

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



FIRST COMMITTEE
8th meeting
held on
Thursday, 22 October 1981
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 8TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 56, 128 AND 135 (continued)

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Korhonen (Finland)
Mr. Sheldov (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)
Mr. Liang Yufan (China)
Mr. Racz (Hungary)
Mr. de Laiglesia (Spain)

UN LIBRARY

OCT 26 1981

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.1/36/PV.8
23 October 1981

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 to 56, 128 and 135 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. KORHONEN (Finland): Sir, I should like to join previous speakers who have congratulated you on your election to the chairmanship of this Committee. I wish you and the other officers good luck and all success in your work.

The First Committee provides my delegation with its principal opportunity to express its views on disarmament. Therefore it is my intention to concentrate at this time on the main problems of the subject and on some aspects of particular interest to my Government. My delegation will return to some other problems at a later stage of the debate.

Obviously, disarmament and arms control as tools for restricting military competition are in grave difficulty. They have been so for several years. Disarmament negotiations stagnate. The characteristics of the present situation are only too well known to us. Yet we, as members of this Committee and participants in its work, cannot renounce our own role and responsibility. As a result of its deliberations this Committee produced in 1965 nine resolutions on disarmament. In 1970, there were 13; in 1975, 28; and, last year, 45 resolutions on disarmament alone. This might appear to be a paradox in terms of realities. It is also a symptom of the increasing frustration of the international community at the lack of substantial results in disarmament. Although the trend in the number of resolutions undoubtedly reflects an increase in interest in the subject and an intensification of efforts to meet the challenges of disarmament, it also poses serious credibility problems. If this situation continues, United Nations disarmament negotiations will face doubts and scepticism, even in countries like my own where the public traditionally looks to the United Nations with trust, patience and positive expectations. The second special session on disarmament next year will provide ample opportunity for the requisite rethinking, which should not exclude constructive self-criticism. My delegation will return to this aspect later.

Despite frustration and criticism, the path of negotiations remains the only one available to us. By this I mean not only the States possessing the bulk of existing military hardware in the world and bearing heavy responsibility for the

(Mr. Korhonen, Finland)

perilous trend in the arms race, but also the rest of us, the majority of the Member States of the United Nations. Disarmament negotiations have over the years become an indispensable tool and channel for international politics, and they must be revitalized as this tool.

While disarmament negotiations have come to a virtual standstill, while new military technology is being developed, resort to the open use of force in various parts of the world is increasing. A recent reminder of the risks of international lawlessness was the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear research centre. That act, representing a new form of international violence, could have incalculable consequences. It stands condemned by the Security Council, by the International Atomic Energy Agency and by the entire international community.

A wider use of nuclear technology and the concomitant spread of nuclear facilities underline the need for effective measures to protect nuclear installations against all military operations and against the risk of mass destruction through the dissemination of radioactive substances. The Israeli attack only highlights that danger. One possible approach would be by legally binding international arrangements in line with the ideas put forward by the delegation of Sweden in the Committee on Disarmament. Finland considers that the Committee on Disarmament should give serious consideration to this question.

We find it encouraging that the Soviet Union and the United States have agreed to resume talks on nuclear weapons in Europe. Both parties admit, we understand, that those talks will have to be integrated into a wider context of negotiations on nuclear weapons.

It can be expected that one of the main difficulties in the bilateral talks on theatre nuclear forces is going to be the question of nuclear parity. Long-range TNFs are difficult to conceptualize in military terms and their political implications are equally intricate. It is to be hoped that the coming negotiations will be guided by fundamental considerations of a political nature rather than be obsessed by mere technical data about the military forces in question.

The negotiations due to begin in Geneva will be global in impact but will most directly concern the future of Europe. It is, therefore, the right of every European State, big or small, neutral or allied, to expect from the TNF negotiations tangible results which will eliminate the danger of nuclear devastation that looms over Europe.

(Mr. Korhonen, Finland)

The fate of Europe is integrally linked with the so-called central strategic balance between the two main nuclear Powers. We are gratified to learn that new Strategic Arms Limitation Talks might begin next year. Co-ordination between the two processes of negotiations is intrinsic in terms of both nuclear weaponry and nuclear strategies.

The Madrid follow-up meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe will be resumed next week. Many delegations have spoken here of the significance of that meeting in the light of the present international situation. My Government shares those views and considers that a successful outcome in the form of a substantial and balanced concluding document from Madrid would be of the utmost importance and would give an impetus to the continuation of the process of negotiations on security and co-operation in Europe, which we consider essential.

(Mr. Korhonen, Finland)

In the military domain the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe has initiated the development of confidence-building measures which, in spite of their relatively modest scope and limited military significance so far, have proved useful and opened prospects for wider measures involving more far-reaching security aspects. All States participating in the Conference seem to be prepared to enter into further talks to develop the confidence-building measures and give them new dimensions and character. This willingness has been manifested in the plan under discussion to convene a conference on disarmament in Europe. A detailed mandate for such a conference has been a central issue at the negotiating table in Madrid since the very beginning of the meeting. Although important aspects of the mandate are still open, talks have advanced. Thus the aim of the new conference would be to focus on further progress in strengthening confidence and security and in achieving disarmament by effective and concrete actions. Furthermore, the conference is conceived as an undertaking in stages, the first being devoted to the negotiation and adoption of a set of mutually complementary confidence-building measures.

The Government of Finland has given its active support to this joint endeavour and hopes that an agreement on its mandate can indeed be reached as part of a broader accord -- a goal that my Government continues to pursue in Madrid.

Although the planned conference would first devote its attention to the concrete aspects of confidence-building measures, it should in its later phases mark an important longer-term conceptual opening in the field of arms control and disarmament in Europe.

The Finnish Government has stressed its view that a thorough discussion on the entire range of basic considerations pertaining to disarmament in Europe would be a relevant and necessary task for all States responsible for security in our continent. It was with such a longer-term perspective in mind that my Government put forward already two years ago in this same forum its initiative aimed at outlining a special disarmament programme for Europe. The objective of this initiative is to promote the consideration

(Mr. Korhonen, Finland)

on a comprehensive basis of multifaceted problems relating to arms control and disarmament negotiations concerning Europe or parts thereof and to arrive at a comprehensive view regarding these matters.

We continue to feel that there is a need to focus on these issues and we hope that they may form the basis for further detailed discussion at a time when European disarmament is entering a phase of concrete disarmament negotiations.

Finland is part of the Nordic region, which during the post-war era has become a region of stability and remained largely untouched by international tension. In the opinion of my Government, the continued absence of nuclear weapons is an indispensable element in the present Nordic security situation. In our view, it would be of advantage to the entire Nordic region if the absence of nuclear weapons were confirmed by a contractual arrangement. As members of this Committee may recall, the President of Finland, Dr. Urho Kekkonen, suggested in May 1978 a Nordic arms control arrangement, which is a further elaboration of his idea of a Nordic nuclear-weapon-free zone, first advanced in 1963.

At their meeting in Copenhagen last September the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Nordic countries pointed out that the security policy of their countries contributed to the maintenance of peace and security also in a wider international context. The Ministers informed each other of the prerequisites which, in view of the different national security policy situation of each country, should apply to the work for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Nordic area, and they agreed to keep in contact concerning their future work on this question.

The continuing nuclear arms race, in particular its new technological dimensions, may affect areas that so far have been outside nuclear strategic calculations. To arrest this development, the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone has become an increasingly interesting approach to arms limitation. The agenda of the current session of the General Assembly bears witness to the growing importance of such zones. The main objective is obviously the strengthening of the security of the zonal States. The minimum requirement is indeed that the status of the zone is respected by all States and especially by the nuclear-weapon States. In order to be a contribution to international

(Mr. Korhonen, Finland)

peace and security, the zones should be based on arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and should involve binding commitments by the nuclear-weapon States. In our view, the initiative for negotiations must come from the States in the region; they must themselves conduct the necessary talks in good faith, without coercion or pressure, since they alone are qualified to interpret their respective security needs.

Nevertheless, the United Nations can play a role in providing tools and methods for use in any regional context where a nuclear-weapon-free zone may be considered. In this respect it might prove useful to undertake, as a follow-up of the 1975 United Nations study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects, a comprehensive re-examination of this question in the light of recent developments and present-day needs.

Finally, I have to note that the regional approach to disarmament and arms control has become increasingly topical. Two studies -- one on regional disarmament itself and the other on confidence-building measures -- provide new elements which, together with a follow-up study on nuclear-weapon-free zones, should amount to a comprehensive contribution on this aspect of the problem.

Mr. SHEDOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Sir, I should like to welcome you, the representative of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, to the chairmanship of the First Committee and also to congratulate the other officers of the Committee on their election to their responsible posts. I sincerely wish you all success in carrying out your important tasks.

Each session of the United Nations General Assembly, which is the most representative international political forum on earth, presupposes, we believe, a constructive businesslike and, it is hoped, fruitful discussion in order to solve the problems of most vital concern to mankind and, first and foremost, to remove the danger of nuclear war, strengthen world peace and curb the arms race. In preparing for these discussions and in weighing what steps can be taken and the progress that can be achieved along these lines, we must have a very clear idea of the stage of development that has been reached in international relations.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

In retrospect it can be said that between the 1960s and the 1970s it was possible to secure a change from the cold war to détente which we believe was of truly historic significance. What was done in the 1970s continues to affect the world even today in the exacerbated international situation. But let us look the truth in the face. Today there is the danger of a new kind of turning-point, a change from détente to a second edition, as it were, of the cold war, and no country stands to gain anything good from that.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

The forces of peace and progress, which are deeply aware of their responsibility for the fate of mankind, are trying to make it impossible for such a trend to develop. For the socialist States peace has been, and continues to be, the highest value, the leitmotif, in practical international affairs. This has been demonstrated by their consistent position in the General Assembly and by their initiatives.

Today the world situation requires new, additional efforts to remove the threat of war and to strengthen international security. In our view, the international community has no more vital or more serious task than putting an end to the arms race. We are all aware that the very nature of present-day weapons is such that if they were unleashed the future of all mankind would be at stake.

We believe that in the present situation particular attention should be paid to halting the nuclear arms race. The world is already over-stocked with weapons of mass destruction. According to existing data, more than 50,000 nuclear weapons have already been accumulated. Their destructive force is such that if they were used they might decimate more than 1 million cities the size of Hiroshima. But that arms race continues. More sophisticated and devastating weapons, such as the neutron weapon, are being created.

Testing-grounds for hundreds of new nuclear missiles are being prepared in Western Europe. Washington is doing everything it can to accustom people to the criminal idea that the use of nuclear weapons is permissible. The Soviet State is, on the contrary, doing everything it can to make nuclear war impossible and to remove that threat. This was emphasized by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, Comrade Brezhnev, in his reply to Pravda, published yesterday, 21 October. He said:

"only he who has decided to commit suicide can start a nuclear war in the hope of emerging a victor from it".

The Byelorussian people, like all peoples in Europe and throughout the world, welcomed the news that talks between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation of the nuclear arms race in Europe would shortly

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

be resumed. Clearly, the talks can be successful only if they are conducted in accordance with the principles of parity and an equal degree of security. The fact that the Soviet Union has expressed its readiness to end, on a reciprocal basis, the deployment of its medium-range missiles in the European part of the country on the very day when the talks on the substance begin is extremely constructive and bodes well for their outcome. However, it is to be regretted that some doubt has been cast by some people on the Soviet Union's suggestion of a moratorium on the deployment of new medium-range missiles by NATO and the Soviet Union. The countries of the socialist community expect genuine and worthwhile results from the talks. We believe that the time has come finally to make real progress in restraining the nuclear arms race.

If we are genuinely to strengthen world security it is essential that the arms race be ended. It is also vital that all strictly observe the commitments in the relevant agreements of the 1970s, which were drawn up taking into account the opinions and interests of all and with general consent. Those treaties, particularly those relating to disarmament, should be observed - pacta sunt servanda. Their fate should not depend on changes of Government in any particular State. To a large extent on this will hinge the soundness of the foundation of international security and, in the final analysis, the very fate of human civilization.

The main - and in present conditions perhaps the only possible - means and instruments for creating and ensuring the effectiveness of international security are talks and agreements between States, with mutual respect for equality and each other's security, without any preconditions. Essentially, what we need is negotiations on the substance, not negotiations about how the talks should be initiated. But now in certain capitals the thesis is being pushed strongly to the forefront that specific issues must be discussed in conjunction with the entire spectrum of international problems. Recently everything was supposed to be related to the pseudo-concern about human right. Now new links have been suggested.

What is the purpose of that? It is to make it possible for people to avoid having talks on strategic arms limitation and unilaterally to end talks on disarmament which are already taking place, to encourage conflicts and as a

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

result directly or indirectly intervene in the internal affairs of other countries by sending in bands of hirelings and by the constant spread of provocative myths to undermine normal relations between States. It must be emphasized that to make the solution of certain problems depend on the solution of others, and vice versa, is to create a vicious circle from which there is no way out. For that reason the concept of links which is often put forward is simply a pretext deliberately to worsen the international situation and fish in troubled waters, as it were.

A genuinely responsible policy, dealing in facts, not words, aimed at strengthening peace cannot be founded on such concepts. A far-reaching dialogue would be the aim of well-thought-out and realistic policy. As Mr. Brezhnev said on 7 September this year:

"In order to achieve peace we need not so much fine words as real deeds, a readiness in practice to take account of the rights and interests of other States, and of course the ability patiently to seek solutions around the conference table to disputes. But to theorize about restraint and 'reciprocity' and at the same time to pursue a provocative and challenging policy, in the sphere of arms as well, simply spawns distrust and shakes the foundations of peace."

At the XXVIth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which was held this year, an object-oriented programme was put forward containing major initiatives aimed at preventing the threat of nuclear war, restraining the arms race and strengthening international security. It related both to nuclear missiles and to conventional weapons and to land, sea and air forces. These initiatives affect the situation in Europe, the Near East, Middle East and Far East. They refer to the adoption of concrete political and military steps and to the Soviet Union's readiness to extend confidence-building measures to the entire European part of the country, provided there is a corresponding extension of such confidence-building measures by the Western States. On the whole, the Soviet peace programme for the 1980s, its concrete proposals and ways and means of implementing them are motivated by a desire to promote the development of peaceful dialogue and co-operation between States of all continents.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

Unfortunately, the United States and its followers in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) have so far not displayed any willingness to undertake action along these lines.

In the present conditions it is extremely urgent - and this was also pointed out in that high forum of the Soviet communists - to continue the SALT process on the basis of equality and equal security while preserving everything positive that has resulted from the many years of effort devoted to the SALT II treaty. The fact that the United States has blocked this process has given the go-ahead for people to move in a completely different direction, that is, towards the unrestrained development of the most devastating forms of weaponry. One of the most recent demonstrations of this is the decision taken by the United States to deploy the intercontinental ballistic MX system, to build the B-1 bomber and atomic super-carriers, and so forth.

We still have to find a solution to another problem, or at least take some steps in that direction, that is the question regarding the cessation of the manufacture of all forms of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of their stockpiles until they are completely eliminated. At the same time, certain permanent members of the Security Council, despite the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and despite statements that they have themselves made about their desire for nuclear disarmament, are taking decisions that can bluntly be termed irresponsible and, moreover, dangerous for the cause of peace. I am referring to the decision of the United States regarding the full-scale production of a new system of nuclear weapons, the neutron weapon, which will be tantamount to marking the beginning of a further and perhaps the most dangerous round of all in the arms race in weapons of mass destruction. Do such acts help to promote the cause of disarmament? Would not the best solution be to prohibit the neutron weapon on the basis of a Treaty at the international level, as was proposed by the socialist countries when some years ago they put forward a specific draft convention calling for the prohibition of the manufacture, stockpiling, deployment and utilization of neutron weapons?

The cause of peace has quite definitely been harmed by the position of the United States and also by certain other States in the Committee on Disarmament, where they have blocked any possible talks on nuclear weapons and on the prohibition of new forms and systems of weapons of mass destruction. The

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

delegation of the Byelorussian SSR supports the view of the socialist member countries in the Committee on Disarmament, as expressed in document CD/200, to the effect that over and above a general discussion it is high time to hold specific talks in various subsidiary bodies, as provided for in the rules of procedure of the Committee. In particular, the establishment of a single subsidiary body on questions related to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and to nuclear disarmament, which the socialist and non-aligned countries have supported in the Committee, is a step that could help make further progress in resolving the question of nuclear disarmament.

As far as the question of the prohibition of nuclear tests is concerned, we continue to believe that to resolve this problem it is vital that a treaty be speedily concluded on general and complete prohibition of nuclear-~~weapons~~ tests. In the present circumstances, the Committee on Disarmament must play an active part in resolving these issues, and we share the position expressed by the socialist and non-aligned countries which, as members of the Committee, have favoured the setting up in the Committee of a working group on nuclear tests with the participation of representatives of all nuclear Powers.

An important element in our general approach to the elaboration and implementation of nuclear disarmament measures is the need to take into account their indissoluble link to strengthening political and international legal guarantees for the security of States and preserving peace, and the key document here would be a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. However, those who are reluctant to refrain from the use of force and diktat towards independent States are undermining the possibility of drawing up such a treaty.

In conditions where militaristic forces are stepping up their nuclear potential in ever more dangerous forms and where the policy of certain nuclear Powers is founded on inhuman doctrines that envisage the utilization of that potential, there is a growing danger of nuclear war. A significant step towards preventing this catastrophe would be that of the adoption of a declaration by the General Assembly solemnly proclaiming that States and statesmen that are the first to resort to the use of nuclear weapons will thereby be committing

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

the gravest crime against humanity. All States, both great and small, with or without major military potential, may play an important part in preventing such a nuclear holocaust. The adoption of the declaration as proposed by the Soviet Union would be a contribution that, with the joint efforts of peace-loving forces, could serve the task facing the present session of the General Assembly.

From among the broad range of problems connected with nuclear arms, I should at this stage like to refer to the question of strengthening security guarantees for States that are non-nuclear Powers. We are very pleased to note that the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations support the need for such guarantees to be set forth and embodied in an international convention. The assertion of certain Western States that drafting a mutually acceptable convention is unpromising and, indeed, unachievable is not, caused simply by the difficulty of the problem but by the lack of political will and of a desire to give clear-cut guarantees. There are certain difficulties, of course, in the way of such a convention, and a certain amount of time will be required to overcome them and to reach a consensus. Therefore, a constructive interim step at this stage would be taken if the nuclear-weapon Powers could make a similar declaration on the non-use of nuclear weapons against States having no such weapons on their territory, as proposed in resolution 35/154 of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR is one of the sponsors of that resolution and is therefore very pleased to note that this idea has already won support and that individual formulations for such a declaration have appeared. However, in drafting documents, which are of such importance for the security of States, we should assume that there can be no place in them for vague formulations that would make for arbitrary interpretations.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

The socialist countries also favour reaching agreement on the non-deployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of those States which do not possess such weapons at the present time. Such an international agreement would serve the interests of peace, and its preparation in the Committee on Disarmament should be speeded up. At the same time, it is extremely important for international peace and security that, even at this stage, the nuclear-weapon Powers should refrain from further action to deploy nuclear weapons in any other States, including those where such weapons already exist. In attempting to spare peoples from the threat of being involved in nuclear conflict, we must say that every support should be given to the proposal for the creation of denuclearized zones. In particular, détente in international relations could very well help to promote the creation of certain nuclear-free-zones in Europe, including the Balkans and the northern part of the continent. An important factor that would promote the creation of such zones in northern Europe is the readiness expressed by the Soviet Union to take relevant steps of this nature on its own territory.

Returning now to a matter I have already touched upon - prohibition of new forms of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons our delegation would like once again to emphasize an already fairly well-known fact: that, in the development of military technology in recent years there have been rapid and far-reaching changes the result of which has been the elaboration of such qualitatively new types of weapons of mass destruction that control over them - in other words, any agreed limitation of them - would be extremely difficult, if not impossible. Consequently, no one can fail to be seriously concerned by the urgency of the problem of finding new constructive approaches to a solution.

At the same time, as a result of the position of certain States, the Committee on Disarmament has as yet not even embarked on talks on this particular issue. Before we pass the point of no return, it is essential

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

that, as soon as possible, an agreement - or agreements - be elaborated and agreed upon to prohibit the development and manufacture of new forms of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. Progress in such talks would indeed be greatly helped if the Committee on Disarmament made it possible for a competent group of governmental experts to work on this problem.

The possibilities offered by scientific and technological progress are limitless. Unfortunately, so are the ambitions of reactionary militaristic forces, and mankind has now reached a stage where the military aspirations of those forces prompt them not only to declare spheres of influence and heat up the arms race, dictated by their so-called "vital interests", but also to direct their gaze into outer space. We need hardly refer to the extremely destructive military-strategic, economic, ecological and other consequences deriving from such a turn of events: they are easily understandable. Before it is too late, we must do everything to prevent the arms race extending into outer space.

This possibility is offered by the Soviet Union's proposal on the conclusion of a treaty on the non-stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. The speedy implementation of that proposal is of direct concern to all mankind. Otherwise, the nightmares of the American television series which are in such fashion may become reality.

No less dangerous is the prospect of the utilization of chemical weapons. However, the aggressive militaristic circles cannot bear to approach this, and they have already given the green light for a new generation - the binary - of these weapons. The modus operandi is quite familiar: instead of limiting and reducing already-existing systems of weapons, new ones are being added to them. The talks on prohibiting the manufacture, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and destroying existing stockpiles of such weapons have shared the same fate as the remaining questions of disarmament: they have been blocked, and more and more artificial difficulties are invented.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

Legitimate concern has been caused among all peace-loving forces by the scope of the arms race, in terms not only of weapons of mass destruction but also of conventional weapons and armed forces. That is why the socialist countries proposed a ceiling on the armed forces and conventional armaments of the permanent members of the Security Council and the countries which have military agreements with them as a first step to a subsequent reduction of their armed forces and conventional armaments.

At its last session the General Assembly adopted resolution 35/152 G, containing an appeal along those lines. As you know, as yet only one permanent member of the Security Council - the Soviet Union - has declared its readiness to take such steps. Although the other permanent members of the Security Council, as well as the other militarily important States, have verbally stated their interest in limiting the arms race, they have, under fictitious pretexts, simply ignored that appeal of the General Assembly, despite the fact that reductions in conventional weapons is the very area where every one of them could take very important steps for the cause of peace contributing to confidence-building and military détente.

An important supplement to radical steps in the disarmament field on a world scale would be to combat the arms race in individual regions of the world. In this context, we must emphasize the urgency and great importance of the Soviet proposal to strengthen security in the Mediterranean. The implementation of that proposal would have a very beneficial effect on a number of regions which at the present time, unfortunately, are more divided by that sea than united by it.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

The question of implementing the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace is a painful and eloquent one. It is painful because in 10 years there has been not even a minimum of progress made in its implementation, owing to the attitude of some Western countries. At the same time, it is eloquent because it gives a true picture of what their policies are. Who is it that, to serve its global ambitions, has declared regions adjacent to the Indian Ocean spheres of its "vital interests"? Who is it that continues to maintain its military bases there? Who is it that modernizes them and builds new ones, despite the demands of the peoples of the region? Who is it that has unilaterally called a halt to talks on restricting military activities in the Indian Ocean? Who is it that blocks the convening of the United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean, despite decisions taken by the General Assembly with their own consent?

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

We need not look far for the answer to those questions. The unsavoury position of the United States and some of its allies is camouflaged by none of the fine brushwork it has used in other matters relating to détente and disarmament. The line taken by the United States of America, which has been hidden behind the false pretext of the so-called Soviet military threat, its refusal to refrain from the arms race and its untrammelled pursuit of that race, its exacerbation of the international situation and violations of the Charter of the United Nations, its attempt to present black as white, must be contrasted with the clear, consistent policy of strengthening peace, restricting the arms race and properly settling crises and disputes around the conference table. This is precisely the policy followed by the socialist countries. Those countries consider that relations between States with differing social systems should, particularly in this nuclear age, be based on the principles of peaceful coexistence, which presupposes reducing the level of military confrontation, a constant, ongoing and constructive dialogue and the development of mutually advantageous peaceful co-operation.

A substantive contribution to disarmament can and should be made by the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, whose provisional agenda has been drafted by the Preparatory Committee that has just concluded its meetings. If all Member States, without exception, come to that forum with a serious desire to make honest and constructive attempts to find a solution to the problems of restricting the arms race, and particularly the nuclear arms race, and if they relinquish their intentions to attempt to distract the Assembly from making such efforts, then the special session will be able to achieve genuine progress and success, on the basis of existing documents and new initiatives and proposals, towards solving the tasks before it and will become an important milestone on the way to the convening of a world disarmament conference.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

In conclusion, we feel we should emphasize that the blessing of peace is necessary to all countries and peoples. Peace is the common heritage of mankind and a prerequisite for its existence. For that reason, the protection and strengthening of peace should be a common cause of all States. That being so, the already important role of the United Nations is further enhanced. Through the joint efforts of the Member States, the words contained in the Charter - "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" - must be made a reality.

Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Allow me first of all to congratulate you warmly, Sir, on behalf of the Chinese delegation on your assumption of the chairmanship of the First Committee of this session. We are convinced that the Committee will work effectively under your wise guidance, with the assistance of the Vice-Presidents and the Rapporteur. The Chinese delegation is prepared to co-operate with you.

In the past year, the tense international situation has worsened, the arms race between the super-Powers has further escalated and no substantive progress has been made in disarmament negotiations. The representatives of many countries have expressed their dissatisfaction and concern with this state of affairs during the general debates in the plenary and the First Committee. The deterioration of the international situation is characterized by the frenzied arms expansion and the direct or indirect use of force on the part of the super-Powers. High-sounding words about disarmament cannot cover up the reality of arms expansion, and naked armed aggression and the threat of force have exposed the emptiness of the promises. It was amidst the clash of arms that the Disarmament Decade of the 1980s began.

What are the causes for the lack of progress in the disarmament negotiations? As pointed out by some representatives, the super-Powers bear a special responsibility. One super-Power openly refuses to accept the reasonable demands and proposals of the small and medium-sized countries, while

(Mr. Liang Yufan, China)

the other uses negotiations to cover up its arms expansion. For over a decade now, this super-Power has been deceiving world public opinion by coming up every year with multifarious and rehashed disarmament proposals. It has always presented a very active profile in disarmament negotiations. No one, however, has ever noticed any reduction in the size of its enormous arsenal. Quite the contrary, what can be noticed are the large-scale increases in armaments and its acts of expansion and aggression. It has derived obvious advantages from more than a decade of disarmament negotiations, i.e. it has gained a relatively favourable position militarily vis-à-vis its rival.

This super-Power is mounting a new "peace offensive" at the present session of the United Nations General Assembly by repeatedly claiming that it is pursuing a "policy of peace" and is in favour of "limiting" and "stopping" the arms race and by making new proposals. But how can anyone be sure that it is sincere? While it calls for a "declaration" on the first use of nuclear weapons as "the most serious crime against mankind", it has refused all along to undertake "not to be the first to use nuclear weapons at any time and under any circumstance", or to assume unconditionally the obligation not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear-weapon States. In fact, it continues to develop its nuclear weapons and refuses to make any reduction. On the other hand, when the conventional armaments of this super-Power far exceed those of its rival, people have every reason to suspect that there might be an ulterior motive behind its so-called proposal against the first use of nuclear weapons. The plain truth is that the proposal would enable it to carry out blackmail and expand its sphere of influence by relying on its superiority in conventional armaments. The invasion of Afghanistan is ample evidence that unbridled aggression and expansion by means of superior conventional armaments are possible without prejudice to the strategy of nuclear deterrent. We should not just listen to what it says, but observe what it does. High-sounding words, no matter how attractive, can never cover up the actual deeds. The discrepancy between the words and deeds of this super-Power has enabled everyone to see through, even more clearly, its utter hypocrisy.

(Mr. Liang Yufan, China)

At present, disarmament negotiations are faced with even greater difficulties because the two super-Powers have started a new round of arms race. That super-Power, which has professed that "it has never sought, nor does it now seek, military superiority" has obtained after years of painstaking efforts superiority over the other super-Power in some fields. Moreover, its arms expansion is gaining momentum all the time. In this regard, ample proof can be found in the detailed figures released by world-renowned research institutions and in the facts contained in the Secretary-General's report, "A Comprehensive Study on Nuclear Weapons". In these circumstances, the other super-Power, not to be outdone, is trying very hard to catch up. It has made a major readjustment of its military policy and increased its military expenditure. Recently it has also announced its decision to produce neutron bombs and a strategic plan of strengthening its nuclear forces. All the facts mentioned above should leave no doubt as to where the responsibility should lie for the lack of progress in disarmament negotiations. If the super-Powers are sincere about disarmament, they should come up with concrete actions, such as adopting effective disarmament measures, reducing the size of their enormous arsenals, decreasing the military threat against the other countries and withdrawing their aggressor troops from foreign soil. They should stop deceiving the world with empty words.

I will now turn to some of the disarmament questions on the agenda of this Committee.

First, as to the question of nuclear disarmament, the people of the world at present are seriously concerned and disturbed by the intensification of the nuclear arms race and the increased danger of a nuclear war. In view of the continued increase of nuclear armaments in the already enormous nuclear arsenals of the super-Powers, more and more countries have come to realize the need for the super-Powers to take the lead in the disarmament process. In this regard, the non-aligned countries have put forward a series of ideas and specific proposals at this year's session of the Committee on Disarmament. They have

(Mr. Liang Yufan, China)

pointed out in clear terms that countries with the most important nuclear arsenals bear a special responsibility for nuclear disarmament. They have called on these countries to stop the development and production of all types of nuclear weapons and to reduce by stages their nuclear warheads and means of delivery. This is completely reasonable.

In view of the tremendous destructive power of nuclear weapons, the Chinese Government has always been in favour of tackling the question of nuclear disarmament on a priority basis. Taking into account the present world situation in terms of nuclear armaments and where the threat of a nuclear war would come from, we have come to the conclusion that the only way to reduce and remove the danger of a nuclear war is to halt the nuclear arms race between the two super-Powers and to demand a drastic reduction of their enormous nuclear arsenals. Of course, other nuclear countries, including China, also have a share in the responsibility for nuclear disarmament. After the super-Powers have taken effective measures for nuclear disarmament, the other nuclear countries should then join them in the reduction of nuclear weapons until such weapons are completely destroyed. As a developing country engaged in a modernization programme, China fervently hopes for the early achievement of complete prohibition and total destruction of nuclear weapons.

Many countries are calling for an early cessation of nuclear weapon tests with a view to halting the nuclear arms race and preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. A nuclear test ban, in our view, is an integral part of the whole process of nuclear disarmament. It must be linked with other measures such as a ban on the development, production and use of nuclear weapons and the reduction and destruction of these weapons before it can help to end the nuclear arms expansion of the super-Powers, or reduce and remove the danger of a nuclear war.

Faced with the nuclear threat of the super-Powers, the small and medium-sized countries have been for years vigorously demanding interim measures before the realization of nuclear disarmament, such as a ban on the use of nuclear weapons, especially on the use or the threat of use of these weapons against the

(Mr. Liang Yufan, China)

non-nuclear-weapons countries. We support their legitimate demand. Since many of the non-nuclear-weapon countries are facing the serious threat of nuclear weapons, the nuclear-weapon countries should unconditionally guarantee not to use or threaten to use such weapons against these countries and should stop procrastinating under various pretexts.

Secondly, while the race for nuclear superiority between the super-Powers is being stepped up, the pace in the conventional arms race has also quickened. The rapid development of military technology has led to a continuous rise in the destructive power of modern conventional weapons. This has become a serious and real threat to international peace and security. All the wars of aggression launched indirectly or directly by the super-Powers have been fought with conventional weapons. More and more countries have, therefore, become aware of the importance of the question of conventional disarmament. It is of positive significance that, on the initiative of a number of small and medium-sized countries, the United Nations Disarmament Commission considered this question at its last session. In order to safeguard world peace and defend the independence and security of States in the face of ever-increasing military threat from the super-Powers, it is not only necessary to oppose nuclear war and to strive for nuclear disarmament, but also to oppose wars of aggression fought with conventional weapons and to seek corresponding progress in conventional disarmament. Of course, due attention paid to conventional disarmament does not in any way detract from the importance and priority given to nuclear disarmament. We are in favour of giving the question of conventional disarmament the attention it deserves and of proceeding with it in conjunction with nuclear disarmament.

The conclusion of the Convention on Prohibition or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects and the related Protocols would help to limit the use of these weapons by the aggressors for massacring the military and civilian victims of their aggression. China actively supports, and has already signed, this Convention. We hope the inadequacies that now exist in the Convention and Protocols, such as the failure to provide for the control and verification of violations, can be rectified in due time.

(Mr. Liang Yufan, China)

Thirdly, the question of complete prohibition of chemical weapons has long been of concern to the people of the world. Despite the fact that the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare has entered into force for so many years, the super-Powers are still engaged in the development and stockpiling of chemical weapons, and regard these weapons as an important means of warfare. Recently, there have been numerous reports about chemical weapons being used in large-scale massacres of victims of aggression and oppression. Therefore, the early conclusion of a convention on the complete prohibition and total destruction of chemical weapons has become an even more urgent task.

(Mr. Liang Yufan, China)

We are happy to note that progress has been made by the Committee on Disarmament in formulating the elements of the future convention. Some countries are of the opinion that the scope of the future convention should cover not only the development, production, stockpiling, acquisition and transfer but also the use of these weapons. The main reason is that, although the use in war of chemical weapons is prohibited by the 1925 Geneva Protocol, continuous developments and changes over the last 50 years in the international situation, methods of warfare and military technology have made it necessary to supplement and strengthen the provisions of the Protocol. In fact, the Protocol itself contains references to other treaties on the prohibition of use. It all goes to show that to supplement existing international instruments with new ones would only serve to strengthen, and not weaken, the former. Since the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons is the heart of the question of prohibiting such weapons, we hope that the Committee on Disarmament will proceed speedily with the negotiations for the formulation of a convention on the complete prohibition and total destruction of chemical weapons, including a ban on the use of such weapons.

In the recent past, reports and information about the use of chemical weapons in Afghanistan, Cambodia and Laos have continued to surface. This has incurred the strong indignation and condemnation of the international community. In order to facilitate the early verification of these crimes, the work of the Expert Group established in pursuance of last year's General Assembly resolution to investigate the use of chemical weapons should be supported and strengthened. The Group should be given an opportunity to inspect all victims, on the spot, and no one should be allowed to obstruct on any pretext.

Fourthly, for years many countries have been calling for the establishment of zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world. The only one established, however, is the nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America; all the rest have remained unrealized. The basic cause for this has been the super-Powers' rivalry for hegemony and their military expansion which, instead of coming to a halt, are in fact being intensified in those regions.

(Mr. Liang Yufan, China)

Their military presence and fierce rivalry in the Indian Ocean region, particularly the armed invasion of a hinterland State by one super-Power, have made the establishment of this region as a zone of peace even more difficult. The main obstacle to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in Africa and the Middle East is the attempt to develop nuclear weapons by the South African racist régime and the Israeli expansionist régime. The flagrant Israeli bombing of a nuclear reactor in Iraq not long ago has created new difficulties for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. The third-world countries have strongly condemned Israel for its crime of aggression and are firmly opposed to the possession of nuclear weapons by Israel and South Africa. We fully support their just position. It should be clear from the above that in order to establish such zones in various regions of the world, it is necessary to oppose the policy of aggression and expansion of the super-Powers, the racists and the expansionists, put an end to the interference, infiltration, aggression and expansion of the super-Powers, remove all forms of foreign military presence and withdraw all occupation forces.

Fifthly, the second special session on disarmament is scheduled to take place next year. In the absence of substantive progress in the field of disarmament since the first special session on disarmament, many people are placing their hopes on next year's session. China, like many other countries, also hopes that next year's session will provide a new impetus for the disarmament efforts. To this end, the second special session should review the over-all situation since the closure of the first session, analyse and assess the present international situation and find the root cause for the continued intensification of the arms race and the lack of progress in the field of disarmament, so as to set a correct course for our future disarmament efforts. We agree that the consideration and adoption of a "Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament" should occupy an important place on the agenda of that session. The Programme will facilitate the future disarmament process, because it provides for specific disarmament measures by stages on the basis of the armament situation of the present-day world. The Chinese delegation is prepared to co-operate with others and do our share for the proper preparation and the success of the second special session on disarmament.

Mr. RACZ (Hungary): At the outset I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your unanimous election as Chairman of the First Committee. It is a great pleasure for me to see you, the representative of neighbouring and friendly Yugoslavia, in the Chair. My best wishes go also to the other officers of the Committee. I am convinced that, under your able guidance, the Committee will make good progress. In your responsible work I offer you the full co-operation of the Hungarian delegation.

The present international situation, as pointed out by many delegations, is characterized by increased tension, a spreading arms race and the constant and increased danger of the outbreak of a nuclear holocaust. In this period and in these circumstances when the results of détente are under constant attacks, when even the meagre results of the disarmament process are endangered, when the United States policy of seeking military strategic superiority jeopardizes international peace and security, when the American doctrine of a limited nuclear war tries to make acceptable to people the use of nuclear weapons, and when the arms race could be expanded to outer space, in the opinion of the Hungarian delegation everything has to be done to reverse this course of events.

For the sake of those who seem to have forgotten the facts of the history of the arms race and who are speaking loudly about an imaginary Soviet threat, let us be reminded of which side was the first after the Second World War to introduce various kinds of new weapons and weapon systems, thus launching ever new waves of the arms race, and which side was forced to respond to the challenge:

The atomic bomb was introduced in 1946 by the United States and four years later by the Soviet Union.

The hydrogen bomb was introduced in 1953 by the United States and one year later by the Soviet Union.

The strategic bomber was introduced in 1953 by the United States, and four years later by the Soviet Union.

The intermediate-range ballistic missile (IRBM) was introduced in 1953 by the United States, and four years later by the Soviet Union.

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

The tactical nuclear weapon was introduced in 1955 by the United States, and one year later by the Soviet Union.

The intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) was introduced in 1955 by the United States, and two years later by the Soviet Union.

The nuclear submarine was introduced in 1956 by the United States, and six years later by the Soviet Union.

The submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) was introduced in 1959 by the United States, and nine years later by the Soviet Union.

The anti-ballistic missile (ABM) was introduced in 1960 by the United States, and one year later by the Soviet Union.

The MRV warhead was introduced in 1964 by the United States, and six years later by the Soviet Union.

The MIRV warhead was introduced in 1970 by the United States, and five years later by the Soviet Union.

The cruise missile was introduced in 1976 by the United States.

And the neutron weapon was introduced in 1981 by the United States.

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

That list of uncontested facts speaks for itself, clearly showing who is responsible for the arms race. Should that list continue to grow longer year by year? The Hungarian delegation is of the opinion that every effort should be made to maintain the results achieved so far and that new efforts and initiatives are needed to halt the arms race, to decrease the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war and to reduce international tension.

It is against this background that the Hungarian delegation approaches the new Soviet initiatives, namely, those concerning the draft declaration on the non-first-use of nuclear weapons and the draft treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. The Hungarian delegation considers these proposals to be important and timely ones, and it lends them its full support.

In present-day conditions, when there are serious difficulties in the international situation, it is a vital necessity to remind each State of its responsibility for war and peace, and to make concerted efforts to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. Such efforts have to be given the highest priority. This has been done by the Soviet Union in proposing the adoption by the General Assembly of a declaration on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe.

The quantitatively and qualitatively unprecedented level of manufacture and stockpiling of nuclear weapons that has been reached today makes the Second World War, with all the horrors, casualties and devastation it caused, appear trifling. The destructive power possessed by man today is a million times greater than that of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima. There is not a single country in the world which could avoid the horrible effects of a nuclear war. The over-saturation of the world with nuclear overkill power is accompanied by the whipping-up of political tension and the attempt to replace negotiations by confrontation in international relations. Those in the extremist circles of imperialism, showing irresponsibility concerning the fate of their own people and that of the whole of mankind, are pushing the world nearer with every passing day to the brink of a nuclear war. Their attempts to gain military supremacy seriously and concretely increase the possibility of a nuclear disaster. Therefore that policy has to be stopped if mankind is to survive.

Against the background of the intensification of the arms race, generated by these circles advocating the "admissibility" and "acceptability" of a

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

nuclear war, the Soviet Union's proposal expresses the vital interests of all peoples. It is consonant with the real interests of all countries, regardless of their social systems. It urges mankind not to allow itself to slide down into a nuclear abyss, not to permit the irreversible to happen.

The Hungarian delegation, as I have already stated, regards that proposal as of particular importance and timeliness, and consequently it wholeheartedly welcomes and supports it.

I should like now to turn to the other Soviet initiative aimed at the conclusion of an international treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space.

My delegation considers this new Soviet initiative to be an extremely important one, intended to keep outer space free from weapons. The first important step in that direction was taken in 1979 with the conclusion of the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, which prohibits the placing in orbit around the moon or stationing in outer space in any other manner any objects carrying nuclear weapons or other kinds of weapons of mass destruction. The present Soviet initiative is the next logical step, which would exclude the appearance of any kind of weapon in outer space and would thus ensure the exclusively peaceful use of the moon and other celestial bodies within the solar system.

This new Soviet initiative is very timely as well. It is no secret to anyone that for some time we have been facing growing danger of the militarization of outer space. In this connexion, I should like to mention very briefly only two examples. There have been articles on the possible military use of the space shuttle. There are also reports on the possible use of lasers and particle beams as weapons in space. According to one of the reports, the development of laser battle stations in space could make the alteration of the balance of power possible. The adoption of the Soviet proposal would ban this course of development. My delegation takes note with satisfaction that some other delegations have expressed their anxiety over the danger of the militarization of outer space and have urged appropriate action against it.

In conclusion, I should like to express the hope of my delegation that members of the Committee will consider these two new Soviet proposals carefully and will support them.

Mr. de LAIGLESIA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I should like to begin my statement in the general debate by congratulating you and the other officers of the Committee on your election. I am certain that thanks to your great experience we shall achieve positive results and that it will be possible to submit to the General Assembly at this thirty-sixth session many draft resolutions which will contribute to progress in the area of disarmament.

We are meeting once again at United Nations Headquarters with two primary objectives. The first is to consider what has been done since the end of the last session of the General Assembly, and the second is to work for the adoption of new measures aimed at curbing the arms race, the consequences of which could be ominous for the cause of peace and the well-being of mankind.

Although this is a difficult time for the stability of the international community, we are about to convene the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in which we all place such high hopes. It must be recognized that the special session that took place in 1978 prepared a Final Document which without fear of exaggeration might be called the Charter of Disarmament. Unfortunately, little of what that document recommended has been carried out and it is obvious that when next spring we study in depth the progress that has been made in the field of disarmament in the intervening four years we shall not be able to take pride in the report that we shall then be making to the world. Military expenditures have undergone an astonishing increase of around 30 per cent, and the technology of conventional and nuclear weapons has developed to the point where its lethal capacity has increased geometrically.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

Although the importance of our objectives requires that we be immune to discouragement, there is no doubt that it is very difficult to rid ourselves of a deep feeling of frustration.

Our agenda cannot be said to encompass new aspects of the arms race afflicting the international community. Unfortunately, when the time comes to adopt draft resolutions, in all likelihood we shall have before us texts very similar to those we adopted last year. Similarly, the situation with regard to almost all the items is essentially the same. Hence, in considering the reports of the negotiating and deliberating organs dealing with disarmament, we can see that those organs have the same questions before them and that very little progress has been made towards valid solutions. In this regard the words in the Secretary-General's report on the work of the Organization are very revealing. In the second paragraph of section I, he states:

"The arms race, especially the competition in nuclear weapons, continues unabated, representing not only a perennial risk to human survival but also an inordinate waste of human and other vital resources." (A/36/1, p. 2)

I should also like to quote a few words from the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Spain on 25 September in the general debate in the plenary Assembly:

"It is plain that the world is rearming and that the arms escalation is continuing. Fresh conflicts break out, fresh invasions and acts of aggression, which does not augur well for any reduction in the stockpiling and production of war material - far from it. Promises of disarmament are belied by statistics and even public proposals for disarmament are merely a smokescreen for very different measures." (A/36/PV.12, p. 91)

Many speakers have used similar terms, and it would take up too much time if I were to read out some of the views along these lines expressed during the work of this thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

I should like now to make a few comments on the items on our agenda. With regard to the report of the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session, presided over so brilliantly and effectively by Ambassador Adeniji of Nigeria, we are not convinced that the decision which has been adopted concerning the Committee's future work is consistent with its mandate. Indeed,

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

we believe that the substantive questions within the purview of the special session should be studied at the special session of the Assembly itself and not by the Preparatory Committee.

With regard to the reduction of military budgets, we can only recall the debates of the third substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, as well as the reference on this subject appearing in its report - to the effect that it was not possible to reach agreement on the background document submitted by the Chairman of the Working Group. It seems clear, then, that at the third substantive session of the Disarmament Commission no progress in this area was made.

The negotiations currently under way in Geneva on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons are, as always, of great interest to the Government of Spain. In this regard, at the last session of the Committee on Disarmament, I had the honour to speak in the debate on this question, and my country sent an expert to the meetings of the Ad Hoc Working Group in Geneva on this subject.

I would not wish to minimize the importance of the progress achieved in this field, but I should like to state that in my delegation's opinion the draft convention should by now have been submitted to the General Assembly. However, we hope that it will be completed at the next session of the Committee on Disarmament; its importance is increasing daily, since chemical weapons, which a few years ago we had thought had been removed once and for all from military arsenals, at present form a significant part of those arsenals.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

We had also hoped for more concrete results on the cessation of all testing of nuclear weapons. We believe that the work of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts has been extremely positive. Although we understand the objections of some nuclear countries to the creation of an ad hoc working group to begin multilateral discussions on the subject, in our opinion the three countries at present negotiating should show that their procedure is more effective than the procedure which would be followed by setting up the ad hoc working group.

In my statement in this general debate I should not like to pass over in silence a subject which has not been dealt with as forcefully as it should be here. I refer to the problem of the conventional arms race. We are convinced - and this is what we have always stated - that in disarmament priority should go at all times to nuclear weapons. However, we believe that insufficient attention has been given to conventional weapons. World public opinion cannot understand why this question has been ignored. Moreover, it has not yet been possible in the United Nations to approve the carrying out of a study on the subject, whereas so much work has been done on questions of notoriously lesser interest. That hardly speaks in favour of the effectiveness of our work.

In connexion with this subject, I should like to draw representatives' attention to an article in Time magazine this week, which contains very interesting information about the production of, and international traffic in, conventional weapons. The article, which is very instructive, clearly shows the broad scope of action in this field of the arms race, which has contributed to making conflicts much more deadly than they ever were before. We believe that the passive attitude of the United Nations to this problem hardly enhances its prestige in the international community.

I now wish to turn to the machinery that deals with disarmament today. There are two deliberative bodies and one body which negotiates possible disarmament conventions.

The present system was established at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The two most important measures were the restructuring of the negotiating body which functions in Geneva and the new form

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

which the Disarmament Commission has adopted since then. Aside from the fact that its operations have been made somewhat more concrete, the First Committee's basic modus operandi is essentially the same as it was before.

The Committee on Disarmament is now more representative than it was before 1978. The participation of the five nuclear Powers and the slight increase in the number of non-nuclear countries should, we hope, make it possible for it to function more effectively. Access to the Committee's deliberations by non-member countries has been made easier, and my delegation has often taken advantage of that access. This means that the Geneva Committee is an excellent instrument for progress on disarmament.

Finally, I should like to remind representatives of the words of my delegation as they appear in document A/CN.10/32 of the Disarmament Commission. There we said that in view of the results of the third substantive session of the Commission it would be necessary to consider its mandate at the next special session of the General Assembly. It cannot really be said that during its first three sessions the Commission found its proper identity. It must not be simply a different version of the First Committee, nor must it simply have the negotiating characteristics of the Committee on Disarmament. It is an illusion to maintain that it deals with certain concrete questions, for it has not found a positive solution to any of the problems submitted to it.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

That is why we must face the question whether its existence truly meets a definite need, and if it does then we must ask whether the work it has achieved during its three sessions is sufficiently satisfactory. If it is deemed desirable for it to continue to meet, we feel that it is inevitable that we examine our consciences and seek fresh objectives to justify its existence. At the present time, the proliferation of international meetings devoted to disarmament has been such that thought should be given to the problem, since adding further work to an already busy calendar causes problems that are very difficult to solve.

I fear that I may not have been very optimistic with respect to both the progress already made and the proposals that are now being made in the field of disarmament, but I do not believe that there is cause for satisfaction at the present time. I think it is time that we faced the harsh realities and that we must never fail to realize that within this Organization we can make a more effective contribution than we have so far made to the cause of peace and the well-being of the peoples of the world.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last speaker for this afternoon. I shall now call on representatives who wish to exercise the right of reply. I remind members that at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly it was decided that the first statement in exercise of the right of reply by any delegation on any question or item at a given meeting should be limited to 10 minutes, and any second statement to five minutes.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): I regret that it becomes necessary for my delegation to intervene once again to set straight the record of these proceedings.

In the statement this morning of the representative of the German Democratic Republic this Committee was again treated to another series of statements which no doubt all sound very similar. This should, of course, come as a surprise to no one. No doubt we will have to endure several more.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

The lack of veracity of these statements is more evident, for example, from the blatant distortion in the statement of the representative of the German Democratic Republic about what Ambassador Adelman said in this Committee about the Baruch Plan only two days ago. Ambassador Adelman said:

"The very best chance for mankind came when the United States alone possessed nuclear weapons and when the United States alone sought and planned to place those dastardly weapons in the hands of the international community.

"That was the Baruch Plan of June 1946, in which the United States proposed that the United Nations establish an international atomic development authority to ensure full exploitation of the peaceful potential of atomic energy and to ensure full security of all States from any atomic attack. The United States unilaterally offered to dispose of its atomic weapons - the only existing such weapons in the world then - to accept the total ban on all manufacturing or use of such weapons and to turn over to the international community all our scientific and technological knowledge on atomic energy, peaceful or military. All that the United States was fully willing to do."

(A/C.1/36/PV.4, p. 68)

But the delegation of the German Democratic Republic seems to think that the memories of the members of this Committee are very short, or indeed worse. In his statement he claimed:

"...the representative of the United States declared in this Committee that it would have been best for mankind if the United States had retained its monopoly over nuclear weapons". (A/C.1/36/PV.7, p. 11)

This twisting of facts is characteristic of the entire statement made by the representative of the German Democratic Republic and of statements made by those who are either already singing the same tune or who will soon join the choir. I might say, however, that 19 references in the 17-page statement to the Committee this morning by the German Democratic Republic to a foreign country and lengthy passages from statements by the leader of that country leave no doubt as to where the tune has been composed.

Mr. KRUTZSCH (German Democratic Republic): In exercising its right of reply, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic wishes to state the following in regard to the statement just made by the representative of the United States.

My delegation quoted from a statement by the representative of the United States in which praise was heaped on the time when the United States held a monopoly of nuclear weapons and tried with the help of the Baruch Plan to keep this monopoly. This was long ago, and nowadays it is clear that there is no chance of the United States gaining military superiority to subdue the rest of the world and bring it under its domination again.

There is an unavoidable danger in such attempts, danger for the peace of the world and for the very existence of mankind. Since tangible measures of disarmament, especially in the nuclear field, are the only reasonable way to avoid the danger of a nuclear holocaust, we cannot accept any excuses for blocking those measures. Even measures in the nuclear field that are labelled questions of the highest priority in United Nations decisions and resolutions, like the comprehensive test ban, are nowadays directly rejected by the United States delegation as matters for negotiation.

(Mr. Krutzsch, German Democratic Republic)

A thorough assessment of the United States statement on disarmament made in this Committee makes it clear to everybody that the United States is not ready to recognize the right of all Members of the United Nations to participate in the solution of the most urgent disarmament problems. As a result the United Nations will be incapacitated.

The same is true in the case of the Committee on Disarmament. Which measures of nuclear disarmament is the United States delegation willing to discuss in that unique multilateral negotiating body? I have heard of none. The United States is going back on resolutions and decisions unanimously adopted by the United Nations at its first special session devoted to disarmament. It is presenting new priorities for negotiations on disarmament and is not prepared to discuss proposals and initiatives aimed at the implementation of the Programme of Action.

Be that as it may, if there is a clear will on the part of the United States to do everything possible to avoid a nuclear war, we expect a positive attitude concerning the Programme of Action unanimously adopted at the first special session and on proposals and initiatives aimed at implementing them.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.