (Egypt)
Sister Marjorie Keenan (Holy See)
Mr. Korneenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)
Mrs. Castro de Barish (Costa Rica)

* 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.1/37/PV.26
11 November 1982

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 57, 133, 136, 138 AND 139 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. CABELLO SARUBBI (Paraguay) (interpretation from Spanish): The awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to the Ambassador of Mexico, Mr. Garcia Robles, is an honour not only for him and his country but also for all Latin Americans, for whom he has always been a faithful interpreter in his patient and continuous search for an effective disarmament formula. Our sincere congratulations go both to him, and to Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden, who shares the prize with him.

My delegation has followed with attention the events at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and, like previous speakers, we share the disappointment of world public opinion over the meagre results of that session. The second special session should have been a practical complement to the first special session, in which there was a full debate on the causes of the arms race and on possible measures for bringing about general and complete disarmament.

The lack of a comprehensive programme on disarmament has meant that it is illusory to hope for any real reversal of the arms race in the near future. The main responsibility for that failure rests with the major Powers because of their intransigence in determining clear priorities for that programme.

Precisely when the world is undergoing one of the worst economic crises of this century, a large part of the resources of mankind is being invested in the improvement of weapons or the designing of new weapons, or in expansion of already gigantic nuclear arsenals.

While the developing countries, including those of my region, are suffering from a serious lack of the funds needed to continue meeting their development needs, the industrialized countries of both the West and the East are continuing to distort the international economy with large military expenditures or with speculation in the increasingly important arms trade. That trade is so extensive

(Mr. Cabello Sarubbi, Paraguay)

that it would again be appropriate to wonder, as it was fashionable to wonder during the period preceding the Second World War, if armed conflicts are not produced by the large armaments enterprises - of the right or the left - to secure handsome profits, the only difference being that today the large arms merchants are the States themselves.

The economies of some countries have become so enslaved to arms production that it would be senseless to hope today for anything other than a gradual process of disarmament, the only course that would not entail a major economic and social crisis. Consequently, if both the security of those States and the health of their economies is to be preserved, confidence among States must be increased, particularly among the major Powers. For that it is essential to begin a genuine dialogue which could lead to specific measures on the basis of full verification.

The question of verification is a real problem which must be faced courageously by the States involved. Refusal by one of them to agree to the entry into operation of a reasonable programme for the verification of progress in disarmament will inevitably be viewed with suspicion by the international community and interpreted as a sign of reprehensible intentions. My delegation therefore enthusiastically supports the idea of creating an international satellite monitoring agency as proposed at the first special session devoted to disarmament by France, and referred to again in the course of this debate by the representative of Denmark when he spoke on behalf of the members of the European Community.

Europe now has the largest concentration of arms and troops in the world, and consequently it is there that any significant disarmament effort should logically take place. An important step in that direction seems to have been taken by the Soviet Union when, last June, it undertook not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. That declaration would appear to be an invitation to other States to make similar announcements.

However, careful consideration of the European theatre leads to the conclusion that it would be totally unrealistic to hope that the Western countries could renounce the tactical use of short or medium-range nuclear warheads, in view of the present marked imbalance in favour of the Warsaw Pact nations in conventional weapons.

(Mr. Cabello Sarubbi, Paraguay)

In order to gain the credibility that it wants, the Soviet Union must once again try to negotiate clearly and effectively the reduction of conventional weapons in Europe, and to do this we believe that the Vienna forum is the most appropriate.

As the representative of the Bahamas clearly pointed out in his recent statement, any disarmament programme involves an element of risk for the parties concerned. Nevertheless, if one accepts risks, presumably one accepts a certain standard of values and a political will to act. The degree of risk that States are willing to take depends upon the extent to which they are devoted to peace and peaceful coexistence, and also on the importance attached by their adversary to these same values.

As long as there are States which have no compunction about imposing their doctrines or ideologies by any means available to them, including violent means, it will be very difficult to create the necessary climate of confidence for the acceptance of certain risks without counterpart measures being clearly taken.

Thus we find ourselves faced with serious moral problems in the standard of values of certain States, for whom success of their ideology takes precedence over peace or security for other States, for in their minds there is no real difference between lawful and unlawful means; anything is allowed, provided it achieves the final result.

Unfortunately, this is no mere game with minor consequences. The arms race, and worse still the use of such costly equipment not only diverts resources needed so vitally by mankind in other sectors, but constitutes the primary cause of death and suffering for mankind on earth.

We are not surprised then that mankind - represented primarily by the younger generations - is outraged at the thought that there are Governments, like that of one super-Power, which plans to spend nearly \$200 billion on defence this year - and according to certain observers, the other super-Power plans to spend even more, although it does not admit as much - when these resources could resolve all of mankind's most urgent problems in just a few years. There is no ideology or political credo which can possibly

(Mr. Cabello Sarubbi, Paraguay)

justify such an absurd use of assets, especially when the objective is ostensibly the progress of mankind and satisfaction of its most urgent needs.

Consequently, our Organization must redouble its efforts to put an end to the most crude forms of intolerance which impede the peaceful co-existence of States, and in this way abide by one of the primary purposes of the Charter, which is:

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples...

(Article 1, para. 2)

Only thus will there prevail the climate of confidence and mutual respect necessary for the implementation of the recommendations of the already too many international conferences on disarmament.

We do not wish to diminish the effect that other measures might have in promoting confidence among States and which might lead to more ambitious programmes, but my delegation strongly believes that an end must be put to the development and production of new weapons, to all nuclear tests and that the use of weapons with indiscriminate effects, especially chemical or bacteriological weapons is unacceptable. We have heard denunciations against the use of such weapons in Afghanistan and South-East Asia. We believe that the creation of nuclear-free zones, such as the one created in Latin America by the Tlatelolco Treaty, is a positive contribution to regional disarmament and disarmament throughout the world.

We favour a world disarmament campaign provided it has equal access to world public opinion. Otherwise, it would be an expenditure of doubtful usefulness with serious demagogical implications.

My country does not have to be convinced any more than it is of the value of disarmament. For more than three decades we have been living in a climate of internal peace and tranquillity with our neighbours and that has made possible extraordinary progress in our region. Any effective disarmament campaign must be directed at the primary protagonists in the arms race, and in particular towards the masses in the major Powers. This does not mean that regional disarmament is any less important, because effective

(Mr. Cabello Sarubbi, Paraguay)

demilitarization of the world can only be achieved with the co-operation of the entire international community. So wherever a disarmament programme can be properly implemented, that course of action should be taken in order to satisfy other urgent needs, especially in our developing world.

For the reasons set forth in this statement my country will support at this session of the General Assembly any concrete proposal, which is both sincere and practicable, to curb the arms race which stands in the way of the enjoyment of peace and the achievement of genuine security in the world.

Mr. PETROVSKY (United Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has asked to speak in order to share some ideas it has in connection with the work which is now being undertaken by the First Committee. This work has now reached a new and very responsible stage. We are about to conclude the general discussion and delegations are now focussing their attention on drawing up and reaching agreement on draft resolutions.

By way of summarizing the general discussion, I do not think we can fail to note that one of its salient features has been the extremely serious and constructive discussion, which has covered a broad range of topics on the agenda of the First Committee in the field of disarmament.

It should be underlined, and I think with some gratification, that those who participated in this session did not yield to the provocative attempts of at least one delegation, the United States, to divert the discussion into the field of fruitless rhetoric. We share the views expressed by a number of representatives, particularly those of India, Argentina, Algeria, Mexico, Sweden and other countries, in the deep concern they have expressed for the fate of the world, in light of the unprecedented acceleration of the arms race, this being particularly true as concerns the nuclear arms race.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

In this connection, I should particularly like to refer to what was said by the representative of Yugoslavia, Mr. Golob, who emphasized that the arms race represents a constant threat to peace in the world and threatens the security of all countries. Nor can we fail to agree with what was said by the representative of India, Mr. Chanana, when he said that the arms race is threatening the security of all States and the lives of people throughout the world.

Those who bear the main responsibility for the rapid growth of weapons arsenals have tried to assert that there is in fact no such thing as an arms race - among these is the representative of the United States, Mr. Adelman, speaking in the General Assembly. But this is simply further proof of their lack of courtesy towards the delegations present at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, for the Assembly was discussing genuinely acute problems which were a direct result of the intensification of the arms race.

In this discussion we have also heard the opinion that responsibility for the arms race and for there having been no progress towards putting an end to it is borne to an equal degree by both leading military Powers and by the two basic military and political alliances.

We consider that such an approach is incorrect, not only because it does not coincide with the facts, but also because it actually makes it more difficult to find the ways and means of overcoming the unfortunate turn which international events have taken. Is it really possible to equate the positions held by the Soviet Union with those held by the United States? Those held by the Warsaw Treaty Organization with those held by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)? Can it be asserted that both those States and both those alliances approach security problems from a bloc attitude and base their positions on the doctrine of deterrence and the possibility of limited, localized wars?

The States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, which is the defence alliance of the socialist countries, find a bloc policy completely alien to them. They have often stated that they are quite prepared to dissolve their alliance if the NATO bloc were simultaneously dissolved, and they have proposed as a first step eliminating the military organizations of both groups, starting with a mutual reduction of military activities. The Warsaw Treaty Organization has proposed that all States which signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe should conclude a treaty which would include the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against other States. When that proposal was turned down, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries proposed that the States participants in the Conference conclude a treaty committing them not to be the first to use against the others either nuclear or conventional weapons.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

At the meeting of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs held at Moscow on 21 and 22 October this year, the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty expressed the desire that neither of the military and political alliances - NATO and the Warsaw Treaty - should extend its sphere of activity to new parts of the world, such as Asia, Africa and Latin America. For their part, the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty have already stated that they have no intention of extending the sphere of activity of their alliance and that they expect a similar position to be taken by the States members of NATO. However, we have thus far received no reaction to this proposal; it was a constructive proposal aimed at strengthening international détente and eliminating the threat of war.

The States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty have never aspired and will never aspire to any military superiority. It has been their unwavering belief that military balance should be secured at the lowest possible levels. They have no strategic doctrine apart from a doctrine of defence, nor do they have any intention of acquiring a first-strike capability. They reject the doctrine of localized, limited nuclear wars and the possibility of emerging victorious from a nuclear war. They do not strive to gain spheres of influence or to establish military or political control of any part of the world or of any international transport or communications networks.

Facts - and particularly recent facts - indicate that the responsibility for the situation which has arisen lies with those who have been the constant initiators of fundamentally military programmes, which have escalated the arms race to its present level; with those who, on various pretexts, have ended the talks on many subjects relating to the curbing of the arms race and to disarmament; with those who overtly made it impossible to reach agreement at the first special session devoted to disarmament on setting priorities in the field; with those who have now refused to subscribe to agreements already reached. One gets the impression that they have undertaken negotiations only to raise a shield behind which they can continue to accumulate weapons and to foster the illusion that active steps are being taken to reduce them. That policy was in particular evidence at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, where a specific group of States made it impossible to adopt effective resolutions on such important matters as averting nuclear war, a comprehensive programme of disarmament, and others.

Today's statement by the representative of the United States, Mr. Adelman, shows more clearly than anything else that the United States delegation is participating in our work not in order to undertake serious and businesslike discussion of the items on our agenda, but rather in order to try and justify the bellicose, extraordinarily selfish great-Power policy of the United States, which is aimed at creating further tensions, indeed at making the situation as tense as possible. Clearly, this is an obvious example of the slanderous methods resorted to by United States diplomats at the United Nations and of what anti-Soviet paranoia and megalomania can lead to.

In his attempt to denigrate the Soviet Union and to push our discussion towards confrontation, the representative of the United States even went so far as to offend the sacred memory of the hundreds of Byelorussian villages which were set on fire by the Fascists. I would remind the representative of the United States that an American President, Senators and Members of the House of Representatives have laid wreaths at the foot of the monument to the town of Khatin, which exemplifies that memory.

It was the height of hypocrisy for those who yesterday fired on a peace demonstration at Kent State University in the state of Ohio and who today are cynically calling on millions of their citizens to increase United States armaments so that their will may be imposed on other countries and peoples now to spout about the peace movement. The present session has shown that it is not so easy for the United States representative to manipulate world public opinion beyond his shores as it is for him to do so in his own country. For those who are enemies of the anti-war movement, no holds are barred: condemnations, threats, blackmail, and the establishment of groups which seem to have anti-war aims, but in fact try to direct the movement from within and to dismember it.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Also, attempts have been made to convert such organizations into an instrument in the struggle against the socialist countries and in mobilizing the anti-socialist forces in those countries. Those who are hostile to the anti-war movement would like the Soviet people to be against the policies of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government. What reason could there be for this? There are no reasons, because that policy precisely expresses the aspirations of the Soviet people. Today it is expressed in a concrete form in the programme of peace for the 1980s which was put forward by the Twenty-sixth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Soviet people and Soviet public organizations support the peace-loving initiatives put forward by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, Mr. Brezhnev, and the Soviet Government. And why should they not support this?

Let the Western Governments undertake the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons; let them agree to the draft world treaty on the non-use of force; let the Western Governments speak in favour of freezing nuclear weapons; let the Western Governments speak against the development of new means of mass destruction, including new forms of chemical weapons, and the elimination of such weapons. If they did, I think they too would have the support of the anti-war movement. And when governmental bodies in certain countries speak in such a spirit, they will receive this support.

Therefore, it is quite logical that the Soviet people favour the policy of their Government. The truth cannot be hidden from the peoples by means of anti-Soviet slanders which is a speciality of certain American representatives in the United Nations, who overlook the fact that here they are among specialists on matters of arms restriction, disarmament and the strengthening of international security, not at some gathering of ultra-right-wing people in their country.

If we look realistically at the present-day situation, we should not talk about the rivalry between two countries or two blocs but rather about the conflict between two diametrically opposed policies. The warlike policy of refusing to

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

work for détente is challenged by the Soviet Union, with a well-tried policy which is consistent and in keeping with the interests of peace-loving peoples.

"The international situation," as was emphasized quite recently by Mr. Brezhnev at a meeting of the higher echelons of the Soviet Army and the Navy on 27 October in the Kremlin:

"compels us to double or triple our efforts to maintain peace and reduce the threat of nuclear war which hangs over mankind. In this struggle we should strengthen our co-operation with all those that cherish peace on earth."

On the eve of the sixty-fifth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the sixtieth anniversary of the formation of the Soviet Union, it should once again be emphasized that from the first legislative act passed in the Soviet Union, the Peace Decree, the entire policy of our State has been constantly imbued with a genuine desire to preserve peace. We are not seeking confrontation with any country, including the United States. We are against any further growth in Soviet-American tensions. We favour the normalization of such a relationship. We should like them to improve and we are prepared to undertake businesslike, thorough and effective talks, which, necessarily, must take into account the interests of both sides. But, of course, the Soviet Union cannot close its eyes to the truth of where the real military threat comes from; nor can we fail to react to the militaristic policy which is today practised by those in American ruling circles.

No one can deny that we are entitled to protect our own interests and the interests of our friends and allies. Far be it from us to attempt to equate all international problems with the arms race and the need for its cessation. The Soviet Union favours the use of all possible means in order to guarantee peace and prevent a new world war. There is no international problem which we would not be prepared to solve through negotiation. We share the conclusion reached by the United Nations Group of Experts which produced a study on the relationship between disarmament and international security, that

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

"Progress in disarmament and in the strengthening of international security must be looked upon as parallel means in the effort to preserve peace and prevent war." (A/36/597, para. 43)

In this connection, a timely reminder was given by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, in his report on the work of the Organization (A/37/1), concerning the importance of breathing fresh life into the Charter concept of collective action in the interests of preserving peace and security, and the need for strict observance of the United Nations Charter. The Soviet Union fully concurs with such an approach.

At the same time, we are equally aware of the relationship existing between disarmament and development. There is no doubt that the possibility of liberating larger funds than are now available in order to give assistance to developing countries in overcoming the backwardness inherited from colonial times will depend first and foremost on whether resources which are at present being absorbed by the arms race can be switched to peaceful purposes. At the same time, in present-day conditions, which are characterized by an escalation in the arms race and profound and far-reaching changes in the development of military technology, the cessation of the stockpiling of weapons should be the focal-point of the broad thrust of all efforts to strengthen peace and international security.

This is the quintessential question of the present day, as the representative of Sweden, Mrs. Theorin, very properly emphasized in her statement, when speaking of the question of mankind's survival. Now as never before what we need are concrete, meaningful actions. An example of such steps can be seen in the new Soviet initiatives: the undertaking of the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and the proposals on the immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and the intensification of efforts to remove the threat of nuclear war and ensure the safe development of nuclear energy. Their main purpose is further to encourage a broad frontal attack on the growing threat of nuclear warfare and to ensure the success of the negotiations on arms limitation which are now taking place.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

During this discussion delegations may naturally think of certain questions relating to specific aspects of the Soviet proposals - first, in connection with the Soviet Union's unilateral undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. With this act of historic import, we have again assured all States of our unswervingly peaceful intentions, the purely defensive purpose underlying our military doctrines and the absence of any desire to achieve any kind of military superiority.

Many delegations - in particular those of Mexico, Egypt, Pakistan and Sri Lanka -- have emphasized the great significance of this step and the need for other nuclear Powers to follow our example. Such a chain reaction would indeed amount to a universal prohibition of nuclear weapons.

There have been attempts in our Committee to question the real significance of the Soviet undertaking. Apparently, those who have made those attempts are deliberately turning a deaf ear to the clarifications given by the Soviet Union at the highest and most responsible level. We have already said that this undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons involves substantial changes in the organization, structure and training of our armed forces. Consequently, this is no mere verbal assurance; it is indeed a specific action designed to strengthen the material foundations of international peace.

In connection with the undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, we have heard it asserted that to refrain from being the first to use only certain types of weapons offends the principle of the non-use of force, and is thus in conflict with the Charter. If those who advance such arguments took them to their logical conclusion they would have to say that even the Geneva Protocol of 1925 was a harmful document, since it has the same defects as those attributed to the undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. It is no mere coincidence that such well-known American authorities on international relations, military strategy and security as McGeorge Bundy, George Kennan, Robert McNamara and Gerard Smith have concluded that the basic argument in favour of the policy of not being the first to use nuclear weapons can be expressed in strictly military terms - that is, any other policy would involve an unavoidable risk to the life of the nation for whose protection the armed forces actually exist in the first place.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The Soviet Union's undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, which will apply to all countries in the world without exception, is a very important step which will genuinely strengthen the security of States which do not possess such weapons. At the same time, our declaration that we shall unilaterally give guarantees of security to non-nuclear-weapon States which do not have nuclear weapons on their territory -- that is, a guarantee that nuclear weapons will not be used against them -- also remains in force.

The whole course of this discussion has indicated that, with certain prominent exceptions, the overwhelming majority of delegations have agreed that priority should be given to prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests. To solve this problem was in fact the purpose of one proposal put forward by the Soviet Union during the present session. Of course, the proposed cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests is not a new proposal, but in present conditions the need for it has become particularly acute and urgent, since if the matter were resolved it would create a real obstacle to a new round in the spiraling arms race, and thus provide substantial protection against the growing nuclear danger.

The fact that the United States has unilaterally refused to continue the tripartite talks to prohibit nuclear-weapon tests makes it even more necessary for us to take positive action in this multilateral negotiating body on disarmament to produce the text of a draft treaty. The Soviet Union has put forward a document entitled "Basic provisions of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests", designed to provide a practical basis for multilateral talks on the matter, and at the same time a basis that will take into account both the thinking of a broad range of States and the elements agreed upon in the course of the tripartite talks. This was rightly pointed out by a number of representatives in their statements, particularly by the representative of Brazil, Ambassador Souza e Silva.

We noted with interest that the delegation of Sweden also intends to present its own draft treaty to the Committee on Disarmament. The Soviet Union has never claimed to have a monopoly on putting forward disarmament proposals, and it will give the draft all due attention and consider it in a very constructive spirit.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

We certainly believe that the Committee on Disarmament should immediately get down to businesslike and constructive talks on this priority aspect of disarmament, the drafting of a treaty containing a general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. We cannot allow the Committee to be used as a smokescreen for the unsavoury purpose of continuing nuclear tests.

Another Soviet proposal which combines interrelated questions - providing for the safe development of nuclear sources of energy and for the cessation of the nuclear arms race - approaches the problem of preventing nuclear war from a different angle. We are gratified that the ideas in that proposal have received a favourable response from many delegations, as indicated by the considerable attention given to the protection of peaceful nuclear installations against military attack, and by statements in favour of freezing nuclear arsenals, as well as a number of draft resolutions put forward on this item.

It has been said here that the Soviet Union's proposal deals with the question of preventing attacks on civilian nuclear installation in a purely declaratory form. It is true that the draft resolution, if adopted, would be an authoritative declaration of intent by States and would create a tangible moral and political disincentive to the deliberate destruction of peaceful nuclear installations. At the same time, we are quite prepared to go ahead with the drafting of the relevant international legal instruments to add to the existing instruments.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

One of the characteristic features of the work of the First Committee has been the greater attention paid to the question of preventing an arms race in outer space. I think it can be said that this question, the consideration of which was begun on the initiative of the Soviet Union last year, has taken its proper place in the disarmament agenda. This is shown particularly by the statements made by the representatives of India, Sri Lanka, Brazil, Austria, Italy and other countries. Now what we have to do is place the discussion of this matter on a practical basis. We believe that such a purpose is successfully served by draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.8, the sponsors of which have endeavoured to take account of the views expressed by numerous delegations, including what has been said about the question of anti-satellite systems.

In this connection, we cannot fail to express our amazement at the fact that, because of the position of essentially one delegation and one alone, that of the United States, in the Committee on Disarmament, it was impossible to establish a working group for discussions of the question of preventing an arms race in outer space. It is our hope that at the next session the Committee will really get down to this matter.

In many of the statements we have heard in this Committee reference has been made to the need to find an adequate solution to the problem of how to control and monitor agreements reached in the disarmament field, and that is quite natural. We believe that ensuring the effectiveness of agreements which have been concluded and also those which are now being drafted in the field of disarmament is a very important, indeed a major, way of curbing the military threat and strengthening trust between States. Nowadays, when we have seen increasingly frequent attempts to reverse the system of international legal instruments which has been created over the years in this field, when some parties have become accustomed to refusing to ratify treaties they have signed or publicly consider the possibility of establishing systems of armaments which are in direct conflict with existing agreements, this problem naturally takes on particular urgency.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The Soviet Union, while strictly observing the provisions of all those instruments to which its signature is attached, is entitled to expect that other States parties act similarly. One way to strengthen mutual trust and to have agreements on disarmament observed is, as is well known, control. In our approach to this question, we in the Soviet Union are mindful of the relevant provisions of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, which states inter alia:

"Disarmament and arms limitation agreements should provide for adequate measures of verification satisfactory to all parties concerned in order to create the necessary confidence and ensure that they are being observed by all parties. The form and modalities of the verification to be provided for in any specific agreement depend upon and should be determined by the purposes, scope and nature of the agreement." (resolution S-10/2, part II, para. 31)

We also attach great importance to the idea set forth in the Final Document to the effect that the methods and procedures of control should not be discriminatory in nature, that they should not be connected with unwarranted intervention in the internal affairs of States and that they should not threaten their economic or social development.

The Head of the Soviet State, Mr. Brezhnev, has said:

"In Washington they like to proclaim that arms limitation agreements should be subject to very careful control. Who objects to that? We also wish to be certain that the United States stands by its commitments. For that reason we are no less anxious that there should be control than the United States. In fact we are probably more concerned about it."

At the same time, it has been seen that the opponents of disarmament recently have been trying even more zealously to use the problem of control in order to justify their own lack of constructive suggestions in disarmament matters. This is not so much a question of control but rather the myth they have invented, which surrounds this question. They have invented practically everything. Control has been brought out in

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

one of its forms: that is, on-site verification. The finding of a solution in the question of control is made a prerequisite to talks on the substance on disarmament. Approaches to control which have won broad international recognition are ignored, as are also the opinions of eminent specialists.

An example of this control game, I would say, and a very striking one, is the tactic of the United States in the matter of a nuclear-test ban. After long negotiations on a test ban, which led to an agreement on a general approach to all aspects of the problem, and after many years of studying related questions of control, the United States is now suggesting that we start the whole thing right from the beginning. At the same time, it has refused to become involved in the drafting of a treaty on this.

In the light of all this, can we really believe the statements by United States representatives that they take a serious view of control? At the same time, the provisions of the Final Document and the experience that has been gained in the consideration of control matters indicate quite clearly that these matters should be discussed and dealt with simultaneously and as an organic part of our consideration of specific problems relating to arms limitation and disarmament rather than divorced from them.

Experience has also shown that national technological means constitute a very reliable method of verifying the extent to which an agreement has been implemented. That was very convincingly indicated, for example, in the statement made by the representative of Italy, Mr. La Rocca, on 25 October 1982, when he said:

"All such existing agreements, and indeed all proposals made for agreements by any party, give a considerable and irreplaceable role to national technical means of verification." (A/C.1/37/PV.10, p. 36)

At the same time, we believe that, where necessary, various methods of verification should be combined with other control procedures, including

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

international procedures - for example, on-site verification on an agreed basis. The strengthening of trust would help to ensure the application of additional control measures. This approach, based on a combination of national and international means of control, has been reflected in the new proposals for prohibiting chemical weapons and on the nuclear-test ban put forward by my country recently. One can only express surprise at the fact that the representative of the United States, in regard to the question of a test ban, could possibly come to the conclusion that "nothing is said about verification" in the Soviet proposal.

Many of the aspects of our proposal on control in connection with the test ban go even further, I would say, than the provisions of the relevant tripartite communiqués to the Committee on Disarmament, which reflected the degree of agreement among the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom. In the light of the preferences expressed by a number of States, we are prepared to envisage the procedures for verification on a voluntary basis being worked out ahead of time and not for three but for all States, and this should be reflected in the treaty.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Additional functions will, of course, also be performed by the three experts, who will then not only deal with the question of the international exchange of seismological data and help to promote the broad implementation of international consultation and co-operation, but also play some part in on-the-spot verification.

We know that not all States have such highly effective national technology available to them for effecting control as the United States and the Soviet Union. That being so, in a number of Soviet documents that have been put before the General Assembly and the Committee on Disarmament for consideration we envisage the possibility of providing information gathered by means of national control technology to those States parties that do not possess such technology.

On the whole the Soviet Union is ready, I would stress, to undertake a business-like consideration to resolve the question of control over various arms-limitation and disarmament measures. This is equally true of the question of freezing nuclear arsenals.

At the same time we cannot fail to see that certain measures aimed at restricting the arms race may not require any elaborate system of control. This is particularly true of the problem of the non-use of nuclear weapons. We believe that references to the effect that the Soviet Union's undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and indeed the draft convention that has been put before the Committee, which would prohibit the use of such weapons, do not envisage establishing control and are not subject to verification, can only be regarded as a clumsy attempt at dissociation from efforts to find a solution to this problem.

In this connection I should like to ask a question. Perhaps the authors of this line of argument consider their readiness to be the first to use nuclear weapons is easier to verify and is therefore more realistic. In this connection I think it would be appropriate to recall that such clumsy attempts are resorted to by those nuclear Powers that a few years ago made unilateral declarations that they would not use nuclear weapons against a limited number of States that did not possess such weapons. But surely we

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

must all recall that they did not link their declarations with any questions as to how their implementation should be verified.

Some delegations have touched upon the question of setting up an international control organization. In principle we would not rule out the possibility of creating international machinery to verify the implementation of far-reaching steps as a process of genuine disarmament, provided that this need is not dictated by the substance of the steps themselves. I should like to remind members that the Soviet plan for general and complete disarmament, which was put forward in the United Nations as far back as the beginning of the 1960s, envisaged the creation of such an international control organization. However, at that time we believed and we continue to believe, that to divorce control measures from the substance of disarmament agreements is unwarranted and simply serves to jeopardize the cause of disarmament. There cannot be control without disarmament. If there is, in fact, genuine disarmament, then any methods of control, even the most far-reaching, can be utilized.

One of the most important prerequisites for the taking of certain agreed steps in arms limitation and disarmament is necessary political will on the part of Governments. References to the technical difficulties involved in control should not be used as a pretext for not trying to achieve agreement on efforts to curb the arms race.

In conclusion, may I once again express the satisfaction of our delegation at the results of the general discussion in the First Committee which, despite certain efforts to involve the Committee in fruitless flights of rhetoric was, generally speaking, businesslike and gave us a better idea of the positions of States, made it possible to identify the reasons for certain unsatisfactory situations in the field of arms restriction and disarmament and at the same time to determine the best ways of correcting this situation. These positive results have, I think, borne out that those people who wring their hands, those who acquiesce in a pessimistic evaluation of our chances of reaching a constructive solution of the most pressing problems of war and peace, are not right.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, as our Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Gromyko, has emphasized,

"The Soviet people reject the gloomy view that mankind has no other path to follow than building up piles of armaments and preparing for war. It would be a mistake to underestimate the rising menace of war. But it is an even greater mistake to fail to see that possibilities do exist for putting up an insurmountable barrier against war. The Soviet Union and the Soviet people are placing all their political and moral potential and all the prestige of their policy on the scales of peace." (A/37/PV.13, p. 31)

Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (interpretation from French): The Congolese delegation is very pleased that Mr. Gbeho is guiding the work of the First Committee. We see in his election as Chairman a special tribute to his country, Ghana, which is a friend of my country and which at an early date became a symbol on the African and the international scene of the struggle of peoples in their quest for peace and freedom in a world then scarcely aware of the need to put an end to colonialism as a factor of crisis and tension. I wish to stress also the personal merits of the Chairman, which, in the opinion of my delegation, guarantee the smooth functioning of our Committee and the success of its work. We assure the other officers of the Committee and the representatives of the Secretariat that they too have our full confidence.

Of all those who are fighting with all their ardour to have the demanding reality of disarmament acknowledged in law and fact, the current Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament, Mr. Alfonso Garcia Robles, stands out today. He has just been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for 1982 and his presence in this Committee confers a great honour upon us. We should like to address to him and to Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden, that great fighter for peace and disarmament who shares the Prize with him, our congratulations and our most respectful tribute.

We can only hope that the individual and collective efforts to stop the arms race and reverse it, so that the disarmament we all desire may be achieved, will not prove vain. It is a paradox that today world public opinion, which every year is more sensitive to and more mobilized against the lethal potential of the arsenals of armaments, is not receiving the attention and respect it deserves from those that decide military policies.

On the contrary -- and the failure of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly proves this -- it is as if some logic other than that of the peoples determines the attitudes of the powerful States, reducing to mere wishful thinking the sincere desire of the people of the world for a better future -- or should I say just "a future"?

It is ironical that the twelfth special session of the General Assembly was held in the false comfort conferred by arrogance and indifference, in this crystal palace, at the very time when, on First Avenue, right in front of the Headquarters of our Organization, committed throngs of militants from non-governmental organizations and of ordinary people were pleading with us to fulfil our duty.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

Indeed, in a very few years, including the years since 1978 when the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was held, the fear of a general conflagration caused by the apparently uncontrolled arms race, has become the focal point of the concern of the international community.

This is, of course, hardly surprising, since the arms race, in addition to laying the groundwork for a fiendishly sophisticated holocaust for all mankind, also consumes in terms of resources colossal sums, now swallowing up approximately \$600 billion annually which could be used to resolve virtually all the economic and social problems faced in all countries.

The link between disarmament and development thus has ethical implications. Do we have the right to destroy the earth and all life on it? The reply to this question must no longer be handed down from on high by the nuclear-weapon Powers alone. Just as ours is a common danger, so must no nation be absolved from making a modest contribution to the process of disarmament negotiations.

It is within this context that we should view the concerns expressed by the Non-Aligned Movement, which at the beginning of this session deplored the negative attitude adopted by some Powers when it was a question of translating into action the common desire for disarmament, as expressed in 1978 at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to this subject.

As was stated in the Final Document of 1978, we have an absolute duty to "... proceed along the road of binding and effective international agreements in the field of disarmament". (resolution S-10/2, para. 17)

Such agreements would constitute the most tangible manifestation of the will of States really to commit themselves to peace, as each of us is always so ready to claim.

We should like to express our appreciation of the tireless efforts of the Committee on Disarmament, in particular its Group of 21, to ensure the success of the detailed work of its various working groups. It is obviously important to reach agreement on arrangements to guarantee the security of non-nuclear-weapon States or to agree on the prohibition of nuclear tests, chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and radiological weapons. We also attach great importance to the preparation of a genuine programme of disarmament which would exclude neither conventional weapons nor any environment, including outer space.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

In outer space we are today witnessing a very disturbing arms race, in contravention of the 1967 Treaty. The major Powers which are engaged in this game are presumably aware of the fact that they are putting the rest of the world in a vice. We are no longer very sure how much security there is even on the seas and oceans, the common heritage of mankind. To take possession of outer space for military purposes would be finally to destroy all hope of salvation beyond our planet, since this would mean extending beyond the earth's gravity all those devices of death and destruction which have infested our natural habitat.

The militarization of outer space, a recent phenomenon which has been receiving considerable attention in our deliberating and negotiating bodies, poses redoubtable problems of law, if only because of the qualification of the notion of national sovereignty which it involves. But sovereignty is one of the essential foundations of the rights of peoples. Clearly, this principle might be violated if any State could be the victim of fall-out from a military confrontation to which it had not consented in outer space, or elsewhere. The regulation of the use of outer space would be, we are convinced, an important contribution to a new international order, without which there would be no control over progress or guarantee of peace, co-operation and coexistence among nations.

It is in the same context that we place the question of the preservation of zones of peace in the Indian Ocean, the South Atlantic, Latin America, Asia and Africa. The rivalries between the two principal military blocs should not be allowed to spread beyond the areas that those blocs are supposed to be protecting. There is no need to make the confrontations between the Warsaw Pact countries and those of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization a world-wide matter. On the contrary, such an extension would only make it more difficult to carry out positive plans such as those set forth in the Final Act of Helsinki and in time to achieve the indispensable reduction of tension in Central Europe.

While not wishing to take up now the very important question of international security, which our Committee will be discussing later, we should like to point out that disarmament efforts will not achieve real progress unless everything is done at the same time to reduce the causes of tension in the world.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

The arms race cannot be considered or treated as an isolated factor, sui generis. The problem is in fact rooted in the concrete realities that determine the situation in today's world.

The link between disarmament and development is clearly based on this concept. It is not possible to pursue both the arms race and development; a choice must be made. To choose development, in the light of existing data, is in any case to oppose a ruinous arms race. The genius and devotion that the minds of more than 500,000 men of science throughout the world place at the service of the artifices of death and destruction can and should be rechanneled into peaceful research, primarily in the area of general economic and social development.

In our opinion an analagous choice must be made in regard to the preservation of certain regions, such as the African continent, as denuclearized zones. In the southern area of that continent, South Africa is pursuing a policy deliberately opposed to the aims of peace and non-aggression.

When a few years ago, the astounding news was broadcast throughout the world that South Africa had started on the road to possession of nuclear weapons, no one was surprised, given the very nature of the system of apartheid, the crime against mankind practised by a racist community that has completely broken with the norms and principles of everyday life.

In his report on the matter to the present session, contained in document A/37/432, the Secretary-General states that nothing new can be added to previous reports on the question of the nuclear capacity of South Africa. The General Assembly, and particularly the First Committee, must nevertheless refrain from optimism, which is in no way justified in view of the strengthening of the apartheid system and in view of the constant violations of the decision of the Security Council imposing an arms embargo against South Africa.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

In addition, South Africa, which has not acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and which does not deign to submit its military facilities to control by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), still considers itself to be a bridgehead - and one of the more fanatical ones at that - of one of the military blocs that are confronting each other in today's world. Many consider that to be the framework of South Africa's nuclear capacity into which this Committee must look.

The urgency and gravity of the subject under discussion do not in any way diminish the sensitive nature which makes it the cornerstone of today's international relations. Peace or war, development or overarmament - these are the terms of the problem. Men must commit themselves to a firm vision that will allow them truly to break with the past and thus to follow the course of action laid down by the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

The frantic desire to dominate others or to negotiate exclusively from a position of strength does not guarantee firm agreements made in good faith. On the contrary, if such an approach is not changed, there is no proof that partial agreements covering only a small area of the immense field of disarmament will not primarily remain pretexts to continue to adopt other, more dangerous courses of action.

One need only look at the draft resolutions before the First Committee to see to what degree these are a collection of pious wishes. We cannot even say the Non-Proliferation Treaty or the SALT agreements have advanced the process of disarmament or at least of a freeze on the production of weapons and their delivery systems.

Finally, it is in the name of the categorical imperative - the survival of civilization - that we continue to hope that it is not too late and that we subscribe to the idea of an international disarmament campaign. Let us hope, however, that this important undertaking will not be impeded by egoism or blindness on the part of anyone. Recourse to public opinion as our last hope for salvation derives from a reassuring reaction. We must not waste or ignore this opportunity. For it is once again a question of survival.

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt): In its last statement before this Committee, the Egyptian delegation attempted to draw attention to the dangers posed by the continuing failure by the United Nations at all levels and by all its affiliated bodies to take appropriate and timely action in the field of disarmament. We have in fact tried to rouse the General Assembly into breaking the shackles of inertia that have bound it in the recent past. We did so in the full knowledge that the road to disarmament is a long and tortuous one but also in the belief that the General Assembly is still in a position, as it has been in the past, to be a precursor and to set the stage for the international community to take yet another first step towards our ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. If this were the case, then the General Assembly would be in an even better position to follow up on the decisions that it previously adopted without dissent.

One case in point is a subject on which Egypt took the initiative eight years ago, later assuming responsibility for keeping it afloat to the present time. That subject is none other than the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

When that subject was first introduced in 1974, it was received with varying degrees of acceptance or reticence. That was normal and to be expected. The draft resolution submitted at that time was neither drastic nor revolutionary, but the authors were careful to negotiate fully with all concerned in the knowledge that an initiative of this nature required not only careful preparation but, most important, wide international support from within and outside the region of the Middle East.

During the first stages, unanimous support was not readily forthcoming, but our attachment to the idea led us to persevere year after year. The turning point was reached at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, when the draft resolution submitted to the Assembly was adopted without a single dissenting vote. Encouraged by this show of unanimity, we believed that further progress

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

could be made and concrete steps taken. In the first place, we considered that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East should not be seen merely as an objective to be attained in the distant future, with all parties concerned just waiting for appropriate conditions to develop in time. We wanted that objective to be foreseeable rather than distant. We wanted the membership of this Organization to share with us the view that that objective should be imminent rather than pending. We also had certain ideas as to the course of action to be followed. I wish to assure the Committee that those ideas were neither hasty nor unrealistic. We were fully aware of political reality, as well as of all other constraints. Yet we were also in agreement with the conclusion in the study of the committee of experts established by the Secretary-General on nuclear-weapon-free zones, to the effect that:

"The study does not attempt to establish any precise rules, as it is the considered view of the experts that circumstances in different regions vary so widely that a pragmatic and flexible approach would need to be adopted in each case."

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Nothing would have been easier or more routine than merely to ask the Secretary-General to contact the parties once again and await their written replies. That, in our view, would lengthen the process rather than underline the urgency we attach to our objective. Instead, we opted for what, in our view, constituted a more practical approach. We believed that were the Secretary-General to appoint a special representative with well-known credentials, who would establish a dialogue with all parties concerned, the outcome would be a report of realistic and practical content, that would be the result of an interaction of ideas and concepts and that would contain living material that would enable all of us to ponder on the next advisable step.

Our reference to the "parties concerned" was not of a limited nature, for apart from all those who have received letters from the Secretary-General, in accordance with resolution 3263 (XXIX) of 9 December 1974, other parties could also be included, in the light of the contacts and consultations that the special representative will set in motion once he has been appointed.

Unfortunately, the atmosphere prevailing during the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly was not conducive to such a follow-up as the one indicated above. The thirty-seventh session will, I hope, provide the right circumstances for the General Assembly to preserve the momentum created during the thirty-fifth session.

I have allowed myself to share with you these preliminary considerations on the subject as an introduction to further action that the Egyptian delegation intends to take during this session.

The first statement by the Egyptian delegation in this Committee on 20 October contained the following references:

"Sixthly, we believe that the International Atomic Energy Agency has an important and key role to play in future arms control and disarmament agreements.

"The successful and constructive role it has displayed under the Non-Proliferation Treaty reflects the great potential of the Agency in arms control and disarmament.

"We will further elaborate on this issue in a future statement."

(A/C.1/37/PV.6, p. 7)

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

What was meant by this specific reference is that the recognition of the constructive role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) with regard to the implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty should prompt us to envisage an equally constructive role to be undertaken by the Agency in the context of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and other arms control agreements. This is why I would venture to suggest that if the General Assembly were to endorse the concept of the appointment of a special representative of the Secretary-General, it would be useful if, in addition to his contacts with the parties concerned, he were to initiate preliminary contacts with IAEA on the capacity and readiness of the Agency to play a role in this regard, in the light of the experience gained, with regard to the implementation of the Tlatelolco Treaty, and to include the results of those contacts in the report to be submitted to the General Assembly.

Sister Marjorie KEENAN (Holy See): At this time, the Holy See delegation would like to assure the Chairman and the other officers of the First Committee of its full co-operation. It would also like to join with so many others in rendering public homage to Ambassador Garcia Robles, and through the representative of Sweden, to Mrs. Alva Myrdal, for the high recognition that they have received for their work for peace, particularly within the United Nations.

As we near the end of this general debate on disarmament questions, the delegation of the Holy See is grateful to be able once again to address the First Committee, thereby showing its particular interest in the subjects under discussion. Repeatedly, here and in other forums, the Holy See has directly addressed the question of disarmament, registering its concern at the continuing nuclear menace, as well as its desire to see a halt to the arms race in all of its aspects, be it conventional arms, nuclear and chemical weapons, or new types of weapons. In this brief intervention, however, we intend to concentrate on what could be called the human component of peace.

(Sister Marjorie Keenan, Holy See)

We are all aware of the strange paradox with which we are now living. Men and women the world over desire peace. Far too many are the victims of past and present wars and know from experience their horror. Others, particularly the young, look with fear into the future. Yet, despite this universal longing for peace, humanity is still faced with the possibility of nuclear war and with the present reality of numerous limited conflicts.

In the aftermath of a war, the United Nations was founded precisely, as we know, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", and its Member States have freely pledged to uphold certain principles directly related to peace. Since its foundation, countless efforts have been made to lessen the danger of conflict and to promote peace through declarations, conventions, and treaties on a broad range of subjects. In the field of disarmament, however, the progress made does not seem to be able to keep pace with the growing menace of war. Yet nowhere else is the duty of governments to work for peace more apparent than within the United Nations, where all are bound to seek the common good and to be the voice of the people of the world in this search. Ultimately, it is these people who are at the heart of peace, people who are citizens of a particular State or nation and yet who are bound to all other peoples by a common humanity, despite any difference in culture or ideology.

These peoples have fundamental rights which must be protected if peace is to be, at the very least, preserved. These same rights must be actively promoted if peace is to become what it ultimately should be, the common heritage of all. Whenever and wherever people are not able to live in full human dignity, peace is gravely endangered. Pope John Paul II spoke of this recently in Coventry when he said: "Wherever the strong exploit the weak, wherever the rich take advantage of the poor; wherever great powers seek to dominate and impose ideologies, there the work of making peace is undone." (May 30, 1982)

The United Nations has made explicit many of these fundamental rights in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in other more recent codes and covenants, and has institutionalized the link between human rights and peace. A respect for these rights, again in the words of Pope John Paul II, aims at "banishing from the life of humanity all forms of imperialism, aggression, domination, exploitation and colonialism". The respect for human rights is indeed a powerful component of peace.

There is little need to dwell at length on another human component of peace: development. The tragic misallocation of resources from human needs to the purchase or development of weapons has long concerned the Holy See. In his recent message to the second special session on disarmament, His Holiness again indicated that any new efforts to devote some of the vast sums spent on arms to development purposes would be met with universal approval. The Holy See has also consistently urged the setting up of a fund for development with money drawn from military budgets. Even the symbolic gesture of setting up such a fund would bear witness to the willingness of Governments to attempt to redirect their resources for peaceful purposes, that is, for the development of peoples, particularly those most in need. The present world economic situation reminds us once again that development must ultimately take place in solidarity, that it must be for the benefit of all. Expenditures on arms render this difficult.

The relationship between peace and international security is particularly complex. While the Holy See delegation does not intend to enter into the political implications of this question, there are other aspects that directly concern people.

No security can exist, except the false one of force, where there is no mutual trust. This trust, in turn, cannot exist where there is no mutual understanding. To promote peace, therefore, positive efforts must be made to build understanding on all levels. It is the duty of Governments which desire peace, and of all peoples, to take concrete steps to increase their knowledge and understanding of other peoples. One means, frequently used in times of less tension and which redounds to the benefit of all, is the sharing of the gifts of mind, heart and spirit. These are part of the common heritage of humanity and therefore belong to all. This cultural and intellectual exchange leads to

respect for the inherent dignity of other peoples and of other cultures, and is an incalculable contribution to peace. Misunderstandings and misconceptions can only foster division and heighten the possibility of conflict. With knowledge, mutual respect can exist even in the midst of ideological differences. Security is thereby strengthened.

In the political realm these efforts for mutual understanding take the form of negotiations. In the present situation, negotiations, be they bilateral or multilateral, appear to be the only concrete path to peace. To refuse to negotiate, or not to negotiate in good faith, is therefore to refuse to take this path. As with the building of mutual trust among peoples, negotiations require going beyond the legitimate interests of one's own State to a perception of those of the partners in negotiations. Far from leading to a neglect of a State's legitimate interests, this effort finds expression in a willingness to work for the common good, for the common interests of humanity. To negotiate in this spirit implies the avoidance of excessive secrecy and doing all possible to promote mutual trust, something that can be won only by concrete acts and facts.

A climate favourable to negotiations also calls for an avoidance of what Pope John Paul II has called the phenomenon of rhetoric. While initiatives that are of little more than a propagandistic nature serve little, any proposal that would seem to favour true peace merits careful consideration. As the language of peace can increase trust among peoples, so the contrary only fosters distrust and fear.

Security for all peoples is closely related to the strengthening of international organizations. Ultimately, an acknowledged universal public authority, vested with effective power, would be a means to ensure this security for the strong as well as the weak States, for both the rich and the poorer nations. Such an authority does not exist, as we all know. Hence the importance of seeking better means within the United Nations to assure common security. The recent report of the Secretary-General merits careful attention, and serious consideration should be given to the proposals he makes.

International security, which is basically the security of people, is of vital interest to all, because insecurity and instability have been a basic driving force behind the spiralling arms race and for the constant increase in arms trade. Insecurity has led to increased confrontations, to what might be called

(Sister Marjorie Keenan, Holy See)

"either/or situations". Increased security would enlarge this closed pattern and foster a more multi-faceted approach that would work to the benefit of all.

Human rights, development and security form this human component of peace. Attention to it would help peoples and States to break out of the apparent fascination with the abstract aspects of the arms race, where the creation of the human mind seems almost to escape human control. It is a strange aberration of human nature that the best minds among scientists and researchers are being used for purposes other than the promotion of the good of humanity. Governments have a heavy responsibility for this.

The Holy See is strong in its belief in a humanity created by God and redeemed in Christ. It is therefore equally strong in its belief that peace for the peoples of the world is possible. The Holy See will, therefore, continue to spare no effort within its own competence to work for peace, to attempt to promote understanding, to educate for peace, to encourage study for peace and to implore God for the gift of peace.

Mr. KORNEENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Recently there has been a growing clamour among all peace-loving forces on earth against nuclear war, and in favour of persuading all nuclear Powers to refrain from being the first to use nuclear weapons, to freeze nuclear arsenals and progressively to reduce them until they are completely eliminated. We are highly gratified that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament reached consensus on the basic principles for holding a World Disarmament Campaign; this will certainly be an important factor in mobilizing the peoples' movement to eliminate the threat of war, for the halting of the arms race and for disarmament.

The peace movement in our Republic is a mass phenomenon. This year, for example, throughout the Ukraine we commemorated: The Week of Action for Security and Co-operation; the Week of Mass Action for Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat; Peace Week; World Peace Day; and Disarmament Week.

The Ukrainian SSR also gave a warm welcome to those participating in the "Peace March 82" which comprised representatives from peace-loving public organizations and movements from 30 countries in Europe, America, Asia and Africa.

In the context of mass action for peace against the nuclear threat alone, more than 8,000 meetings and demonstrations were held, in which there participated more than 3 million people. About 16 million inhabitants of the Ukrainian SSR took part in mass activities devoted to "Peace Week".

At virtually all these meetings, gatherings and demonstrations, resolutions, petitions, messages and telegrams were adopted, addressed to the concerned international organizations, including the United Nations and the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which expressed the desire of our people to live in peace, and contained an appeal that everything be done in order to prevent a thermonuclear holocaust and to curb the arms race and bring about disarmament.

Today's statement made by the representative of the United States fully bypassed the appeals made by the overwhelming majority of delegations and was simply aimed at imposing confrontation on us and hindering the normal working atmosphere of the First Committee. This, as we are all quite certain, naturally reflects the general approach of the United States to the discussion of the most important problems of the present day in the United Nations. This statement was couched in unseemly and undignified terms, and was slanderous, cynical and hypocritical. The malicious and unsavoury insinuations made in the American statement about the mass meetings and demonstrations among Soviet people were simply an act of insolent ridicule of the feelings of our people, who have known through their own experience what are the horrors of war, who are aspiring to live in peace and friendship with other peoples and who are in favour of curbing the arms race, protesting against the senseless plans of those who instigate nuclear war. This can only be regarded as a further manifestation of the attempts which have been made recently by the United States to discredit and to undermine the popular movement for peace which is growing throughout the world, including the United States, which favours the efforts

to avert a nuclear catastrophe, against the new round in the arms race which has recently been unleashed by the United States in order to nudge the world to the brink of the nuclear abyss. The fact that the demands of world public opinion have been addressed to the United States is hardly surprising, in view of the policy pursued by the Administration of that country towards militarization and preparing for nuclear war.

United Nations sponsorship of the World Disarmament Campaign can be effected in various ways. They all come together under three main purposes which are referred to in the report of the Secretary-General on this question, that is, to inform, to educate and to promote understanding and support of world public opinion for United Nations aims in the disarmament field. However, we believe at the same time that one of the most important ways of effecting this should be to launch a campaign to collect signatures in favour of steps to prevent nuclear warfare, curbing the arms race, and disarmament. Such a collection of signatures, were it to be affixed to the text of a brief appeal which could be usefully drafted and addressed to Member countries of the United Nations could be carried out in each country in the light of its own particular traditions, experience and conditions. If signatures were thus successfully gathered as part of the World Disarmament Campaign as a whole, this would play an important part in expressing the position of the broad masses of the population of this world in matters of peace, détente and increased tension and would also depend on the presence of necessary material funds. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR in this connection has been authorized to state that it will make a voluntary contribution to the trust fund to finance the World Disarmament Campaign in the sum of 200,000 roubles.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish):

As this is the first time I have spoken in the First Committee, it is an honour for me to express through you, Sir, to the Chairman of our Committee my congratulations and those of our delegation on his unanimous election to preside over the work of the Committee. Our congratulations go also to his fellow-officers of the Committee, and we particularly congratulate Ambassador Carasales of Argentina on his election as one of the Vice-Chairmen. We pledge the

(Mrs. Castro de Barish,
Costa Rica)

co-operation of our delegation in the arduous task ahead, and we hope that we shall approve concrete recommendations on the crucially important subjects before us.

It is a great pleasure and an honour to extend our hearty congratulations to Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden and Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles of Mexico, whose devotion to the cause of disarmament is well-known. They have received the Nobel Peace Prize in acknowledgement of their continuing and constant efforts to promote this goal so ardently desired by the international community

At this stage of our debate, there is nothing new or original which can be said, but as representative of Costa Rica, I believe I should repeat something that is a living reality for us. Here I might quote the words of our Permanent Representative and Chairman of the delegation of Costa Rica at the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament last June:

"Costa Rica has come to this Assembly as a people without arms, without soldiers, without an army. That institution was abolished in 1948, more than three decades ago. During those three decades, Costa Rica has lived in peace with itself and with its neighbours.

"The decision to disarm unilaterally also required deep respect for and an almost boundless confidence in the rule of law and in the international machinery established to preserve peace and security. For that very reason, Costa Rica, which is among the 51 original signatory countries of the United Nations Charter, is committed to the strengthening of this Organization and is determined to see it play an increasingly useful and active role in responding to the numerous challenges we face today." (A/S-12/PV.25, pp. 87-88)

The distinguished statesman, Mr. Carlos Romulo, in his important statement as representative of the Philippines in this Committee said that the United Nations propose and the super-Powers dispose, and he added that this year,

(Mrs. Castro de Berish,
Costa Rica)

during the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the United Nations has not even been able to propose. I think that that is a very pertinent observation.

The eloquent appeal by all sectors of world public opinion, particularly among the young, especially the youth in States with nuclear weapons and the largest military arsenals, that every effort be made to put an end to the unbridled arms race in which those States seem to be so involved, regardless of their political or ideological perceptions, has served little purpose. My delegation agrees with many others here that in order realistically to achieve the goal of disarmament there must be a collective will for action, leading to firm agreements by all.

(Mrs. Castro de Barish, Costa Rica)

The second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament showed how little progress can be made if the political will to undertake the task is lacking. Unfortunately, as time passes quickly there arise new ideas for the development and sophistication of the artefacts of death, which day by day bring us closer to the time when there will be no chance to turn back.

In this respect, Pope John Paul II told a group of scientists in Spain yesterday -- I quote from today's edition of The New York Times:

"Men and women who represent science and culture, your moral power is enormous.

"It is you who can see to it that the scientific sector serves above all the culture of man and that it should never be perverted and used for his destruction. It is a scandal of our times that many researchers are dedicated to perfecting new arms for war, which one day could prove fatal."

Those eloquent words of His Holiness further strengthen the clamour of men and women of the whole world, whatever their religion, their ethical or humanist perceptions, or their ideology.

The Secretary-General, in his much-praised annual report, said:

"our most urgent goal is to reconstruct the Charter concept of collective action for peace and security so as to render the United Nations more capable of carrying out its primary function."

(A/37/1, p. 5)

My delegation is well aware that the goal of general and complete disarmament, under international control as an essential element to generate confidence seems to be increasingly elusive. Therefore, Costa Rica believes that it may be appropriate to consider positive ways and means which might lead us later to this goal. Regional disarmament agreements, as regards both nuclear and conventional arms, are very useful for this purpose.

In the field of nuclear weapons, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, banning nuclear weapons in Latin America, was the first pioneering effort. We hope that, in spite of the great difficulties inherent in the conflicts in crucial parts of our planet today, resulting from the great polarization of the world, further such agreements will be reached, for they are sorely needed.

(Mrs. Castro de Barish, Costa Rica)

However, we must focus our attention on the increased pace of the conventional arms race. Costa Rica said at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament that the well-documented horrors of what the results of a nuclear war would be might have deadened the sensitivity of the international community to the effects of so-called conventional wars. We have seen with great indignation how often more emphasis is put on the development of this or that destructive device or the efficiency of an army than on the misery of death, the loss of means of survival or the humiliation of the vanquished.

That is why my delegation expresses the fervent hope that just as Latin America pioneered regional agreements on nuclear weapons, it will also be a pioneer in agreements on conventional weapons.

This question of regional disarmament agreements has been considered in various forums. My delegation has reiterated its support for these goals, not only because we believe that they are excellent for bringing about an atmosphere of peace in those areas fortunate enough to reach such agreements, thus facilitating later agreements and promoting harmony and good relations between States, especially neighbours, but also because Costa Rica pursues a policy of complete disarmament, as I have already said. After all, the internal security of a State does not rest solely on its armaments or those that can be given it by other States, whether neighbours or not. Such aid is sometimes illusory because it has been shown that one can pay dearly for this "disinterested" aid.

It is important to remind the Committee here - and in this connection I was pleased to hear the statement by the representative of the Holy See - that a necessary condition for the elimination, or at least the limitation to a reasonable level, of the weapons possessed by States for the purpose of keeping domestic order, is respect for human rights by their Governments. That is what gives greater security. When a people, even one that is neither rich nor developed, can exercise its right to self-determination, not only that deriving from its independence in accordance with the Charter, as a consequence of decolonization, but true freedom of expression, then it does not need to resort to violence against its leaders; it can remedy their errors at the polls. That has been our experience since we achieved our independent life, and we can say with great satisfaction that it is an excellent recipe. This is the virtue

(Mrs. Castro de Barish, Costa Rica)

of the democratic system, when there is respect for and acceptance of the freely expressed will of the people. In those circumstances there is no need for large arsenals to repress or intimidate peoples; one needs only the means necessary to maintain order.

All this is reflected in international relations, especially in the behaviour of neighbouring States to one another, whether they are large or small, powerful or weak, rich or poor.

As we all know, Costa Rica is in a region in which there is much turmoil and in which the use of weapons to obtain or keep power seems to have been institutionalized. The geopolitical factors in the region have been largely responsible for the fact that domestic political strife has spilled over beyond frontiers, with the result that the great Powers become involved in some form in these conflicts, either directly or by proxy. For these reasons Costa Rica holds to the view that weapons are in themselves a cause of internal and external violence. We believe that peace and tranquillity must be given a chance in our part of the world. As I have already urged and shall continue to urge vigorously, it is therefore imperative to begin the process of demilitarization in Central America.

That needs the political will not only of the States of the region but of other neighbouring States and of the major Powers. It is our hope that with patience, dedication and good will our efforts will succeed, and we can thus bring the longed-for peace, tranquillity and prosperity to our Central America.

As regards military expenditures, which because of their astronomical figures unquestionably damage the world economy, we have joined in efforts which have been made for years to bring about greater co-operation between those States which spend enormous sums on destructive weapons of all kinds, in order to establish effective systems of information and comparison of those expenditures which are, as we know, out of all proportion. This is a very important exercise in the attempt to reduce armaments to logical, reasonable levels.

(Mrs. Castro de Barish, Costa Rica)

According to data in a pamphlet produced by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute this year, a pamphlet entitled "Armaments or Disarmament?", in the past four years military expenditures have increased by 3 per cent a year in volume terms. That represents a growth rate larger than that of the four previous years, even though the output of the world economy has gone down. The pamphlet says with irrefutable logic:

"Both in Western industrialized countries and in the Socialist countries, national output is rising much more slowly than it used to do. There has been no corresponding deceleration in world military spending. So in a large number of countries the burden of military spending - as measured by its share of the national product - has been rising."

This has an adverse effect on the developing countries, not only because most of them felt impelled to make an exaggerated increase in their military budgets, but also because even the wealthy countries have felt obliged to reduce their contribution to international development aid programmes and at the same time have taken protectionist measures in the international markets, as a palliative for their own internal economic problems, in order to finance their disproportionate military expenditures and satisfy their priorities in various areas.

(Mrs. Castro de Barish,
Costa Rica)

Another position taken by Costa Rica which was put forward at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is that in the allocation of resources, special consideration should be given, either through incentives or programmes of international co-operation, not only to the relative poverty of a people but also to its efforts in favour of disarmament.

Costa Rica has for many years shared the concern over the use and improvement of chemical weapons and has supported the initiatives of those who advocate legal instruments to strengthen the Geneva Protocol of 1925, so as to put an end to this unspeakable practice. We have always made vigorous protests against these weapons, which are lethal not only for combatants but also for the civilian population, including children, youths, adults and the elderly of both sexes and also invalids and disabled persons. For these reasons, we are prepared to support any proposals made in this Committee to stop this unspeakable use of such weapons.

Finally, we have heard observations to the effect that there have been many situations in the past similar or presenting similar challenges to those of today; but mankind has never had weapons that are as lethal or technologically efficient as today's weapons. Therefore we must all, without exception, devote all our efforts to ensuring that succeeding generations will coexist in peace and harmony, and that at all costs we must ensure that they will not be the victims of our errors and our insensitivity.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I would remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second.

Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): At this morning's meeting Mr. Adelman of the United States made a clumsy attempt to vitiate the very idea behind the World Disarmament Campaign and he replaced it with a whole series of inventions and anti-Soviet calumnies. That seems to be his specialty in the United States Mission to the United Nations. In whatever body he appears, his statements are on the same subject: anti-Sovietism and the intensification of tension, hostility and fear.

This is not a new tactic for justifying one's country's policy of aggression or the arms race. That is the way the Goebbels propaganda machine functioned. That is how John Foster Dulles, the warmonger of sorry memory, operated. He said:

"To force the country to bear the burden of armaments, one must create an emotional atmosphere which promotes a feeling of insecurity and fear concerning the future. People must believe that their country is threatened by an external danger."

Here is a more recent statement, and this is by Mr. Ikle, United States Under-Secretary of Defense:

"The massive psychological campaign regarding the Soviet threat has borne fruit. To continue to preserve our interests it is indispensable that we continue to cultivate it to the utmost."

He went on to say:

"If the movement from the cold war to détente constitutes progress, we can no longer afford progress."

Mr. Adelman, as we have seen, not only is trying to fall into step with those persons but is trying to go one better by inventing what does not exist. He said that in the 1982 peace march, in which peace supporters from Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden, and the Soviet Union took part, we wanted to take advantage of the meeting arranged in Khatin to organize a meeting for so-called unjustifiable purposes. I shall disappoint him. A mass meeting took place in Khatin, with thousands of my own countrymen and survivors who had lived in that village. The participants in the peace march came from Finland, Japan and Sweden and they all spoke of the need to fight for peace and disarmament.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

They all said that there should never be another Lidice, Khatin or Ouradour. What is Khatin? It is a memorial in the square of a small Byelorussian town not far from Minsk. There are 26 houses there. People lived in those houses, but on 22 March 1943 Hitler's SS troops destroyed the village completely, and 149 inhabitants, including 76 children, were burned alive on the collective farm there. Another 619 villages met the same fate as Khatin during the war. Quite a few of them came back to life, thanks to the heroic labours of our people, but 186, like Khatin, did not reappear on the post-war map. There was no one able to bring these towns back to life. In memory of the victims, in memory of the 209 villages and towns which were destroyed, in memory of the 9,200 persons who were burned in the villages, in memory of the victims of the 260 concentration camps established by the Nazis during the war on Byelorussian soil, in memory of the more than 2 million victims of the war and the one fourth of the inhabitants of our country who sacrificed their lives for the freedom and independence of their country and for victory in the Second World War, that memorial was built. It is visited every year by an unceasing flow of visitors from every part of the world. President Nixon of the United States went to Khatin, as did a group of United States senators and many others. They all understood and sympathized with the appeal etched on the tombstone of Khatin, from which I should now like to read.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

"Remember, all of you who are here, that we loved life in our country. We perished in the flames. Our prayer is that our sadness and our pain will become your courage and your strength. Strength in peace and tranquillity on earth for ever. Let life never come to an end, as it has in the flames of Khatin."

Yet now Mr. Adelman tarnishes the memory of the victims of nazism. This shows the extent to which one should believe his other statements. Certainly Mr. Adelman will divert no one from efforts to bring about disarmament and peace. We are prepared to give Mr. Adelman, and we will right away, literature on Khatin in English. We imagine he will be able to make use of it to engage in active propaganda during this Campaign in his country.

Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): The representative of the United States saw fit in his statement to this Committee this morning to refer to my country among others. Apparently, from a position of strength, what he wants to do is to strike down several targets with a single blow.

He referred to the World Campaign for Peace in the United States, but he forgot that his audience here was composed not of students but of representatives of sovereign States.

Czechoslovakia is a small country, but we have a strong sense of dignity and a great deal of pride. As far as the advice of the United States is concerned, we simply do not need it. We can manage quite well without such advice. The representative of the United States should rather pay attention to the situation regarding liberty in his own country, with the racial discrimination against its black population, the situation and status of the Indian population, the mass unemployment and the fact that people have been reduced to the very depths of human existence, in total despair.

Mr. Representative of the United States, do not look into the distance. Just look around you in this very city - the Bronx, Harlem and other parts of it. Look closely at instances of so-called freedom in those territories covered by resolution 1514 (XV) under the administration of the United States. Can such a state of affairs be compared with the handful

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

of so-called dissidents in our own country? You call them dissidents, but we call them something different: anti-State elements is what we call them because they deliberately, on instructions from abroad, and we know where those instructions come from, violate the laws of our socialist country, the laws of a sovereign State, which, like any other State in the world, including the United States, considers the question of internal legislation to be its own prerogative. He compared this handful of people with the thousands of Czechoslovak citizens who through the peace movement of that country and through other public organizations practically daily express their true desire that war be prevented. They have had occasion to experience the horrors of war immediately for themselves, and they express their genuine aspiration to live in peace, to achieve disarmament and to work peacefully

This is, to say the least, hypocrisy on the part of the United States and indeed a gross affront to the Czechoslovak people. We reject what the representative of the United States has said as interference in our sovereign domestic affairs and part of the ongoing attempts of that delegation to distract this Committee's attention from the substance of its work and an attempt to inject a spirit of confrontation and an atmosphere of useless polemics. That tactic is well known to us; it is advantageous to people who have no useful or constructive proposal to make, nothing that would help us.

This will not help this body, which must tackle other, more serious, problems relating to the removal of the threat of nuclear war, and the maintenance of international peace and security. We would welcome a constructive approach on the part of the United States delegation.

Mr. AL-SAHAF (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The statement of the representative of Israel today contained certain mistakes that need to be corrected, factual errors that invalidated his statement.

The representative of the Zionist entity pretended that he wanted the Middle East to be a nuclear-free zone and wanted to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Al-Sahaf, Iraq)

If he is sincere in his allegations, why has Israel refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards? Why does Israel co-operate with the racist régime of South Africa, which has been rejected by the whole international community, in developing nuclear weapons and their delivery systems? It is the Zionist entity itself that has introduced nuclear weapons into the Middle East. It is the only country that has a nuclear bomb. The report of the Secretary-General in document A/36/431 emphasizes the facts and stresses the gravity of the situation arising from the unbridled and reckless policies pursued by the Zionist entity which menace the peace and security of the peoples of the Middle East.

The General Assembly of the United Nations, in its resolution 36/98, took note of the report of the Secretary-General, expressed its concern over the fact that the report confirms that Israel has the technical capability to manufacture nuclear weapons and possesses the means of delivery of such weapons, called on all States and other parties and institutions to terminate forthwith all nuclear collaboration with Israel, and requested the Secretary-General to give maximum publicity to the report on Israeli nuclear armament. Moreover, Security Council resolution 487 (1981), adopted on 19 June 1981, called on Israel urgently to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. Israel refused to heed that call, or to heed similar resolutions adopted by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

In view of these facts, what are we to think of the false allegations by the representative of Israel? I leave that to the judgement of my distinguished colleagues. Israel called for a multilateral convention in the Middle East along the lines of the Treaty of Tlatelolco in Latin America. But that call is pure demagoguery, which is freely indulged in by Israel to deceive public opinion and to conceal its nuclear capacity, which is a threat to the whole region. The Zionist entity is able, through its possession of the nuclear weapon, to blackmail the Arab countries and the international community. That is why Israel wants to possess nuclear capacity and force recognition from the Arab States.

(Mr. Al-Sahaf, Iraq)

In his statement the representative of Israel struck a strange note about confidence-building in the region. The history of the wretched Zionist entity, from the occupation of Palestine and the displacement of the Palestinian people, right up to present day, with the bombing of Iraq's nuclear reactor for peaceful purposes, the occupation of Lebanon and the murder of the Palestinian people, shows the kind of contribution that the Zionist entity has in fact made to confidence-building in the region.

Mr. AKALEVSKY (United States of America): The United States delegation has listened carefully to the comments made by the Soviet delegation and others who have spoken in response to the statement made this morning by the United States deputy permanent representative concerning the World Disarmament Campaign. Those responses, including the ad hominem comments we have just heard, seem to be designed to throw a smoke-screen around the real issues involved in our statement rather than to get at their heart.

The heart of the matter is precisely this: despite the support which Member States have given to the concept of a truly universal disarmament campaign, to be carried out in all regions of the world in a balanced, factual and objective manner, the realities of the situation in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are quite different.

We believe it is important that this be recognized and we have substantiated our comments on the situation in a factual and objective manner. To the Soviet Union and its allies, independent, non-Government-controlled peace and disarmament movements are welcome only if they take place abroad. They are not tolerated at home.

Just two days ago, the Director of the Soviet Institute for the United States and Canada, Mr. Georgiy Arbatov, appealed in the Soviet newspaper Literary Gazette to Western peace movements to take a more active role on arms control issues. He praised the anti-war movement in the United States and Europe which, he argued, "... can ultimately have a determining impact on the arms race".

(Mr. Akalevsky, United States)

If free debate is to be welcomed, praised and encouraged in the rest of the world by the Soviet Union, why not let similar flowers bloom in the Soviet Union and Eastern European gardens? The Soviet representatives in their statements have presented no answer to this fundamental question. The reason for their silence is evident. The Communist Party, whose officials supervise and control all aspects of national life, carefully monitors activities at every level of public and private life. This supervision is augmented by an elaborate system of control of information to guide and channel popular opinion. For the authorities, propaganda serves to generate support for official policies, not to subject them to debate. It is used to assert the legitimacy of the régime's monopoly of power and to combat undesirable or "alien" ways of thought.

We in the United States have no doubt that the Soviet people, like all other peoples of the world, yearn for peace. But the fact is that in every major field of public activity in the USSR there are information agencies which mobilize opinion in support of official policy. Each level has its equivalent party committee to provide detailed guidance on the party line of the moment. Among the principal information agencies are the indoctrination and propaganda apparatus of the party itself, of the Government, of youth organizations, trade unions and the armed forces. Every factory, farm, military unit and even penal institution has at least one person responsible for propaganda. Obligatory lectures are organized at places of residence. Schools, the media, literature, and the arts and sciences all have the responsibility of carrying the official line to the people.

This elaborate apparatus for control and manipulation grinds fine. Its results can sometimes be impressive - even 60 million signatures. But organized hand-clapping under the pressure of an authoritarian system of Government does not represent free expression on the issues. It does not represent the free budding of ideas nor the type of balanced, factual and objective debate foreseen in the special session disarmament document for a universal disarmament campaign.

(Mr. Akalevsky, United States)

The Soviet delegation and some others have also spoken with considerable emotion about the United States reference to the Scandinavian group's visit to Katyn, the site of the Second World War massacre of thousands of Polish officers.

The United States delegation regrets that, due to a mistake in transliteration, the place visited by the Scandinavian group was identified erroneously. The group actually visited Khatyn, which the Soviet delegation correctly described as the site of a major Soviet monument to victims of Nazism, whose memory we deeply respect and towards whom, as my delegation wishes to assure everyone, no offence was intended.

Mr. PHETSAVAN (Lao People's Democratic Republic): I am sorry to have to speak at this late hour. However, I ask for the indulgence of all members of our Committee, and I should like to make some remarks about the statement made by the representative of the United States.

(Mr. Phetsavan, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

As the general debate of our Committee approaches its end, the United States representative this morning once again accused some States, including my own country, of being occupied by foreign troops. The United States imperialists and their followers have more than once since our debate began made slanderous allegations against my country, a sovereign and independent State. A reply is thus necessary in order to emphasize that facts are facts and lies never become truths.

First, I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the statement made by Mr. Eugene Rostow in the course of the general debate on 27 October, at our thirteenth meeting, in which he referred to so-called "reports" that Lao and Vietnamese forces, under the direct supervision of Soviet personnel, have used what he called "lethal chemical weapons including prohibited toxins, since 1976." (A/C.1/37/PV.13, p. 27)

On that occasion, in a spirit of preserving the calm process of our debate and of avoiding a vain exchange of polemics with the United States representative, my delegation did not intervene. Such a silence was due to the fact that those reports which the United States representative referred to are unconfirmed, groundless and without foundation and, as is well known, are passed around from paper to paper. In fact, as in past years, those reports have been flagrantly and shamelessly fabricated by the United States itself, in order to cover up its own criminal acts of using toxic chemicals during the war of aggression against the three peoples of Indo-China - Laos, Viet Nam and Kampuchea - and in order to divert world public opinion from Washington's criminal decision to intensify the arms race and, particularly, to produce new generations of chemical and biological weapons on a large scale.

The second point which my delegation wishes to underline is related to the question which the Ambassador of the United States referred to this morning: that is, what he called "Vietnamese troops in Laos and Cambodia".

(Mr. Phetsavan, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

In regard to this question, once again the representative of the United States represented himself as an indefatigable and fervent defender of the principle of independence and the sovereignty of States. In so doing, as a matter of fact, he of course took great care not to mention the presence of American troops and military bases in various parts of the world, such as in South-East Asia, Okinawa, South Korea, Diego Garcia, Guantanamo and in certain Western European countries.

Was this a manifestation of hypocrisy on the part of the representative of the United States? The answer is yes, as was clearly confirmed by the words of former President Richard Nixon himself, who said:

"To lie is not a sin for a politician." (Agence France Presse, 27 October 1982)

Having made these observations, my delegation wonders if it is not high time that the delegation of the United States saw reason and demonstrated some good will, thereby contributing more effectively and sincerely to the work of our Committee. On this note, I should like to say that I look forward to hearing a more reasonable declaration on the part of the delegation of the United States which, I hope, will help our Committee to progress.

Mr. CANDA MORALES (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish):

Since this is the first time that my delegation has spoken in the First Committee, we can do no less than express our satisfaction on the election of the representative of Ghana to the chairmanship of this Committee, as well as the election of the other officers of the Committee.

In truth, my delegation would have preferred to speak in different circumstances in order to be able to put forward ideas that might contribute to the search for solutions of problems we are trying to deal with - that is, that of finding formulas which would be conducive to an improvement in the international

(Mr. Canda Morales, Nicaragua)

climate. Nevertheless, we have decided to speak at this juncture because this morning the Ambassador of the United States, Mr. Adelman, had occasion for better or for worse - it is unclear which - to refer to my country in really unacceptable terms. And I would say that those terms were not only unacceptable, but gratuitous; he spoke of Nicaragua in a tendentious and intemperate manner, as a country which indulges in the import of arms in order to "destabilize" countries in Latin America.

In fact, that surprised us, because it was somewhat cynical - we cannot think of what else to call it - since the United States insists on depicting our country as playing some active part in supposed destabilization to serve interests alien to Latin America.

We do not want to go into detail, although we could indeed do so, in order to set the record straight and state the bald facts of the situation which at present burdens Central America in general and Nicaragua in particular, thanks to overt intervention by the United States.

I should like to remind Mr. Adelman of something of which he perhaps is not aware, because many things happen in the current North American administration, such as covert activities and decisions to undertake active destabilization of small countries such as ours, and these decisions are not always known by all the employees of the State Department of the United States. Thus, I should like to inform Mr. Adelman that up till now his Government has never seriously, responsibly or convincingly been able to prove, with any convincing evidence, that our country is a pipeline or staging post for weapons being sent to El Salvador.

According to the logic of the intelligence services of the United States, it has been suggested that there is evidence that weapons have gone through our country to El Salvador. When, about a year ago, Mr. Enders came to Nicaragua, we told him that if they were so sure that an arms traffic existed in Nicaragua, that is to say, if they knew the alleged embarkation points, transit points and other such information, then they should tell so as to allow us to take measures in this case and put an end to this alleged arms trafficking.

(Mr. Canda Morales, Nicaragua)

At the time, Mr. Enders replied that he did not have enough confidence that our Government would do so. We said that if the United States knew that there was trade in arms through our country to Honduras, and if he did not have confidence in us, then he should have said so to the Hondurans, so that the Honduran authorities could then themselves determine where this was happening and ensure that these weapons did not reach El Salvador, all of this, of course, within the context of the hypothesis entertained by the United States.

The reply given at that time was that there are some things that can be done theoretically but that are not always done in practice. But what does that mean? We will leave it up to the Committee to judge.

We would also like to stress the most recent article in Newsweek, which I think most, if not all delegates have read and have seen that, as a matter of pure fact, the United States is playing a truly dangerous role in destabilizing our country. That is all we have to say.

We do not wish to conclude, however, without reminding the Committee of the position of our country, namely that we want immediate and practical formulas for peace in Central America. We want rational, serious and mature steps which until now, unfortunately for peace and security in the region and in the world, have not met with the response which we would have expected from the United States Government.

Mr. STRULAK (Poland): I, too, am compelled to speak in exercise of my delegation's right of reply to yet another arrogant and abusive reference to the situation in my country by a United States representative this morning. Ambassador Adelman chose this time also to denigrate the Pugwash movement which held its conference in Warsaw in August 1982. As we have already informed this Committee, that conference adopted the declaration endorsed by 97 Nobel Prize laureates in the natural sciences, which points to the growing dangers to human survival posed by the increased arms race and confrontation in recent years and stresses the urgent necessity, in the first place, to build an effective barrier, universally adhered to, against any actual use of nuclear weapons.

The representative of the United States has nothing to tell us about the substance of this, indeed, penetrating and dramatic appeal of the world's men of science, which is very much in consonance with the disarmament efforts and aspirations of the United Nations, as well as the objectives of the World Disarmament Campaign which was the subject of the statement of the representative of the United States. He only dresses up the utterly nonsensical charge of manipulation of the Pugwash conference by Polish authorities, while at the same time indicating that he would have, in fact, himself manipulated the conference so that it should instead have dealt with Polish internal problems.

One may ask, why this attack on the Pugwash Conference? Two possible explanations come readily to mind: one is that the constructive thrust of the conference, its importance, seem to be in clear contradiction with the present confrontational policy of the United States. The second reason seems to be that the conference was welcomed and took place successfully in Warsaw. This fact clearly does not correspond with the distorted picture of Poland that some representatives of the United States draw here.

The Polish delegation must, of course, once again reject the irresponsible and totally irrelevant references to Poland's internal affairs by the representative of the United States, but having in mind the interests of the productive work of our Committee, we must also sincerely regret that Ambassador Adelman - and I think also the United States representative who spoke this afternoon - do not heed the wise counsel of his immediate predecessor in this morning's debate, Ambassador Chanana of India, who called

(Mr. Strulak, Poland)

for restraint and prudence in our discussions, particularly by those who bear the primary responsibility for disarmament.

We noted an earlier similar appeal by the representative of Denmark, Ambassador Michaelsen, and we cannot give these appeals any more support than we have already.

Mr. TARI (Israel) (interpretation from French): Notwithstanding all our experience, we were surprised by the words uttered by the representative of Iraq. We would have hoped that he would have spared this Committee a repetition of these ritual attacks.

In his statement this morning the representative of Israel raised a number of fundamental problems and reminded the Committee of a few concrete positive proposals. Once again they have been ignored by the representative of Iraq in favour of sterile polemics, which we can only regret.

One more word, certain delegations this morning uttered intolerable words about my country, which cast a shadow on the deliberations of this Committee. Out of esteem for the Committee and out of respect for ourselves, we shall refrain from any reply.

Mr. VO ANH TUAN (Viet Nam) (interpretation from French): I should like to start the exercise of my right of reply by addressing myself to the United States delegation and telling a story taken from Oriental mythology, as follows: once upon a time, in times immemorial, there was a person who considered himself to be the most virtuous of his age, and he arrogated to himself the right to have contempt for the rest of the world, including heaven. One day he turned his head toward heaven and he spat. The saliva did not reach heaven, but unfortunately fell back in his own face

In oriental mythology, heaven is the symbol of truth.

The truth here in our Committee is that the overwhelming majority of the delegations which have spoken in the general debate, from its beginning until this afternoon, have condemned the negative and dangerous policy of the United States Government regarding disarmament. Instead of heeding the voice of reason, the representatives of the United States of America have on numerous occasions had recourse to the language of the cold war and to gross slander; this is out of place in this respectable forum which is intended for constructive exchange of views aimed at finding the ways and means of halting and reversing the arms race and, above all, at averting a nuclear catastrophe.

My delegation would further observe that neither grandiloquence nor defamatory slander can change the great truth of our era one iota. That undeniable truth is that the United States of America was and remains the self-appointed international policeman. The statement made this morning by the United States representative once more confirms that truth. That statement could be considered only as an explicit and cynical expression of belief by the United States that it has the right to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, even militarily, to support what it calls democratic change and free expression of ideas.

Is that argument an attempt to justify its war of aggression against peoples which refuse to bend to American diktat and which wish freely to choose their own path to development? The American war of aggression - which was also the first large-scale chemical war in history - against the three peoples of the countries of Indo-China, used more than 10 million tons of bombs and 100,000 tons of toxic chemicals, and is a damning example of the United States policy of being an international policeman.

As the representative of the United States was speaking here this morning, his Government did not renounce its aggressive intentions against Viet Nam. The proof of this is that the United States Secretary of Defense, Caspar Weinberger, who is now visiting certain South-East Asian countries, stated on 2 November to the United Press International correspondent that the United States reaffirms its commitments made under the South-East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) treaty.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

It is a secret to no one that SEATO is an aggressive military organization created under United States auspices in the mid-1950s to carry out hostile activities against the three countries of Indo-China. The next day, yesterday, Mr. Weinberger was even more explicit when he replied to a question from the Agence France Presse correspondent concerning the lessons he could draw from the American war of aggression against Viet Nam. He said that "the United States took part in the Viet Nam war without the intention of winning. In my opinion, that was a serious error". Such a war-mongering statement needs no comment.

Regarding the tendentious, hackneyed claims made by the representatives of the United States on the alleged use of chemical weapons in Kampuchea, my delegation has more than once categorically rejected such false slanders, the unadmitted purpose of which has been unmasked and severely criticized by a number of delegations, including my own. For the sake of brevity, my delegation will refrain at this stage from making detailed comments on the United States representative's remarks concerning the alleged use of chemical weapons. We reserve our right to do this in due course.

For the present, we should like simply to suggest to the representative of the United States that if the American Government wants the Group of Experts established on its initiative to be able to visit the regions of Kampuchea where, it claims, chemical weapons have been used, it has only to apply officially and directly to the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, a sovereign country with its capital at Phnom Penh, to obtain the information it needs, rather than hemming and hawing and slandering others.

Mr. AKALEVSKY (United States of America): My delegation is very conscious of the lateness of the hour and therefore has no intention of imposing upon Committee members this evening. My delegation, however, reserves the right to reply at a later time to some of the speakers who followed me in making statements.

Mr. AL-SAHAF (Iraq)(interpretation from Arabic): In our reply to the representative of the Zionist entity, we based ourselves on facts set out in United Nations documents and in reports of the Secretary-General on Israeli nuclear armament. My questions were questions following on the statement made this morning by the representative of the Zionist entity. In that statement he tried to deceive the international community by distorting the facts and trying to whitewash the Zionist entity.

If the representative of the Zionist entity wants to prove the truth of these facts before the international community, let him answer the following questions: First, why does the Zionist entity refuse to sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons? Secondly, why does the Zionist entity refuse to submit its nuclear installations, especially the one at Dimona, to international safeguards? Thirdly, are the decimation of the Palestinian people and the invasion of a sovereign country like Lebanon acts likely to instil confidence among States? Having said this, I do not intend to engage in polemics with the representative of the Zionist entity, who seeks only to divert the attention of our Committee.

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic):

I apologize for asking to speak so late in the day. I shall not take up too much time. Nevertheless, what prompted me to do so were the allegations made by the representative of Israel in his statement this morning, and also what he said just now. He claimed that the intentions of his country had been distorted. I thought it was my duty to set the record straight and, for greater objectivity, may I say that when facts are laid before this Committee, apparently the Zionist entity believes us to be motivated by hatred and spite. If the facts are quoted, he sees it as a threat to the peace of Israel. All those who disagree with the Zionist strategy seem to be against zionism.

I do not want to go too far into the past; I simply wish to refer to resolution 478 (1981) of the Security Council and to General Assembly resolutions on the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi facilities. Those resolutions condemned Israel and requested that there be no recurrence of such aggressive acts in the future.

What was the result? The result has been that the Prime Minister of Israel declared that he was going to prohibit any Arab State from having nuclear facilities for peaceful purposes and that he intended to destroy such installations.

Therefore, the international community and this Committee should put an end to this challenge. The Prime Minister of Israel is no longer the head of a gang of terrorists as in the past - unless, of course, the entire State is made up of terrorists.

We must remember that Israel's nuclear greed is not something which has just happened today, but it has been discussed by the Assembly frequently in the past, and its aims have been condemned. Israel has been asked to place its nuclear installations under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency. It is quite obvious that the fact that Israel persists in defying the resolutions of the General Assembly is because Israel wishes to establish hegemony in the region.

The fact that Israel has not adhered to the Non-Proliferation Treaty is another reason which makes us doubtful about Israel's intentions. Before requesting a nuclear free zone in the Middle East, the Zionist entity has to

convince the international community of its seriousness by adhering to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and, secondly, by making its own nuclear installations subject to international control.

In this connection, I should also like to recall that Israel could never have remained at daggers drawn with the international community if it had not received support from the United States. The doors of American arsenals are thrown wide open to the spoilt child, Israel, because of the recent strategic agreements between these two friends and allies.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.