

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



UNITED NATIONS
CENTRE FOR DISARMAMENT
DEPARTMENT OF
POLITICAL AND SECURITY COUNCIL AFFAIRS
Reference Library
Dist. GENERAL



A/CN.10/PV.11
15 May 1979

ENGLISH

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 15 May 1979, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. VELLODI

(India)

- General exchange of views (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

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

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: I wish once again to remind those representatives who desire to participate in the general exchange of views but have not so far inscribed their names on the list to do so before 5 p.m. today.

I would inform the Commission that more than 40 representatives have inscribed their names on the list. Starting with tomorrow morning's meeting, the speaker lists will be quite substantial. I would therefore suggest that we try to meet punctually at 10.30 a.m. and 3 p.m. It is very important that we use all the time at our disposal.

To continue the general exchange of views, I call upon the representative of Sweden.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): Mr. Chairman, may I first say how glad we are that the Disarmament Commission has started its first substantive session under your very able leadership. I wish to assure you of my delegation's full co-operation in this endeavour.

General and complete disarmament under effective international control remains the ultimate objective of our disarmament efforts. Today this goal appears to be at least as distant as ever before. The partial approach, by now pursued for almost two decades, has admittedly produced some limited results, and some political and confidence-building effects have been achieved. Although not devoid of significance, these limited measures have not moved the world closer to general and complete disarmament. On the contrary, the arms race, particularly in the nuclear field, continues unabated and by far outstrips the efforts to curb it.

In this context a matter of particular concern to the Swedish Government is the fact that in recent years the arms race has been transformed from a race in quantities into a race in qualities. Almost half a million scientists and technicians the world over are at the present time giving their talents to military research and development. It appears that whenever disarmament negotiations are approaching an agreement new achievements in weaponry technology

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

threaten to destabilize the situation, further darkening the road leading to general and complete disarmament. In our deliberations regarding the long-term aspects of the disarmament efforts, the impact of this trend should be duly considered.

Sometimes one has the feeling that the complexity of the immediate disarmament problems diverts our attention from the long-range perspective of the matter. It is, however, the view of the Swedish Government that we must continue our search for a common basis for progress towards general and complete disarmament. In order to reach effective agreements on important individual measures it is of use to formulate a strategy for disarmament. Such a strategy should not aim at a general agreement in one stroke, but it should seek a formula that as far as possible unites agreements on specific measures into an integrated whole. These measures, which taken together would over a period lead to general and complete disarmament, may be decided upon in the form of multilateral, regional or bilateral agreements. A comprehensive programme of disarmament should consequently embrace not only the work of the Committee on Disarmament but also that of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and other relevant United Nations organs and all negotiations and other important activities in the matter, in whatever forum they may take place. Such a programme should furthermore include effective procedures in order to facilitate the co-ordination of such activities and ensure that the United Nations General Assembly is kept informed on their progress. The General Assembly would then be able properly to perform its functions, including the constant evaluation of the situation.

Over the years a large number of proposals has been made as to the content of a comprehensive programme of disarmament and the methods directed towards its elaboration. Although no general agreement exists, some significant achievements on the subjects have been registered. The agreement in 1961 between the United States and the Soviet Union on a programme of general and complete disarmament constitutes a decisive turning-point in the disarmament efforts. It lays down in broad terms the ultimate goals for a disarmed world and designs the general outlines of a systematic and effective disarmament process. That document, known as the McCloy-Zorin agreement, is of great importance, although it was unfortunately not pursued and consummated. Since that agreement identifies and

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

establishes the main elements of a comprehensive programme, it should, in the view of the Swedish Government, be taken into account in the elaboration of such a programme.

Several proposals on the matter were submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Permit me to recall only one of them, the draft comprehensive programme of disarmament which Sweden, Mexico and Yugoslavia submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in 1970. That draft in many respects still reflects the views of the Swedish Government. Because of events since 1970, however, a number of changes and additions have, of course, been made.

In order to clarify the position of the Swedish Government in this context, I wish to dwell for a moment on our understanding of the task ahead of us. The programme of action of the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament urgently calls for a gradual but effective process of disarmament. That programme constitutes a fresh starting-point containing a selection of measures which, as the wording goes, "should be implemented over the next few years". The comprehensive programme, on the other hand, should, as we see it, be a general plan for a process of disarmament negotiations leading towards the final objective, general and complete disarmament.

In paragraph 118 (a) of the Final Document of the special session, the United Nations Disarmament Commission is requested, inter alia, to consider the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament. Our task in this body is, consequently, to establish elements of a comprehensive programme, while it is the responsibility of the Committee on Disarmament to elaborate and negotiate the programme as such.

The measures and priorities in the Final Document of the special session were decided at the highest political level of the international community. They should therefore be accepted as the basis for our efforts to elaborate elements for a comprehensive programme for disarmament.

When setting time-tables in such a programme it is essential to keep in mind that the dynamics of disarmament negotiations and political developments in general make accurate advance appraisal hardly possible. While strict time frames may be justified in short-term programmes, a relatively flexible approach seems advisable at least for non-immediate stages with regard to a programme leading all the way to the ultimate objective.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

Guiding principles aimed at strengthening the political momentum are an essential element of a comprehensive programme. The declaration in the Final Document of the special session contains such principles, which seem relevant also in the long-term perspective. I will touch upon a few of those principles that we consider to be of fundamental importance in this context.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

The principle of balanced disarmament should be kept in mind. The adoption of disarmament measures should take place in such an equitable and balanced manner as to ensure the right of each State to security. No individual State or group of States should obtain military advantages over others at any stage. In each phase the objective should be to preserve security at the lowest possible level of armaments and military forces. The concept of balanced disarmament should, however, not be given too narrow an interpretation. Disarmament measures should be broadly assessed, taking into account the combined effects of both quantitative and qualitative elements.

Verification methods form an indispensable part of disarmament measures. When such methods are being elaborated, it must be recognized that full certainty can never be obtained by any such system. Methods which give less than full certainty may, however, provide sufficient deterrence against deliberate violations of agreed obligations. Also, a combination of several methods reinforcing one another could give adequate assurance that a certain disarmament measure is being observed by all parties.

It should also be emphasized that various kinds of confidence-building measures could become effective means either for facilitating the conclusion of disarmament agreements or, in specific circumstances, for complementing them. A broad outlook on security concepts among nations should inspire the confidence-building efforts. My Government believes that confidence comes from consistent conduct on the part of States, from their respect for agreements, pledges and international norms, from responsible action in all areas of friction and from unilateral restraint. Further progress is needed and should be possible with regard to specific agreed confidence-building measures of the kind considered in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

It is necessary to release the real resources now being used for military purposes for use in economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of developing countries. The objective should be to ensure that concrete disarmament measures can contribute to the establishment of the New International Economic Order. The United Nations study on the relationship between disarmament

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

and economic and social development is aimed at formulating practical measures for the reallocation at the local, national, regional and international levels of such resources as are now used for military purposes.

In this context I wish briefly to comment also on agenda item 5, regarding military budgets. In the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament, it is stated that

"Gradual reduction of military budgets on a mutually agreed basis, for example, in absolute figures or in terms of percentage points ... would be a measure that would contribute to the curbing of the arms race."
(A/S-10/4, para. 89)

The efforts to establish such a "mutually agreed basis" should be pursued, and the Swedish Government welcomes the fact that the United Nations Disarmament Commission will now consider the matter with a view to arriving at some recommendations on the subject, irrespective of which formula is eventually arrived at as the "agreed basis". My Government firmly believes that for practical implementation it is imperative to design a mechanism or a procedure by which military expenditure can be defined and evaluated and which would permit meaningful comparisons between different systems of military budgeting and provide a basis for analyses of trends in military spending. The framework of such a procedure has been elaborated by experts appointed by the Secretary-General and presented in General Assembly document A/31/222. That document provides a clear exposition of the budgeting and accounting problems involved and contains a matrix for standardized reporting on military expenditures.

At the thirty-third session the United Nations General Assembly decided, in resolution 33/67, that a practical test of the reporting instrument should be carried out by an ad hoc panel of experienced practitioners in the field of military budgeting. The Ad Hoc Panel has been set up by the Secretary-General and is now holding its first meeting. The task of the Ad Hoc Panel is not an easy one, and I wish to express my Government's hope for the co-operation of a sufficient number of States with different economic and budgeting systems in the carrying out of the pilot test.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

I now turn to the specific subjects which, in our view, should be given priority in a comprehensive disarmament programme.

First, the Swedish Government regards nuclear disarmament as the most urgent task on the international agenda. Negotiations of agreements are urgently required in accordance with the outlines embodied in paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament.

In the context of nuclear disarmament, the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT) occupy a key role. Even if a SALT II treaty does not entail substantial reductions of arsenals and qualitative restraints, we have no doubt that it will be of great significance. As the Swedish Prime Minister has declared, we greet with satisfaction the fact that the negotiations on SALT II between the United States and the Soviet Union have now in all essentials been concluded. It is vital that the negotiation process continue in respect of the strategic arsenals both in order to create confidence and to reach more decisive results. That is why my Government stresses that a SALT II treaty must be speedily followed by a substantial SALT III agreement.

Another aspect concerns the inclusion in actual negotiations of weapons that have so far not been directly dealt with in bilateral or multilateral forums. My Government has on previous occasions focused attention on those so-called grey-area systems of nuclear weapons which fall outside the SALT II negotiations but which in one way or another have to be included in future negotiations on the reduction of nuclear weapons.

Since nuclear disarmament is the concern of all States, it is important that the principal forum for multilateral negotiations be fully utilized for the implementation of a comprehensive programme. Against this background the Swedish Government has welcomed the multilateral approach to nuclear disarmament negotiations suggested by seven members of the Committee on Disarmament. This proposal to initiate consultations and negotiations on nuclear disarmament in the Committee on Disarmament involves a number of extremely difficult political and technical problems which should be further explored and discussed. But it is essential that the Committee on Disarmament should be a central forum for such nuclear disarmament negotiations.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

A comprehensive nuclear test ban would constitute an important first step towards nuclear disarmament by restricting the further technological development of nuclear weapons. This matter has the highest priority on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament and should remain a matter of utmost urgency.

The prevention of the further proliferation of nuclear weapons -- quantitatively as well as qualitatively -- remains a critical problem for the international community. Effective non-proliferation measures are therefore needed. Real progress towards nuclear disarmament has great significance with regard to the efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons to additional States. Effective guarantees including full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards are required so that nuclear energy is used for peaceful purposes only.

Secondly, the elements of a comprehensive programme should include the question of chemical weapons. The efforts under way in the Committee on Disarmament to initiate real negotiations on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons should be pursued with a view to the early conclusion of an agreement.

Thirdly, the limitation and reduction of the production of and trade in conventional weapons should be an essential element within the framework of progress towards general and complete disarmament. Various approaches could be considered on a bilateral, regional or multilateral basis. In this context efforts should be made to curb the accelerating international arms trade.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

Let me conclude where I started by again calling attention to the increasingly important qualitative aspect of the arms race. This aspect should to a larger extent be brought into actual negotiations. Whenever scientific discoveries of indisputable relevance occur and there is reasonable ground for fears that they will be used for military purposes, adequate countermeasures are justified. In elaborating elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme, therefore, it seems natural to take account of the need to strengthen political control over the military research and development sector so as to counter the dangers of military applications of scientific advances.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): Mr. Chairman, may I first say that it gives great satisfaction to my delegation to see this first substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission under your able chairmanship. Your long and rich experience in the field of disarmament deliberations and negotiations and your qualities of head and heart which are well known to my delegation and to me personally will, I am sure, make certain the successful outcome of these meetings.

While this Commission is about to embark upon its work significant developments seem to be taking place in disarmament negotiations. To my delegation those signs give reason for feeling encouraged. The most important of those developments is, of course, the announcement of the imminent conclusion of a treaty on the limitation of strategic weapons by the Soviet Union and the United States. That is a measure for which the General Assembly has consistently called. It would seem natural, therefore, that this Commission, having identical membership with the General Assembly and being the first disarmament forum to convene after that announcement, should in an appropriate way be responsive to the imminent achievement of a SALT II treaty and express its expectation of its rapid implementation.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

When the General Assembly at its tenth special session decided to revive the Disarmament Commission and assign it a specific mandate, the Commission was given a substantive and useful role as a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly. More clearly than ever before, the special session underscored the interest of the entire international community in disarmament. The Assembly there agreed on an overriding principle: all States have the right to benefit from disarmament and, equally, all States have the obligation to contribute to efforts towards it. The decision to re-establish the Disarmament Commission reflected the desire of an increasing number of nations to contribute towards halting the arms race. My delegation is confident that the Commission will prove to be an important forum for channelling the efforts of all its members in the search for disarmament and greater international security.

In reviewing and revising the international disarmament machinery, the intent of the special session was to make it more efficient while at the same time ensuring wider participation in it. The enlarged Committee on Disarmament will continue as the main multilateral negotiating body. That is as it should be. It is the task of that body to produce agreements on tangible disarmament measures, as indeed its predecessor did. Thus the exclusive concentration of the Committee on Disarmament on concrete negotiable issues should take precedence over any other matter. In the view of my delegation, the Committee is at present rightly focusing on questions to which the international community has accorded priority.

The special session also clarified the profile of the First Committee. The status of the First Committee as the main deliberative organ was reaffirmed. Henceforth that Committee will discuss solely disarmament matters and closely related security questions. Essentially, the task of the First Committee - or, properly speaking, the General Assembly - is to guide the international disarmament machinery and assess its performance.

The role of this Commission might best be characterized as reflective. As no work related to disarmament can be pursued in isolation, there should be constant interaction among the various parts of the disarmament machinery. Thus, while contributing to the work of other bodies, the Commission should also draw on

and reflect that work. My delegation believes that this body, by virtue of its mandate and its organizational links, will not work in isolation but will constitute an integral part of the international disarmament machinery. Although comprehensive in its approach, the Commission will complement the work of the General Assembly by focusing its attention on elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

It follows from what I have just said that there is a clear division of functions among the various parts of the disarmament machinery. First, the General Assembly is the supreme deliberative body and has the power to recommend and criticize. Secondly, the Committee on Disarmament is not only the main but also the only multilateral body for negotiations in this system. And, thirdly, the Disarmament Commission is a body for consideration and reflection with a concisely defined mandate of its own.

The agenda which the Commission tentatively agreed upon at its session last December and which it adopted yesterday consists of three main substantive items. It was agreed in December that the first item - the consideration of elements of a comprehensive programme - would be accorded priority at this session. This agreement is in harmony with the mandate of the Commission. In our view, the Commission would do well in limiting its work on what is expressly requested of it, that is, the consideration of elements of a comprehensive programme. And in this connexion I should like to agree completely with what was said this morning by the representative of Mexico, Ambassador Garcia Robles, on this particular point.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

But the consideration of the elements of a comprehensive programme is a vast undertaking. Therefore, the Commission should devote some time and thought to how it could fulfil its mandate in a most appropriate and effective way. My delegation suggests that the Commission concentrate in this session on those areas on which agreement on priorities and the outlines of substance have already been reached. In this, the Commission should fully benefit from the Final Document of the special session.

Among the areas of priority, the question of nuclear disarmament will probably constitute a major part in the consideration of elements for a comprehensive programme. That this should be so is even more obvious in the light of the second substantive item on the Commission's agenda, which deals with the halting of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and with nuclear disarmament.

In this context, my delegation would find it important that such aspects as the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime and the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones be included in the work of the Commission.

The third item addresses itself to the reduction of military spending and the reallocation of military resources to economic and social development. As my delegation has stated on previous occasions, the links between disarmament and development make disarmament imperative for the international community. Most appropriately, the Commission could, in due time, profit from the work of the group of governmental experts on the relationship between disarmament and development, when results from that group are available.

Those are the considerations my delegation wanted to offer to the Commission at this stage. I have not elaborated on our substantive position because, in its reply to the Secretary-General my Government has already expounded its views on the purpose and scope of a comprehensive programme. In that reply we also made a number of suggestions concerning elements for such a programme.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

My delegation has often described its approach to disarmament with the word "pragmatic". We believe that the main attention should at all times be given to negotiations that aim at practical results in the form of arms limitation and disarmament measures. The other component bodies of the disarmament machinery, while reviewing and guiding the efforts towards disarmament, should fashion their activities in a manner that would enhance the efficacy of disarmament negotiations.

In this perspective we see the work towards a comprehensive programme of disarmament as an important, positive undertaking. Such a programme could be called a frame of reference for the international disarmament machinery and its component bodies. In the view of my delegation, the consideration of its elements should thus be geared to giving guidance to the international disarmament machinery. Although a comprehensive programme would, by definition, aim at general and complete disarmament, its elements can best be translated into a plan of action if emphasis is given to relatively short-term measures. Such a time span could appropriately be the period up to the second special session on disarmament in 1982.

Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Mr. Chairman, allow me, first of all, to express my warm congratulations to Your Excellency on your election as Chairman of the current session.

The first substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, which is set up by decision of the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, is another highly representative disarmament conference after that special session devoted to disarmament. The establishment of the Commission reflects the strong dissatisfaction of the third world and all small and medium-sized countries with the intensified arms race between the super-Powers and their fierce rivalry for hegemony. It also reflects the serious concern of these countries about the growing tension in the world today and their eager desire to eliminate the danger of war and safeguard world peace. The Chinese delegation is

(Mr. Lai Ya-li, China)

attending the session with a positive and constructive attitude and will do its bit towards making the session a success. We hope that the current session will lay a good foundation for the future work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the rest of the disarmament machinery, formulate sound principles and guidelines and contribute usefully to the cause of safeguarding world peace and security.

Our present session is being held at a time when the international situation is undergoing new changes. In discussing and drawing up a comprehensive disarmament programme, we must proceed from realities and an accurate appraisal of the situation, point out a correct orientation and lay down correct principles for the struggle of the people of all countries for disarmament so that it can really help uphold world peace and security. Since the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament last May, the international situation has further developed, not towards relaxation, but towards greater tension. The factors making for war have continued to grow, and the whole world has found itself in greater turbulence and unrest. A salient feature of this development is the continued intensification of the arms race between the two super-Powers. The military expenditures of the Soviet Union and the United States have kept rising year after year. Those of each already exceeded \$US 100 billion in 1978, and they are increasing by wide margins. Those of the two countries taken together surpass the aggregate of the military expenses of the more than 150 other countries. At present, their strategic nuclear arms race centred around MIRVs is becoming ever fiercer. Each of them has in the past year increased its strategic nuclear warheads by more than a thousand, and the Soviet Union has deployed large numbers of new-type guided missiles, including SS-20s and strategic bombers. Both of them are stepping up the renewal of their strategic weapons and developing those of a new generation in a mad drive for nuclear superiority. The recent agreement on SALT II reached between the United States and the Soviet Union, like similar agreements reached earlier, cannot cover up, and still less limit, the

(Mr. Lai Ya-li, China)

intensified nuclear arms race between them. At the same time, they are continuing to expand and renew their conventional arms and vying with each other in developing new weapons of mass destruction and chemical weapons. In a word, both the nuclear and conventional arsenals of the super-Powers are rapidly increasing. A new round of the arms race between the super-Powers was well on its way before the ink of the resolution of the special session had dried. Another sign of great turbulence in the international situation is the fact that the super Powers have stepped up their policies of aggression and expansion by relying on their massive military strength. The one that boasts of its global "offensive strategy" shows a more vigorous momentum in expansion. Reaching out its hands everywhere, it has accelerated its strategic plan for world domination. While increasing its military threat to Europe, it is energetically pushing a policy of southward drive, seeking breakthroughs in Africa and the Middle East in an attempt to outflank and encircle Europe.

(Mr. Lai Ya-li, China)

It has also carried out a series of expansionist activities in South Asia and South-East Asia in an ambitious attempt to establish an "Asian Collective Security System". It is using every possible means to achieve its end, from scheming for subversion to "divide and control", war by proxy and flagrant support to armed aggression and indefinite military occupation. All this goes to show that the danger of war resulting from super-Power hegemonistic policies is ever more seriously threatening the people of the world.

We hold that, in the present situation, the people of the world must combine their struggle for disarmament with that against aggression, expansion and hegemonism. We should call on the super-Powers to assume disarmament commitments, but at the same time we should do much down-to-earth work in other fields and fight constantly against the super-Power policies of aggression and expansion. Only thus will we be able to prevent world war and safeguard international peace and security.

The Chinese Government and people are always in favour of genuine disarmament. We firmly support all the reasonable disarmament proposals made by the small and medium-sized countries. We on our part not only have advanced a number of positive disarmament proposals but also have taken practical actions which are in accord with the desire and interests of the people of the world. We have done so in the past and will continue to do so in future.

Now allow me to submit to the session for consideration the Chinese delegation's proposal on the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. First, I shall read out the full text of the proposal.

"Chinese delegation's proposal on the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament

"I. Objective of the comprehensive programme of disarmament:

"The objective of the comprehensive programme of disarmament is, by formulating reasonable principles and practical and effective measures for disarmament, to promote real progress in disarmament, oppose a new world war and all armed aggression and safeguard international peace and security.

"II. The programme should include the following main principles:

"(1) For the purpose of safeguarding international peace and security, relations between States must be based on the principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression,

(Mr. Lai Ya-li, China)

non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful coexistence. No State may seek hegemony in any form and in any part of the world or subject other States to aggression, interference, subversion, expansion or control. No disarmament measure may impair the sovereignty, independence and security of any State.

"(2) In order to safeguard the security of all States, the two States with the largest nuclear and conventional arsenals have the primary responsibility for disarmament and should be the first to reduce their armaments. When they have drastically reduced their nuclear and conventional armaments and closed the huge gap between them and the other nuclear States and militarily significant States, the other nuclear States and militarily significant States should join them in reducing armaments according to reasonable ratios.

"(3) It is imperative to bring about the complete prohibition and total destruction of nuclear weapons so as truly to eliminate the danger of nuclear war. While nuclear disarmament is being considered, equal importance should be given to the question of reducing the super-Powers' ever-growing arsenals of conventional armaments, and disarmament in these two fields should be carried out in conjunction. Full attention should also be paid to the prohibition and destruction of biological and chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

"(4) The actual process of disarmament should benefit the economic and social development of States. The super-Powers are spending huge sums on the arms race, which not only increases the danger of war and jeopardizes international peace and security, but also hinders the establishment of a new international economic order. Their military expenditures account for two thirds of the military budgets of all countries put together, so it is only natural that they should be called on first of all to reduce greatly their military expenditures and to make real contributions to aiding the developing countries.

"(5) No disarmament measure may prejudice the right of States to make use of modern scientific and technological achievements to promote their economic development. The super-Powers must be prevented from using disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as pretexts to

(Mr. Lai Ya-li, China)

deprive other States of their right to use nuclear energy and to develop their nuclear industries for peaceful purposes.

"(6) While formulating more comprehensive disarmament measures, importance should be attached to limited-scope measures, including regional measures. Zones of peace or nuclear-weapon-free zones shall be established in the light of the specific conditions prevailing in different parts of the world and the desire of the States in the regions concerned. These zones shall be free from rivalry for hegemony between the super-Powers, foreign military presence in all its forms, all armed occupation of other countries' territory and direct or indirect armed intervention and the threat of force. All nuclear States shall unconditionally undertake not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against these zones.

"(7) The question of disarmament concerns the security and interests of all States and should be discussed and settled by all States on an equal footing. The organization and procedures of the disarmament machinery should be democratized; they should be free from super-Power manipulation and control and should fully reflect the demands and wishes of all States in the world.

"(8) The role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament should be strengthened. The United Nations General Assembly shall be kept informed of progress in all bilateral and multilateral disarmament negotiations. All parties to disarmament negotiations should earnestly consider and respect the recommendations and calls made by the General Assembly.

"(9) Disarmament agreements should provide for strict and effective measures of international control to ensure their effective implementation. No control or verification measure may prejudice the sovereignty and security of any State.

(Mr. Lai Ya-li, China)

"(10) The people of the world should be fully informed about the intensification of the arms race between the super-Powers, the increasing danger of war and the lack of progress in disarmament in order to get active mass participation in the struggle for disarmament and the defence of world peace.

"III. The comprehensive programme of disarmament should provide for the following main measures:

"(1) Nuclear disarmament

"1. The ultimate aim of nuclear disarmament is the complete prohibition and total destruction of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery.

"2. Pending agreement by the nuclear States on the non-use of nuclear weapons, all nuclear States, the two States with the largest nuclear arsenals in particular, shall unconditionally undertake not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-weapon-free zones.

"3. The two States with the largest nuclear arsenals shall immediately stop their nuclear arms race, cease all activities aimed at improving the quality and increasing the quantity of their nuclear weapons and begin to reduce and destroy their nuclear weapons by stages. When substantial progress has been made in the destruction of their nuclear weapons, thus closing the huge gap between their nuclear arsenals and those of the other nuclear States to the satisfaction of the majority of States, the other nuclear States shall then join them in negotiations for the total destruction of nuclear weapons.

"(2) Reduction of conventional weapons

"1. As a step preceding the reduction of conventional weapons, the two States with the largest conventional arsenals shall renounce military intervention in and threat of force against other States, both direct and indirect, withdraw all their troops stationed abroad and dismantle all their military bases on foreign soil.

(Mr. Lai Ya-li, China)

"2. The two States with the largest conventional arsenals shall first greatly reduce their conventional weapons and equipment. They can start by reducing the number of such heavy weapons as tanks, aircraft, warships and artillery. When substantial progress has been made in this regard, the other militarily significant States shall join them in reducing conventional armaments according to reasonable ratios.

"(3) Prohibition of chemical and biological weapons

"1. All chemical and biological weapons shall be completely prohibited and totally destroyed. Pending the attainment of this goal, all States shall unequivocally undertake not to use any chemical or biological weapons.

"2. A convention on the complete prohibition and total destruction of all chemical and biological weapons shall be negotiated and concluded as soon as possible.

"(4) Prohibition of all new weapons of mass destruction

The two super-Powers shall immediately stop the research, development and production of all new weapons of mass destruction and renounce their use.

"(5) Establishment of zones of peace

"1. At the request of the States in the region, South-East Asia should be declared a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality. All attempts by any State to seek any form of hegemony in this zone are prohibited, all foreign troops shall be withdrawn, all foreign military bases dismantled and all foreign aggression, expansion, interference and control eliminated.

"2. The position of declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace should be respected by all States, the two super-Powers in particular. Activities of rivalry for hegemony between the super-Powers must be put an end to. The independence and sovereignty of the littoral and hinterland States there should be strictly respected. There must be no military threat, aggression or expansion in any form directed against these States.

"3. In conformity with the desire of the countries in the region, the Mediterranean should be declared a zone of peace.

(Mr. Lai Ya-li, China)

"(6) Nuclear-weapon-free zones

"1. All nuclear States shall respect the status of the nuclear-weapon-free zones and unconditionally undertake not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against these zones.

"2. The status of the nuclear-free zone in Latin America shall be respected by all States.

"3. In conformity with the common desires of the States in the respective regions, nuclear-weapon-free zones shall be established in the Middle East, Africa, South Asia etc."

Now, I wish to make some additional remarks on some of the important principles put forth in our proposal.

First, we propose that, whether in drawing up a programme or in deliberating or negotiating the whole disarmament question, we should follow the basic principle that the two super-Powers should be the first to reduce their armaments. This principle should be applied in all aspects of disarmament and should be the chief criterion for judging whether there is real progress in disarmament. This principle reflects objective reality and is in accord with the eager desire of the small and medium-sized countries; it is perfectly reasonable. The present reality is that the two super-Powers, and not any other countries, are maintaining armaments at the highest level in the world. They station a large number of troops and set up many military bases abroad, and they have organized the biggest military blocs. Only they really have the capacity to start a new world war. It is therefore right and proper that the two super-Powers should be the first to reduce their armaments. Their lack of good faith is the crucial reason why there has been no progress in disarmament for such a long time.

While insisting on this principle, we do not mean to say that other countries need not reduce their armaments. The two super-Powers must be the first to take disarmament steps so long as they have a huge military superiority over other countries. When substantial and satisfactory progress has truly been made in the reduction of their armaments, the other nuclear States and militarily significant States should join them in reducing armaments according to agreed procedures and in reasonable ratios. Do not the super-Powers

(Mr. Lai Ya-li, China)

advocate the principles of "equal security", "balance" and "not seeking unilateral advantages" in disarmament? If it is said that the security of the Soviet Union and the United States depends on the maintenance of a balance of strength between them, do not the small and medium-sized countries, which are threatened by the great military preponderance of the Soviet Union and the United States, have all the more right, for their own security, to demand that these two countries be the first to reduce their armaments? So it is clear that, even judging by the American and Russian arguments, our proposed principle is indisputable.

However, the super-Powers have deliberately proposed that all nuclear States stop producing nuclear weapons and that the permanent members of the Security Council freeze their conventional armaments and armed forces. They assert that everybody has a share in the arms race and that, therefore, there should be "general disarmament" by all countries. This is only a clumsy tactic to disguise their refusal to reduce their armaments.

(Mr. Lai Ya-li, China)

One may ask, why put the other countries lacking defensive capabilities on a par with the super-Powers, which are armed to the teeth? Why do they cling to their great superiority in armaments? Obviously not for the sake of other countries' security, but in order to base their own security on the insecurity of other countries. That is why, when it comes to the security of other countries, they completely forget about "equal security" and the other principles they have advocated.

World opinion should be mobilized to call on the Soviet Union and the United States to act on their nice words about willingness to reduce their armaments. Only thus will it be possible to have real progress in disarmament.

Secondly, with regard to the order of priority of disarmament measures, we hold that, though nuclear disarmament is important, conventional disarmament should be given equal importance, and that the two should be carried out in conjunction. Adequate attention should also be given to the question of chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

China is firmly opposed to nuclear war, and it has always stood for the complete prohibition and total destruction of nuclear weapons as the fundamental way to save mankind from the scourge of nuclear war. For this purpose we have put forward a number of important proposals, including the non-use of nuclear weapons and the first reduction of the armaments of the super-Powers. But the super-Powers have responded to none of them. On the contrary, they have tried by hook or by crook to obstruct the realization of this basic goal so as to continue with their policies of nuclear threat and blackmail.

It must be stressed that in order to eliminate the danger of war mere nuclear disarmament is obviously not enough and conventional armaments must also be reduced. While engaged in their nuclear arms race, the super-Powers are vigorously increasing their heavy conventional weapons, including tanks, bombers, aircraft carriers and artillery, and developing new ones. Each of them is devoting 80 per cent of its huge military spending to the conventional arms race. Nuclear arms and conventional arms equally endanger world peace and security. People will not forget that both world wars were started with conventional weapons, and that since 1945 the wars which have taken place in various parts of the world have all been fought with conventional weapons. At present, the

(Mr. Lai Ya-li, China)

super-Power which has already attained superiority in conventional armaments still spares no effort in increasing and developing conventional weapons. While using nuclear weapons as a strategic deterrent, it is using conventional weapons as a means to carry out aggression and expansion everywhere. That is why it has tried its utmost to delay and obstruct conventional disarmament. Therefore, with a view to safeguarding international peace and security, conventional disarmament and nuclear disarmament should start at the same time and be carried out in conjunction.

Thirdly, disarmament and development are two important goals which were established by United Nations resolutions long ago. In order to carry out arms expansion and war preparations, the super-Powers not only exploit their own peoples and squander enormous human and material resources but also plunder the resources and wealth of other countries by every means and shift their own difficulties on to small and medium-sized countries. Their doings have aggravated inequality in international economic relations, seriously hampered the establishment of a new international economic order and created grave difficulties for the development of many countries. Many small and medium-sized countries demand that the super-Powers forthwith stop their arms race and that funds released through the reduction of armaments be channelled towards the economic and social development of the developing countries. We fully understand and support this just demand. In this sense, there can be a linkage between disarmament and development. But the super-Powers' assertion that "development wholly depends on general and complete disarmament" is obviously made with ulterior motives. We hope that the super-Powers will show by deed some goodwill in aiding the developing countries and not seek to buy cheap fame with pretty verbiage.

Fourthly, we hold that for the purpose of safeguarding international peace and security relations between States must be based on the principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful coexistence. No State may seek hegemony in any form and in any part of the world. We believe that the establishment of zones of peace or nuclear-free zones in accordance with the desire of the States in various parts of the world will undoubtedly help to realize these principles. These zones shall be free from

(Mr. Lai Ya-li, China)

foreign military presence in all its forms and direct or indirect armed intervention and the threat of force. All nuclear States shall unconditionally undertake not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against these zones. In this spirit, we give our active support to the propositions for the establishment of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South East Asia, a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean and a zone of peace in the Mediterranean.

Fifthly, we have always held that all countries irrespective of size are equal. We are opposed to the monopoly of international affairs by a few countries. This should also be set down as a principle to be followed in reducing armaments and drawing up the programme. Disarmament and security have a close bearing on the vital interests of all countries. Therefore, all countries, whether big or small, strong or weak, and whether with or without nuclear weapons, are entitled to take part in the settlement of disarmament issues on a completely equal footing. It must be pointed out, however, that more often than not the past disarmament machinery was controlled by the super-Powers while the majority of States were either excluded or reduced to the passive position of onlookers. An end must be put to this abnormal state of affairs. It is worthy of welcome that the process of structural reform started by the special session last year has in a way reflected some reasonable demands of the small and medium-sized countries. A case in point is the establishment of this United Nations Disarmament Commission. From the very beginning we have given it our support and co-operation. As for the new Committee on Disarmament, though it is not without shortcomings it has undergone some change and is still in the process of change. We wish to take a forward-looking attitude towards it, and we regard with sympathy the small and medium-sized countries waging a struggle there. Incidentally, we have noticed that the new Committee on Disarmament, at its first session, observing the decision of the special session, reserved a seat for China. In due time we will be prepared to take a direct part in the work of the Committee. We wish to see the Committee on Disarmament taking a warning from the past Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and advancing in a correct direction.

(Mr. Lai Ya-li, China)

Apart from the above-mentioned points, our proposal contains a number of other principles and propositions which we shall not elaborate here. We shall make further explanations when the necessity arises.

China is a peace-loving country, and the Chinese people ardently love peace. Like the people of other countries, the Chinese people are firmly opposed to a new world war. This is no expediency but a fundamental principle of our foreign policy, which is determined by our socialist system. We Chinese people are now working hard to attain the great goal of the four modernizations -- modernization of agriculture, industry, science-technology and national defence. We need a peaceful and stable international environment.

The aim of our multiracial people is to maintain peace and build socialism, and we shall spare no effort to attain this aim. At the same time, we are soberly aware that the danger of world war still exists. We are determined to work together with all peace-loving countries and people in the world for the cause of world peace and human progress.

The CHAIRMAN: As we have decided, the list of speakers will close at 5 o'clock today. I understand from the Secretary of the Commission that we now have on the list for tomorrow, the day after and Friday a total of 50 more delegations wishing to participate in the general exchange of views. In this connexion I wish to point out one fact, which is that almost half of those 50 delegations are inscribed to speak on Friday, and that might create a slight problem for us unless those statements were very brief. I would therefore appeal to those delegations that have put down their names for Friday to try to speak instead either tomorrow or the day after if possible.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.