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The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS (continued)

Mr. PEARSON (Canada): Mr. Chairman, let me first welcome you to the Chair. You yourself as well as your country have contributed much to the cause of disarmament and to the creation of this new body, the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Canada hopes that the United Nations Disarmament Commission will concentrate its efforts on the underlying issues of disarmament and arms control in the framework of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. We foresee a continuing exchange of views both on the elements of the programme as a whole and on those specific elements which from time to time it may be appropriate for us to discuss. Removed from the constraints of actual negotiations, which are the province of the Committee on Disarmament, and of an agenda which is oriented towards action on resolutions, which is the role of the First Committee, this Commission gives the opportunity to explore all national views in some depth and in an atmosphere of relative serenity.

My Government welcomes this opportunity to comment on the concept and the practical implications of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

The idea of a comprehensive programme of disarmament is based on the assumption that the goal of general and complete disarmament is valid and acceptable to all and that in order to reach it a programme of work is desirable. It also assumes that measures of disarmament are interrelated, that they cannot be pursued in isolation, either by region or by system of weapons, without sooner or later impinging on other systems or regions. It is true that some measures of arms control or confidence-building have been and are feasible on their own merits. But these measures, important as they are, do not always slow the arms race, as we know from the experience of the last 15 years.

The dilemma facing us has always been that it is more difficult - and some may think it is impossible - to agree to implement a programme of disarmament as a whole. Earlier attempts to do so have failed. Indeed to
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prefer the best to the good in this field may be to prevent any agreement at all. It has been accepted therefore that a comprehensive programme of disarmament is only one amongst many items on the disarmament agenda. These other items have absorbed our attention now for almost two decades. It was not until the special session on disarmament adopted last year a Programme of Action on disarmament that the concept was finally put into agreed form. The Programme of Action is relatively short term, however, and it lacks definition of the relationship between its elements. The Final Document allocates the task of giving greater coherence to such elements to the United Nations Disarmament Commission, and that is the principal task facing us.

The main components of a comprehensive programme of disarmament are the principles to guide it, the measures to be included, and the stages and format of the negotiations. In the view of my delegation, the United Nations Disarmament Commission should concentrate on achieving consensus on a framework to guide the negotiations proper, which are the responsibility of the Committee on Disarmament. In regard to principles, several Governments have put forward suggestions in working papers submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and the Committee on Disarmament since 1970 and now to the United Nations Disarmament Commission.
It should not be impossible to reach agreement on a short list of such principles. It is for consideration whether the list ought to include a statement of priorities for disarmament. A preliminary step in this regard might be a definition of what is meant by priority — whether it is based on the notion of potential threat, or on the notion of the actual use of weapons, or on the notion of the progress already achieved in negotiations — what is feasible. Account should be taken of the agenda agreed on by the Committee on Disarmament, which is to go forward in any event and which reflects terminology contained in paragraphs 45 and 46 of the Final Document of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament.

In regard to the measures to be included in a comprehensive programme of disarmament there are also a number of lists. A first step might be to consider categories of measures. A first category, as suggested in the six-Power draft of 1970, might be those treaties or agreements already in force or in preparation, to be followed by other measures relating to the cessation of the arms race and then by measures relating to the reduction of armaments. This arrangement of categories has the advantage of following a logical sequence, and it includes both nuclear and non-nuclear weapons in each group, without attempting to make what are sometimes artificial distinctions. My Government would also like to see included a category of associated measures, including those related to the reporting of military expenditures, the exchange of information about military manoeuvres and movements, principles of verification, and regional approaches.

Finally, the comprehensive programme on disarmament might include a category of measures relating to the peaceful settlement of disputes and to keeping the peace. We are not elaborating a programme of general and complete disarmament, but even partial measures of disarmament will be vulnerable to challenge if at the same time progress is not made on alternative security arrangements of a regional or global nature.

We must also try to define what are the procedures to be followed. The Committee on Disarmament is to begin negotiations on certain measures now before it. Studies of disarmament and international security, of disarmament and development, and of other subjects bearing on disarmament are to be completed within two years. Bilateral and regional agreements of various kinds are under negotiation or review.
In this connexion my Government welcomes the conclusion of SALT II and looks forward to early ratification of the agreement. We believe the agreement helps to minimize the risk of nuclear war, to lay the basis for greater confidence between East and West and to encourage further arms control agreements - especially a comprehensive test ban but perhaps indirectly also a complete prohibition on the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction.

In these circumstances a comprehensive programme should be more than simply a catalogue of activities and proposals but less than a definitive programme to be added to these measures for separate negotiation. We agree that it should look forward to the goal of general and complete disarmament and might therefore be divided into phases. The first phase might include those measures already identified in the Final Document of the special session as of high priority, those which strengthen or extend agreements now in force, and those which may serve to prevent the emergence of new factors or trends contributing to the arms race, especially those of a qualitative nature. Canada continues to attach particular importance to measures which will restrain the momentum of the strategic nuclear arms race, a series of measures which at the special session we described as forming a strategy of suffocation. We do not, however, believe that the setting of deadlines will facilitate the reaching of agreement. Rather, we would hope that a comprehensive programme of disarmament will act as a spur to negotiations and as a measuring-rod against which the United Nations can review progress at regular intervals.

If we can reach agreement on the main headings of a comprehensive programme at this meeting of the Commission we shall have made a good start. Let us regard our work as a process of confidence building in itself. Future meetings of the Commission might then fill out, review and examine particular elements of the programme in the light of all the circumstances at the time.
Mr. AL-HAMZAH (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation is very pleased to be able to share the interest that has been shown by other delegations in the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Its establishment represents the reactivation of a very important international initiative that makes it possible for all Members of the United Nations, including my own country and others which various obstacles had prevented from participating in disarmament meetings, to express their own opinions and to participate more effectively by affirming their desire for the achievement of general and complete disarmament, since the achievement of that goal is of concern to all States and peoples large and small.

Despite the fact that concern in our debates must essentially be devoted to the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme, the consideration of certain other matters that are pertinent to the issue may help to develop the over-all disarmament process and to consolidate international peace and security and to increase the prospects of joint co-operation to produce détente in international relations.

The progress that has been achieved in our work will have a very positive influence on ensuring the success of what will be done at the second special session of the General Assembly to be devoted to disarmament, planned for 1982. Furthermore, we are fully convinced that the results of this session of the Commission will contribute to and assist the Geneva Committee on Disarmament and the work of the next session of the General Assembly.

We should emphasize here the possibility that now exists of the conclusion of a new agreement to limit strategic weapons (SALT II) between the Soviet Union and the United States. In the opinion of our delegation, this is a pioneering step forward and a response to the appeals of the General Assembly. It also shows a growing awareness of the responsibility that must be assumed in order to help speed up the achievement of our final objective of complete disarmament.

We should like to express our hope that negotiations for a third round of talks on the limitation of strategic weapons (SALT III) will soon begin. The constituent elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme should include the need to conclude further agreements to achieve this end and should help to speed up the process of complete disarmament under secure international guarantees,
so as to consolidate security in international life and to bring about a New International Economic Order.

In this connexion it is important for the programme to deal with fundamental principles guaranteeing mutual respect among States, joint co-operation, non-interference in the internal affairs of others, the elimination of military bases and aggressive pacts, and affirmation of the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination and to choose their own path to progress, which will guarantee their security and their independence and management of their own wealth without any pressure from outside.
It would also be appropriate for the principle of the non-use or the
threat of force in international relations to occupy an important place, so
that all peoples would be guaranteed the right to enjoy stability and to
be completely protected from any threat of aggression, including the threat
of the use of force under the pretext that their vital interests would be
protected in this way. This principle, if further consolidated in the form
of an international agreement having the binding force of law, would provide
a guarantee for all peoples to be able to devote their efforts to their
independent economic and social development.

We believe that it would also be appropriate to reduce military budgets
and rechannel the tremendous resources saved thereby to deal with the economic
requirements of the developing countries. This is a point to which particular
importance should be attached when efforts are made to formulate the basic
principles forming the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

But the most desirable course in this connexion would be to follow the
guidelines laid down in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the
General Assembly, particularly in paragraphs 25 to 42, in accordance with the
priorities set in paragraph 45 of that document. The comprehensive programme
could then contain a number of elements which have been proposed, and priorities
should be allocated according to the method which has already been defined.

Among those priorities pride of place should be given to the cessation of
the nuclear arms race, since this is the most serious threat to humanity at
the present time. This means that every effort should be bent to avoiding
nuclear war. To this end, it is necessary to curb the use of nuclear weapons,
prohibit nuclear testing and conclude a general agreement to that effect.
Thus we might bring about the end of the arms race and nuclear disarmament once
and for all.

The proposals voiced at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly
regarding the consolidation of guarantees for non-nuclear States and the
non-emplacement of nuclear weapons on the territory of States which do not yet
have such weapons would have a very decisive impact, should they be followed up
by international agreements. This is something else which should be reaffirmed
when the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament are defined.
Regarding weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons, it is important in this connexion to prohibit their use, planning and manufacture and not to help in the manufacture of new systems, in contravention of the process of disarmament. An international convention should be drawn up prohibiting chemical weapons and providing for the destruction of stockpiles of such weapons. It is also important to speed up work along these lines.

Then, there is the question of reducing the conventional arms race, which is also of vital importance in the policies of small and medium-sized States, since military expenditure absorbs a major part of their budget at a time when these States particularly need to reallocate those sums to development purposes. Means must be agreed upon to deal with this problem. It would also be essential to elaborate an international convention prohibiting the utilization of certain conventional weapons which might be considered excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects.

A comprehensive disarmament programme should comprise appropriate solutions of other matters such as the reduction of military forces, for example, and should include steps to carry out verification, as contained in paragraph 31 of the Final Document, as well as establishing a relationship between disarmament and the consolidation of international security. Certain aspects of these questions were considered by the General Assembly of the United Nations at the tenth special session and regular sessions.

Those were some of the points which my delegation wished to make in co-operating in this work and this debate, which provides a general context. We feel, in considering the over-all elements of a comprehensive programme, that it cannot be carried out properly unless there is political will on the part of all States, particularly the nuclear States, and a desire on their part to participate more actively in discussions on disarmament in its various aspects.
Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, we are happy to see you presiding over our debate. Your experience, prestige, dedication and expertise and the devotion of your country to the lofty goals of disarmament are guarantees of the success of our work.

The delegation of Ecuador is present at this Disarmament Commission because of the encouraging mandate, as universal as it is democratic, which the tenth special session of the General Assembly decided to give to this deliberative body, one of its subsidiary organs.

It is hoped that this universality will be evident both when the problems of the item are defined and when the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament are listed, in accordance with agenda item 3, and as indicated in paragraph 118 of the Final Document on machinery; likewise that the nature of the final goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control will also be universal. This Commission will continue to work unstintingly to achieve it.

The programme we seek must include elements covering negotiations and measures both substantive and political, regarding arms limitation and related action to be adopted in other spheres.

In listing the negotiations and measures to be considered, we would mention the following:

Firstly, since the greatest danger for the auto-destruction of mankind is to be found in nuclear weapons stockpiled in macabre fashion and ready for the planetary holocaust which would equally affect peoples large and small, it is up to the two major nuclear Powers to take the responsibility for arriving at concrete disarmament measures as soon as possible. In this respect we are encouraged by the preliminary information on the progress achieved in the second round of strategic arms limitation talks (SALT II) and it is to be hoped that in this world forum we shall know the complete range of that agreement and that it will be followed by others with the participation of other nuclear Powers, since there exists the danger of a hecatomb which might result from the chain reaction that could be started by accident or deliberate action by any nuclear Power, whatever its size.
That is why it is essential first to limit and later destroy nuclear arsenals, speed up the approval and coming into force of a complete ban of nuclear tests, which are not only steps towards universal suicide but also acts which in effect destroy the environment of the earth, the sea and the atmosphere. We must move towards the destruction or effective limitation of the delivery systems of nuclear weapons and towards a commitment by each State never to be the first to use nuclear weapons in case of conflict.
Secondly, we must succeed in eliminating weapons of mass destruction, whether radiological, chemical, biological or meteorological. We must arrive at agreements to eliminate these types of weapons and prevent scientific research and technological applications from being used for the destructive purpose of devising new weapons of mass destruction instead of the constructive purpose of solving the problems of poverty, ignorance, disease and injustice that afflict mankind. Science and scientists must be given new directions, so that instead of serving the ends of death they will rather serve the purposes of life.

Thirdly, the march towards the universality of disarmament, which leads to its being general and complete, does not exclude proceeding by stages. Thus it is gratifying for Latin American countries that the Treaty of Tlatelolco has repeatedly been mentioned as a gradual contribution to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The Foreign Minister of Ecuador, José Ayala Lasso, when he recently inaugurated at Quito the fourth regular session of the Organization for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (OPANAL), at which 22 countries were represented, recalled that the scepticism some had felt about the future of the Treaty had fortunately been overcome and that that instrument was instead "a commitment that responds to the pacifist mentality and to the spontaneous desire of the Latin American continent to survive".

Fourthly, as regards conventional weapons which represent such a heavy burden for small countries and which bring such lucrative profits to the arms sellers in this deplorable flow of arms transfers from North to South, we must promote regional measures on the production and limitation of conventional weapons and decrease international trade in arms, with no other exception than those elements required in the exercise of the inherent right of legitimate self-defence as covered in Article 51 of the Charter and to maintain order and security within States.

Among those regional measures we may also mention the constructive initiative of the Ayacucho Declaration of 1974 in which eight Latin American countries, including my own, undertook:
"... to promote and support the building of a lasting order of international peace and co-operation and to create the conditions which will make possible the effective limitation of armaments and an end to their acquisition for offensive purposes ..." (A/10044, annex, p. 2)

Fifthly, in this respect the Foreign Ministers of the countries signatories to the Ayacucho Declaration, stated in Washington in 1978 that the persistence of problems in the international field is one of the major causes of the arms build-up and, accordingly, reaffirmed their will to work towards the solution of all disputes by peaceful means, thus contributing to the elimination of tensions and to the preservation and strengthening of peace.

It is this, the peaceful settlement of disputes, which constitutes one of the greatest and most fruitful recommendations for a disarmament programme, because if that principle were universally applied, with elements and machinery that would make it totally enforceable and binding, in accordance with Article 2 (3) of the Charter, major steps could be taken towards genuine universal disarmament. Likewise disarmament by means of tangible measures could be an expression of the true vigour of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations.

We must encourage any negotiation and deliberation designed to move us towards the limitation of weapons at the regional level. Ecuador, together with many other Latin American countries, has been working in this way for the reduction of conventional weapons in the region, starting at the meeting sponsored by Mexico in August 1978.

Sixthly, progress must be made in the studies on the relationship between disarmament and development, because of the astronomical expenditure on arms of more than $1 billion per day. The guilt is shared by all countries, but the two major nuclear Powers are those chiefly responsible, and this is one of the main causes for world inflation which afflicts all peoples - its effects being greater in the weaker countries. The diversion of those sums, as a result of disarmament, to the humanitarian purposes implied in development would be the greatest historical event of this century and the greatest achievement of this Organization, whose effectiveness and prestige go hand in hand with disarmament and whose failure and demise might be brought about by
the arms build-up if we were finally to use those weapons of war in a world conflict.

Seventhly, we must exclude from the arms race and, therefore, from use for military purposes the other spheres that contribute to the well-being of mankind, namely outer space and the sea-bed. It is inconceivable that from the beginning of its exploration and discovery outer space should be used for military purposes. Already the use of anti-satellite missiles and of nuclear energy in outer space, with possible lethal effects, makes it urgent to declare nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace in outer space and in the sea-bed and the subsoil thereof.

Eighthly, the reiteration of those recommendations, which have been made by the representatives of all Member countries year after year in all forums on disarmament, is somewhat similar to the repeated ritual readings of various religions. But, like them, they are inspired by mankind's trust that intelligent judgement and the instinct for survival so closely linked with the concept of disarmament will prevail. The universal extension of this feeling among the masses of the people will constitute world public opinion, which will come to be the only force which the great Powers will take into account, in their awareness of their responsibility before world history and with regard to the destiny of their peoples. We must therefore recommend the intensification of dissemination measures, in co-operation with the information media, public or private, as well as national and international programmes of information and education, so that the concept of disarmament may live in the minds of men and especially of the new generations, together with a thorough knowledge of and renewed confidence in the United Nations system, the only available alternative for effective international control which is part of the solemn commitment of the resolutions on the subject. This objective would be what the former Foreign Minister of Ecuador, Luis Bosano, an outstanding jurist, described as "mental disarmament", the true, genuine path to the goal that we seek to achieve.
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Monthly, the comprehensive programme of disarmament, when it comes to measures applied and the transfer of resources to the goals of human well-being, could constitute the new course for the New International Economic Order, including not only economic balance but also the benefits of development and the further sharing in justice of the benefits of individual and collective freedoms inherent in the dignity of individuals and of States, access to goods and cultural opportunities, and in general a better quality of life for all members of the human species, which is the essential objective of dynamic peace, and also, in the final analysis, that of the United Nations.

Mr. CU DINH BA (Viet Nam): I should like, Sir, to extend my warm congratulations to you on your assumption of the duties of Chairman of this important Commission, and also to congratulate the other members of the Bureau.

At the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, my delegation already expressed its views on the question that is under consideration. My Government firmly supports the struggle for general and complete disarmament and considers it as one of the important measures in the struggle to safeguard international peace and security and peaceful coexistence between States with different political and social systems, and in the struggle against oppression, exploitation and unjust wars. My delegation does not minimize the great difficulties lying on the road to general and complete disarmament. It is, indeed, an arduous and complex struggle, because imperialism, colonialism and international reactionary forces will never of themselves be willing to give up subjugating peoples and to put an end to the arms race. With the joint effort of all peace-loving forces in the world, we will have the capacity to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. We strongly believe that, if general and complete disarmament can be achieved, it will no doubt constitute a very important factor in the strengthening of international peace and security.

Mankind has witnessed countless sufferings and incalculable destruction caused by war. That is why the people of the world ardently desire peace and security. History has shown that as long as the imperialists, colonialists and
international reactionaries fail to disarm but continue their arms race, and as long as they go on fomenting wars of aggression in order to enslave and to exploit the people in the world, the peace-loving peoples must step up their vigilance, strengthen their defence capacity and, if the necessity arises, be ready to take up arms against wars of aggression in order to be able to live in independence and freedom and to be the real masters of their own destinies and of their own countries.

We are facing a situation in which the arms race, both in quantity and in quality, is intensifying day by day, and the production and further refinement of new types of arms of mass destruction, such as neutron bombs, radiological weapons and chemical weapons, are constantly increasing. Such a situation is a real threat to international peace and security.

We, the Vietnamese people, were the victims of 30 years of war in which the imperialist aggressors used our country as a laboratory for experimenting with their modern and sophisticated weapons, including the most deadly ones, such as fragmentation bombs, chemical weapons and so forth. Judging from our own experience, the struggle for international peace and security is a strategic task closely connected with the struggle for national independence, democracy and social progress. That is why, in our view, the problem of disarmament - disarmament as a means of struggling for the maintenance of peace and security - should be based on the principles of respect for the independence, freedom and sovereignty of peoples.

My delegation firmly supports all reasonable measures leading to genuine disarmament. Once carried out, measures to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons and the manufacture of neutron bombs, to halt the manufacture and to prohibit the use of chemical and biological weapons, to halt and prohibit the manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and to halt and prohibit the production of new conventional weapons having great destructive power will certainly constitute an important contribution to the cause of consolidating international peace and security.

In this connexion, my delegation is gratified at the initiative taken by the Soviet Union with a view to the conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States.
The nuclear-weapon States must undertake not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States. Jointly with many delegations, my delegation is in favour of the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. My delegation believes that, if such a treaty is concluded, it should make a clear distinction between armed attack by one State against another independent and sovereign State and the armed struggle of peoples against wars of aggression, and against oppression and exploitation.

The establishment of zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones should be encouraged, but it is important to bear in mind the opinions of the countries concerned.

A world disarmament conference should be convened at the earliest possible time.

My delegation is ready to support other reasonable measures leading to general and complete disarmament.

Following the exchange of views in the Commission these past days, my delegation finds that there is an important question that is directly related to the disarmament issue. Today, my delegation wishes to lay stress on the particular responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council - the nuclear-weapon Powers and those possessing great military potential - towards disarmament, and international peace and security. As we know, the Security Council bears important responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security.
The Vietnamese people on many occasions over these past decades have been the victims of wars of aggression launched by a number of countries which are permanent members of the Security Council. Recently another permanent member of the Security Council carried out a war of aggression against my country and is threatening – as it claims – "to teach Viet Nam another lesson". That permanent member of the Security Council – a nuclear Power – is also posing a threat to the peace and security of Laos; and it is that same permanent member of the Security Council which has carried out a policy of genocide in Kampuchea. In the report of 11 May 1979 by the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-use of Force in International Relations, it is stated:

"A permanent member of the Security Council had recently launched an overt and premeditated armed aggression against a neighbouring country in order to punish that country for not following a policy pleasing to the aggressor and to teach it a 'bloody lesson'. The world has thus witnessed naked aggression against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam".

(A/AC.193/L.7/Add.1, para. 14)

Everybody knows which Power that is. Such an act of aggression against an independent and sovereign country – a Member of the United Nations – runs totally counter to the principles of the United Nations and flagrantly violates international law. It shows how irresponsible is the attitude of the Chinese leaders with regard to the fate of peace and security in the world.

The war of aggression launched by the Chinese leaders in Peking against my country is obviously an extremely barbarous war of extermination. The Chinese troops have committed monstrous crimes against the Vietnamese people. Fair and honest public opinion in the world has clearly realized that the deep-rooted and immediate cause of launching a massive armed attack against Viet Nam lies in the policy of big-nation expansionism and hegemonism of the Chinese leaders and their hostile policy towards the peoples of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea and other South-East Asian countries. The Chinese leaders are concentrating all their efforts on the arms race so that China might become a first-class nuclear super-Power by the end of this century in the so-called four modernizations. It is hurriedly seeking an all-round alliance with
imperialism, calling itself an Eastern NATO Power, with a view to the realization of its global strategy against the socialist countries, the national liberation movement, and peace and social progress in the world.

Everybody knows that Viet Nam does not derive any benefit whatsoever from making war with any country after it has gone through 30 years of war to regain its independence and freedom. But as soon as the danger of United States aggression and enslavement was disposed of, a new danger reappeared, this time from China, another permanent member of the Security Council and a nuclear-weapon Power. The Chinese leaders cannot evade their responsibility for their criminal war against Viet Nam. From these realities, the policy of the reactionary Chinese leaders becomes a real threat to the peace and security of all mankind.

On the basis of what I have said, and in the light of experience in international political affairs, disarmament measures can be positive only if they are oriented towards general and complete disarmament. From their experience drawn from the long struggle for independence and freedom against aggressors, the Vietnamese believe that on the question of disarmament one should point out the particular responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council - the nuclear-weapon Powers - towards genuine disarmament. In order to reach the ultimate goal, namely, general and complete disarmament, all permanent members of the Security Council must demonstrate their will to abide by commitments that have been undertaken.

With the combined strength and effort of all progressive forces in the world - the forces of socialism, national independence, democracy, peace and social progress - the people of the world are more capable than ever before of defending international peace and security, defeating every dark scheme of the warmongers, and advancing towards the goal of general and complete disarmament.
Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, first may I say how pleased my delegation is to see you presiding over the Disarmament Commission, which represents a very important step forward in the process of revitalizing existing machinery. Your experience and your outstanding qualities give us every reason to hope that the first session of this Commission will be crowned with success. At all events, I can assure you that the Turkish delegation will do everything in its power to make easier the delicate and responsible task that has fallen to you.

Since the end of the Second World War, throughout the lengthy process of disarmament, a number of fine words have been spoken and many papers produced. However, from the point of view of action very little has been done. It is high time, therefore, to focus on the most appropriate ways and means of promoting concerted action rather than to go on drawing up complex and confusing texts which very often give even experts some pause.

The Turkish delegation feels that the Disarmament Commission could be of great usefulness if it were to attempt to identify the guidelines which should underlie an over-all disarmament process, on the one hand, and if it were able, on the other hand, to stimulate the interest of world public opinion by drawing up brief, systematic and easily understandable texts which could, as it were, serve as a yardstick in order to gauge the relative progress made in negotiations within a given time frame.

In reply to the questionnaire sent out by the Secretary-General, Turkey has already made known its views in a concise text regarding the main elements which we believe should be included in a comprehensive programme of disarmament. I do not intend to repeat those here. But, I should like to dwell on certain key ideas and I shall try to give a brief description of our preliminary views as to what should be the form and substance of the final outcome of this first session.
It is abundantly clear that the drawing up of a comprehensive programme of disarmament with all its details is an arduous task. The two weeks we have available is a very short space of time in the face of such an immense task. Furthermore, the actual negotiation on the comprehensive programme will take place in the Disarmament Committee in Geneva. What is necessary for us then is to be sufficiently concise and clear in what we say so that we can give guidance which is quite definite and in accordance with the profound aspirations of world public opinion and the future work which will have to be continued up to the second special session on disarmament.

We believe that the end product of the first session of our Commission, which will also be the first joint text on a comprehensive programme of disarmament, should be conceived in a way which will mean that even the man in the street will be able to regard it as a clear and understandable blueprint. Therefore, it should serve as both the foundation and the point of departure for forthcoming work, and, furthermore, should serve as a gauge for world public opinion of the progress which has been made in the specific time frame.
Work on disarmament, however unproductive it has been in general, is regarded by the general public as being so complex that sometimes even experts cannot see the wood for the trees. It is therefore our belief that the comprehensive disarmament programme should give an over-all picture of the fields of action that were defined in the Final Document of the special session and also systematically fit together the various components and the over-all scope of joint action.

These components can be summarized as follows: research and information; deliberation; and negotiation. The range can be bilateral, regional or multilateral. The schematic diagram should also represent the time element in a flexible manner in the form of an optimum curve. In point of fact the time element can be regarded as a kind of third dimension; it is very closely dependent upon the preliminary elaboration of an integrated diagram or, shall we say, an organic whole.

In the reply we filed with the Secretary-General we brought out the need for the adoption of an integrated approach that takes account of the security needs of States. A selective approach has no chance of being productive in any way, we feel. We also stressed the greater likelihood of a regional arrangement being successful. Such arrangements could be concluded on the basis of geo-strategic realities which often differ considerably from one region to another.

Any project that aspires to having a global impact in present world conditions runs the risk of also being fraught with factors that make for instability in particular regions, in complete contrast with the good and peaceful intentions that may have been at its origin, inevitably leading to intolerable turmoil.

I now come to the final factor, which, as we see it, is the most important one of the organic whole to which I have just referred, and that is the element of trust. Measures designed to increase trust, which apparently are military measures but are in essence political in nature, as in the case of the measures laid down in the Final Act of Helsinki - those measures, on the one hand, and the question of verification, on the other, are, we believe, the two main components of the process of promoting mutual trust, which is a sine qua non for success in any disarmament project.
At this stage of our work I should like deliberately to confine myself to these preliminary comments in order to be as brief as possible. We believe that the main body of the work can be done in an informal atmosphere or in some spontaneous discussion that would be open and far-reaching and would replace the reading of comparative texts, of statements prepared some time in advance.

Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, at the outset I should like to convey to you my sincerest congratulations and to welcome you as Chairman of the Disarmament Commission. Your election reflects our esteem for your person and your efficiency and your expansive diplomatic experience. It also reflects our esteem for the constructive role being played by India in the international field.

My delegation considers that the present meetings to discuss the elaboration of elements to be included in a comprehensive programme of disarmament represent a serious and complementary step that strengthens the efforts of the negotiating body. Our participation in the discussions on this item in accordance with the Disarmament Commission's mandate set forth in paragraph 116 (a) of the Final Document of the special session on disarmament, will undoubtedly convey to the negotiating body the urgent desire of all States to push ahead with the disarmament process and their opinion that it is a question that requires a responsible approach because of the international situation, which is constantly threatened by the quantitative and qualitative nuclear arms race, and because of the constant adoption of strategies of balance of power based on policies of nuclear deterrence.

It is possible to achieve general and complete disarmament through the elaboration of a programme of action in which priorities are defined and determined within a time framework and under a system of effective international control by removing constraints that obstruct the elaboration of parallel procedures permitting the practical conclusion of an agreement on disarmament, and in particular nuclear disarmament, to which we accord the highest priority.

Egypt supports a general and complete programme of disarmament that includes the following principal subjects: nuclear disarmament; weapons of mass
destruction, including chemical and radiological weapons and conventional weapons that may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects; the reduction of armed forces; the reduction of military budgets; and international control.

When dealing with questions relating to nuclear disarmament a time-table must be worked out to curb the production and development of nuclear weapons and to remove and destroy existing stockpiles. Simultaneously, necessary adequate steps must be taken to conclude a treaty for the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear weapons tests and a treaty on the strengthening of security guarantees for non-nuclear States. Furthermore we must adopt the principle of refraining from the use of nuclear weapons or the threat of their use under any circumstances whatsoever; and we must work towards finding adequate means of dealing with the negative aspects of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), with the aim of guaranteeing its universality through the achievement of a balance in the responsibilities of the nuclear and the non-nuclear States.

One thing that must be borne in mind is the necessity of establishing zones free of nuclear weapons, particularly in the Middle East and Africa, which face the possible danger of South Africa's and Israel's obtaining and possessing nuclear weapons that will lead other States of those regions to engage in a nuclear arms race. International efforts must be intensified to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones as an effective fundamental step and as a principal basis for the curbing of horizontal proliferation.
The leaders of the nuclear Powers have in their statements repeatedly expressed their desire to proceed with substantial and effective reductions of nuclear weapons with a view to reducing existing stockpiles until their total elimination. However, the progress envisaged has not been accomplished in the process of negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

Furthermore, we find that the nuclear arms race has been focused on the qualitative aspect, which demonstrates a missing link between what is stated by the leaders of big Powers and what is in fact the interpretation and transformation of their statements into practical measures.

The delegation of my country submitted a proposal at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly stating that the United Nations Centre for Disarmament should gather and analyse the public statements of leaders of the nuclear Powers and their representatives at the United Nations in order to be able to submit to us a detailed and integrated study of points of agreement and disagreement with respect to the positions of nuclear Powers. Such a study will undoubtedly enable the United Nations Disarmament Commission to submit its views and establish a strategy to deal with the nuclear aspect. Also it will help the negotiating body when it comes to submitting formulas and alternatives concerning the parallel reduction of weapons.

Turning to the subject of weapons of mass destruction, the delegation of my country finds it of paramount importance to reach an agreement on a comprehensive prohibition of the development and production of new weapons of mass destruction and the destruction of existing stockpiles of such weapons. It is also necessary to conclude an agreement on the complete prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their final elimination, hence permitting the deliberative body to establish priorities either for concluding the agreements under way or for elaborating other agreements to restrain and curb both possession and development of such weapons, including radiological weapons, and to establish a time-table for the implementation of these priorities.
The question of conventional weapons is part of the framework of the process of general and complete disarmament. The principal objective is to conclude an agreement on the prohibition of the development and production of new conventional weapons and also of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects. We hope that the Conference to be held next September to study this subject will achieve positive results. Some States have asked for restrictions to be imposed on the transport of conventional weapons, which is considered the basis on which non-nuclear States build their defence systems. Therefore, the matter must be dealt with within the framework of general and complete disarmament, including confidence-building measures and the solving of existing political problems.

Reduction of military budgets, particularly those of the nuclear States and other States having an important military potential, is considered to be one of the important elements in an agreement on disarmament. It would help the implementation of disarmament procedures. It is also considered to be a step in achieving the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. We hope that the panel of experts established for this purpose will conclude the elaboration of a unified formula capable of achieving constant reduction of military budgets.

Among the important subjects which should be included in a programme of disarmament is the question of military activities in outer space. This question was included in the statements submitted by my country's delegation on two occasions to the First Committee, on 26 October and 22 November 1978, when we drew attention to the danger of the arms race in outer space and the shifting of the field of activities in outer space of Powers possessing satellites

"from control operations to the acquisition of military outer space satellites which are now part of their military strategic arsenals for interception and attack". (A/C.1/33/PV.47, p. 56)

My delegation has asked that

"the short-comings in the 1967 Treaty be dealt with so as to adapt it to the rapid progress in technology and so that it would be possible to reaffirm the principle of the prohibition of the use of outer space for military purposes and the prohibition of the stockpiling of nuclear weapons, weapons of mass destruction or any device in outer space or on the moon or other celestial bodies". (Ibid.)
Mr. Abd El Haridy, Egypt

We strongly support bilateral negotiations between the two superpowers, and we hope that they will be conducted simultaneously with the efforts of the negotiating body when it deals with this subject.

Before concluding, I wish to point out one of the important and complementary elements in the disarmament process, which is the importance of strengthening the basis of international confidence by international control measures for the verification of disarmament agreements, as well as by respect for the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, settlement of disputes by peaceful means, refraining from the use of force in international relations, consolidation of international détente and, finally, the reaching of just and lasting solutions of political problems, particularly those of the Middle East, Palestine, Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa. All these are complementary elements of the disarmament process and have an impact on the reshaping of international relations.

Those are the most important measures which my delegation considers it necessary to have implemented.

Mr. BHANDARI (Nepal): Mr. Chairman, my delegation is pleased to see you in the Chair guiding the deliberations of this Commission.

We know you as an expert in disarmament matters, and we are confident that, under your wise and experienced leadership, the Commission will accomplish its task to the satisfaction of all.

My delegation attaches great importance to the deliberations of this Commission, since the special session on disarmament, while reorganizing the Committee on Disarmament as a negotiating body of limited membership, revived the United Nations Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body, in which all the States Members of the United Nations could take part in the discussion and express their views on matters relating to disarmament. This Commission has an important responsibility in making such recommendations and guidelines as would provide a meaningful framework for substantive negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament. The consideration of the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament and the recommendations resulting therefrom become a test case for the Commission at the current session.
The continuing arms race resorted to by States as a means of enhancing their security has, ironically enough, made the world dangerously insecure. Vast nuclear arsenals at the disposal of a few nuclear States have been a source of constant threat to the perpetuation of the human race. The international community has repeatedly said that the road to peace lies through total disarmament. While partial arms control measures create a favourable impact, it is universally accepted that our ultimate goal is general and complete disarmament under effective international control. We can categorically say that all disarmament measures should be directed to that end.

The Final Document adopted by consensus at the special session devoted to disarmament, though not fully satisfactory to all concerned, spells out in detail the objectives, principles and priorities in the field of disarmament, and thus forms a sound basis for future negotiations on various aspects and facets of disarmament. The Commission, in carrying out the mandate contained in paragraph 116 of that Final Document, has primary source material from which the priority elements to make up a comprehensive programme of disarmament can be drawn. In the opinion of my delegation, the following elements should be emphasized in the formulation of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

The nuclear arms race being a major threat to human existence, priority should without doubt be accorded to nuclear disarmament. It is regrettable that with the disarmament decade drawing to a close the reversal of the arms race is still a distant goal. All nuclear-weapon States, and in particular the two major nuclear Powers, bear a special responsibility for eliminating the threat of a nuclear war and achieving the goals of nuclear disarmament. Strategic weapons should be limited both quantitatively and qualitatively, since qualitative improvements brought about by technological innovations in strategic weapons overshadow the size and volume of nuclear arsenals. The conclusion of SALT II between the United States of America and the Soviet Union is encouraging, and we hope that SALT II will pave the way for the commencement of and speedy negotiations on SALT III.
A comprehensive test-ban treaty still eludes us. We appeal to those involved for its early conclusion. As a signatory of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), Nepal has consistently opposed vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons and raised its voice in favour of universal adherence to NPT and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. However, we recognize the right of States to develop their programmes for the peaceful use of nuclear technology under effective and non-discriminatory safeguards. It is our view that the solemn commitment of nuclear States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States will be a contributing factor in further strengthening the non-proliferation regime. The commitment of nuclear Powers not to be the first to use nuclear weapons would also greatly reduce the risks of nuclear confrontation.

The cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons, the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and radiological weapons and their destruction and, lastly, the restriction and prohibition of all types of weapons of mass destruction are indispensable components of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

Conventional disarmament is as important as nuclear disarmament. Various studies and reports indicate that the quantitative and qualitative arms race in conventional weapons consumes an overwhelming portion of military expenditure in the world. The limitation of international transfers of conventional weapons is essential, for such transfers have a destabilizing effect at the regional level.

An effective disarmament measure is the establishment and recognition of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace. Nepal has supported the denuclearization of Africa and the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East and South Asia. The 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace continues to receive our support. We have further supported the proposal for a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality made up of the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN). In this context, we recall the proposal made by His Majesty King Birendra in 1975
that Nepal be declared a zone of peace. That proposal is motivated by our desire to institutionalize peace, an action which will not only be conducive to accelerated national development but could also significantly contribute to the maintenance of regional stability and world peace. The growing support of friendly countries for this proposal is highly encouraging, and we are grateful to them for that. In our judgement, the establishment of zones of peace can help to restore confidence in international relations and thereby eliminate the causes of tension and conflict.

The inseparable link between disarmament and development cannot be over-emphasized. It can hardly be disputed that the implementation of disarmament measures could be a catalyst in the establishment of a New International Economic Order. Needless to point out, huge sums of money being invested in the production and development of all kinds of weapons stand in glaring contrast to external aid flows to developing countries in terms of official development assistance which, with a few exceptions, falls far short of the agreed target of 0.7 per cent of the gross national product of the developed countries. It is being increasingly recognized that the military budgets of all major militarily significant States, and in particular the permanent members of the Security Council, should be substantially reduced and the resources released thereby should be earmarked for the development of developing countries, and in particular the least developed among them. Nepal sticks to the proposal on the freezing and gradual reduction of military budgets. We hope that efforts at the evolution of acceptable, standardized reporting instruments for military budgets will be successful.

We have consistently held the view that the participation of all States, big or small, weak or strong, nuclear or non-nuclear, on an equal footing in disarmament discussions and negotiations is essential to ensure the widest possible acceptance of wide-ranging disarmament agreements. This leads us to a reaffirmation of our belief that the United Nations as a custodian of small and powerless countries should be further strengthened. We strongly support the view that the United Nations should be kept informed of progress and
developments in disarmament negotiations. While we recognize the fact that any disarmament measure should be supplemented and reinforced by effective verification measures, such measures can, in our view, be conceived only within the framework of the United Nations. The possibility of establishing an international agency for disarmament monitoring and verification should be examined in this perspective.

Nepal is a strong supporter of United Nations peace-keeping operations. Our participation in such operations on different occasions lends credence to that statement. In view of frequent delays in the composition and dispatch of United Nations peace forces, we have repeatedly suggested — and do so again — the establishment of a permanent United Nations peace force.

Finally, it is our hope that a comprehensive programme of disarmament will encompass all the elements essential for creating a world which is disarmed, peaceful, just and equitable.

Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): I should like to begin by associating my delegation with those which have spoken previously and expressed deep satisfaction at seeing you, Mr. Chairman, presiding over this first substantive session of the Disarmament Commission — which we are also happy to see revived after nearly 15 years of inaction. The vast experience that you have acquired in international affairs in general and in the field of disarmament in particular over the years during which you have so ably distinguished yourself assures us of the successful completion of the delicate task entrusted to the Disarmament Commission for this year.

In due response to the Chairman's appeal, the Ethiopian delegation will, in its present statement, confine itself to outlining briefly and in general terms its views on the priority agenda item, namely, "Consideration of the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament". We shall be stating our views briefly and in general terms also because the present exercise in which the Commission is engaged is, we believe, only an exchange of views and because the position of socialist Ethiopia on the various aspects of disarmament problems is well known and fully reflected in the records of the General Assembly, particularly in those of the special session devoted to disarmament and the thirty-third regular session.
The ultimate objective in all disarmament efforts was defined by the General Assembly two decades ago as general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Prior to that, all efforts in the field of disarmament were focused merely on regulating or controlling armaments. It was only after that clear definition of the basic goal in 1959 that the focus shifted, at least partially, towards general and complete disarmament.

Subsequent efforts are characterized by the assertion that general and complete disarmament is essentially a long-term objective fully compatible with efforts aimed at the adoption of partial measures and that, in fact, early agreement on and implementation of the latter could facilitate the achievement of the former. In the view of the Ethiopian delegation, it is precisely with this assertion in mind that the General Assembly, while proclaiming the decade beginning in 1970 as the Disarmament Decade in resolution 2602 E (XXIV), adopted on 16 December 1969, requested the then Conference of the Committee on Disarmament

"while continuing intensive negotiations with a view to reaching the widest possible agreement on collateral measures, to work out at the same time a comprehensive programme, dealing with all aspects of the problem of the cessation of the arms race and general and complete disarmament under effective international control, which would provide the Conference with a guideline to chart the course of its further work and its negotiations".

(Resolution 2602 E (XXIV)

While this would seem to be the first time that the General Assembly pronounced itself on the need for a comprehensive programme of disarmament, the Disarmament Decade is coming to a close and, regrettably, we still do not have that programme. Nevertheless, we have the consensus Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament which, in paragraph 109, reaffirms the earlier assertion that negotiations on general and complete disarmament shall be conducted concurrently with negotiations on partial measures of disarmament. It goes on to state further:

'With this purpose in mind, the Committee on Disarmament will undertake the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament encompassing all measures thought to be advisable in order to ensure that the goal of
general and complete disarmament under effective international control becomes a reality in a world in which international peace and security prevail and in which the new international economic order is strengthened and consolidated". (*Resolution 8-10/2, para. 109*)

While the Committee on Disarmament, as the negotiating body, is entrusted with the actual task of undertaking the elaboration of a comprehensive programme, the Disarmament Commission, the deliberative body, is called upon to consider the elements that such a programme should be composed of and to submit recommendations to the General Assembly and, through it, to the negotiating body.

This being the general framework of the mandate given to the Disarmament Commission regarding agenda item 3, the task before it at this first substantive session will be to identify the essential components of a global programme that would, in the aggregate, enhance the realization of the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. It would also seem to be necessary that, at each stage of the consideration of the elements, adequate explanation be included underlining the pertinence and significance of each disarmament measure. The Commission need not attempt to be exhaustive at this current session since it will have other opportunities to consider the elements further and to make additional improvements in the text. The usefulness of the Final Document of the tenth special session in this exercise can hardly be over-emphasized.

In conclusion, my delegation ventures to submit that, while short-term objectives are being considered, absolute priority should be accorded to the halting of the arms race, particularly in the nuclear field, as stipulated in the Final Document. As long as the arms race continues, the security concerns of States will also continue to depend closely on armaments. The early cessation of the arms race in all its aspects and progress towards genuine disarmament would greatly contribute to the international order envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations and thus to the strengthening of security in all its aspects, thereby facilitating the adoption and implementation of further disarmament measures and the solution of the pressing economic and social problems that the world faces today.
The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is the representative of Democratic Kampuchea.

I call on the representative of Czechoslovakia on a point of order.

Mr. HULINSKY (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): The question of disarmament and of peace and international security which our Commission is now seized of and in the process of discussing requires that our work be conducted in a business-like and constructive manner and atmosphere. We very much appreciate - and this is an important point - that up till now our meetings have been conducted in precisely that atmosphere.

At the present time, however, an attempt is being made to involve in the work of our Committee a private individual who has nothing to do with the legitimate representation of his country in this forum. I have been authorized by a majority of the European socialist countries to stress once again, on their behalf, that the participation in the work of this Commission of private individuals styling themselves "representatives of Democratic Kampuchea", but who are, in fact, representatives of the overthrown Pol Pot régime, is in sharp contradiction to the real state of affairs in Kampuchea and represents interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea.
The Kampuchean people after many years of suffering overthrew the criminal Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime and their executors who carried out feudal experiments which cost the entire Kampuchean people very dear, and the régime of Pol Pot no longer exists. It was quite properly swept aside. Those who claim to be representatives of Kampuchea here in fact represent only themselves and their Chinese patrons. Only the People's Revolutionary Council of the Republic of Kampuchea and its representatives are entitled to represent their country in international forums and gatherings, including in the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the representative of Viet Nam who has asked to speak on a point of order, I should like to say this: the representative of Czechoslovakia has raised a question concerning the representation of Democratic Kampuchea in this Commission. The Chair is of the view that this is not the appropriate forum in which to discuss such issues and that we should not let this body be distracted in any way from its substantive work. I shall therefore ask the representative of Democratic Kampuchea to continue with his statement.

I call on the representative of Viet Nam on a point of order.

Mr. CU DINH BA (Viet Nam): My delegation would like to reiterate that as from 7 January 1979 the Pol Pot fascist and genocidal régime has been completely overthrown by the Kampuchean people and that since that date so-called Democratic Kampuchea no longer exists. The People's Republic of Kampuchea was established by the People's Revolutionary Council as the sole authentic legal representative of the Kampuchean people. In a letter dated 26 March 1979 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Hun Sen, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea stated:

"... the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea affirms that the representative of the country and people of Kampuchea to the United Nations and to all other international organizations and international
conferences must be appointed by the People's Revolutionary Council, the United Front for the National Salvation of Kampuchea. The traitorous Pol Pot-Leng Sary clique, agent of Peking, was completely wiped out by the Kampuchean people. It has no right to represent the Kampuchean people." (A/34/136, p. 2)

My delegation fully supports that statement made by Mr. Hun Sen, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of China who has asked to speak on a point of order.

Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The representative of Czechoslovakia and the representative of Viet Nam have once again engaged in unreasonable haggling over the so-called question of the representation of Democratic Kampuchea. This is an attempt to interfere with the normal course of our session and is impermissible. It is known to all that Democratic Kampuchea is an independent, sovereign State and a Member of the United Nations. The Government of Democratic Kampuchea is the sole legal Government of Kampuchea and that fact was acknowledged by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its thirty-third session. The credentials of the representative of Democratic Kampuchea were accepted as being in good order by the Secretary-General at the time of the recent meeting of the Security Council on the question of Kampuchea and on the situation in South-East Asia. On 22 March the Secretary-General accepted the credentials presented by the Permanent Mission of Democratic Kampuchea to the United Nations.

Democratic Kampuchea is a member of the non-aligned movement. It has made contributions in upholding the purposes and principles of that movement. The recent attempt of Viet Nam to exclude Democratic Kampuchea from the non-aligned movement has met with ignominious defeat. As for the puppets in Phnom Penh which have been propped up by Viet Nam with bayonets and guns they are a quisling régime pure and simple. They are merely an instrument of the Vietnamese aggressors and can in no way represent the Kampuchean people. The Vietnamese aggressors are making deliberate attempts to introduce them into the international community and their aim is none other than to disguise the
truth of the Vietnamese authorities' armed invasion of Kampuchea and to confer legitimacy on their acts of aggression and expansion.

These attempts will, of course, be futile. The crimes of the Vietnamese aggressors in flouting and grossly violating the Charter of the United Nations and norms of international law and pushing a policy of regional hegemonism have aroused the great indignation of the people of Kampuchea, the countries of South-East Asia and the rest of the world. They have been and will continue to be denounced and firmly opposed by the peoples of all countries. The Chinese delegation supports the view of the Chairman and is in favour of putting a stop to this intervention and allowing the representative of Democratic Kampuchea to speak.

As for the malicious attack and vilification by the Vietnamese representative with regard to China, the Chinese delegation reserves the right to make a reply at the appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN: I have several speakers who wish to speak on points of order and while it is certainly not my intention to deny members the opportunity to speak, may I once again make an appeal. I have indicated that the Chair does not consider this to be the appropriate forum for discussing the point raised by the representative of Czechoslovakia and that I intend to let the representative of Democratic Kampuchea speak. I have two more speakers on whom I will call but after that I sincerely hope that we can get on with our work.

I call on the representative of the Lao People's Republic who has asked to speak on a point of order.

Mr. SOUTHICHAK (Lao People's Republic) (interpretation from French): My delegation, like others, objects to having the Pol Pot representative speak here on behalf of the people of Kampuchea. Since 7 January 1979 a new régime has been installed in Kampuchea led by the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea, which is the only legal Government of the people of Kampuchea and the only one authorized to speak on behalf of that people.
The Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, which has recognized the Revolutionary People's Council of Kampuchea as the sole genuine and legitimate representative of the people of Kampuchea, in no way recognizes the tyrannical Pol Pot régime nor the presence of its representative at the United Nations and other international organizations attached to it.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the USSR on a point of order.

Mr. KALINKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In addition to what has quite justly been said by the representatives of Czechoslovakia, Viet Nam and Laos, and in connexion with the statement of the representative of China, the Soviet delegation wishes to say the following.

The Soviet delegation objects to a person's being permitted to speak who calls himself the representative of Democratic Kampuchea but in fact represents no one at all. As has frequently been emphasized in official statements of the leaders of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, and in particular in the telegram of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which has been distributed in United Nations document A/33/559 of 2 February 1979, no one, apart from those appointed by the People's Revolutionary Council and the Central Committee of the United Front for National Salvation of Kampuchea, is entitled to represent the Kampuchean people in international affairs, including in the United Nations and its bodies.

As members are aware, more than four months ago the Kampuchean people, under the leadership of the United Front for National Salvation of Kampuchea, put an end to the illegal régime of the puppet clique of Pol Pot and Ieng Sary, which, at the behest of their masters in Peking, were carrying out a policy of mass destruction of the population of the country and aggressive attacks upon neighbouring States. Now, when Peking's plans to turn Kampuchea into a tool for the realization of their own expansionist purposes in South-East Asia have failed completely, the Chinese representatives here in the United Nations are attempting to play out a farce with the help of their puppets, who represent
no one at all, who simply sing with the voices of their Peking overlords and with their presence here in the United Nations do nothing but harm to the prestige of this international Organization.

It is quite obvious that the Revolutionary Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea is the sole authentic representative of the Kampuchean people and that only its representatives can speak on behalf of Kampuchea and its people at the United Nations, including in this body, the United Nations Commission on Disarmament.

The Soviet delegation would like once again to stress that statements before United Nations bodies by persons who speak on behalf of the criminal puppet clique of Pol Pot and Ieng Sary, which was overthrown by the Kampuchean people, are completely inadmissible and illegal; they harm and jeopardize the authority and prestige of this international Organization and do nothing to help promote the successful performance of the tasks that must be carried out by the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Viet Nam wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. QU DINH DA (Viet Nam): I should like to make a brief statement in reference to what has been said by the Chinese representative here, who has made many slanderous allegations about our people.

As members are aware, the Chinese rulers in Peking have used the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime to attack Viet Nam. Under the leadership of the rulers in Peking, the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime has killed 3 million of the 7 million people of Kampuchea. The Washington Post of 3 May 1979 reported that Sihanouk said that Pol Pot had killed 3 million out of 7 million Kampuchean. On Tuesday the Chinese delegation said that China is a peace-loving country. But, as members are aware, the world has not witnessed a more serious and pernicious crime. In the early hours of Saturday, 17 February 1979, the Chinese started a massive attack against our country with over 300,000 men and a thousand tanks -

The CHAIRMAN: May I make an appeal to the representative of Viet Nam to permit me to continue with the work of this Commission.
On the point of order raised by the representative of Czechoslovakia, I stated that we should not in this forum consider or discuss the question of representation, and I called upon the representative of Democratic Kampuchea. So I would appeal once again to the representative of Viet Nam to permit me, as Chairman of the Commission, to continue with the business of this Commission.

I call upon the representative of Democratic Kampuchea.

Mr. CHAH YOURAN (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French):
Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the delegation of Democratic Kampuchea may I first of all congratulate you most warmly on your election to the chairmanship of the Disarmament Commission and wish you complete success in your important task.

Everyone is aware of the eminent role that your great country, India, plays in the field of disarmament as well as in the safeguarding of international peace.

The present international situation is fraught with threats to peace and security. The dangers of a new world war, far from diminishing, are increasing. In addition to the local hotbeds of tension, particularly in southern Africa and in the Middle East, there has since 25 December last been a new regional conflict in South-East Asia, which is extending to the Pacific and to the rest of Asia.

This situation cannot fail to be of grave concern to all peoples throughout the world that love peace and justice.

That is why the delegation of Democratic Kampuchea considers that the problem of disarmament can be studied only within this context and cannot be dissociated from the struggle being waged by the peoples of the world that love peace and justice, and in particular by the non-aligned countries and the third world, to eliminate the causes of these tensions and to establish a New International Economic Order.

For decades the great Powers have been talking about disarmament while in fact their respective military arsenals of both conventional and nuclear weapons have been constantly increasing throughout the years. The Declaration of the Ministerial Conference of Non-Aligned Countries held in Belgrade in July 1973 states that this unbridled arms race today constitutes one of the principal threats not only to international peace and security but also to the very survival of all mankind.
That patently proves that the great Powers pay no heed to the legitimate
demands of the non-aligned countries and the small and medium-size countries
throughout the world, which call on them, in the first place, solemnly to
undertake not to use nuclear weapons or weapons of mass destruction against
countries which do not possess such weapons or against demilitarized zones.

Furthermore, these great Powers evade the fundamental question of the
total prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

It is appropriate to note very particularly that the fine words pronounced
by a permanent members of the Security Council - in this case the great
expansionist Soviet State - on "détente","peaceful coexistence" and "non-recourse
to the use of force in international relations", for example, are in fact used
only to camouflage its policy of hegemonism and expansionism throughout the
world and to lull the vigilance of the peoples that love peace and justice.

Democratic Kampuchea, which is at present the victim of the war of
aggression and invasion by an armed force of 150,000 from Viet Nam, a satellite
of that great Power, is a typical case. Today everybody knows that the Soviet
Union - that great expansionist Power - supports and aids its satellite in its
war of aggression against Democratic Kampuchea, an independent country, a
Member of the United Nations and a non-aligned country. It supplies Viet Nam
with vast amounts of sophisticated weapons to enable it to perpetrate this
aggression, to commit crimes of genocide against the people of Kampuchea and to
devastation and ruin in that country.

This international expansionist great Power, the Soviet Union, and the small
regional expansionist Power, Viet Nam, which calls itself "socialist" and
"revolutionary", in practice follow a policy of aggression and expansion against
small countries which refuse to become their satellites and to give up their
freedom and independence, their honour and their national dignity. This
aggression against Democratic Kampuchea represents a grave threat to international
peace and security, apart from the fact that it tramples underfoot the principles
of the United Nations Charter and violates every international rule of law
governing relations among States.
At the present time that war of aggression is intensifying and threatens to extend to Thailand and to the other countries of the region. The only way to put an end to this is to demand an immediate end to this war of aggression and the total and unconditional withdrawal of all troops of aggression from Kampuchea so as to allow the people of Kampuchea to decide on their own destiny.

The people of Kampuchea, like other peoples, aspires only to live in peace on its own territory in independence, honour and dignity. It is for this reason that our people has made independence and non-alignment, divorced from any rivalry of great Powers or of blocs, the bulwark of its foreign policy. Today it finds itself obliged, in self-defence, to wage a resolute people's war against the most barbarous Vietnamese war of aggression and expansion to preserve that policy of independence and non-alignment. At the international level, it continues to fight to defend the noble ideas of peace, justice and independence, and to safeguard peace and international security.

To attain that objective, my delegation is convinced of the following. First, all States must scrupulously comply with the principles of the Charter. In particular, they must respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, and the principles of non-aggression and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, of equality, of reciprocal advantages, and of the right of every people to decide its own destiny and that of its country.

Secondly, the great nuclear Powers must solemnly undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, and in no case to use them against States which have no such weapons or in demilitarized zones. They must cease the production of these weapons and destroy them completely.

Thirdly, the great Powers must refrain from supplying weapons, conventional or non-conventional, to any aggressor and expansionist State whose objective is to destroy the peace, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of other States.

Fourthly, the region of South-East Asia should be declared a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality, in accordance with the legitimate aspirations of the peoples and countries of the region. All foreign troops must be withdrawn from the zone and all foreign bases, whether camouflaged or not, must be dismantled.
Fifthly, the Indian Ocean, like the Mediterranean, should be declared a zone of peace.

Sixthly, all countries must recognize and respect the status of the denuclearized zones in Latin America, the Middle East, Africa and South-East Asia, in conformity with the legitimate aspirations of the peoples and countries of those regions.

Before concluding, I should like to add that, if the Soviet Union, Viet Nam and the other elements of the socialist bloc were to leave my country, Democratic Kampuchea, as their representatives have left this room today, South-East Asia would certainly become a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality. The grotesque and ignoble farce which the representatives of the Le Duan-Brezhnev clique are playing here can in no way travesty the truth or deceive the peoples of the world that love peace and justice. Indeed, the entire world knows that that clique is committing aggression against Democratic Kampuchea and destroying peace and security in South-East Asia, Asia and the Pacific, and trampling underfoot the principles of the United Nations Charter and instituting the law of the jungle in its international relations. Today that same clique has been unmasked and condemned by the international community because of its extremely barbarous aggression and its crimes of genocide in Democratic Kampuchea, and its expansionist policy in South-East Asia. The propaganda carried out by this clique in favour of the puppets it has installed in Phnom Penh by its aggression in no way changes the facts. The only way out for it is to halt its aggression immediately and totally withdraw the 150,000 members of its armed forces from Democratic Kampuchea. That is the only means of restoring peace and security in our region, that is to say in South-East Asia.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.