

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION

*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE
15th meeting
held on
Thursday, 28 October 1982
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 15TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GBEHO (Ghana)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

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

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Petrovsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Mr. Dorji (Bhutan)
Mr. Stephanou (Greece)
Mr. Sahnoun (Algeria)
Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait)
Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

UN LIBRARY

NOV 3 1982

UN/SA COLLECTION

* 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.15
30 October 1982

ENGLISH

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

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

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has already had an opportunity to present in this Committee the new proposals of the Soviet Union for the prompt cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and the need to increase efforts to eliminate the threat of nuclear war and guarantee the secure development of nuclear energy. We have also had an opportunity to state our views on the prevention of an arms race in space.

All of those proposals were designed to erect political and material obstacles to the intensification of the threat of war in particularly dangerous directions. Today, we should like to dwell on other questions of arms limitation and disarmament.

Having endorsed the Final Document of the first special session, the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament endorsed an important postulate of the nuclear and space age which that document contained: namely, that there can be no security through arms build-ups and policies based on positions of strength. A truly sound concept of security requires not the drawing up of strategic schemes and graphs for escalation of armed conflicts, including nuclear conflicts, but active efforts to prevent their outbreak.

This is the conclusion reached by all those who think realistically, and it was recently confirmed by the authoritative Commission working under the chairmanship of Mr. Olof Palme. The report of that Commission clearly states that no matter how many armaments any country manages to stockpile, they cannot guarantee that country's security.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The way to strengthen international security is for all States, great and small, to join their efforts in preventing nuclear war, limiting and halting the arms race, eliminating situations of crisis and eradicating the vestiges of colonialism. As noted by the President of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union and leader of the Soviet Communist Party, Mr. Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev:

"It is not preparations for war, dooming peoples to a senseless waste of their material and spiritual wealth, but the consolidation of peace that is the essential and necessary course for tomorrow's world."

It is obvious that the development of events in the world in recent years is reason for justified alarm about the future of the whole of mankind. And we must be quite frank about this: the cause is the aggressive policies of imperialism, primarily American imperialism.

According to American military doctrine, as currently formulated by the senior members of the present Administration, and also in a Pentagon document on directives on the build-up of United States armed forces, the United States, according to all indicators, is the number one military power in the world.

It is in order to attain this supremacy that they have drawn up programmes for a build-up of strategic offensive weapons, both nuclear and conventional, and an increase in United States and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) military forces in general.

In the next five years the United States intends to spend no less than \$1.5 trillion on military preparations. The main effort is concentrated on the development of strategic offensive weapons. The gross appropriation it is planned to devote to this purpose is more than 40 per cent of the military budget for 1983. As a result, by the end of the 1980s the quantity of nuclear warheads contained in a single vehicle launch will have increased 1.5 times and their accuracy and power will also increase.

The new United States strategy of so-called direct response not only involves all the extremes of previous military theories, such as nuclear brinkmanship, but greatly intensifies them. It is designed for making a first nuclear strike. Washington has been supplementing its nuclear warfare policies with the concept of protracted nuclear war from which it hopes to emerge victorious. The new strategy sanctions the most barbarous means of waging warfare, with the use not only of nuclear but also of all other types of weapons of mass destruction, neutron, chemical, and so on.

By virtue of this doctrine qualitatively new systems of arms have been set up: the MX inter-continental ballistic missile, submarine ballistic missiles, Trident I and II, the B-1B and stealth bombers, long-range cruise missiles, binary chemical munitions, beam weapons, and so on. These new systems of armaments, if deployed, would become a truly destabilizing element and would intensify the danger of an outbreak of war.

The United States intends to step up its strategic offensive capacity by deploying new United States missiles in Western Europe and elsewhere, in regions adjacent to the Soviet Union and its allies. The United States NATO allies are thus exposed to a retaliatory strike.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

This new strategy, which is pointed directly against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, has a broader political and geographical intention. It is virtually directed against all freedom-loving progressive elements in the world today. Washington would like nothing more nor less than to drive back the emancipated peoples, to snatch away the gains which they have made in a long and hard struggle and cancel out their role in world politics.

The United States tramples under foot the sovereignty of young States and interferes in their internal affairs, encourages the racist régime of Pretoria to carry out military raids against Angola, Mozambique and other States, and sets up rapid deployment forces intended for use in countries of the Middle East and other regions.

Having set in motion an unprecedented arms race, particularly in nuclear arms, in an attempt to attain military supremacy, the United States and its followers are playing irresponsibly with the fate of the peoples. In order to exacerbate the international situation and impede the cause of co-operation in Europe, the United States and certain others are trying to take advantage of the internal problems of the Polish People's Republic. We would like to state most resolutely that it is Poland alone that has the sovereign and inalienable right to take decisions on and resolve Polish questions. No one has the right to interfere in its internal affairs.

In this regard, the United States seeks justification for its acts through the myth which it has been spreading about the Soviet military threat. People are being told about the military supremacy of the Soviet Union, the aggressive nature of Soviet military doctrine; and they are told bare-faced lies - I repeat, bare-faced lies - about the United States lagging behind, in the sphere of strategic armaments, in particular. If we consider this on the basis of facts alone - and no other basis can exist for an objective assessment of the balance of forces - we have to admit, whether we take strategic nuclear weapons, or medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe or the conventional armed forces, of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, in all instances there is approximate equality between the two sides. There is no Soviet supremacy. Apart from anything else, this is acknowledged by many authoritative figures in Western countries.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

As has repeatedly been pointed out by Soviet leaders, our military doctrine is profoundly defensive in nature. The nature of the Soviet armed forces, the principles on which they are built, the strategy and tactics of their use, have been and continue to be established with the idea of repelling aggression and threats emerging from imperialism against us and our friends. The very substance of our approach was formulated recently by Mr. Brezhnev, who said:

"The militaristic and aggressive policies of the NATO bloc, headed by the United States, compel us to take measures to maintain at a proper level the defensive capacity of our country. This is a grim necessity in today's world and, of course, it requires the diversion of considerable resources, to the detriment of our plans for peaceful construction. We are not spending and will not spend for those purposes a single rouble over and above what is absolutely necessary to assure the security of our people, its friends and its allies. We see the future not in terms of an unlimited build-up of a mountain of weapons, but rather in terms of the attainment of sensible agreements with the other side on a mutual reduction of levels of military confrontation."

The general defensive orientation of Soviet doctrine has been and is reflected in the military and technological policies of our State. The Soviet Union has never initiated the creation of the most destructive means of waging war, those which are particularly dangerous for human beings and for all living things on earth. On the contrary, it has always sought and continues to seek to prevent a further increase in the barbarity of means of waging war and the extension of the arms race to new spheres. This is true of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction.

It was not the Soviet Union but the United States that built the first hydrogen bomb. It was not the Soviet Union but the United States that initiated the construction of nuclear submarines, intercontinental bombers, atomic-powered aircraft carriers and multiple, independently-targeted warheads. Washington assumed a grave responsibility by embarking upon the production of the neutron weapon.

Today the need for practical action to resolve the question of the prevention of nuclear war, of arms limitation and of the achievement of disarmament is greater than ever. The Soviet Union has taken a number of important unilateral steps in that regard. It has reduced the total manpower of its forces in Central Europe and has reduced its armaments there. It has stopped the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons capable of reaching Western European targets and has reduced their quantity. Lastly, it has unilaterally assumed the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

There are those who try to belittle the significance of that step by the Soviet Union. Leaders of the Western Powers at the NATO Council have drawn up a solemn collective commitment to the effect that not one of their weapons will be used except as part of a retaliatory strike. They are trying to use that as a counter to the Soviet commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The value of such a statement can be understood when we look back at history. Not one aggressor, not even the most brazen, has ever started aggression without having it look like a retaliatory strike. I ask representatives to think back to the beginning of the Second World War for an example.

Moreover, the military and strategic doctrines of the present United States Administration provide for carrying out a nuclear strike to disarm the other side, a strike that the United States could make first on the pretext that it was intended to prevent a hypothetical attack on the United States. Consequently, NATO regards such a nuclear strike as being a retaliatory strike. In other words, the NATO Council's formula in no way prevents aggression being committed by NATO with nuclear or any other kind of weapons.

I emphasize that all the statements to the effect that the Soviet Union is counting on a build-up of its military forces, and in particular of conventional weapons, is not only malicious slander but a smokescreen to hide the unwillingness

of the United States to renounce the use of force, as the United Nations Charter requires. It is the United States that has been blocking the implementation of the Soviet Union's proposal, adopted by the United Nations in 1976, on the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations, whether the force be nuclear or conventional. In his statement at this session the head of the Soviet delegation again emphasized the Soviet Union's willingness to conclude such a treaty as soon as possible.

The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that sooner or later all the nuclear Powers will follow its example and assume an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. A guarantee of that is provided by the broad support that continues to be given to the Soviet Union's initiative in this regard by States and broad sections of world public opinion.

The Soviet Union is ready to go even further and to reach an agreement not to use nuclear weapons at all. In this respect we support India's proposal that an appropriate convention be drawn up.

Obviously, the complete elimination of the nuclear threat and the attainment of arms limitation and real disarmament are possible only through joint efforts. Honourable, constructive negotiations are the only means to that end. The whole world is showing great and justified interest in the Soviet-United States negotiations in Geneva on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms and the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe. As Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev emphasized at his meeting with the Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Pact countries on 21 October this year:

"These negotiations are proceeding with some difficulty, and the root of the difficulty lies in the unwillingness of the United States to reach agreement on a just basis - that is, on the basis of the principle of equality and identical security."

I should like to say something about the strategic arms limitation talks. The Soviet Union has always favoured substantial reductions and limitations of strategic arms. The Soviet delegation at the negotiations with the United States in Geneva has appropriate instructions to that effect. Unfortunately,

however, the position of the United States at the negotiations shows no evidence of a willingness to reach a basis for agreement.

Of the whole range of strategic means of warfare, ballistic missiles have been chosen by the United States as a basis for negotiations, with the emphasis on land-based, multi-stage ballistic missiles. From those rockets it has singled out the SS-18 heavy, intercontinental ballistic missile. It is precisely that type of strategic weapon that the United States says it finds destabilizing. Is that a serious, businesslike approach to negotiations? It is well known that the strategic armaments of the Soviet Union and the United States are not identical in structure. About 70 per cent of the Soviet Union's warheads are in land-based ballistic missiles. The comparable figure for the United States is about 20 per cent. The United States has more than 80 per cent of its warheads in ballistic missiles carried by submarines and in missiles carried by heavy bombers - in other words, several times more than the relevant, corresponding components of the Soviet strategic forces.

Those differences in the structure of the strategic arsenals of the Soviet Union and the United States have come about for historical reasons, not least the Soviet Union's geographical position and in particular its difficulty, compared with the United States in gaining access to the open sea. If, following the American example, the Soviet Union declared the most destabilizing elements to be those components of the American strategic forces in which the United States had a clear supremacy, we could say, for example, that we considered the most destabilizing factor to be the United States' almost threefold edge in submarine-based ballistic missiles.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

We could also declare as a particularly destabilizing factor American strategic aircraft carrying nuclear weapons, in which the United States has a very large edge over the Soviet Union. But we do not intend to do that because we firmly and in good faith adhere to the principle of equality and identical security, observance of which requires a strict accounting of all the components of strategic forces.

The reductions proposed by the United States relate essentially to Soviet inter-continental ballistic missiles and when translated into concrete quantitative indicators this would lead to a 50 to 60 per cent reduction of Soviet inter-continental ballistic missiles and the greater proportion of the missiles themselves. As for the United States, according to the American plan, while keeping a certain quantity of warheads by means of removing from its armaments a number of obsolete submarines, it would have an opportunity even to increase the quantity of its warheads of land-based inter-continental ballistic missiles, deploying for that purpose the latest missiles. The reductions would not affect the major arsenal of warheads concentrated in American heavy bombers.

If the plan of the United States Administration were put into effect, Soviet strategic nuclear potential in terms of the number of warheads would be three times lower than that of the United States, while that country would have an opportunity to increase its strategic armaments unimpeded by deploying new MX inter-continental ballistic missiles and Trident 1 and 2 submarine-based missiles, the B-1-B strategic bombers and long-range cruise missiles. What is this other than a wholly unrealistic and one-sided approach to the negotiations which relate to the most powerful armaments in the arsenals of States?

The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that in these negotiations, given equal structures for the strategic armaments of the two sides, it should be possible, taking into account political, geographic and other factors, to find such mutually acceptable solutions as would substantially reduce the level of military confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union without detriment to their security.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

For this purpose it is essential to take a comprehensive look at all the components of the strategic potentials, of both sides because any other selective consideration of them in conditions of the objective - differences that exist between them could not fail to lead to a sharp disruption of the existing balance of strategic potentials and be detrimental to the security interests of one of the sides.

We also believe that, together with quantitative limitations and reductions, it is essential also to provide for limitation of the qualitative improvement of strategic armaments.

The Soviet Union is doing its utmost to achieve a solution of the problem of medium-range nuclear weapons. We favour the full elimination of all medium-range nuclear weapons capable of striking at targets in Europe. The Soviet Union has declared its willingness to go even further and to reach an agreement on the complete freeing of Europe from nuclear weapons, medium-range or tactical. This would be a real zero option. If the NATO countries were to agree to such a truly zero solution of the question, then the cause of peace in Europe would be placed on an unprecedentedly solid basis. However, as the West is not yet ready to make radical changes, the Soviet Union proposes, to begin with, agreement on a major reduction by both sides of medium-range nuclear weapons - a very large reduction, by hundreds of units.

At the Geneva negotiations the Soviet Union has introduced proposals that provide for the establishment of an extensive European zone for the reduction and limitation of nuclear weapons, from the Arctic to Africa, and from the Mid-Atlantic to the Ural Mountains. It is proposed that in this zone existing medium-range nuclear armaments - 1,000 kilometres and up, but not inter-continental - be reduced in such a way that the Soviet Union and NATO should within five years of arriving at the agreement have no more than 300 units of weapons of this sort. The reduction would apply to all types of medium-range weapons, missiles and aircraft. In the zone there would be prohibition of the deployment of new types of nuclear weapons, including American Pershing-2 and cruise missiles. The Soviet proposals do not provide for any obligations on third countries, but at a summary level of 300 units of medium-range units of armaments, together with those of the United States, account is also being taken of the medium-range missiles and aircraft of Great Britain

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

and France. These means of warfare are a part of NATO's military potential and are targeted directly on sites in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and, as is acknowledged by American representatives, they are intended to supplement the advance-based nuclear weapons of the United States. The Soviet Union, of course, cannot fail to take this into account within the Geneva negotiations.

However, one gets the impression that at these negotiations also the United States does not intend to take constructive steps in response to our initiatives. The United States continues to cling to its so-called zero option, which can be called zero only if one is prepared to make a mockery of common sense. Implementation of this famed zero option would mean that the quantity of medium-range nuclear weapons of NATO would remain at the previous level or even be increased, while Soviet weapons deployed in the European part of the Soviet Union would be more than cut in half.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

As a result NATO would have a more than twofold advantage in terms of medium-range nuclear delivery vehicles and a threefold edge in terms of nuclear warheads. However, were the Soviet Union to refuse this American variant, the United States would deploy in Western Europe, in addition to NATO's weapons, another 600 of its latest medium-range nuclear missiles. So whichever way one looks at it the question is the following: either unilateral disarmament by the Soviet Union or the creation of an impasse in the negotiations in order to spin them out for an indefinite period and to accuse us of failure to show good will and to draw Europe into a new and highly dangerous phase of the arms race.

In the communiqué of the meeting of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty issued on 22 October, it was emphasized that solution of the question of nuclear armaments in Europe cannot be based on conditions that would disrupt the security and stability of Europe and therefore on one-sided military advantages to NATO to the detriment of the security interests of the socialist countries. The success of these negotiations depends on the need to ensure that there will be an agreement elaborated on the basis of the principle of equality and common security such as would guarantee a radical reduction and effective limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe to the lowest possible levels.

I have one more comment in connection with medium-range nuclear missiles. I should like to state that the United States representative is getting unnecessarily worked up over the question of Soviet missiles being deployed in the eastern part of our country. He ought to know that the Soviet Union has officially declared that it is possible to solve questions related to their limitation and reduction. This should be done on a reciprocal basis through negotiations with those holding in their hands nuclear weapons to which our missiles are meant to be a response.

A serious and truly businesslike approach to the Geneva negotiations is incompatible with the cult of prevailing force, demands for one-sided concessions and a retreat from international obligations that have been previously assumed. Genuine political realism, to which reference has been made so often at this session, requires that negotiations be conducted in

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

strict compliance with the principle of equality and equal security, endorsed in a whole number of Soviet-United States documents and that they provide real and tangible results, thereby reducing the gulf between the arms race and the establishment of barriers to its further growth and eliminating it altogether. In other words, in present conditions the question is to ensure that the result and effect of the negotiations should be to prevent the build up of armaments and to help bring about their reduction.

Even given the importance that one should attach to the successful conclusion of the Geneva negotiations, they do not encompass the whole range of overdue arms limitation and disarmament issues. The situation that has developed in other areas of arms limitations and the need to shift to disarmament cannot fail to cause legitimate alarm. The bilateral negotiations on a wide range of questions, which were suspended by the United States, have not yet been resumed, nor at this session have we received an answer to our repeated calls for a return to the conference table on the matters of the prohibition of chemical weapons, the limitation on the sale and supply of conventional weapons, and limitation and reduction of military activities in the Indian Ocean. The United States side has remained deaf also to the recent Soviet proposal for the resumption of negotiations on anti-satellite systems. Moreover, a direct challenge to the requests of the Organization and the obligations assumed under the 1963 partial nuclear-test-ban Treaty and the Non-Proliferation Treaty has arisen in the form of a statement by the representative of the United States to the effect that in present conditions full prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing will not help to lessen the threat of nuclear war.

The Soviet Union advocates the resumption of all the negotiations that have been suspended. At the same time we are prepared to start negotiations on those particular sectors warranted by circumstances. The Soviet Union proposes that we begin in a business-like manner at long last on the elaboration, adoption and phased implementation of a programme of nuclear disarmament up to and including the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. As one of our first steps in such a programme, consideration could be given to the question of the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for the manufacture of various types of nuclear weapons. Obviously this would

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

have to be resolved in the context of the questions of the limitation and reduction of the nuclear-arms race and not in isolation from them.

We feel also that, as the nuclear-weapons disarmament programme is gradually put into effect, the fissionable materials released as a result of the dismantling of nuclear warheads should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, including that of helping to meet the economic needs of the developing countries. The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that the question of control of the cessation of nuclear-weapons production and the gradual reduction of stockpiles of such weapons must be agreed on during the negotiations. We would hope that all those States which have been impeding the commencement of negotiations on nuclear disarmament in the Committee on Disarmament, in particular the United States, will take another look at their unconstructive position on this question and heed the appeals of the overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations. This applies fully also to negotiations on the prohibition of neutron weapons.

The problem of the prevention of further proliferation of nuclear weapons is directly related to the task of nuclear disarmament. Taking into account the wishes of many non-nuclear-weapon countries, the Soviet Union has declared its willingness, as an act of good will, to bring under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) a part of its peaceful nuclear facilities - some atomic power stations and research reactors. Now we are ready to embark upon negotiations with the IAEA with a view to concluding an agreement on safeguards.

The Soviet Union advocates the prompt conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security guarantees of the non-nuclear countries. As we can see from the report of the Committee on Disarmament, there has been no progress in this sphere.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

We consider that it is essential to activate efforts to resolve this problem.

Great importance should also be attached to the attainment of an international agreement not to deploy nuclear weapons in countries where there are no such weapons at the present time and also to refrain from further deployment of nuclear weapons on the territories of other States. In this regard we believe that the General Assembly could make a significant contribution by calling upon the nuclear States to institute a qualitative freeze on nuclear weapons on foreign territories. This is a new proposal of ours.

The Soviet Union, like many other States, considers that in the whole range of tasks concerned with bringing about the limitation and prohibition of weapons of mass destruction, questions relating to the prohibition of chemical weapons occupy a prominent place. We are pleased to note that the Soviet proposal for the basic provisions of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction led to the initiation of negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament this summer. At the same time, the position of the United States at those negotiations demonstrates the lack of interest of the present United States Administration in any real movement forward in this important sphere also. The unwillingness of the United States to resume the bilateral Soviet-American negotiations on chemical weapons and the creation of all kinds of obstacles to the finalization of agreements on these questions which in essence have already been decided upon - all this is an indication of the lack of sincerity in the United States approach to the matter of the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons. Clear confirmation of this is provided by the campaign of slander again being waged by the United States with the object of ascribing to the Soviet Union the blame for an alleged involvement in the use of chemical weapons in Laos, Kampuchea and Afghanistan. The "data" and "proof" that the United States has been using to confirm its accusations have been frequently revealed as being completely lacking in foundation. This is shown not only by the critical analysis of those data that has been prepared

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

by competent institutions of the Soviet Union and distributed as an official United Nations document, but also by the well-known conclusions of the United Nations Group of Experts which studied the question. Nevertheless, the statement by the United States yesterday shows that the United States Administration is again disseminating the fables that it has concocted. There can be no doubt that this whole base lie is designed to justify the decision by the United States to engage in large-scale production of new types of chemical weapons. It is designed to cover up the unwillingness of Washington to conduct serious negotiations for the prohibition of such weapons. Using fabrications about the use of Soviet-manufactured chemical weapons, the United States has at the same time been trying to gloss over the monstrous crimes it committed against the peoples of Indo-China during the period of its aggression in that region; but the peoples remember this. They remember that more than two million persons suffered from the effects of the toxic substances which were used on a vast scale by the Americans in Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea. They remember the irreparable damage done by those substances not only to the people of those countries but also to their economies and environments. They remember the heinous crimes of the United States militarists. This is remembered inside the United States itself. Tens of thousands of Americans during the aggression in Viet Nam suffered from the effects of the highly toxic Agent Orange and became invalids as a result.

I should like to touch on one more important problem. The Soviet Union has always consistently argued that the attainments of science and technology should be used solely for the benefit of mankind and should not be sacrificed to the monster of military preparations. The time has now come, in practical terms, to think together of ways of resolving the problems concerning the renunciation by States of the use for military purposes of the latest discoveries and achievements of science and technology. This is an important and far-reaching problem and obviously its solution is not a simple one. We believe that it will be necessary for experts and scientists to be involved in the consideration of this problem.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The question of the limitation and reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces is becoming more and more relevant nowadays. A useful step in this field was the conclusion of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. The Soviet Union has already ratified that Convention and its protocols and was the first to do so. We feel that this example should be followed as soon as possible by other States. At the same time, it is essential to continue negotiations on further steps in this field so that further additional protocols to that Convention may be concluded. In that regard, we must mention the use by Israel in Lebanon of such weapons as fragmentation and cluster bombs, which were supplied to the Israeli aggressors by the United States. In our opinion, the time has come to make a serious effort to prevent any such actions in the future.

Within the sphere of conventional weapons there are also other issues. A good basis for agreement on these matters could be provided by agreement not to increase conventional armaments and armed forces. The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries are ready at any time to sign an agreement in Vienna on the reduction of levels of armed forces and armaments of the two sides in Central Europe. As is well known, in the search for ways and means to stop the arms race, the socialist countries taking part in the Vienna negotiations have gone more than half-way in trying to reach a mutually acceptable agreement. However, in response to that, the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which for two and a half years simply marked time at the Vienna negotiations, this summer produced a document which is in essence a combination of the previous NATO positions with an additional number of elements which further complicate the situation at the Vienna talks.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), first of all, proposes the extension of the reduction of manpower over seven years, although during the negotiations an understanding had already been reached over the expediency of the reduction of the armed forces of each of the alliances over four to five years. In my opinion, this makes it clear that the so-called new proposal of the Western side is in fact a step backwards.

Secondly, nothing new and constructive has emerged in the NATO position on another matter, that is, the question of the volume and method of reduction of ground troops of the Soviet Union and the United States in the first phase. NATO countries are not only continuing to advocate inequitable volumes and methods of reduction, but they are ignoring the unilateral withdrawal by the Soviet Union from the German Democratic Republic of 20,000 military personnel and 1,000 tanks and they fail to take into account the considerable increase in manpower of the American contingent in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The proposals of the NATO countries contain no constructive elements which show evidence of their desire to find a way out of the dead end which they themselves have created in this discussion of the figures. The exchange of official data on the figures, conducted on the proposal of the socialist countries, confirms the presence in Central Europe of an approximate equality of the aggregate manpower of land-based troops and air forces of the NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries.

As in the past, however, the NATO countries continue without a shred of evidence to affirm that the States of the Warsaw Treaty have a distinct edge in that area. They have been quoting figures of 150,000 to 180,000 as if these figures were like a needle in a haystack and could not be found. The negative character of the latest NATO proposals, finally, can be seen also in the fact that despite the 1973 agreement reached at the preliminary consultations, the NATO side has completely excluded from their draft the question of the mutual reduction of armaments.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Such an approach, of course, does not make it possible to resolve the question of an effective reduction of levels of military confrontation in Central Europe.

At the same time, objective prerequisites for progress at the Vienna talks do exist. The socialist countries have presented a draft agreement which is a sound basis for achieving a mutually acceptable agreement which would make it possible to strengthen military and political stability in Europe and the security of all States in the region. We appeal to the Western participants in the negotiations to set to work at last on the elaboration of mutually acceptable agreements on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. In our opinion it is also important that there should be no build up of troops and armaments in Central Europe and that no other action should be taken that would complicate the attainment of agreement.

We consider that the meeting of representatives of States at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, to be resumed soon in Madrid, must have in present conditions a particular importance for the improvement of the political climate in Europe and the world. The Soviet Union firmly advocates the need for the Pan-European process, which started with the Helsinki Conference, to be not just maintained but continued, and that it should gain strength. It is particularly important in this respect for the Madrid meeting to lead to positive results and, above all, to the adoption of a decision on questions, for example, such as the convening of a conference on confidence-building measures and disarmament in Europe.

An important question whose solution, in our opinion, is long overdue, is the limitation of navies, particularly the naval forces of the major naval powers. The Soviet Union has already, both alone and jointly with other socialist countries, taken a number of initiatives to limit naval activity in certain regions of the world's oceans.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Similar proposals have been made by a number of other States. We seek a limitation and reduction of the military presence and military activity where the possibility for an outbreak of situations of conflict is more likely.

The Soviet Union, as is well known, also supports the idea advanced by the non-aligned countries for turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace and has been taking an active part in preparations for an international conference on the question. Now, in our opinion, it is essential to concentrate on practical preparations for convening the conference within the time limit set by the General Assembly, that is, in the first half of 1983.

The question of the reduction of military budgets is of particular importance. Although this question has been under discussion at the United Nations and other international forums for many years, actual military expenditures of States, particularly of the United States, have continued to grow rapidly. In trying to divert attention from the build up of its own military budget, the United States has lately been - and they are quite good at this - actively thinking up all kinds of fables and concoctions about the alleged growth of Soviet defence expenditures and their supposedly unjustifiably high level. With its threadbare anti-Soviet attacks, the United States is trying to shift this important question from the sphere of the attainment of concrete agreements into the sphere of sterile polemics. Therein lies the essence of the proposal of the United States for the holding of a so-called international conference for the comparison of military expenditures of various States. Actually, the purpose of this proposal is to digress altogether from the question of the reduction of military budgets.

The Soviet Union has another, entirely different and practical approach to this question. We consider that the reduction of military budgets can be approached by various methods, in percentage and in absolute terms, on the basis of radical solutions for gradual progress. For example, we could start with the freezing of military budgets. Such a measure could in our opinion be agreed with minimal difficulty, provided, of course, that there exists the political will for this.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The delegations of many States have expressed concern in their speeches at what they call the micro-results of the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. And it is true that one cannot fail to be disappointed at the fact, in particular, that the special session failed to adopt the comprehensive programme on disarmament and a number of important documents. Together with the other socialist countries, the Soviet Union has taken a most active part in the elaboration of the comprehensive programme of disarmament. We are pleased to note that our approach to the elaboration of the comprehensive programme is consonant with the proposals which have been advanced by the non-aligned countries.

Where are we to find the reason for the failure to elaborate and adopt the comprehensive programme at the special session? The answer to this question was provided by the Chairman of the Working Group on that question, Mr. Garcia Robles of Mexico, at the meeting of our Committee on 18 October last, when he said:

"I also consider it essential to emphasize that the reluctance of two nuclear-weapon States - among which stands one of the so-called super-Powers - to have the comprehensive programme give adequate treatment to a nuclear-test ban was the factor responsible for the failure of the Assembly." (A/C.1/37/PV.3 p. 22)

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

There is nothing I can add to that.

At the same time, the second special session on disarmament demonstrated that the overwhelming majority of States acknowledge the primary importance of the task of eliminating the threat of nuclear war and the need for real measures to curb the arms race and bring about disarmament. The particular characteristic of the special session was that it took place at a time of unprecedented increase in anti-war feeling in many countries of the world. The session further became an important mobilizing factor in the development of the anti-war movement.

The will of the majority, so clearly expressed at the special session, must now be given concrete form in tangible decisions which will bring political pressure to bear on the advocates of the arms race. We see this as one of the fundamental tasks facing the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

In the present alarming international situation, the need is greater than ever before for practical and really tangible measures to safeguard peace and avert a nuclear war. No dispute between States or groups of States, no differences in social structure, way of life or ideology, no consideration of short-term interests, can possibly obscure this basic need which is shared by all peoples.

The Soviet Union advocates progress along all lines that seem to offer a possibility for the limitation and reduction of armaments. We are prepared to reach agreement on any measures, radical or partial, in this field. There is no type of weapon which the Soviet Union would not be prepared to limit or prohibit on a reciprocal basis. Among the most important elements for the relaxation of international tension is the unswerving desire to take practical steps to promote the curbing of the arms race which afflicts the world and to strengthen security through the continual deepening of mutual trust on a just and reciprocal basis. The Soviet Union has worked hard for this relaxation of tension for many years - many decades, even.

In his statement yesterday in Moscow, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev emphasized again that

"Our line is a line for détente and strengthening international security. We shall not abandon it and shall step up our efforts and retain the initiative in international affairs."

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Détente is a historical attainment of the peoples. Its preservation, development and enhancement would be a triumph of the human mind over the military threat. This will be the direction of the main thrust of my delegation's efforts in the work of this Committee.

Mr. DORJI (Bhutan): Sir, on behalf of the delegation of the Kingdom of Bhutan, I should like to extend to you our warm congratulations on your election as Chairman of this Committee. We are confident that the wisdom and experience you bring with you to the chairmanship of this Committee will help us conclude our work successfully. We offer you our full co-operation to that end. I should like also to extend the congratulations of my delegation to the other officers of the Committee on their election.

I wish also to congratulate Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico and Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden on the high honour bestowed upon them by the Nobel Prize Committee. It is indeed fitting that the Nobel Peace Prize for 1982 has been awarded to two dedicated promoters of disarmament, particularly at this time when the world is precariously balanced between peace and a nuclear holocaust.

I must begin by referring to the dismal failure of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly, on disarmament. Despite the concerns of the international community and two special sessions on disarmament, the arms race is accelerating at a pace which causes us grave concern. Reports indicate that military expenditures are exceeding \$600 billion annually and that thousands of new weapons of mass destruction are being produced each year, hurling us towards self-destruction. But I cannot fail to highlight the consensus reached on the World Disarmament Campaign. The realization by all peoples of the world of the imminence of the nuclear threat will also contribute to the attainment of our objective of nuclear disarmament.

The building up of armaments, and particularly nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, is a threat to international peace and security, and it is our responsibility to succeeding generations to stop the arms race.

The facts and figures that confront us have reached incomprehensible dimensions. Estimates reveal that more than \$26 billion annually changes hands in arms transactions by both developed and developing countries. In fact, for

(Mr. Dorji, Bhutan)

the last 30 years approximately 8 per cent of the world's total output has been allocated to the military sector. It seems that the coexistence of high rates of military expenditure and low rates of economic growth does not indicate just a casual linkage between armament and development.

One of the major tasks in connection with disarmament is to address the question of the burden of military spending on economic growth at different levels of development. We must have the foresight to tackle, and focus our energies and resources on, social and economic problems, rather than concentrate on increasing weapon stockpiles and nuclear arsenals. My delegation supports the moves made towards the transition from military production to civilian production. At the same time, military budgets must also be reduced and more financial resources channelled to assistance for developing countries. A more economically stable world would indeed contribute considerably to international peace and security.

Today, however, aid as a whole is stagnating, while on the other hand military expenditures are spiralling to an all-time high.

As a developing country, Bhutan is naturally concerned with the economic aspects of disarmament and we shall appeal again and again for the diversion of financing from armaments to development. But at the same time we believe that the major cause of concern is military confrontation. We are witnessing the tremendous proliferation of nuclear weapons and have heard suggestions about the possibility of winning a limited nuclear war. That idea is a dangerous concept and tends to distort reality.

(Mr. Dorji, Bhutan)

The justification for policies such as deterrence, balance of power, parity, national security and bloc alliances have all been heard in the past. We believe, however, that no one nation or nations has the right to predetermine the destiny of all nations and humanity in general. It is interesting to note that the security concerns of a few nations have brought about a threatening situation of international insecurity. While a few nuclear-weapon States have the power of global destruction, it would seem that other States have little or no say in their own destinies.

Disarmament forums and conferences which resound with words espousing the need for disarmament will have no effective and meaningful results until the nuclear-weapon States agree to concerted action on a reduction of arms leading to general and complete disarmament. The primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament clearly must be borne by the nuclear-weapon States. We do, however, support the World Disarmament Conference, despite some reactions which indicate that it will not provide positive results.

We believe that persistent action on disarmament by the international community will eventually result in a positive outcome. At this juncture, I would briefly express our satisfaction at the establishment of an Ad Hoc Working Group on a nuclear-test ban by the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation would like to reiterate its support for a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty.

Accusations and counter-accusations concerning the use of chemical and toxic weapons are of deep concern to my delegation, and any use of such chemical weapons must be vehemently condemned. There should be no excuse whatsoever for the stockpiling and production of chemical, biological and bacteriological weapons. It is our hope that a convention to ban the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons will be drafted soon.

(Mr. Dorji, Bhutan)

An issue that our delegation has followed since it was first raised at the thirty-third session is the question of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons pending complete nuclear disarmament. We look forward to and support steps towards an international convention giving such guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We therefore support India's proposal contained in document A/C.1/37/L.4.

Bhutan, as a hinterland State of the Indian Ocean, is keen to see it become a zone of peace. We regret that no consensus could be reached in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean for the convening of a conference.

Finally, I should like briefly to touch upon the item on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. While we are attempting to establish outer space as a common heritage of mankind for peaceful purposes, it distresses us to hear of the development of weapons for use in outer space. We believe that priority must be given to negotiations directed to an international treaty on that subject before arms proliferation in outer space becomes a reality.

In conclusion, let me say that it is the hope of my delegation that the General Assembly can take positive steps at this session towards our goal of general and complete disarmament.

Mr. STEPHANOU (Greece) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, the Greek delegation wishes first of all to express to you its congratulations and its wishes for your full success in discharging your functions. The African country you represent is making a particularly active and highly appreciated contribution to international co-operation. This is equally true in the field of disarmament.

We are therefore convinced that under your guidance the work of the First Committee will proceed in the best possible conditions. May I also extend my congratulations to the other Officers of the Committee.

(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

I should also like to take this opportunity to extend, on behalf of the Greek delegation, our warmest congratulations to two well-known apostles of disarmament, the former Foreign Minister of Mexico, Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles, and Mrs. Alva Myrdal, who fully deserved the Nobel Peace Prize which was awarded them.

The Danish representative, Ambassador Peter Michaelson, who is the current President of the Council of Ministers of the European Community, on 21 October in this forum summarized the views of the Community in the general debate on disarmament. While subscribing fully to what was said by Ambassador Michaelson, I should like to submit some additional views of the Greek Government - which I hope will facilitate the success of the work of our Committee.

Greece has followed with keen interest recent developments in the field of disarmament, and in particular the deliberations of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament held a few months ago. Unfortunately, although no one has denied the urgent need for disarmament, the special session did not yield the expected results. We should not, however, overlook the fact that it showed that all peoples are desirous of living in peace, safe from the scourge of war. All Governments, and above all the super-Powers, should understand the true meaning of that message and should redouble their efforts.

First of all, Greece - a country attached to peace and to peaceful procedures for the settlement of disputes - must hope for the success of every effort and the taking of every measure that can speed up the process of disarmament. On the other hand, it cannot disregard the fact that the international community is now heavily overarmed. The world's arsenals of nuclear and conventional weapons have steadily increased, to reaching a destructive capability that could exterminate the inhabitants of our planet several times over.

(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

In that connection, I am in duty bound to recall that the Greek Prime Minister, Mr. Andreas Papandreou, has repeatedly stated that the question of disarmament is one of the most important in the world today; that is why the present Greek Government has on several occasions been among the foremost in making proposals designed to speed up negotiations on halting the arms race.

In addition, Greece, being firmly attached to the principles and ideals of the United Nations Charter and above all to the maintenance of international peace and security, is convinced of the need to strengthen the disarmament machinery.

Although it would be superfluous to dwell again on the close interdependence between disarmament and international security, I should like to stress two over-riding ideas that the Secretary-General of our Organization recalled in his address last April on the occasion of the inauguration of the Institute of Studies on East-West Security. He stated:

"National security has always been and will continue to be the primary concern of all Governments. History offers sufficient examples of cases where neglect of security has led to war and national subjection."

He also noted:

"There is no way of escaping the fundamental truth that security does not only mean immunity from external aggression but also the elimination of fear and the strengthening of confidence in the stability of the world order."

If, on the other hand, we wish seriously to avoid not only another world war but also local conflicts which are on the increase, as well as tensions which continue to become exacerbated, we must not only cultivate more and more the co-operation of all the families of nations, but also scrupulously respect the purposes and principles of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter, which invites us to refrain from resorting to the threat or the use of force in international relations.

Hence, the time has come to abandon the threat or the use of force in international relations and to seek security in disarmament, that is to say, through a gradual yet effective process, beginning with a reduction of the present levels of armaments until the lowest level is reached.

Faced daily as we are with those dangers, and forgetting, as it were, the purposes and principles of our Organization, it is urgent, as was pointed out by the Foreign Minister of Greece, Mr. Haralambopoulos, in the course of his statement before the twelfth special session of the General Assembly on disarmament:

"It is urgent that those steps be taken which can promote détente and co-operation and open the way for the adoption of concrete measures for arms control and disarmament." (A/S-12/PV.18, p.12-15.)

To that end, it is the responsibility of nuclear and non-nuclear States to establish as a priority task in their policy the prevention of both nuclear and conventional war.

Thus we note with satisfaction that the two principal nuclear Powers have already begun negotiations among themselves concerning intercontinental strategic nuclear weapons and intermediate nuclear forces. Those negotiations are, in fact, of the highest importance for all European countries. With respect more specifically to strategic weapons, we hope that the negotiations will encompass not only limitations but also significant reductions of strategic weapons.

(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

As for the negotiations on the intermediate range nuclear weapons, we hope for results which will include the complete elimination of such weapons, both by the United States and the Soviet Union.

In addition, the Government of Greece fully supports the implementation of an effective policy of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. We are also in favour of ratification by all countries of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons which is one of the essential conditions for the effective attainment of the purposes of nuclear disarmament. But this can only go hand in hand with the need for the nuclear Powers to give the non-nuclear Powers sufficient security guarantees and the assurance that they will have access to the indispensable technology for the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

In addition, the conclusion of a comprehensive agreement on the cessation of all nuclear tests is an objective of paramount importance and should be an inseparable part of the effective process of nuclear disarmament.

We are equally aware of the fact that nuclear disarmament cannot be tackled in isolation. Let us not forget that in the arms race, of which all our peoples are victims, 80 percent of military expenditures are earmarked for so-called conventional weapons.

To that end, in his report to this session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General said explicitly that:

"There exist vast quantities of sophisticated conventional weapons... these weapons are...immensely destructive." (A/37/1, p.2)

Disarmament is a multi-dimensional process. Thus, nuclear disarmament should go hand in hand with conventional disarmament and with the elimination of all systems of weapons of mass destruction.

Permit me to refer to another aspect of disarmament, namely regional disarmament. Indeed, the latter can, to a very large degree, strengthen multilateral and broader efforts which are aimed at the attainment of the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

It is becoming increasingly apparent, moreover, that given the complex nature of the problems involved and the diversity of considerations of a political nature, as well as the security requirements of the various regions, that it would probably be easier in these particular cases to tackle certain questions of arms limitation and disarmament in a regional context, rather than to try to apply broad concepts to situations that are very different in themselves. Thus there is much room in each region for independent initiatives and practical action.

As was pointed out by the Group of Experts in the relevant study, to attach greater importance to the regional approach to disarmament would in no way be at variance with the realization of the comprehensive objective. Rather, it would promote it. While it can, under no circumstance, substitute for general and complete disarmament, the regional approach, nevertheless, could effectively complete global measures and constitute an important element in the progressive approach to comprehensive disarmament.

More specifically, as regards the Balkan Peninsula, the Greek Government is convinced that the development of good-neighbourly relations and co-operation among the Balkan States, both in the bilateral and multilateral fields, that is to say, a development founded on respect for the principles of independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, meets the interests of the Balkan peoples and would help to transform the Peninsula into a zone of confidence, co-operation, security and peace.

Such a highly desirable climate could even, given favourable conditions and appropriate contacts, lead to the transformation of the Balkans into a nuclear-free zone.

The Greek Government believes that such an evolution would be the best contribution the Balkan countries could make to the cause of détente and the gradual denuclearization of the European continent.

(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

I should like now to refer to the sole multilateral negotiating body available to the United Nations. Since 1978 the Committee on Disarmament has been dealing with questions of the highest importance in the field of disarmament.

My country attaches special significance to its discharging its mandate. We place our hopes in the expectation that that body will achieve the tangible results to which the whole of mankind aspires.

Moreover, the Greek Government sincerely hopes that the Committee on Disarmament will arrive at a conclusion satisfactory to all States with respect to the highly complex question of its expansion. We are aware of the gravity of that problem but, on the other hand, we are convinced that all States should, one way or another, participate in that unique multilateral negotiating body, bearing in mind the fact that disarmament is everybody's business.

(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

Greece also attaches very great importance to the comprehensive programme of disarmament as an effective instrument in our future activities. We sincerely hope that the Working Group of the Committee on Disarmament will continue its work with the maximum effectiveness, so that the Committee may be in a position to submit a constructive report to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, in accordance with the concluding Document of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Similarly, Greece is ready to contribute in one way or another, within the limits of its potential, to the World Disarmament Campaign proclaimed by the President of the second special session devoted to disarmament, Ambassador Kittani. On the other hand, we believe that various non-governmental organizations which are also committed to the solution of disarmament questions - organizations such as, among others, the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, which was presided over by the present Prime Minister of Sweden, Mr. Olof Palme - can make a constructive contribution to the disarmament process.

Furthermore, the Greek Government subscribes to the belief that there is an imperative need to prevent the military use of outer space, to prohibit radiological weapons, to prohibit the development, manufacture and stockpiling of chemical weapons, and to develop national and international machinery for the verification of disarmament agreements.

In referring earlier to the maintenance of peace I mentioned only two means to that end: disarmament and international security. However, it would be unforgivable if I overlooked the third factor that is closely linked with peace and world stability and also with disarmament.

I am speaking of the idea of development, on which depends the social, economic and scientific progress of our endangered planet, which cannot prosper without it. The primary target of that development should be the underprivileged countries of the third world, which are the first victims of the present overarmament. They would be the first to benefit if in the course of progressive disarmament the material assistance given to them were in direct proportion to the reduction of military budgets.

(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

Without such a courageous objective, which above all must be sincere, our planet and the international community living on it - which we never fail to refer to in our statements - will always be at the mercy of fear, unhealthy chauvinism, poverty, disease and every other calamity that arouses human passions. Those passions certainly will not contribute either to disarmament or to international security. Nor will they contribute to peace, which is the priority objective of our Organization.

Mr. SAHNOUN (Algeria) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, I have great pleasure in addressing the political Committee of the General Assembly at a time when a worthy son of Africa is in charge of its work. This distinction is a tribute to our continent, which, although grappling with the urgent tasks involved in the completion of its emancipation and development, intends to make its contribution to every enterprise likely to bring about the future solidarity of mankind. It is also a tribute, Sir, to your country, Ghana, with which Algeria has excellent relations. And it is both a tribute to you personally and the professional endorsement of a man who, as I know from experience, has always striven to promote understanding between nations, a man to whom I am bound by friendship forged in our common struggle - in particular, the struggle for the liberation of our continent, the struggle against racial discrimination and apartheid.

I also congratulate the other officers of the Committee, whom I assure of the Algerian delegation's co-operation, and thank your predecessor, Ambassador Golob, who performed his task as Chairman brilliantly.

I wish to associate my delegation with the cordial congratulations offered to Mrs. Alva Myrdal and Mr. Alfonso Garcia Robles, winners of the Nobel Peace Prize, who have devoted much of their lives to struggling faithfully and with determination to achieve the objectives of disarmament.

(Mr. Sahnoun, Algeria)

The First Committee is meeting again this year in what we all agree on calling a situation of crisis, a crisis that is steadily becoming worse and more widespread. There is an increase in the focal points of tension and of the violations of the rights of peoples. As all representatives know, the gulf between the levels of development in our countries is widening. The United Nations Charter is ignored every day and its principles are flouted. At the same time, negotiations on disarmament and arms control are marking time, and the spirit of the cold war seems to have been revived.

From year to year at each of our sessions we find that the same disorder is undermining international relations. Each time we deplore and denounce what is happening, yet we continue to nourish the hope that the problems can be overcome. But because the will of the majority is opposed by powerful national interests, or because the solutions advocated and sometimes adopted are partial or biased, our decisions prove inadequate to change the tumultuous course of events.

If that tumultuous course has become a constant feature of international affairs, that is because the logic of conflict continues to underlie the system of international relations itself. As that system continued to be based essentially on the balance of power and the interplay of the various Powers, it was inevitable that the equilibrium established after the Second World War should be very precarious and provide particularly suitable conditions for the arms race.

Of all the problems that are of legitimate concern to the international community, the arms race is undoubtedly the one whose destabilizing effects are the most direct threat to world security today.

(Mr. Sahnoun, Algeria)

Although since time immemorial man has provided for his protection and sometimes even his survival with weapons, the discovery of nuclear weapons has introduced a radically new element into the equation, because these are weapons whose accumulation is in itself a threat to the future of mankind, a point very aptly made in the Final Document of 1978.

Acting as spokesman for the demands of our peoples, and feeling, like them, the unanimously proclaimed need for a world of peace and development safe from the threat of weapons, the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, was a source of great hope. It seemed to be a privileged moment in the history of man; it seemed to make a break with traditional approaches and to usher in a new world of collective reason and common destiny.

Four years later, not only have the promises vanished but trends have been reversed. On this slippery path towards the edge of the abyss, man now measures his destiny in terms of the implacable statistical probability of nuclear catastrophe and the apocalyptic vision of doctrines which seek to underpin this possibility.

In the sense that they challenge precise choices and commitments entered into, and because of the objectives they set for themselves and the means they intend to apply, the proclaimed policies of certain Powers project nuclear war into our daily lives as a fate we have to come to terms with.

From this point of view scientific research for the control of nature has digressed from its natural objective, economic and social progress, and is now partly addressed to the development and constant improvement of armaments. Increasing sophistication and miniaturization have now led to a situation in which the arms race is spreading to space.

The squandering of the colossal resources involved in the acceleration and intensification of the arms race more than precipitates an economic crisis. It not merely stands in sharp contrast with the paucity of development aid; it is clearly a scandal for the conscience of mankind at a time when so many people still live in conditions that prevailed many hundreds of years ago.

(Mr. Sahnoun, Algeria)

The present deliberations of the Committee are taking place only several months after the acknowledged failure of the second special session devoted to disarmament. The imprint of such evident failure cannot but weigh on our work, as it already weighs on the process of negotiation as a whole.

The truth is that neither the urgent nature of the need to disarm nor the pressure of public opinion, which is more highly mobilized now than ever before, nor the constructive spirit shown by the majority of States has proved able to overcome the intransigence of those responsible for the failure of the session.

Though originally seen as a new milestone in the multilateral disarmament process because it constituted a critical evaluation of work done since 1978 to define concrete measures to intensify the disarmament process, the session in fact amounted to nothing more than a missed opportunity. It is true that the session did record the unilateral declaration by a second nuclear Power not to make first use of nuclear weapons, but none the less a comprehensive programme of disarmament, which would have been a far-reaching gain, was not elaborated.

However, now that non-negotiation has been elevated to the status of a negotiating technique, and when the spirit of consensus has been perverted to block compromises, it was inevitable that the necessary quest for common interests should be sacrificed on the altar of vested interests. Such a spirit could not fail to lead to a whole cascade of reversals of principles and priorities agreed on in 1978, reversals which solemn reaffirmation of the Final Document cannot make us forget.

In such a context even the pressing preoccupation with the prevention of nuclear war was sacrificed for the convenience of doctrines designed to lend credence to the thesis whereby nuclear war can be fought and contained.

Actually, the failure of the session was not isolated or fortuitous. It merely brought to light the deadlock in which disarmament negotiations now find themselves. Negotiations on high-priority questions are not always properly conducted. The deliberating and negotiating organs are blocked, and that certainly is not due to intrinsic flaws in those organs themselves, but rather to the fact that the reorganization of the Committee on Disarmament was not carried out fully and that the implications of the

(Mr. Sahnoun, Algeria)

statute whereby the Committee is the sole multilateral negotiating organ were rejected. This emphasizes the extent to which the task of disarmament depends on the political willingness of the nuclear Powers, which has proved rather meagre so far.

It is highly significant that since the advent of the nuclear age no weapons have been destroyed. It is equally significant that negotiations and discussions on disarmament and even arms control have suffered the negative fall-out from tension in international relations.

Hence it is only natural that disarmament should be duly perceived as an essential component of a global approach having the objective of peace, with its various elements, thus integrating the requirements of decolonization, development and security.

Non-alignment, which has mutual relations of interaction with national liberation movements, is well aware of the importance and the sheer magnitude of the efforts to bring about a universal age of peace, and it is aware of its own contribution to such an arduous enterprise as disarmament. Because it was absent from the interplay of the conflicting balances of power and is therefore free of blame for the competition that is pushing the world towards the holocaust, the Non-Aligned Movement is all the more justified in bearing witness to the failure of restrictive concepts of peace and their harmful consequences for world security and the socio-economic development of peoples.

(Mr. Sahnoun, Algeria)

Because it is also a dynamic factor in the transformation of international relations, the Non-Aligned Movement should, we believe, throw its full moral and political weight, derived from the aspirations of peoples to peace and progress, behind the initiation and conduct of the process of general and complete disarmament. This is certainly a point to which my delegation hopes will be given real priority at the next summit meeting of non-aligned countries, to be held in New Delhi.

This should no longer be seen as impatience or as an unattainable ideal.

We realize that the attainment of the objective of general and complete disarmament cannot but be a long-term venture and thus we must not yield to pessimism and discouragement in the face of the complexity of the task. We must begin and persevere.

This requires a more constructive approach from those that have the power to give a real impetus to the disarmament process, an approach which will give the Committee on Disarmament the opportunity and means to negotiate in a practical way on high-priority issues with a view to reaching significant international agreements; to respect the central role of the United Nations in the process of negotiations and to provide it with the means necessary to that end; to curb the acceleration of the arms race and gradually to reverse it; to undertake or step up negotiation on concrete aspects, leading ultimately to the complete destruction of stockpiles.

The initiation of urgent measures, such as the provision of security guarantees to the non-nuclear-weapon States and the cessation of the testing and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, would, over and above their real scope, constitute meaningful indications of a desire for peace and to rid the world of the spectre of nuclear war. In this respect, the freeze on arsenals, although inadequate in itself, would represent a point of departure for a resolute effort to reverse the arms race. It would be a first step, provided, of course, that it was quickly followed up by other effective measures and that it did not serve to consolidate the status quo.

(Mr. Sahnoun, Algeria)

But is it not the distinctive feature of conflicts and crisis situations that they make it possible to reopen issues, rethink ideas, analyse one's conduct and evaluate one's actions? If at this session we were to have the courage to do just that and show the lucidity required by the demands of the peoples, who refuse to be hostages to the implacable arms race, there would be some reason for believing that the fantastic sum total of efforts made for decades in the cause of disarmament had not been in vain and that we had been faithful to the ideals underlying this Organization.

Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like first of all to convey to you, Sir, the congratulations of the delegation of Kuwait on your election as Chairman of the Committee. We are convinced that, thanks to your wide experience and skill, our work will be crowned with success.

I wish also to congratulate the other officers of the Committee on their election to their respective posts. My delegation is ready to co-operate with you all.

I would not wish to fail in my duty to congratulate Ambassador Garcia Robles and Mrs. Myrdal on having been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in recognition of their efforts over many years on behalf of disarmament and the cause of peace.

We are meeting at this session to tackle questions relating to disarmament in a climate of tension, unrest and perplexity and we wonder which are the best means to rid the world of this scourge that is leading us to the brink of a disastrous nuclear war. We might think that the daily cries of alarm of the world community found no favourable echo. The feeling day by day that the end of the world is approaching inexorably increases and fear and despair are taking over the minds of men.

Recently, a special session of the General Assembly - the second on this subject - was convened to consider possible ways of arriving at even partial agreement on the major questions of disarmament, in particular in the nuclear field. We know that the Final Document affirmed the importance of that

(Mr. Abulhassan, Kuwait)

question, which places on us a heavy responsibility. It is strange that this disastrous nuclear weapon should be the basis and cornerstone of the security of so many States. The delegation of Kuwait believes, however, that the security of those States is threatened even further by their increased dependence on those weapons. We derive this conviction from the fact that scientific and technological efforts are channelled into nuclear weaponry in an unbridled race which the efforts we make at the international level have so far been unable to curb.

We cannot help wondering whether we are moving towards total destruction. What wise person would doubt the possibility of the world ending unless we take decisive steps to stop that race? Those who are involved in it do not realize that there are no boundaries, national or international, to nuclear weapons. Let us not forget that our civilization is threatened by total destruction. How can we convince those people that the security of nations cannot be based on nuclear weapons? Furthermore, what has happened to the right of the peoples of small nations to self-defence, as laid down in the United Nations Charter?

Are we to continue on this course, which affects all peoples, because of the pretext used by the promoters of the arms race, who say that this is for their own defence?

(Mr. Abulhassan, Kuwait)

The United Nations and the international community have discussed this matter for many years. In the hundreds of documents that exist there are many resolutions adopted by the United Nations with the aim of banning nuclear weapons altogether. Each year many countries submit proposals for the prevention of nuclear war. Press reports provide information in connection with the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union to find a solution to the nuclear dilemma and they talk about the fundamental causes that compel us to find such a solution. In spite of that, we hear that the pace of those negotiations is slow and we also hear it said that the countries concerned continue to spread strategic weapons throughout the world and to perfect other weapons. We also hear it said that the field of nuclear weapons is not confined to this planet but is being expanded to outer space. As a result of this, non-nuclear States at the Conference on Outer Space held in August in Vienna had become aware of this new danger and urged that the arms race not be extended to outer space, as that would jeopardize possible peaceful means of using outer space.

Quite recently we have witnessed significant demonstrations all over the world in opposition to the arms race and as an expression of the awareness of peoples who refuse to be guinea-pigs and to be led to their destruction. What was the result of those demonstrations by those people and the appeals they addressed to their Governments to put an end to these dangerous activities? If we look at the results of those demonstrations and what Governments did subsequently, we see that those demonstrations did not have the expected results. It was merely another attempt to put an end to the arms race.

This new aspect was reflected in the World Disarmament Campaign launched by the General Assembly at its twelfth special session, which was the only positive result of that session. Unfortunately, at that session we observed that the great Powers did not yield an inch in their well-known positions on disarmament. Today we are confronted with a situation that has not improved one iota since that special session. We wonder about the repetition of words and the reiteration of positions,

(Mr. Abulhassan, Kuwait)

but we find we are in a vicious circle or that we are advancing along a single path without any other alternatives. All this leads us to believe that we must redouble our efforts to achieve at least one small part of our objective and not allow ourselves to be overcome by despair.

The arms race not only threatens the security of all States, large and small. The arms race also threatens the prosperity and the economic and social well-being of all countries, rich and poor. This was demonstrated in the studies made by the group that dealt with the interrelationship between disarmament and development and the social consequences of the arms race. We hope that this Committee at the current session will pay special attention to those studies, which pointed out in particular that more than \$600 billion had been invested in armaments, to the detriment of social and economic development, particularly in the developing countries, which have followed the course of the large industrial Powers and are resorting to armament at an exorbitant cost and to the detriment of the other needs of their peoples.

In the past few months the Middle East has been the theatre of a brutal war launched by Israel. Israel continues to arm itself to ensure its security, it claims. On the contrary, its weapons are in fact used against a peaceful country. Israel pleads weakness and the need to ensure the safety of its population, but in actual fact Israel is a barbarous aggressor which does not hesitate to use the most sophisticated weapons to ensure its hegemony over neighbouring countries. Israel is thus seeking to impose its will through the force of arms, to the extent that the world now no longer listens to the untruths by which Israel has convinced part of the world - in particular the United States - that it needs to be strong, whereas actually it uses its strength for its expansionist aims in defiance of the will of the international community. The Israeli attack on Lebanon, which led to the destruction of that country and the loss of human life among the Palestinian people, bears witness to the dangers of intensive armament, threatening the security of the region. If the situation continues in the same manner, there will be increased tension and more armament,

(Mr. Abulhassan, Kuwait)

and the great Powers will be involved by introducing nuclear weapons into the area in order to establish parity of forces in that part of the world. Therefore we think there is a need to secure the region against nuclear weapons, and Kuwait supports the decisions of the General Assembly for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East.

Furthermore, we must not forget what happened last year, when Israel perpetrated an aggression in its raid on the Baghdad nuclear power plant, thus creating a dangerous international precedent jeopardizing the right of people to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, since that raid jeopardized the objectives of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, international law and the United Nations Charter. Kuwait, faithful to its previous positions, supports the establishment of nuclear-free zones wherever possible and in particular in Africa, where a nuclear Power, South Africa, represents a threat to the security of the African countries - a danger that is similar to the threat represented by Israel's nuclear power, which is a great danger for the peoples of the Middle East. Therefore Kuwait supports the establishment of nuclear-free zones in South Asia, as referred to in previous resolutions of the General Assembly.

This leads us to the question of peace zones throughout the world. The Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace remains a dead letter, as it has not yet been implemented. This is because of the rivalry between the great Powers in the region. The meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean have achieved no results because of that rivalry between the great Powers. Vested interests continue to hinder the convening of the proposed conference in that regard. Kuwait considers that the Committee should arrive at a solution, and it believes that certain parties should end their intransigence and co-operate in 1983, thus associating themselves with the majority of the members of the Committee which believe that the convening of that conference would represent a step forward towards the realization of the objectives of the Declaration.

(Mr. Abulhassan, Kuwait)

This, however, does not mean that regional measures suffice in themselves to ensure peace and security throughout the world. We are convinced that all regional measures will remain only partial and ineffective unless they are accompanied by other measures at the world level. In fact, world security is indivisible and the disruption of peace in one region results in a similar disruption of peace in other parts of the world. Thus, we believe that the bilateral, trilateral or multilateral negotiations on disarmament in the Geneva Committee on Disarmament or in any other body should be pursued in greater earnest and in a spirit different from that which has prevailed in the past. The negotiators must realize that they are dealing not just with the security of their country or region, but with the security of the whole world and that this gives their responsibilities a crucial importance.

These world conditions have aroused the indignation of the whole world and we find no better expression of that indignation than in the Secretary-General's Report on the work of the Organization, in which he states:

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

(A/37/1, p. 5)

My delegation wonders how we can achieve that goal by practical measures. Shall we go on to amend texts year after year? Shall we fail to find practical solutions? Or must we wait until the great Powers show us that they have become convinced of the need to modify the concept of peace and security by taking the measures necessary to ensure respect for those ideas and thus spare the world the danger of a disastrous nuclear

(Mr. Abulhassan, Kuwait)

war? Or should we continue to chatter away in this Committee, adopting more and more resolutions on more and more items year after year?

These are questions to which we must find an answer at this session and at subsequent sessions. However, it is incumbent upon us to undertake whatever task we can assume. Is it possible, for instance, to rationalize the work of our Committee by avoiding repetition and duplication and reducing both the number of agenda items and the number of resolutions adopted each year? My delegation thinks that this is feasible. Those who have spoken before me have expressed similar sentiments.

I urge the members of our Committee to consider this question in earnest and to try to act within the realm of the possible. The disarmament bodies in the United Nations are proceeding with their work, but this does not prevent them from occasionally undertaking a review and assessment of the results of their work. The effectiveness of those bodies should be our first objective.

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic):

I should like at the outset on my own behalf and that of my delegation cordially to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. I need hardly emphasize the cordial relations which unite our two brother countries or, for that matter, the close personal relations I have developed with you since I have been here. I am quite sure that, thanks to your competence and skill, your chairmanship will help our Committee achieve the desired results. I should also like to congratulate the other Officers of the Committee.

The disarmament question is one of the most important issues facing today's world, because of its close links to the vital interests of mankind and to international peace and security, which represent the ultimate purpose

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

for which the United Nations was founded. For the last 37 years this question has been at the centre of debates, resolutions and agreements in the United Nations and elsewhere.

On every occasion there has been unanimous acknowledgement of the need for measures to end the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race. However, the results obtained so far in this field have been very meagre or non-existent. Most of the results achieved at the end of these negotiations and these decisions amounted to little more than a dead letter. The arms race continued to intensify, to cover the whole world, and to spread to outer space. The danger is increasing and threatening mankind with total destruction. Through the quantitative and qualitative increases in weaponry and the development of new weapons of mass and methods of destruction. Furthermore, world military spending rose to reach the sum of \$600 billion in 1981, while at the same time, economic and social problems worsened in both the developed and the developing countries.

A glance at the long list of agenda items on disarmament questions and the consolidation and strengthening of international security clearly shows the importance of the subject matter of this Committee's work. It will not be easy to make any progress in this sphere because of the present international situation, which is worsening rapidly as a result of the more and more frequent recourse to the threat or use of force, the standstill in strategic arms talks, the lack of trust between the great Powers, the persistence of international problems which have not always been solved equitably, and the political and economic pressures being brought to bear by imperialist and racist forces to secure their hegemony and domination over the developing countries. The presence of these negative factors could be said to account for the failure of disarmament efforts.

The disappointing results of the second special session devoted to disarmament cannot be considered in isolation from those factors. The second special session failed to adopt the comprehensive programme of disarmament and was unable to draw up a programme to implement the recommendations of the first special session on disarmament.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

It also failed to lead international disarmament talks out of the deadlock that had arisen for various reasons, including the diverse and conflicting interests of the great Powers, which cherished their own interests and those of their allies, with no regard for the interests of other countries.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

In the circumstances, the efforts of the non-aligned countries to get results in the search for disarmament have led nowhere.

The major obstacle to the achievement of disarmament and international security is neither a lack of resolutions nor the lack of an international disarmament strategy. It is rather the lack of trust and conviction on the part of the nuclear Powers regarding the importance of disarmament. It is also because the great Powers view the matter from a military standpoint based on the accumulation of weapons, on the pretext of providing for their security and national interests. That is the pretext put forward by certain imperialist and racist forces when they attack the territorial integrity of other States in a manner incompatible with the principles of the Charter particularly those calling upon States not to use force in international relations, for the peaceful settlement of disputes and for adherence to the principles of equality among States, of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States.

The pretext of safeguarding vital interests and national security has been abused very extensively by the United States Government, which takes into account only narrow United States interests and could not care less for the interests of others. It proceeds solely from the basis of strength and military hegemony in order to assure its domination over other peoples and thus control the destiny of those peoples, and exploit their economic resources.

There are many examples of this, including the installation of military bases outside United States territory, the establishment of the so-called rapid deployment force, and the despatch of naval vessels and reconnaissance aircraft to bring pressure to bear on and commit aggression against peoples which refuse to accept United States domination. That was done against the small, peace-loving people of my country, which suffered aggression at the hands of the United States Sixth Fleet.

On the pretext of protecting United States interests, the American Administration is designing and manufacturing new weapons of mass destruction, such as the neutron bomb, and is deploying nuclear missiles in Europe without any regard for the right of peoples to life or for the mounting opposition, in Europe and in the United States, which is calling for withdrawal of bases and missiles from Europe and the cessation of the production of weapons of mass destruction.

On the same pretext, the United States Administration provides unlimited support to the racist régime in occupied Palestine and to the racist régime in

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

South Africa, to enable them to continue their policies of aggression against the Arab and African peoples.

On the same pretext, the United States Administration has concluded agreements on so-called strategic co-operation with the Zionist entity and has been providing the Zionist entity with sophisticated weaponry to enable it to spread its influence and to invade and occupy further Arab territories. These destructive weapons - which were used by the Zionist racists in their invasion of Lebanon and which dealt death to thousands of men, women and children - include cluster bombs supplied to Israel by the United States. In fact, the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples have become guinea pigs on which sophisticated American weapons can be tried out, while the Americans are constantly heard to be talking about human rights and peace. Add to this the interference in the internal affairs of countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America which has been carried out by United States imperialism; these are so many attempts to bolster United States hegemony.

The fact that the United States is supplying Israel with sophisticated weapons with which to carry out its annexationist aims has brought about a state of anarchy and insecurity in the region and spurred a greater arms race, thus denying the impoverished peoples of the region the opportunity to use their resources to meet their needs. That is the case also of southern Africa.

The presence of foreign fleets and bases in the Mediterranean basin has led to psychosis and caused the countries of the region to purchase more armaments. The Mediterranean area, formerly a haven of peace, is thus becoming a focus of tension, which poses a threat to the peoples that live there.

The relationship between disarmament and international security is a close one; those questions have been at the core of United Nations deliberations since the Organization's foundation. The very first purpose enunciated in Article 1 of the United Nations Charter is the maintenance of international peace and security, and all the efforts of the Organization should be directed to that primary purpose. Disarmament, therefore, is undoubtedly a major purpose of the United Nations. The arms race is thus incompatible with the development efforts of peoples and also with the Charter. International developments demonstrate that the accumulation of armaments, particularly nuclear armaments, and the theories of deterrence and balance of terror cannot provide security. An increase in weaponry cannot achieve that security either. International peace and security can be achieved only through the cessation of the arms race and the implementation of measures to cut back on armaments, as well as through dedication to the purposes and principles of the United

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Nations Charter and the cessation of the threat or use of force against territorial integrity and independence of peoples, and of intervention in the internal affairs of other States.

As we said in connexion with the relationship between disarmament and international security, there is also a very close relationship between disarmament and development. The United Nations has carried out studies on that relationship in which it has analyzed military spending as an obstacle to social and economic development and as a heavy burden on the economies of many peoples, particularly those of the developing countries, whose peoples suffer from a lack of food, medical care and education.

Consider, for example the amount of money spent by the United States for military purposes - some \$225 billion a year, or more than a third of the worldwide total of \$600 billion - and compare it with the amount spent on international development assistance; we see the sheer magnitude of the disaster confronting the international community. This point is illustrated by the statistics contained in the report of the Secretary-General on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and of military expenditures, contained in document A/37/386. We read there that military expenditure amounts to \$110 for every man, woman and child, that it is the equivalent of the combined gross national product of all the countries of Africa and Latin America and that it was nearly 19 times as large as the official development assistance provided by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development to the poorer countries.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Paragraph 59 of the same report draws attention to the paradoxical contrast between military expenditure and the amounts allocated to meet the basic needs of the millions living in poverty, in various parts of the world.

In 1981, the world expenditure on armaments per minute was enough to feed over 2,000 children for one year in the developing countries. Over 1,200 million in various parts of the world have an annual per capita income of less than \$150. Less than half of one per cent of global military spending for 1980 would have been sufficient to buy all the farm equipment needed to increase agricultural output in low-income countries up to 1990.

On the other hand, the harmful consequences of the arms race are not confined merely to the fact that the civilian sector is denied the money being spent on military weaponry; the arms race is also an impediment to the establishment of the New International Economic Order and widens the gap between developed and developing countries.

General and complete disarmament under effective international control is the ultimate objective and aspiration of all peoples. All States, particularly the nuclear Powers, must do their utmost to apply the Programme of Action adopted at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The immediate relevance of that Programme to today's world has frequently been confirmed.

The adoption of practical disarmament measures, in keeping with the priorities contained in the Programme of Action - the complete cessation of nuclear-weapon testing, elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons, and the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones - would go a long way towards putting an end to the present nuclear threat.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which is faithful to its policy in support of disarmament and world security, has approved all disarmament measures and initiatives, particularly with respect to nuclear disarmament. It has supported all the resolutions calling for peaceful uses of nuclear energy, in order to improve the living standards of the people. We have also supported resolutions calling for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions as an important disarmament measure.

In that context, all indicators and reports point to the fact that, possession of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles by the régimes in Palestine and South Africa jeopardize the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East and in Africa. Libya has repeatedly said that the

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Mediterranean region should become a lake of peace, as should the Indian Ocean. We call for the withdrawal of all naval forces and the dismantling of all imperialist military bases in those regions.

Our desire for disarmament and the strengthening of security compels us to ask for a strengthening of the role of the United Nations which, under the Charter, has a special responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and security. It also has an important role in disarmament and the activities of disarmament organs. The Security Council, the main organ of the United Nations entrusted with maintaining peace has unfortunately failed to play its proper role as defined in the Charter. It has failed to achieve credibility in regard to its ability to settle many disputes with which the world is confronted. This is due to negative factors such as the right of veto and the hegemony exercised by certain imperialist forces which, abuse their privileges in the Security Council and hamper the establishment of peace and security in many areas of the world, in defiance of the overwhelming majority of States Members of the Organization. We insist that those negative factors, including the right of veto be abolished.

As far as the work of the Disarmament Commission is concerned, its report, which is now before us in document A/37/42, indicates that the Committee failed to make any progress in its deliberations. Thus, both the Commission and the Committee have failed in their work this year.

Responsibility for disarmament and the strengthening of world security is one which we all bear. The gloomy state on international relations should not discourage us; rather, it should encourage us to work harder towards our goals of peace and security. Moreover, we must not leave international affairs in the hands of those who wish to foster tension and war in the world.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.