

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



FIRST COMMITTEE  
56th meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 7 December 1982  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

COPY:  
DO NOT REMOVE  
FROM ROOM  
L-201 (WWRR)

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 56TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GBEHO (Ghana)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 58: DEVELOPMENT AND STRENGTHENING OF GOOD-NEIGHBOURLINESS BETWEEN STATES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 59: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 137: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY (continued)

\* 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.56  
15 January 1983

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 58, 59 AND 137 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue its general debate on agenda items relating to the strengthening of international peace and security.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): First of all, my delegation would like to express its gratitude to the Secretary-General for the reports contained in documents A/37/476 and A/37/355, which my delegation has found to be helpful to the Committee's consideration of the items now before it.

Our debate on these items this year is taking place in the context of a world situation in profound disarray. International relations today are characterized by several negative trends and tendencies, including confrontation, open preparation for war, intensified bloc rivalries and increased resort to the threat or use of force. The growing tendency for States to resort to force in seeking to settle disputes or conflicts is particularly worrisome, especially since parallel to this tendency we find the diversion of increasing quantities of the world's resources into an arms race which merely serves to imperil the bases of a system of peaceful international relations.

The rhetoric of confrontation is eclipsing that of co-operation. Deliberate strategies of intervention, interference and destabilization are increasingly being implemented. Threats to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of small States are intensifying, while those States especially are the victims of policies of pressure and threats.

Genuine disarmament, an essential aspect of international security, still continues to be an elusive goal despite the efforts of the international community, at two special sessions of the Assembly devoted to this topic and elsewhere. While immense amounts of human, financial and technological resources are being wilfully deployed for the stockpiling of armaments, the goal of security which they are intended to serve is becoming increasingly unattainable.

In the meantime, the search, through negotiations, for solutions to various problems of global significance seems intractably stalemated. In the area of international economic relations, the very effort to begin a process of negotiations is being frustrated.

(Mr. Sinclair, Guyana)

Relations at both the regional and the local levels have been seriously affected by these negative manifestations. Many regional crises remain unresolved and in some cases they have even worsened. We have been witnessing, moreover, the studied policies of certain big Powers, which openly manipulate local situations of conflict in pursuit of interests that are alien to the peoples or regions concerned.

There is an ever-present danger that one or another regional conflict might produce effects which would spill over into the complex relations of the two super-Powers with adverse consequences for peace and security in general.

It is not that the international community lacks the bases on which to found a régime of co-operative endeavour and stable relations. In fact, the exact opposite is the truth: we have this very Organization and its Charter which together embody a set of principles for the creation of a sense of global community and for the establishment of a system of inter-State relations based on sovereign equality and the rule of law. Yet there has been a marked reluctance on the part of some States to harmonize their national interests with the good of the wider international community. At the same time, the collective security provisions of the Charter have not been effectively utilized, with the result that there is a lack of confidence on the part of States in the ability of the Organization in particular the Security Council, to deal with problems affecting peace and security. The international community has never been more in need of a reliable system of collective security, a fact which the Secretary-General has very frankly and appropriately stated in his report to the Assembly, when he wrote that:

"our most urgent goal is to reconstruct the Charter concept of collective action for peace and security". (A/37/1, p. 5)

Additionally, over the years we have been able to evolve a number of instruments intended to govern the conduct of inter-State relations, instruments which, if scrupulously respected and implemented, would be conducive to the establishment of the régime of security that all States seek. Foremost among these instruments are: the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security adopted at the Assembly's twenty-fifth session; the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations; the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs

(Mr. Sinclair, Guyana)

of States adopted only last year by the Assembly; and the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes which the Assembly adopted earlier in the current session.

It is not surprising that non-aligned States spearheaded the efforts of the international community to elaborate these instruments. The validity of the principles which they embody has been amply demonstrated with the passage of time. Their relevance for the conduct of stable international relations is undisputed even by those States which at first showed resistance to our efforts.

The seriousness and zeal with which non-aligned States have worked for the elaboration and adoption of these instruments are consistent with our Movement's commitment to the creation of a world free of domination and exploitation one in which the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States will be respected on an equal basis. They are consistent with our particular vocation as an independent factor in international relations and a progressive force for global political and economic change.

(Mr. Sinclair, Guyana)

The review of the implementation of the Declaration is not therefore seen simply as an annual ritualistic exercise. In the context of the deteriorating international climate, such a review is meaningless if it is not accompanied at the same time by a recommitment by all States to the principles of that Declaration. Valuable though it may be as a statement of principles for the conduct of inter-State behaviour, the Declaration is of little practical usefulness unless it becomes a living force and point of reference for the intercourse of States.

The sad reality, as many delegations have reflected in their presentations, is that the provisions of the Declaration have in general not been applied in a practical way to inter-State behaviour, and nowhere is this more evident than in the Middle East. The Palestinian people continue in their dispossession and exile while, in their ever-expanding nationalist ambitions, the Israeli Zionists blatantly disregard the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of their neighbours. Israel must withdraw from all occupied Arab and Palestinian territory, and the Palestinian people must be allowed to establish their own independent state. There is no alternative if peace and security in the Middle East region are to be secured.

In southern Africa, the Pretoria régime continues to hold the majority of its people in bondage, illegally to occupy Namibia, and to destabilize and physically attack its neighbours, all with the backing of its powerful Western friends. These States must desist from supporting South Africa in the prosecution of its oppressive policies. The system of apartheid must be dismantled. The independence of Namibia must be achieved in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and there is no question of any linkage with the sovereign actions of any neighbouring independent African State.

The problem of Cyprus continues to be with us. My delegation calls for a solution to this question on the basis of the framework for action long established by this Organization. We reaffirm our support for the intercommunal talks and give every encouragement to their successful issue.

(Mr. Sinclair, Guyana)

The people of Korea remain divided against their will. My delegation supports the peaceful reunification of Korea without outside interference, and based on the withdrawal of foreign troops. We believe that the proposals advanced by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea constitute a positive and constructive step towards this objective.

The war between Iran and Iraq continues. Guyana calls for strict implementation of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council relating to this matter, in particular resolutions 514 (1982) and 522 (1982).

As a nation of the Latin American and Caribbean region, Guyana is particularly disturbed at recent events in our part of the world. We have consistently opposed the use of force to settle disputes, calling instead for their settlement by peaceful means in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant instruments adopted by the Assembly.

Unfortunately, this has not been the case in Central America, where secret wars are being waged, where military solutions are being deliberately encouraged, and the wherewithal for such solutions generously provided. Destabilization and harassment of régimes are being loudly proclaimed as policy objectives.

It is difficult to overstate the seriousness of the situation prevailing in the Central American sub-region. We are - and must be - particularly grieved at external efforts aimed at subverting a people's legitimate choice of their own development orientation and their efforts to restructure their society on the basis of priorities and needs which they themselves determine. We cannot condone strategies of destabilization, whatever their source or their motivation. Such strategies deliberately sow discord and instability, thereby dangerously threatening the peace and security of the region. It was preoccupations such as these which moved non-aligned States to work as hard as we did for the adoption by this Assembly of a Declaration proscribing intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States. Guyana calls for the strict implementation of the provisions of this Declaration in respect of Central America.

(Mr. Sinclair, Guyana)

My delegation urges the search for peaceful solutions to the conflicts in Central America, based on respect for the fundamental principles of international relations, in particular respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, the inadmissibility of the use of force to settle disputes, and non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

An essential aspect of strengthening international security is necessarily the establishment of reliable and effective structures and mechanisms which would prevent breaches of the peace and even pre-empt situations of conflict. My delegation has consistently called in the General Assembly for the creation of such mechanisms. Delegations are well aware of the extent to which the complexities of the relations between the two super-Powers can prejudice the effectiveness of the Security Council in the area of the maintenance of international peace and security. This is all the more reason for concrete steps to be taken towards the early establishment of a system of collective security that is at once flexible, reliable and responsive to the urgent demands of States in conflict situations.

The Guyana delegation is pleased to be a sponsor of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.77 on the development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States. We believe that this draft addresses a fundamental point of departure for the construction of regional and international peace and security. According to document A/37/476, the view has been expressed by many delegations that the security of nations and the maintenance of international peace and security largely depend on the nature of relations between neighbouring States. My delegation fully concurs with this view.

Guyana is unreservedly committed to the development of good-neighbourly relations and we consistently seek the development of such relations, premised, of course, on mutual respect for sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, and strengthened through a process of co-operation for mutual advantage.

(Mr. Sinclair, Guyana)

Guyana believes, as do many other States here represented, that the first duty of every State towards its neighbours is to respect scrupulously their independence and their sovereignty and equal rights, and that this duty comprehends the obligation to refrain from any act which might be regarded as a violation of, or threat to violate land frontiers and sea and air-space areas as defined in bilateral or multilateral treaties and by international law. In accordance with this obligation, therefore, States must curb expansionist ambitions and must show respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of their neighbours, for the sanctity of legally established international frontiers, and for international agreements freely entered into. They must refrain from placing obstacles in the way of the development efforts of their neighbours and from all other acts of coercion or pressure against them. Such actions are inconsistent with good-neighbourliness, and with the strengthening of security, whether at the international or the regional level.

(Mr. Sinclair, Guyana)

Guyana believes that the concept of good-neighbourliness as a principle of international conduct is deserving of further study and elaboration. It is clear also from the replies which Governments have given and from the report of the Secretary-General that this is a widely shared view. We praise the delegation of Romania for its initiative and urge its continuation and development as a contribution to the strengthening of international security.

The security which States seek is not to be found in arms. Arms create fear and distrust and bring with them the constant risk that one day they will be used. What we need instead is to take that step beyond the piety of declarations, to promote the establishment of mutual confidence among States and an ethos of collective responsibility for the strengthening of international security. My delegation sincerely hopes that our review exercise this year will contribute in a real way to the satisfaction of that need.

Mr. KONADU-YIADOMI (Ghana): Mr. Chairman, the Ghana delegation has restrained itself in its participation in the debates of the Committee for very obvious reasons, and for the same reasons it has not been possible to pay you the compliments you richly deserve. However, since I am speaking for the first time in the Committee, I wish to add my personal congratulations to the many expressions of confidence and trust in your leadership of the Committee. I also wish to offer congratulations to the other officers of the Committee on their election. Permit me at this juncture to congratulate warmly Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico and Mrs. Myrdal of Sweden on the well-deserved recognition of their untiring work on disarmament expressed in the award to them of the Nobel Peace Prize for 1982.

International peace and security have constituted one of the major preoccupations of the United Nations since its creation. In fact the Charter, which still remains the main stay of the Organization and the clearest expression of its collective will, has given international peace and security pride of place in its Article 1 -- undoubtedly to underscore its fundamental importance in international relations and its relevance to the survival of the human family. Yet, after 37 years of incessant deliberations in this

and other forums, international peace and security, as a desirable goal, still remain a forlorn hope. An unfettered demonstration of might and aggression has been juxtaposed with fear and suspicion in the global picture. **Potentially** explosive situations have been nurtured through stages of crisis into armed confrontation. In recent decades an average of about four serious armed conflicts every year have occurred, often with repercussions far exceeding conservative estimates in loss of life and property and human suffering. In this state of affairs, we could not with any degree of **sincerity** give credit to ourselves - and naturally to our Organization for having successfully worked towards those ideals of peace and security which were uppermost in the minds of the founding fathers of our Organization and which the Charter makes quite explicit. Nor can we claim to have demonstrated any appreciable degree of political will or dedication even in the rather few instances where one or both of the States Parties to a dispute have shown a willingness to settle differences by peaceful means and only need our active encouragement. Therefore it is no wonder that crisis situations remain in several parts of the world, particularly in southern Africa, the Middle East, Central America, the Caribbean and Asia.

It is regrettable that decisions of the Security Council affecting peace and security in the world remain unimplemented while at the same time its authority is being increasingly flouted and international security undermined. It is also becoming increasingly clear that those countries that are militarily and economically strong prefer to use this leverage to settle international questions rather than have recourse to the mechanisms of the Security Council. It is the view of the Ghana delegation that this not only is tantamount to the subversion of the United Nations machinery for maintaining international peace and security but also seriously endangers peace.

If the grave deterioration of the international situation is allowed to continue unchecked not only will the capacity of the United Nations to act as an effective instrument of world peace and conscience be **irretrievably** damaged but also the stability and progress for which we all must legitimately strive will be greatly jeopardized.

(Mr. Konadu Yiadom Ghana)

In the light of this the Ghana delegation would call on Member States to give new substance and meaning to the relevant provisions of the Charter, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States and the 1970 Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, so that mankind might be rid of the scourge of war that, like the proverbial sword of Damocles, hangs over its head.

A number of those conflict situations would not have arisen if Member States had adhered to the principles of good-neighbourliness, which demands mutual respect for equality, sovereignty, territorial integrity and the inviolability of borders. Unless Member States recognize and accept these principles, the international community will remain in constant conflict, negating efforts to maintain international peace and security. Therefore Ghana calls for increased and more friendly dialogue between Member States, mutual tolerance and respect and the maintenance and strengthening of good-neighbourliness, so as to improve the state of international relations through the strengthening of international peace and security.

In the current world situation, in which millions of people in the poor South do not have adequate means of bettering their livelihood, success in the maintenance of peace and security will elude our efforts unless the rich North, with the necessary political will, agrees to share some of its resources with the poor South. The gap between the North and the South widens every day. Therefore it is imperative that the ongoing dialogue on the New International Economic Order, aimed at ensuring fair and equitable international economic relationships between the industrialized nations and those dependent on the export of primary products, succeed in order to promote international stability, which is a condition for peace and security in our world. Therefore we urge Member States, particularly those in the developed world, to give the negotiations the attention and support they deserve. In the end mankind will be better served, because a world half poor and half rich cannot hope to live in peace and be at peace.

In the view of Ghana, efforts must be exerted to strengthen international security. In this connection, we feel that the following measures are vital. First, there must be strict adherence to the principles and purposes of the United Nations and the General Assembly Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States. Secondly, hotbeds of tension, wherever they may exist, must be removed through a gradual **eradication** of the arms build-up and the promotion of confidence-building measures which take into account specific political and military situations. Thirdly, the effectiveness of the international security systems can be maintained if the key provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter are implemented. The Security Council has the requisite mandate under Articles 41 to 43 of the Charter; there is, therefore, a need to revitalize the Military Staff Committee to see to the collective security needs of the international community. Fourthly, there must be a prohibition of direct or indirect **assistance** in the **fomenting** of interference in the political, **social** and economic systems of other States. Fifthly, a weighty responsibility **rests** on the major military Powers to engage with one another in **dialogue**, negotiation and what might be called mutual code-building, so as to promote military restraint and ultimately peace.

(Mr. Konadu-Yiadom, Ghana)

Additionally, there is a need to strengthen the fact-finding role of the Secretary-General in order to enable him better to anticipate and prevent crises; States must be encouraged to bring matters to the Security Council more promptly and to encourage the Secretary-General to make fuller use of his own authority to bring matters before the Council. Determined and sustained efforts must be promoted and the necessary political will of the international community strengthened so as to correct the present imbalance in the level of wealth between the industrialized countries and the poor, developing world. It is also necessary to strengthen the United Nations in its peace-keeping functions and, in particular, to improve the capacity of the United Nations to respond quickly and in a more organized manner to potential threats to peace. This can only be realized, however, when all States honour their obligations, including the willingness to pay for peace-keeping operations pursuant to Article 17 of the Charter.

In conclusion, peace and security in our time are no longer merely the hope of idealists; they are an urgent and immediate need that can be realized if we all rededicate ourselves to the principles and purposes of the Charter.

Mrs. OSODE (Liberia): Before my delegation addresses itself to agenda item 137 on the implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security, an item which rightfully deserves our attention and interest, we should like to make the following brief observations on the discussions of disarmament issues that have been concluded.

We believe that for delegations to appraise the actual accomplishments of the First Committee, it is not enough that they carefully scrutinize the proliferation of resolutions adopted year after year. What we consider important is to ascertain to what extent our respective Governments have taken practical steps to implement those resolutions following their adoption.

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

It is assumed that no Member State possessing nuclear weapons would plan a nuclear war, for it might well annihilate mankind, including the citizens of that State. It is agreed that each and every Member State takes its security interests seriously into account and considers them matters of priority. Members of this Committee have unanimously expressed the view that time has not altered the validity of their perceptions and reaffirmation of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In the four years that have elapsed since that historic session, the world has witnessed a steady deterioration in the climate of international relations. There is a visible lack of international confidence, and suspicion is rife among and between States. The sovereignty of States continues to be eroded because of political and economic blackmail. Cogent statements that we have heard made on disarmament issues run counter to actions that would otherwise exemplify political will and moral courage.

In view of the momentum gained at the first special session devoted to disarmament, my Government was disappointed at the results of the second special session. We continue, however, to endorse proposals such as the non-first use of nuclear weapons, nuclear freeze, treaties on the banning of conventional weapons and nuclear-weapon-free zones. We have reason to believe, however, in the view of some statements made in this Committee and action taken on certain resolutions which we believe would run counter to the enhancement of disarmament efforts, that such proposals and their enabling resolutions are either primarily propagandistic gestures or are devoid of realism and practicality, which indicates possible difficulties for serious attempts at implementing them and arriving at agreements or meaningful negotiations that would benefit mankind as a whole. My delegation also ventures to say that it had not expected some of the sentiments expressed in statements it has heard but that it nonetheless appreciates the candour that generated those sentiments.

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

My Governemnt will strive to implement all resolutions on disarmament that it supports. It should also be noted that my delegation, which takes disarmament issues seriously, finds it unnecessary to submit to the overwhelming self-esteem of any one State or group of States by deliberately misinterpreting the intentions of provisions in resolutions submitted to this Committee, which we believe to be faithful and straightforward.

We have no intention, moreover, of drawing ourselves in a sea of disillusionment because of the differences between rhetoric and action. We are convinced and confident that disarmament in its true sense will one day be translated into what it was meant to be and that the United Nations will perform its functions.

My delegation now turns to agenda item 137. In so doing, we should like to register our strong support for item 59 on the review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and item 58 on the development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States, which Liberia has had the opportunity to address in this Committee.

As a founding Member of the United Nations, Liberia recalls that the expectations created among Members by the establishment of this Organization were based on its alleged merits as an organization for the maintenance of peace and security, which have the highest priority of all the aims it was designed to fulfil. The protection which the United Nations system was expected to offer developing countries such as Liberia was to reconcile them to the privilege and power enjoyed and exercised by the five permanent members of the Security Council.

My delegation's understanding of collective security is that the natural security of any one Member State should be a matter of concern to all other Member States. As we understand it, States are under an obligation to rally around a victimized State.

According to Article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations, a military establishment composed of national contingents should be at the disposal of the Security Council. As this Committee is aware, members of the Security Council have yet to reach agreement on the character and size of the proposed armed forces.

(Mrs. Osode Liberia)

It is my delegation's belief that the lofty idea of collective security must be made to work. Member States, big or small, should be ready in exchange for collective security to accept limitation on their sovereignty, on the right to arm, in support of the common interest of the community of nations. States must resist their obsession with their own security problems, which sometimes appears to be unjustifiable.

My delegation recognizes that from its inception the United Nations has operated within a very narrow scope. The permanent members of the Security Council have always had the right to veto any enforcement measures, whereas the non-permanent members have had no such right. We are convinced, however, that rationality and justice will prevail and not the status quo, and that adjustments would be made to reflect the true universality of the United Nations if the idea of collective security were to be made workable.

One of the problems with collective security is the fact that the Security Council could never institute enforcement proceedings against any of its permanent members. What my delegation finds most disappointing is that small States are not entitled to collective protection even when threatened by a big Power. The case of Afghanistan comes readily to mind.

Short of the application of Article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations, my delegation expected that the diplomatic and economic measures for the enforcement of Article 41 of Chapter VII of the Charter, which complements Article 43, were the prerogative of the Security Council. We are disappointed, however, to observe that only the formal authorization for those powers exists. Here again, although the General Assembly and Security Council have called for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa because of its illegal occupation in Namibia and its defiance of United Nations resolutions, certain permanent members of the Security Council have refused to participate in such action, thus blocking enforcement procedures against South Africa. We have every reason to believe that national interest suggested this course.

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

Paradoxically, while nations talk of disarmament there prevails the fatalistic belief in an unavoidable clash of arms. Defensive and offensive motives and actions merge all too easily, as has been demonstrated in world affairs and as already mentioned. The pace of disarmament has risen rapidly with the growing realization of the deficiencies of the United Nations peace and security system. In the present circumstances, we must give serious consideration to the idea of collective security.

Collective security, in my delegation's interpretation of the Charter provision, prohibits war waged by an individual State to serve its own ends. The Security Council is the only appropriate authority that can make lawful the use of force. Yet Article 51 of the Charter establishes as an exception the right of an individual State Member to wage defensive war. This argument was advanced in the crisis we witnessed in the South Atlantic in April of this year. This Article, which restores the right to make war, was invoked, and those States supporting one of the parties to the conflict felt that it was unreasonable, for all practical purposes, to expect it to renounce its reservation under the provision of Article 51.

Finally, my delegation realizes the complexity and intricacies of collective security. However, this should not prevent the General Assembly from inviting the Security Council to study this question as a matter of priority and, upon completion of the study, States Members should be given the opportunity to assess it carefully and to communicate their views on this all-important matter to the Secretary-General. All States Members of the United Nations should be involved in this question. We therefore particularly call upon the good offices of the permanent members of the Security Council in this matter.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): Over the past week of debate on the strengthening of international security, this Committee has been subjected to

(ir. Lodge United States)

a familiar and well-orchestrated litany of charges by the so-called socialist bloc of States. One after another, each of these States has slavishly echoed the party line, each statement following the form as well as the content promulgated by the conductor of the chorus in Moscow. I suppose we should not expect an independence of views or thoughtful analysis from States which do not allow self-expression among their own people and which have no freedom of action, but are imprisoned in a knee-jerk subservience. According to their demonological view of history, all the woes of the world since the Second World War can be attributed to a single source of evil. How will future historians look back on our age? They will note that it was the West which refused to use the threat of its nuclear monopoly in the 1940s and early 1950s for territorial or colonial or imperial gain. Who doubts that, had the nuclear monopoly been in the hands of Russia, the map of Europe and, indeed, of the world, would look quite different today? Who invaded and occupied, with unparalleled brutality and heavy casualties, the non-aligned nation of Afghanistan? Who intimidated the proud people of Poland or used chemical and toxin warfare in Afghanistan and South East Asia?

Rather than conduct a lengthy tour d'horizon of the issues encompassed by the strengthening of international security, allow me briefly to address one unsettling development which affects us all, namely, the massive increase in spending on the tools of destruction, the mounting cost of the weapons of war. The dedication of any nation's resources to military ends is unfortunate, even when unavoidable. It is undeniable that in many parts of the world today families which are hungry might be fed and dying infants might be strong and growing were their Governments to spend less on armaments. Even in the United States the cost of modernizing our military forces is far more than we would like to see as we set the goals and priorities for the national economy over the next few years. However, this is the world we live in. General Marshall, when Secretary of State, once said to his staff: "Gentlemen, don't fight the problem, solve it."

RF/G

A/C.1/37/PV.56  
24-25

(Mr. Lodge United States)

In his lengthy statement in this Committee on 29 November, the Soviet First Deputy Permanent Representative challenged some of the United States figures on Soviet military spending. As always, of course, the Soviet representative quoted United States sources, from Henry Kissinger to the Georgetown Center for Strategic Studies, to buttress his argument.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

How many times have we heard Soviet representatives quote from The New York Times to lend credibility to their case? Has anyone ever found an article in Pravda or Izvetsia that was at variance with the Soviet Government? Be that as it may, we welcome the opportunity to discuss the question of military spending freely and openly. Nevertheless, it is difficult seriously to discuss the issue when one side shrouds its military spending and programmes in secrecy, when one side refuses to submit its military data to the United Nations, utilizing the standardized United Nations reporting instruments. In short, it is difficult to conduct a dialogue with a stone wall.

We have heard much theoretical musing over the past weeks in this Committee about United States military doctrines and programmes. However, the fact remains that the actual United States military posture has changed little over the past decade. What has changed has been the level and character of the Russian military establishment. If the representatives of the Soviet Union wish to refute any of the following facts, let them open up their books, let them accept President Reagan's offer to the Soviet leadership to speak on issues of war and peace directly to the American people on United States television for a reciprocal opportunity.

We may not like the facts which confirm the rapid expansion of Soviet military spending. They make us all uncomfortable. However, if history teaches us anything, it teaches that self-delusion in the face of unpleasant facts is the road to perdition. We must not, like the proverbial ostrich, stick our heads in the sand. Today, the estimated dollar cost of Soviet defence activities is some 50 per cent more than corresponding United States outlays. That is a relentless fact. The United States spent 5.5 per cent of its gross national product on defence during fiscal year 1981, compared to approximately 12 per cent for the Soviet Union. Today the United States estimates the Soviet Union's defence budget is 40 per cent larger in real terms than it was 10 years ago, while the United States defence budget is 10 per cent lower than it was 10 years ago.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

Over this same period, the Soviet Union has spent at least 150 per cent of what the United States has on defence. During this same period the Soviet Union has spent twice as much on conventional armaments as the United States. The outlays for Soviet strategic offensive weapons, ICBMs, submarines and bombers, nearly doubled United States spending on comparable systems during the past decade. Soviet emphasis on ICBMs is well known. However, the Soviet Union has outspent the United States on submarines as well. During the same period, Soviet expenditures on strategic defence, that is civil defence programmes, have also clearly outpaced United States programmes. Soviet military investments, research and development, procurement and military construction, have exceeded United States efforts even more markedly, ranging from 80 to 90 per cent more than United States expenditures during the past five years.

The Soviet Union has twice as many personnel under arms as the United States: 4.3 million for the Soviet Union to 2.1 million for the United States. The difference in ready reserve strength is even more dramatic: 9.2 million for the Soviet Union, 1.2 million for the United States. These startling and alarming realities are not figments of our imagination. There are disagreements, of course, about some specific figures, but no one can doubt the trends of military spending and their implications. They have been documented by all recognized centres of disarmament and military studies and by all objective governmental analyses.

Despite these spending realities the Soviet Union routinely reports, year after year, the same single defence budget figure of 17 billion roubles. This evokes the chilling memory of "Newspeak" described in George Orwell's novel "1984". Converted into dollars at the arbitrary Soviet rate of exchange, this now is stated by the Soviet Union to be equivalent to \$23 billion, which is outrageous. To accept that patently inaccurate figure would create a humpty-dumpty world, in which true is false and false is true.

The irrefutable fact remains that over the past 10 years the Soviet Government has launched the greatest and most expensive military build-up in world history and has produced and deployed more potential explosive power than has ever before in all recorded history been compiled in any given period of time by any single State or combination of States.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

The Soviet military build-up has taken place while the United States has tried to restrain the arms race unilaterally, a period in which not one single new strategic weapon system was introduced into the United States nuclear arsenal. As a result of their accelerated build-up during the decade of the 1970s, the Soviet Union now leads the United States by almost all quantitative indicators of strategic capacity, especially in ICBMs and nuclear throw-aways.

One corollary of the massive Soviet build-up is the fact that the Soviet Union is now the most militarized industrial society that has ever existed during so-called peace-time. Another corollary is that while the Soviet Union has been generally reluctant to extend significant economic assistance to so-called developing nations, it has shown a willingness to pour lethal weapons into these areas. Between 1977 and 1981, while the Soviet Union spent only \$2.3 billion in economic assistance, it disbursed over \$36 billion on military hardware to the third world.

According to information from internationally recognized disarmament centres, the Soviet Union out-delivered the United States in all major categories of conventional weapon transfers, often by ratios of 5 to 1. The stark contrast between the great volume of Soviet weapon transfers, on the one hand, and the meagre amount of development assistance on the other, illuminates in bold relief the true intentions of the Soviet Union towards the developing nations. The human toll is also devastating. The Soviet Union and its allies have created some 10 million refugees from Indo-China, through Afghanistan to the Horn of Africa, and across the Atlantic to Cuba and Central America.

In his address to the second special session on disarmament, President Reagan reminded us of the tragic fact that since the end of the Second World War over 100 conflicts, all of them using conventional weapons, have disturbed the peace of the world. The tragedy of destabilizing arms transfers to the developing world is compounded by the sad fact that today this same developing world now devotes a higher percentage of its gross national product to military expenditures than does the industrialized world. We should all share a concern for rising military expenditures, a concern that affects, or should affect most nations represented in this forum.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

While we are all aware of the huge potential destructive power contained in the nuclear arsenals of the super-Powers - and we can all agree that these super-Powers have primary responsibility for nuclear arms control and disarmament - this should not make us overlook the actual, present and ongoing realities of conventional armed conflict in the developing nations, including the spiralling military expenditures of many of these States. For example, the developing world now accounts for nearly one quarter of the world's total military spending: 23 per cent in 1979. In 1970 the share was 17 per cent. In the decade of the 1970s, for the developed countries taken together, the average annual growth rate of military spending after inflation was 1.5 per cent; for the developing countries it was 5.5 per cent.

If these rates were to continue at the same pace, the military spending of the developing countries would exceed that of the developed countries soon after the year 2000 - 2008, I believe, is the year projected.

The military spending of any country, however necessary it may be for security reasons, usually diverts resources from alternative economic uses, including social and economic development. This is especially poignant in the developing countries. The average burden of military spending relative to gross national product in developing countries was 5.5 per cent in 1979, compared to 5.3 per cent for developed countries. Where legitimate security needs do not require such spending it is to be deplored. Where it is necessary for national survival we should all seek ways to relieve the security threat.

Those States attempting economic and political destabilization of other countries should cease such illegal and immoral activities.

Let us not labour under any illusions: we will not solve the complex problem of spiralling military spending by ignoring it. We will begin to address the real causes and solutions to the problem only if we address them openly and frankly and with the objective of finding solutions.

Mr. CANDA MORALES (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): The truth is that it is not very difficult to note the extreme fragility of international peace at the present time. The general picture presented by the current world situation could not be more disturbing. Calm, level-headed, even brilliant diplomats in this Committee have put forward interesting broad analyses of the state of international relations. We have listened very carefully here to statements about the gradual deterioration of relations among States. We have heard about the fundamental importance of certain principles, such as the non-use or threat of use of force. We have heard timely and valid statements about how the collective security system of the United Nations has been weakened.

A few days ago, one of our colleagues reminded us very bluntly that failure to observe the principles which gave life to our Organization can lead only to real anarchy in international relations.

Hotbeds of tension, which have not ceased to appear since the establishment of the United Nations, have not only persisted, but have increased in number. I would mention just a few. The Middle East continues to be a highly explosive region. No one doubts that until the Zionist army withdraws from all territories occupied since 1967, until it gives up Lebanese territory, until it recognizes the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to its own homeland, there will be no peace in the Middle East.

Then there is the racist régime in Pretoria, whose formidable war-machine has been developed with the support of the United States, Israel and other countries well known to representatives. Everybody knows that one of the South African régime's objectives is to destabilize, harass and pressure the front-line States. Even now, Pretoria's troops are polluting Angolan territory and are illegally occupying Namibia.

The reunification of the Korean people has not yet been possible. The presence of foreign troops in the southern part of the peninsula militates against a just political settlement. In fact, that presence constitutes a clear threat of the use of force against the North.

A part of Latin American territory, the archipelago of the Malvinas Islands in the South Atlantic, has served as an unwilling reminder of colonial times, which we had thought were behind us. Latter-day pirates, very much like the

buccaneers who centuries ago put to fire and sword the shores of the Caribbean, have maintained an illegal and disproportionate presence in the Malvinas archipelago.

To this chain of hotbeds of tension whose persistence is a constant threat to peace and stability in the world we can add another, in the very heart of the American continent. We are, of course, referring to Central America. With the Chairman's indulgence and without attempting to be exhaustive, we wish to highlight the principle aspects of the crisis besetting our region. A Manichean, absurdist, unrealistic view of the situation would have it that the explosive social situation of the peoples of Central America, and their struggle, their just aspirations, their desire to leave underdevelopment behind them, are a part of the East-West balance.

Nicaragua has made tremendous efforts to rebuild its country and to bring about better living standards for its people. Unfortunately, we have had only aggressiveness, blackmail and threats from the Reagan Administration.

(Mr. Canda Morales, Nicaragua)

We have presented two concrete proposals on negotiations to the United States; the first met with a negative reply, and the second met with no reply at all. If it did not on the first occasion accept the presence of a witness of the standing of Mexico, now it would seem that it does not even agree to our meeting on Mexican soil. In any case we think it is obvious that it is the express desire of the Reagan Administration to create an appropriate political framework within which it will be possible to isolate Nicaragua and thereby justify foreign aggression and foreign intervention.

For this purpose, for example, the United States scheduled and organized a meeting of Foreign Ministers in San José, Costa Rica, on 4 October last, excluding Nicaragua. In passing it might be said that not all the Foreign Ministers were present. President Reagan mentioned that meeting when he replied to a letter sent to him by the Presidents of Venezuela and Mexico a few days earlier, in which they simply requested that an attempt be made to bring about an understanding in the region. They suggested that Honduras and Nicaragua meet at the highest level, the meeting to be held in Caracas, Venezuela. But that meeting never took place because of Honduras' refusal to meet with Nicaragua. The excuse used by the Executive of that country was that there were agenda problems. But how can the delicate problem of peace be called an agenda problem?

These political and diplomatic pressures are increasing daily, and to them must be added economic pressures. After cutting us off from all kinds of assistance, the United States is bringing pressure to bear within the multilateral financing bodies in an attempt to strangle Nicaragua economically.

It should be pointed out that directly after our revolutionary triumph Nicaragua renegotiated its debt, which it had inherited from the dictatorship, with the World Bank. Since then we have abided by our obligations even though that has meant that we have had to close certain enterprises due to a lack of raw materials, because our earnings from our increasingly poorly paid-for products are being used by us to pay off our debt. For the months of November and December we shall be paying \$90 million as installments on our loan. Yet the financing bodies continue to deny Nicaragua the loans it has requested in order to restructure our industry and promote socially beneficial programmes. That refusal was due to pressure from the Reagan Administration.

(Mr. Canda Morales, Nicaragua)

But that is not all. The international community and serious and responsible Governments are quite familiar with the decision of the United States to destabilize our country through covert operations, which in truth are no longer very covert. The secret United States war against Nicaragua is no longer very secret. Most serious, however, is that the Reagan Administration itself recognizes and officially condones the operations being carried out against Nicaragua, and broad sectors of the Government, armed forces, and territory of Honduras are being used, with the collaboration of other Governments, and not just Central American Governments.

In its desire to destroy our revolution the United States is seriously jeopardizing Honduras, a country that has become a veritable bunker in the sense that it is an impressive staging area that can be used against our country.

Nicaragua continues to pay a high price for its freedom and independence. Since 1981 our country has experienced 225 attacks from Honduran territory. About 350 Nicaraguan civilians and soldiers have died, and our air space and maritime space have been violated about 130 times.

And what has Nicaragua's attitude been? We have made tireless appeals for wisdom and dialogue. Since 13 May 1981 we have ceaselessly made such appeals. It was on that date that the then Chief of State of Honduras, a military man, agreed to meet with the Co-ordinator of the Junta of the Government of Reconstruction, Daniel Ortega. We have thus far sent the Government of Honduras 73 notes of protest, channelled through our Foreign Ministry, regarding military acts of aggression by bands of ex-Somozista guards from the territory of Honduras, with the support of the Honduran army. Fifty-five of those notes of protest were sent this year, and the two most recent during last week-end. We have sent copies of some of those notes to the Security Council and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations so as to make quite plain the acts of aggression to which we have fallen victim and to expose the great danger to peace in the region that will ensue if this escalation and the acts of aggression do not cease.

(Mr. Canda Morales, Nicaragua)

Since our Committee is taking up the delicate issue of international security and good-neighbourliness between States, it is not Nicaragua's intention to put the United States in the dock on this occasion. We have merely wished to speak about something that is not unknown to the international community and to say that the present American Administration is determined to do its utmost to destroy our revolution. It will do anything to achieve its objective even if it means a war involving all the countries of the area, which would have incalculable consequences for international peace and security.

(Mr. Canda Morales, Nicaragua)

We only wish to say that the conduct of the United States is totally in violation of the principles which gave life to our Organization and are contained in the United Nations Charter. For example, Article 1, paragraph 1 of the United Nations Charter says:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace".

Article 2, paragraph 4 says:

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations".

By cutting off all assistance to us, denying our request for loans in international organizations, authorizing covert plans of destabilization, financing, organizing and training counter-revolutionary gangs, the United States ignores the principle of good-neighbourliness which should govern relations among civilized States. Even more, it ignores obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law.

It is not far-fetched to think that the United States is planning a revision of the Charter of our Organization. By playing with peace in Nicaragua, that is to say irresponsibly playing with war in Central America, the United States, not only places itself beyond the pale of international law, but is encouraging tension to a point which might well bring the world to the brink of a nuclear war. Everyone knows that today to play with war is to play with the survival of the human race.

(Mr. Canda Morales, Nicaragua)

While pointing out once again the degree of responsibility which the Government of the United States has for security in Central America and the Caribbean, we should like to state Nicaragua's position. We would repeat that a dialogue and negotiations are urgently needed on the basis, inter alia, of the following principles. Nicaragua is prepared immediately to sign non-aggression pacts with the bordering countries. Nicaragua rejects United States efforts to impose humiliating restrictions on our country's prerogatives in matters of national defence. The use of Honduras territory as a base for armed aggression against Nicaragua must cease. The traffic in weapons and counter-revolutionary efforts in Honduras and Nicaragua must stop. The training of counter-revolutionaries in the United States must end. The presence of American warships in Central American and Nicaraguan waters must cease. Flights of spy planes over Nicaraguan airspace must be halted. The participation of the intelligence services of the United States in the financing, training and organization of covert operations against Nicaragua must cease. The United States must stop encouraging policies of economic, commercial or financial blockade against Nicaragua. The United States, finally, must officially and explicitly, pledge not to commit an act of aggression against Nicaragua or advocate direct or indirect aggression in Central America.

Those are, inter alia, the points which we would like to discuss with the United States. We believe that serious and immediate negotiations are the only remaining possibility which can remove the spectre of war from the Central American region. Once again we insist that it is of paramount importance that a meeting be held between the Heads of State of Honduras and Nicaragua, on the one hand, and high-level meetings between the Foreign Ministries of Nicaragua and the United States, on the other. We believe that it is still not too late to avoid war, in spite of the fact that warlike preparations for wide-spread aggression against Nicaragua are already under way and only the date remains to be decided.

(Mr. Canda Morales, Nicaragua)

In conclusion, my delegation believes that the international community must spare no effort to reverse the senseless, adventurist, irresponsible, aggressive policies. It must spare no effort to maintain international détente, and ceaselessly to seek effective disarmament measures and the maintenance and strengthening of international security. On this occasion we should like to repeat the challenge that we issued to the Reagan Administration in February of this year. It was only a challenge in favour of peace in Central America. We told the United States to honour the Preamble of our Charter which says:

"We the peoples of the United Nations determined ... to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, ... and for these ends to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest".

(Mr. Canda Morales, Nicaragua)

We believe that there is one more opportunity, perhaps the last one, for the Reagan Administration to redeem itself before history and before the peoples of the world. It must cease to act like an empire. We should like to remind it, in view of **its** policy of drum-beating that the 104 countries that voted for Nicaragua's membership in the Security Council for a two-year period in fact voted - and let there be no doubt about this - for the maintenance of peace in Central America.

Mr. ERDENECHULUUN (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): Recent events in international affairs have again shown very convincingly the need to have a regular review of the implementation of the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. We proceed from the premise that a comprehensive analysis of the problems affecting the basis of peace and security enables us to obtain an objective evaluation of the world situation so as to determine the basic orientations of the efforts of the international community.

The general debates in the General Assembly and here in the First Committee showed very clearly the serious concern of the world community over the growing threat of the outbreak of a nuclear war as a result of the escalation of the arms race, particularly the nuclear one. At the same time there was a clear expression of the resolve of countries and peoples even more actively to counter this dangerous trend and to seek ways and means of halting the arms race. This was very clearly reflected in the overwhelming majority of draft resolutions adopted by the First Committee at this session of the General Assembly.

The consideration of the new Soviet initiative on an immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and on the intensification of efforts to avert the threat of nuclear war and ensure the safe development of nuclear power, in our view helped to focus the attention of States on the most burning issues of the current situation. We note with satisfaction that in the work of this Committee a constructive spirit has on the whole prevailed and there has been a desire to seek mutually acceptable positions. At the same time, we cannot pass over in silence the dissonant statements made in this Committee - and this has occurred again today - to the effect that the deterioration of the international situation, has supposedly nothing at all to do

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

with the arms race. It was even claimed that the arms race simply did not exist at all. Such statements have absolutely nothing in common with reality and the multi-billion-dollar programme for an arms build-up envisaged for the next few decades and the concepts underlying it, those of so-called limited and protracted wars. The most recent example of this was the decision by the United States Administration to develop the so-called MX missile, the most destabilizing kind of offensive weapon. This decision was a clear breach of the provisions of the SALT II Treaty and designed to establish a nuclear first-strike capability. Clearly this is why the United States has so stubbornly been refusing to enter into a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. In connection with this commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, arguments have been advanced here to the effect that such a commitment was not subject to verification and did not mean too much and that it would leave the door open to the use of conventional weapons. If those who use such arguments followed them to their logical conclusion, one might ask why they do not agree with the proposal of the Soviet Union for the concluding of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations, which would provide for a commitment not to use force with weapons of any kind, nuclear or conventional. In brief, in this vitally important issue of disarmament, what is needed, we believe, is not negative or obstructionist rhetoric but rather political will and a true desire to seek actual agreements.

The socialist countries always proceed from the premise that, along with efforts to halt the arms race and achieve disarmament, it is essential to arrive at a settlement of crisis situations and conflicts in the various parts of the world and thus to promote a general easing of tension. The socialist countries will continue to exert maximum efforts to halt the process of the exacerbation of tension in the world, to avert the military danger and to achieve progress in curbing and reducing the build-up of arms, particularly nuclear arms.

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

The Mongolian People's Republic attaches great importance to the Madrid meeting of representatives of States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which recently resumed its work and which inter alia is called upon to take a decision on the convening of a conference on confidence-building measures and security and disarmament in Europe.

Asia is a continent in which there are too many hotbeds of tension and armed conflict. First of all there is the Middle East problem. The most recent Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the mass killings of Lebanese and Palestinians have further worsened the situation in that part of the world and further complicated the prospects for a settlement in the Middle East. All this has once again demonstrated that the policy of separate deals does not work. The efforts to conclude new versions of such deals can lead to nothing but exacerbation of the already critical situation. In order to establish lasting and just peace in the Middle East, what is needed is that Israel withdraw its troops from all the occupied Arab territories and that the Palestinian people be allowed to enjoy their inalienable right to establish their own State.

Because of the policy of the imperialistic and hegemonistic forces, the situation in South-East Asia is still a tense one. All the fuss about the so-called coalition Government is nothing but a futile attempt to revive the genocidal Pol Pot régime. The Mongolian People's Republic considers that the problems of that region should be resolved through dialogue without outside intervention. The basis for such a settlement could be the constructive proposals made by the countries of Indo-China in July of this year in Ho Chi Minh City and set forth in the letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Lao People's Democratic Republic dated 15 September 1982 addressed to the Foreign Ministers of the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations.

MR/sr

A/C.1/37/PV.56  
49-50

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

The Mongolian People's Republic consistently supports the just struggle of the Korean people for a peaceful and democratic unification of the country and for the withdrawal of United States troops and nuclear facilities from South Korea.

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

We advocate a swift halt to the Iran-Iraq conflict, which only plays into the hands of imperialist circles striving on behalf of their own narrow and selfish interests further to exacerbate the situation in the region.

On the subject of peace and security in Asia, I should like briefly to recall the proposal to conclude among the States of Asia and the Pacific a convention on mutual non-aggression and the non-use of force - a proposal made by the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic. As we noted earlier, the essence of our proposal is to outlaw the use of force in relations between Asian States. We firmly believe that it is the very presence of pending problems that requires the countries of the region to take concrete steps to exclude the use of force.

We consider that dialogue and negotiations are the only sensible alternatives for resolving the burning issues of peace and the security of States. Our delegation would like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to all those delegations that have supported our initiatives here in the First Committee.

We would here point out that the proposal by Mongolia is along the same lines as the initiative of the Soviet Union to work on confidence-building measures in the Far East and also along the same lines as other constructive proposals made by the Asian countries.

We support the struggle of the peoples of Cuba, Nicaragua, Grenada and other countries of Central America and the Caribbean and we call for a halt to aggressive and subversive activities that threaten peace and security in the countries of that region.

A matter of serious concern to us is the continuing acts of aggression by South Africa against Angola, Mozambique and other front-line States. The people of Namibia must be given their independence on the basis of the well-known decisions of the United Nations. In this connection, we would reject attempts to link the question of granting independence to the people of Namibia with the presence of Cuban military units in Angola.

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

The armed conflict in the South Atlantic has very clearly demonstrated the urgent need to put an end to all remnants of colonialism. In conclusion, the Mongolian delegation would like to emphasize once again the primary significance of unswerving compliance with the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. This is something which is dictated by the present reality of the world situation.

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): The question of the strengthening of international security is one that has been debated at length before the First Committee of the United Nations over the past few years. This is not only because the issue represents the commitment of the international community after experiencing hard and bitter examples of the contrary condition, but also because of **increasing** occurrences of threats to and actual breaches of the aforementioned commitment.

Building on the ruins left by the Second World War, civilized mankind reformulated certain principles which needed to be updated as a result of the accumulation of lessons of history. No one could dispute then that the survival of civilization would have one overall prerequisite - namely, the elimination of the threat or danger of a qualitatively new war. That conclusion meant that the nations of the world had to accept the overwhelming responsibility of maintaining and consolidating international peace and security - a task so delicate and complicated, yet unquestionably vital. At times, one wonders whether it is the lack of clarity of implications that permits certain quarters to venture on actions that may well develop into an all-out confrontation. Or is it that the image of a post-thermonuclear-war world drawn by those quarters is to a reasonable degree more acceptable than the one foreseen by the vast majority of nations? With the degree of knowledge and the facilities available to humanity, or even on the basis of common sense, however, neither of those possibilities is credible.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

Why is it, then, that despite the vivid and obvious outcome of pushing the world towards complete annihilation, the deliberate exposure of international security to that immense threat still persists? This is perhaps explained in the context of certain theories which could, in the mildest terms, be described as euphoric. Thoughts of limited, protracted or winnable nuclear wars, which have dominated the minds of people in those circles, have caused understandably serious concern to the rest of the international community. One would have wished those ideas simply to be used as bargaining chips or for the purposes of normal and customary rhetoric. Some actual deeds on the parts of war-mongering forces, however, leave no room for such wishful thinking. They have embarked upon the road of drastic escalation of the arms race, drawing up and implementing plans that would quantitatively as well as qualitatively bolster the potential for the complete destruction of the earth.

Apart from the overall strategic approach of the imperialist forces, their day-to-day conduct of international affairs is also a faithful reflection of that major tendency: that is, to create new hotbeds of tension around the world, to fan the flames of those already existing, to resort to the use of force and aggression against small, independent nations and to exert political and economic pressure on them and to destabilize their progressive Governments through the export of mercenaries and saboteurs.

The recent chronology of events in Asia, Africa and Latin America is full of unmistakable examples of that policy. In the Middle East, the Arab countries of the region have been subjected to repeated acts of aggression and the occupation of their territories continues unabated. The people of Palestine, for the nth time, were the target of designs aimed at their mass annihilation. Not only did Israel refuse to withdraw its forces from Palestinians and other occupied Arab territories, but it also went so far as to move its troops into the whole of Lebanon and destroyed that country's capital.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

A just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East and Palestinian questions must be worked out if this grave threat to international security is to be averted. All realistic proposals have suggested that this could only be achieved through the complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from all occupied territories and the effective exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights in Palestine.

In South-East Asia, the people of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam were once again the victims of armed attacks and aggression - this time by a mighty neighbour. Pressure and attempts at destabilization continue against the Lao People's Democratic Republic. While denied the sympathy and amity of some neighbouring countries, the people of Kampuchea still must fight the remnants of a dark era which is deliberately being kept alive by outside forces.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

Acceptance of the peaceful proposals of the three Indo-Chinese nations by the other countries of South-East Asia would inevitably pave the way to cordial and friendly relations among the States of the region and thus help strengthen peace and security in this part of the world.

The proposals of the People's Republic of Mongolia to that end constitute another major contribution by the forces of peace and détente.

The continued senseless war between Iraq and Iran has resulted in bloodshed and fratricide in the region of the Gulf. The amassing of the interventionist forces of the imperialists in the southern waters of our continent and their full-scale attempt to militarize the most reactionary régimes in the region - and to force others into the bleak pursuit of the arms race - are main subjects of legitimate concern for the peoples of our area.

The proposals of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar and other proposals on the security of the Indian Ocean area find a very pertinent place in efforts for the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

Afghanistan, which broke away from the imperialist and reactionary camp as a result of its popular revolution of April 1978, has become the innocent victim of an undeclared war unleashed by imperialists, hegemonists and other reactionary forces and their local lackeys.

Since the victory of the April Revolution, and particularly after its new phase, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has endeavoured to establish and expand friendly and cordial relations with all countries of the world and in particular with our neighbours. In a sincere hope and desire to resolve all outstanding issues with our neighbours, we have submitted the proposals of May 1980, which were further elaborated by the proposals of August 1981.

Realistic as they are, these proposals provide an acceptable basis for a comprehensive settlement of the situation created around Afghanistan. An equally responsible approach on the part of our neighbours would no doubt

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

contribute to the restoration of conditions favourable to normal and even friendly relations among the States and to the consolidation of security in the area. Regrettably, however, the attitudes of the other parties involved leaves much to be desired.

In Africa the peoples of Namibia and South Africa are subject to the most abhorrent racial policies and practices. The territory of Namibia is still illegally occupied by the Pretoria régime in complete defiance of the appeals by the international community. Apartheid is showing its abominable face to the people of South Africa more brazenly than ever before. Armed attempts at destabilization and acts of aggression by the racist South African régime endanger now one independent African State, now another. The acquisition of nuclear potential by this régime, in close collaboration with certain Western countries and the Israeli Zionist régime, would inevitably expand the scope of the danger posed by the Pretoria régime, not only to the whole of the African continent, but to the world at large. The search for a solution to the problem of Namibia is constantly impeded by the obstructionist designs of the Government of South Africa, with the connivance of its imperialist patrons.

The United States policy of treating Latin America and the Caribbean as its backyard and attempts to impose unpopular régimes on the nations of the area have aroused the indignation of those nations. Continuing interference in the internal affairs of States and resort to the use of force and aggression by outside Powers against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the countries of the region have considerably affected the security climate of this continent.

A recent colonial war there could well have developed into a much wider confrontation whose impact would have reached areas far beyond the American continent.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

Given the present state of affairs that prevails in the world, the task of preserving and strengthening international peace and security is of the utmost urgency. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, together with the other non-aligned States, the socialist community and other peace-loving forces, vigilantly and strongly comes out in favour of better and improved international relations based on the universally accepted principles of peaceful coexistence among different socio-economic systems, non-interference, non-intervention, respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of States, good-neighbourliness and international co-operation.

Mr. M'ITESA (Zambia): When the General Assembly, at its twenty-fifth session, adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, there was a shared hope and expectation that world crises would be eased. In fact, it was expected that the world security system would be greatly enhanced. As we meet today, the hope and expectation expressed in 1970 are but a perennial mirage. Each year that has passed since then seems to be a year of mounting problems in the world. We continue to witness increasing tensions and localized wars, while at the same time old conflicts remain difficult to resolve. Above all, the arms race and the danger of nuclear catastrophe become all the more insidious and ominous. The inescapable conclusion is that the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is yet to be realized.

The gravest threat to peace and security emanates from the presence of nuclear weapons. These weapons have unimagined explosive power and can destroy in a matter of seconds what has taken mankind centuries to build. It is regrettable that although we are all aware of the unprecedented destructiveness that nuclear weapons represent there is increasing reliance by major Powers on these lethal weapons. In this situation, military strength has become a symbol

(Mr. M'Tesa, Zambia)

of security, but the truth of the matter is that reliance on qualitative and quantitative military superiority threatens the entire world.

We are also concerned at the fact that we live in an international milieu in which recourse is readily had to the use and the threat of the use of force, especially in the third world. It is common knowledge that the third world has been the scene of all the localized wars since the end of the Second World War. This is evidenced by the fact that since 1945 the world has experienced 140 conflicts, with a death toll of from 10 to 25 million people, not to mention the destruction of property that such acts of violence have created in their wake.

It is therefore clear that military competition, in its nuclear and conventional aspects, is a grave impediment to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Peace and Security. There is therefore an imperative need to put an end to the arms race and embark on the task of disarmament. We believe strongly that in a disarmed world the persistence of wars and political tensions and the unmitigated dangers of a nuclear holocaust would be things of the past.

(Mr. M'Tesa, Zambia)

World security can also be strengthened by releasing the resources, both human and material now being used for destructive purposes, in order to meet the goal of development. This means that the link between disarmament and development must not be ignored in the effort to implement the Declaration. The recognition of the link between disarmament and development requires that the problems of hunger, illiteracy and poverty must also be included on the world agenda to implement the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

Allied to the problem of the arms race is the problem of regional conflicts which requires immediate attention by way of implementing the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Of immediate concern to us in Zambia is the conflict situation in southern Africa. In this regard, my delegation recognizes three problems that constitute obstacles to the implementation of the Declaration in question. The region is plagued by the system of apartheid in South Africa, the problem of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and South Africa's military aggression and destabilization of the neighbouring independent African States.

It is common knowledge that the apartheid system has already been designated as a crime against humanity. Despite that designation, South Africa continues to adhere to that moribund and anachronistic system based on racial discrimination. In order to maintain that system, South Africa has become more ruthless in suppressing the uprising of the oppressed majority. In the meantime, that ruthless suppression is only matched by the intensified determination of the oppressed people of South Africa in fighting for the establishment of democracy in their country. Peace and security can therefore come to South Africa only through the liquidation of the system of apartheid. And with the advent of democracy and majority rule, all the neighbouring African States which are currently opposed to apartheid will, no doubt, embrace South Africa - thus bringing peace and security to the region as a whole, and indeed the whole international community.

As for the question of Namibia, a great deal of optimism was generated this year that independence would eventually be realized by implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978). As in previous attempts, the negotiations stalled due to South Africa's introduction, supported by the

(Mr. M<sup>r</sup> Tesa, Zambia)

United States of America, of an extraneous issue of linkage of the independence of Namibia, with the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

It is our considered view that this issue of linkage flies in the face of resolution 435 (1978). And, above all, it constitutes flagrant interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State, that of Angola. We believe strongly that the issue of linkage is a non-issue which is being used deliberately to freeze the negotiations on the independence of Namibia so that the illegal occupation of that country can be given an extended lease of life. In the meantime, the plunder of Namibia's natural resources continues unimpeded.

On the other hand, we wish to commend the work of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the front-line States and Nigeria, for their steadfast willingness to negotiate in good faith, which is yet to be matched by South Africa. Furthermore, we wish to echo the popular view that the ball is once again in the court of the Western Contact Group of Five. It initiated the plan for the independence of Namibia, it possesses considerable leverage over South Africa and it must ensure that the plan is implemented without delay. At the same time, it should be pointed out that the role of the United Nations in working for the independence of Namibia must be underlined.

In the area of State-to-State relations, South Africa has singled itself out in southern Africa as an element of aggression and destabilization of its neighbours, especially the front-line States. The occupation of the southern part of Angola is a case in point. I need not over-emphasize the imperative need for restoring the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Angola through the unconditional withdrawal of South Africa's military forces from its territory. For now, however, suffice it to say that South Africa's occupation of the southern part of Angola with impunity has been condemned many times over by the international community. My delegation wishes to reiterate its condemnation of this insidious act which is in flagrant violation of international law.

It is well known that South Africa cannot on its own have pursued the policy of apartheid for so long, cannot have continued the unnecessary equivocation over

(Mr. M'Tesa, Zambia)

the Namibian issue and exported aggression and destabilization to the neighbouring independent African States without support and collaboration from some of the Powers in the Western world. The onus therefore lies on these Powers to put an end to these ills by withdrawing their support of and collaboration with the system of apartheid. It is only through the elimination of the aforementioned scourges in southern Africa that peace and security can come to the area and thus contribute substantially to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Peace and Security.

For our part, Zambia remains steadfast in its support of the struggle against apartheid and the independence of Namibia and in our resilient resistance to South Africa's aggression. We urge the international community to continue its dedication and commitment to the struggle against colonialism and apartheid in southern Africa. It is only through the end of colonialism and apartheid in South Africa that the frontiers of peace and security will be extended to the benefit of the entire world.

The implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is further being frustrated by the persistence of conflicts in many regions of the world. During the course of this year, we witnessed, once again, how the unresolved problems of the Middle East can be prone to breeding more dreadful violence. The Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the gruesome Beirut massacre of innocent Palestinian civilians in refugee camps underline once and for all the urgency of the problems that have continued unabated to plague the Middle East, especially the central issue of Arab-Israeli relations, at the core of which is the question of Palestine.

It is our belief that the forced removal of the Palestinian forces from Lebanon does not solve that monumental problem. Consequently, peace and security will continue to elude the Middle East until that problem is tackled with courage and determination. To start with, Israel will have to recognize the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine who must have an independent State of their own. Israel will have to stop once and for all its policy of disregarding the imperative need to enter into negotiations in which Palestinian participation, through the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, is fundamental.

(Mr. N'Tesa, Zambia)

The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination is indisputable, and no body or Power has the right to deny them that, because the principle of self-determination is a fundamental freedom which is enshrined in the United Nations Charter. Colonialism has shown, throughout history, that it will never let people achieve independence unless they fight for it. The Palestinians have been fighting for the liberation of their land for too long. How long must they continue to fight and how many more men, women and children must die before Israel and those who support its expansionist policy recognize that the Palestinians are fighting for peace, freedom and justice?

(Mr. M'Tesa, Zambia)

Too much blood has been shed. The Palestinians have been denied their right to live in peace. Many of them have been born in war and are made to live in war and to die in war.

Here again, we believe that with the solution of the Middle East problem peace and security would come not only to the Middle East, but to adjacent regions as well, thereby not only rendering the implementation of the Declaration under consideration possible, but making it quickly attainable.

One area which would derive immediate benefits from peace and security in the Middle East is the Indian Ocean. Today the fact that the Middle East has become a focal point of major-Power rivalry has made the Indian Ocean area the theatre of this rivalry as well. In the process, that rivalry has constituted a grave threat to the peace and security of the littoral and hinterland States concerned. This ominous development makes it all the more urgent for the Colombo meeting to take place without delay to address the question of creating a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

It was our hope that, because of the urgency of the matter, the Colombo meeting will take place next year, but due to the unwillingness of some members of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean the negotiations have been stalemated. This has resulted in yet another unnecessary postponement of the meeting. We continue to entertain the hope that if we are truly serious about the deteriorating security situation in the Indian Ocean the Colombo meeting will take place, without fail, by mid 1984. It is our belief too that peace and security in the Indian Ocean area would render the resolution of other regional conflicts, such as that of the Middle East, much easier.

There are other areas of enduring conflict which cause immense security difficulties in international relations. We are concerned in this regard with the persistence of the crises in Afghanistan and Kampuchea due to the introduction of foreign forces into those countries. These must be withdrawn without delay so that peace and security may return there.

As regards the crisis in the Korean peninsula, it is our firm belief that the problem can be resolved through the process of reunification, which must be preceded by the withdrawal of all foreign forces from the peninsula.

In Cyprus as elsewhere the presence of foreign forces is a source of conflict. We call once again for the withdrawal of those forces and reiterate our shared view that it is in intercommunal talks that the best way of resolving the Cyprus question lies.

(Mr. M'Tesa, Zambia)

We are also equally disturbed by the continuing conflict between Iran and Iraq. This war must come to an immediate end so that both Iran and Iraq can live in peace and security once again.

Zambia places the highest premium on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security because the entire world stands to gain from the order that would result. We therefore urge the international community to implement the Declaration without delay.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last speaker in the debate for this afternoon. Before I call on those representatives who have asked to speak in exercise of their right of reply, I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the decision taken by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session, which reads, inter alia, as follows:

"Delegations should exercise their right of reply at the end of the day whenever two meetings have been scheduled for that day and whenever such meetings are devoted to the consideration of the same item.

"The number of interventions in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation at a given meeting should be limited to two per item.

"The first intervention in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation on any item at a given meeting should be limited to 10 minutes and the second intervention should be limited to five minutes."

(decision 34/401, paras. 8-10)

I call now on those representatives who wish to make statements in exercise of their right of reply.

Mr. TARI (Israel)(interpretation from French): A number of statements in this Committee, some of which were made today, compel me to exercise my right of reply. My delegation wishes in no way to contribute to transforming this Committee into another forum for debating the questions of the Middle East ad nauseum to the detriment of the work allocated to the First Committee. It is impossible for me, however, to let pass without a brief reply the series of untruths, falsifications, defamatory accusations, demagogic excesses and pseudo-analyses which has been directed against my country.

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

For his part, the representative of Iraq engaged yesterday in his ritual anti-Israel exercise. The concern for international security and for good-neighbourly relations between States in which he cloaked his statement is impressive, as are his scruples concerning respect for human rights. It is no doubt in the name of those same political and moral parameters that Iraq has been engaged for two years in a murderous war against its immediate neighbour, whose own conduct, it is true, is very far indeed from the precepts of the Charter of the United Nations.

It is obviously in the name of those noble principles that the Iraqi régime practices internal repression, arbitrary arrest, torture and execution. Another of Iraq's good neighbours, Syria, which through the voice of its President Assad heard on Radio Damascus on 7 March 1982 accused the Iraqi President, Saddam Hussein, of those practices. I shall not mention the what the Syrian President called his Iraqi counterpart.

The representative of Iraq on this occasion had the virtue - intentional or not - of being perfectly clear regarding Israel when he spoke of 'the Zionist invasion of Palestine' (A/C.1/37/PV.53, p. 26). For him it is not a matter of this or that portion of so-called occupied territory, but of the entire State of Israel. We return here to the basics, the sole authentic point, that is, that Iraq has never accepted the very existence of the State of Israel, that it considers itself to have been at war with it for more than 30 years, and that it is dedicated to its destruction. All this in a spirit of good-neighbourly relations between States and, of course, in compliance with the Charter of the United Nations.

As to Libya, that other apostle of good-neighbourliness and international security, it too has set itself up as a censor of Israel, with all the moral and political authority conferred on it by its subversive activities in the Middle East and its encouragement of international terrorism.

It seems that the system is spreading, bolstered by clichés. The Government which has occupied and subjugated Afghanistan is seeking to cause a diversion by placing upon Israel the responsibility for the Middle East crisis - which it has itself helped to **envencm**.

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

The representatives of enslaved regimes in Eastern Europe are setting themselves up as judges and apostles of human rights and freedom of expression and movement with regard to Israel. The heirs of yesterday's pogromshchiki, who do not reject the contemporary practice of anti-semitism, speak with the moral authority which is theirs about massacres of civilians in the Middle East.

What is more, and this verges on the unspeakable: the German Democratic Republic accuses Israel of practising genocide. That country's part in the massacre of 6 million Jews during the Second World War ought at the least to have caused it to remain silent and paralyzed at the mention in its presence of the very word "genocide". But the German Democratic Republic, in spite of the past, has chosen to support and arm those who aim at the destruction of the State of Israel. And they barely conceal that fact.

We could continue this litany of what has been heard, especially this afternoon, but Israel, despite everything, will continue, as it has in the past, to make its contribution to the work of this Committee.

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

One final point regarding a matter of principle. Yesterday the representative of Iraq once again referred to the State of Israel as the "Zionist entity". He thought that that was viciously critical. And Libya has used the same term today.

Israel is proud precisely because it is a Zionist State. That is its profound historic and human vocation. But it is customary in the United Nations for sovereign Member States to be called by their official name, Israel in this case. A comment to that effect was made in this Committee a few days ago by the representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. It would be a good thing if that comment were to be taken into account.

Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): When the representative of the United States spoke in the general debate on the item relating to the strengthening of international security, many delegations were surprised. So far the United States had not spoken in the debate on this item. It had not done so because it had nothing constructive to say about it.

The statement by the representative of the United States has removed all our doubts on this score. He made a confrontational speech; indeed, he had nothing to say that was constructive.

In this connection the Soviet delegation would like to state the following.

First, in his statement the representative of the United States did everything to praise the nuclear monopoly of the United States. He tried to present it as almost a benefit for mankind. But what in fact happened during the years of the United States nuclear monopoly? There was the use of American nuclear weapons against Japan. Hundreds of thousands of people in Hiroshima and Nagasaki were killed or injured. Recently some hitherto secret American documents were published about the so-called Dropshot Plan. That plan was for the unleashing and conducting in 1950 of a nuclear war against the Soviet Union, for the occupation of the Soviet Union by 600,000 American troops. If we take the memoirs of former United States President Eisenhower, we can see that in 1951 the United States intended to use nuclear weapons in Korea, and that in 1954 it intended to use them in Indo-China. So what the American nuclear monopoly meant was the use of nuclear weapons and attempts to use them in a number of other cases.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

Secondly, the American representative has accused us of - this was his view - inordinately strengthening our defensive capacity. But to prove his argument regarding our "excessive increase" in our defensive capacity he distorted and reversed the facts. He once again repeated his contention that Soviet expenditures on defence amounted to 50 per cent more than those of the United States. I should like to recall that, according to American evaluations for 1976, Soviet defence expenditures amounted to 75 per cent of the military expenditures of the United States. And in one day the American evaluation of Soviet expenditures on defence were doubled. It was doubled, just like that, in one day. That is fraudulent. Yet the American representative continues to give those false figures here in our Committee.

How completely unfounded this American method is can be seen from the following fact. In October of last year there was a pay increase, from 14 to 17 per cent, an average of 15 per cent, for the American armed forces. And what happened at the very same time? The corresponding section of the Soviet defence budget also rose by 15 per cent - even though we did not spend a single additional rouble. Is that not an example of falsification? The United States increases its military budget, and on the same day it inflates the estimated military expenditure of the Soviet Union by exactly the same percentage. So I would advise representatives that when the American representative uses these figures and says that Soviet military expenditures are 50 per cent higher than American military expenditures, it is a lie.

The Soviet Union has increased its defensive capacity within the context of what had been agreed upon with the United States regarding parity in the SALT I and SALT II agreements. We have not violated those agreements.

I would draw attention to another point. When the Soviet Union was seriously lagging behind the United States, when it had not achieved parity, there was a cold war going on. But as soon as parity was achieved, détente was achieved. That is proof that the Soviet Union is not in favour of the arms race; the Soviet Union is in favour of peace.

Once again, today it is not the Soviet Union but the United States that refuses to ratify many agreements that tie the hands of both the United States and the Soviet Union. It is the United States that is undermining those agreements and is claiming superiority.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

My third point is that the American representative said that for about the last 15 years the United States had virtually not increased its military capability. This is also a lie. The United States brought to the maximum level the delivery vehicles for nuclear weapons and launchers built in 1966-67. Since then they have entered a new area of the arms race, the qualitative arms race. Throughout the 1970s, every day - and I would emphasize that - the American nuclear arsenal was increased by three new warheads. In the 1960s the United States had 2,000 nuclear warheads, but as a result, at the present time, it has 15,000 nuclear warheads. This is a qualitative increase in the arms race.

The Soviet Union has done everything to stop this. We proposed to the United States that missiles not be armed with multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles (MIRVs). When the United States wanted to introduce the new "Ohio" nuclear submarine, the Soviet Union proposed that this should not be done, and it entered into a commitment on that occasion not to introduce Soviet submarines of the "Typhoon" type. The United States refused. Accordingly, it was the United States that started and continued this nuclear arms race, and this time qualitatively.

Lastly, what is the thrust of the current policy of the United States in the International arena? It is that the United States is counting on the success of its policy of nuclear blackmail of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. You do not have to go far to look for examples of this.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask the representative of the USSR to conclude his remarks.

Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, I just want to read out two quotations and then I shall end my statement.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

In a recently published book, the American journalist Scheer, in his book "With Enough Shovels - Reagan, Bush and the Nuclear War", he said the following about the current American nuclear strategy, and so that nothing is lost in translation I shall quote from this book in the original English language.

This is what he wrote:

(spoke in English)

"They want to re-establish the nuclear edge that the United States once had so that once again our side can threaten to move up the escalation ladder. The ultimate political aim of these nuclear hawks is to intimidate, disrupt and eventually transform the Soviet Union by the threat of nuclear war."

(continued in Russian)

And another quotation:

(spoke in English)

"Those true believers" ---

The CHAIRMAN: I apologize to the representative to the USSR but I am afraid I must bring his intervention to a close now. Certainly his delegation was a party to the decision taken at the thirty-fourth session, and I know how attached the USSR is to decisions made by the General Assembly. I regret, therefore, that I cannot allow him to continue, otherwise that would constitute not only a flagrant violation of the rules established by the General Assembly but also an undue advantage to the USSR over other speakers.

Mr. MUSLIH (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The last one who has the right to speak about good-neighbourliness and the strengthening of international peace and security is the representative of the Zionist entity. Before the international community in this meeting room, can the representative of the Zionist entity provide us with one practical example, and not mere words, of an action which his entity has undertaken vis à vis the Arab countries and the Palestinian people which would be in keeping with the

(Mr. Muslih, Iraq)

principles of the United Nations Charter and international law, an action which would negate the fact that his entity in occupied Palestine is a racist régime based on the use of armed force, the usurpation of ever more Arab territories and the killing of thousands of Arab people, especially the Palestinian people?

I do not think that the crimes of the Zionist entity are far from the minds of representatives here. The list of the entity's criminals is a long one, and the last of their crimes was that which was perpetrated by the two terrorists, Begin and Sharon, in Lebanon in the month of June of this year, an aggression against an independent Member State of the United Nations, Lebanon, and its occupation by armed force and the mass murders in the two camps, Sabra and Shatila. This took place for the simple reason that they were Arabs, either Palestinian or Lebanese. The armed forces of that entity have remained in Lebanon until this very moment.

Can the representative of this entity convince anyone that the expulsion of Arab citizens from their homes by force and the annexation of territories so as to set up Zionist settlements is a matter which would lead to the relaxation of tension in the area and be in harmony with the principles of the United Nations Charter? Can anyone believe or accept that this is true of the encroachments on Arab airspace or the bombardment of installations such as the crime perpetrated in July 1981 when they bombarded the peaceful nuclear reactor of Iraq? Can anyone maintain that such an act strengthens peace and security in the region?

These are recent examples of the crimes perpetrated by the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine and against the Arab world. I do not want to go into more detail, because evidence of the crimes of that entity are abundant and are reflected in the condemnation of the international community through this international Organization, a condemnation which is increasing day by day.

Mr. GUNDERSEN (United States of America): I shall not engage in these endless exchanges and repetition of numbers. I would say that men do differ on these numbers. I would note, however, that the Soviet Union again, and typically, used United States sources to establish his credibility, and I do appreciate that. I would also note and challenge the representative of the Soviet Union that if he wishes to refute the facts that we have mentioned, let him go beyond the unverifiable rhetoric.

(Mr. Gundersen, United States)

Let him open up the books of the Soviet Union. Let the Soviet Union submit the data it has to the United Nations, as called for. Let it accept President Reagan's offer of free and reciprocal exchanges on television on the issues of war and peace, so that both the people of the United States and the people of the Soviet Union can form their own opinions.

In short, I suppose that, as Mr. Lodge mentioned, it is difficult to conduct a dialogue with the deaf - or more properly I should say 'the mute', since one side refuses to give a serious reply. We welcome this open dialogue. We hope we can conduct it in another forum and not take up the time of this body here.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to speak in further exercise of the right of reply, for which he is now limited to five minutes.

Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union is not interested in television shows, in which the United States representative seems to be so interested. What the Soviet Union is interested in is curbing and reversing the arms race. The Soviet Union and, I think, the entire human race are interested in ensuring that the SALT II Treaty is ratified and brought into force. The United States representative instead proposes to us a television talk show.

I would also note that the United States representative did not find any answers for us in connection with the fact that the system used by the United States for the accounting of the Soviet military budget, as has been proved to us, is a false one. He did not even try to defend that system. So I would merely remind this Committee that whenever the United States delegation says that the Soviet military expenditures are 50 per cent higher than those of the United States it is a lie.

Lastly, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read out a second quotation from the book I quoted earlier in English:

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

(spoke in English)

"Real true believers in nuclear-war fighting, including the President of the United States and most of his key advisers, tell one another what they want to hear: that playing a game of nuclear chicken with the Soviets is not dangerous as it might seem, for even in the worst case, even if the Soviets don't back off, even if they do not submit to nuclear pressure, the resulting war will not be so bad. It can be limited and civilization can bounce back sooner or later."

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its general debate on the agenda items relating to the strengthening of international peace and security.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.