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80-61239
The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 4 (continued)

(a) CONSIDERATION OF VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE ARMS RACE, PARTICULARLY THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE AND NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT, IN ORDER TO EXPEDITE NEGOTIATIONS AIMED AT EFFECTIVE ELIMINATION OF THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR

(b) CONSIDERATION OF THE AGENDA ITEMS CONTAINED IN SECTION II OF RESOLUTION 33/71 H, WITH THE AIM OF ELABORATING, WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRIORITIES ESTABLISHED AT THE TENTH SPECIAL SESSION, A GENERAL APPROACH TO NEGOTIATIONS ON NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL DISARMAMENT

The CHAIRMAN: Before we begin our work this morning I should like to inform members that there are enough speakers remaining to carry the general exchange of views on item 4 into Monday. I hope that it will be possible to complete it at the plenary meeting to be held on the morning of that day. I hope also to be able, as the result of consultations I am having, to make some suggestions - perhaps tomorrow morning - with regard to the procedure to be followed on item 4 after the general exchange of views is completed.

At a plenary meeting on Tuesday morning we shall take up item 5, on which we shall have a similar exchange of views, and I would request those delegations wishing to take part in it to inform the Secretary of the Commission by lunch time tomorrow so that we may have a clearer idea of our programme of work for next week and, in particular, of how many plenary meetings will be needed for that general exchange of views on item 5. That will help me also in my future consultations concerning the best way to use the time remaining for follow-up work on items 4 and 5.

The first speaker for this morning is the representative of Hungary, on whom I now call.
Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): Mr. Chairman, I should like first of all to express the satisfaction of my delegation at seeing you presiding again over the meetings of our Commission. Considering the many items on our agenda, we are certain that more than the usual amount of co-operation will be needed on the part of all of us and I should like to assure you that we shall do our very best to facilitate both your work and the work of the Commission.

When we consider various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, we have to do it in the context of the realities of the day.

We are meeting at a time when the international situation has worsened, when tensions have increased and when we can hear voices all too familiar from the cold war period. Though there are widely different views on the causes of this situation, one fact seems to be certain, namely, that this tendency did not start yesterday, nor was it started by accident. Ever since countries with different social systems started to extricate themselves from the cold war period - a period which proved to be both detrimental and downright dangerous to them - ever since they started to lay new foundations for their relationship, there were forces at work against those developments. When the mutual efforts of countries with different social systems in Europe and North America led to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, and when détente became a familiar and well-known word in political usage, the attacks directed against those developments also became more vehement. Reactionary forces, which are interested in the production of arms and armaments, saw no gains in détente for themselves; on the contrary, they saw advantages in increased tension. Their influence on official government policy has recently increased, as can be seen in their attempts directed at upsetting the existing balance of forces between the two social systems, with the aim of achieving military superiority. Without going too far back in history, I should only like to recall the 1978 summit meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) which decided on a long-term real increase in military expenditures - and which was held, incidentally, at the same time as the first special session devoted to disarmament was taking place here - or the Brussels meeting of 1979, which decided on the production and deployment
in Western Europe of new, medium range American nuclear missiles. The intensification of the arms race by these measures, as well as the increased level of armaments and of the military presence of imperialism in other parts of the world, can only heighten international tension. The misguided policy of threats, sanctions and boycotts, as well as measures aimed at cutting back contacts in the political, cultural, economic and even sports fields, also have negative effects. By abusing their near-monopoly over the capitalist world news media, by creating non-existent threats and by twisting facts, they manipulate public opinion whenever that suits their interest at a given time and in given circumstances.

In spite of the present situation, my Government considers that by the collective efforts and actions of progressive and peace-loving forces there is a realistic possibility of defending the results achieved so far by the policy of détente, of preventing the launching of a new, dangerous wave of the arms race and of preventing a new world war which, in the age of weapons of mass destruction, can threaten the very existence of our civilization. That is the common interest of all countries, socialist and capitalist alike. Peaceful coexistence in our age has no viable alternative. Therefore, Governments should act responsibly in order to lessen international tension, to contribute to peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems and to strengthen international security and peace.
These foreign policy goals were stressed prominently in the resolution adopted by the twelfth Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party held in March this year. The same ideas were elaborated and advanced in the appeal made to the peoples of Europe by the 22 communist and workers' parties participating at their Paris meeting this past April. It is high time for Governments also to work more intensively for peace. The restoration of correct, normal relations with the socialist countries and the solution of international problems through negotiations and political means, taking practical steps for disarmament, would be the way out of the present situation. This is stressed again, emphatically, by the meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. The document just published proves that preserving peace and advancing the cause of disarmament has not ceased to be a major task of that organization throughout the 25 years of its existence.

To contribute to the halting of the arms race and to the reduction of the level of armaments on the basis of equal security is a task more pressing and urgent than ever. For all of this a vital prerequisite would be the strengthening of the results achieved thus far on strategic arms limitation by the Soviet Union and the United States of America, most notably the entry into force of SALT II. It would be on the basis of this that talks on further reductions could be initiated. In Europe the real interests of the peoples demand the start without delay of talks, on the basis of the existing balance of forces as well as on the basis of mutual security, regarding the prevention of the deployment of new nuclear weapons. It is our considered opinion that the talks in Vienna on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe can and should be moved off dead centre and also that the cause of a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe can be brought to a successful conclusion.

The United Nations has a special role and responsibility in the field of disarmament. It is our duty to use its potential to the fullest extent possible. We have to draw the lessons from the first Disarmament Decade before embarking on the next one. During the past decade efforts aimed at disarmament were on the whole more intensive than ever before. As a result of those efforts and of the improvement in the international climate, important international as well as
bilateral disarmament agreements were concluded. Although, as described in the earlier part of my present statement, the international situation has become more tense, there are real possibilities for reversing the negative tendencies before it is too late.

The United Nations General Assembly can and should play an important part in intensifying disarmament efforts. The declaration of the 1980s as a Second Disarmament Decade gives the United Nations an excellent opportunity to call the attention of Governments and peoples of Member States anew to the importance of disarmament, as well as to the dangers of the continuation of the arms race. The resolution should at the same time give an objective evaluation of the results and experience of the First Disarmament Decade and it should reaffirm the final goal of our efforts — which is, general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The more immediate task of the Second Disarmament Decade should be the conclusion of negotiations initiated in the previous decade that are already ripe for solution, like the conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of radiological weapons — to mention only a few.

In addition to incorporating reference to the next special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the resolution should also contain proper reference to the convening of a world disarmament conference.

These were the general, preliminary remarks that I wanted to make on behalf of my delegation. We are observing closely how other delegations express themselves on these and other issues, and we will take an active part in the working group, where we will give a more detailed account of our views on some of the items on our agenda.

Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the German Democratic Republic I should like to express my satisfaction at the fact that you have been appointed to preside over the Disarmament Commission. I am sure that under your skilful leadership this session will make a worthy contribution to the complicated business of calling a halt to the arms race and bringing about disarmament.
A few days ago the people of the German Democratic Republic marked the thirty-fifth anniversary of their liberation from fascism. With the capture of Berlin by the Soviet Army and the unconditional capitulation of Hitler’s Reich and its army to the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom and France, the Second World War ended in Berlin, the very place where it had started. That event is intimately linked to the creation of and the defining of the Goals of the United Nations.

As one who participated in the anti-fascist resistance, I can assure the Commission that with the foundation of the German Democratic Republic a State emerged on German soil from which fascism had been eradicated, root and branch, and which would never again become a fomenter of war. This State is profoundly committed to peace and international security. The proclaimed goals of its policy include the cessation of the arms race and the implementation of effective disarmament measures.

In the view of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, the purpose of this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission is to improve conditions for concrete measures to halt the arms race and to clear the way to overcoming existing differences, and nothing should be allowed to divert attention from a concentrated consideration of substantive questions of disarmament. The argument about the absence of any sensible alternative to détente and disarmament today, in circumstances of a clear exacerbation of the international situation, has become weightier than ever before. The Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Erich Honecker, stated in this connexion:

‘Either political détente will be supplemented by military détente, and hence consolidated, or we will witness the beginning of a new spiralling of the arms race with all the burdens and threats flowing therefrom to the peoples of the world; and here lies the key issue’.
In past years there has arisen a broad system of multilateral, regional and bilateral negotiations in the course of which it has been possible to reach agreement on substantial partial measures on the road to the limitation of the arms race and the bringing about of disarmament. Thus, it has been possible to set specific limits on the continuation of the arms race in qualitative and quantitative terms and to reduce the danger of nuclear war. For example – and first and foremost – there is the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, as well as the Treaty on the partial cessation of nuclear-weapon tests. It has been possible to avert a further spread of weapons of mass destruction to the sea-bed and the ocean floor. The most dangerous forms of environmental modification techniques for military purposes have been prohibited. The Convention on the prohibition of biological weapons has led to the total elimination of a dangerous form of weapons of mass destruction – bacteriological, biological and toxin weapons.

An important event was the conclusion of the Treaty known as SALT II, which contains provisions for limiting the strategic arms race. Furthermore, that Treaty has opened the way to a substantial limitation of strategic weapons. However, the United States resistance to an early ratification of that treaty has proved a serious obstacle to further progress.

Over the last decade, for the first time in history a special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted exclusively to disarmament questions was held. The German Democratic Republic sees it as a great success that at that session general unanimity was achieved on the substantive goals, principles and purposes of disarmament, and they must all be put into effect at the earliest possible time and with the utmost decisiveness.

Of particular relevance and timeliness is the appeal, contained in the Final Document and addressed to all States, to:

"... refrain from action which might adversely affect efforts in the field of disarmament, and display a constructive approach to negotiations and the political will to reach agreements."

(resolution 5-10/2)
The results that have been achieved so far may appear insignificant in comparison with the problems which we have to solve. However, they do constitute a first valuable accomplishment on the road to disarmament. In the decade which has just begun these gains should be preserved, consolidated and expanded.

Concern for the preservation, consolidation and development of what we have achieved is necessary, because there are forces at work which feel that there has been too much progress along this path and find unwelcome the very course of disarmament and détente. This was revealed most clearly two years ago when at the same time as the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Council decided on a sharp increase in military budgets and a large-scale build up of the arms race. Thus, at the very time that the special session of the General Assembly had worked out a programme of urgent measures for disarmament, NATO, in stark contrast, produced a programme aimed at the attainment of military supremacy. That was the overt goal of the decision taken on 24 January 1980 by the United States Congress - a decision on a further sharp increase in the United States military budget. It was with the same goal in mind that a new weapon system was established. For example, the intercontinental MX missiles, the Trident submarines and the cruise missiles.

In Western Europe there are plans for the deployment of a new generation of medium-range missiles, although in a White Paper on the security of the Federal Republic of Germany and the development of the Bundeswehr, dated September 1979, we find the following on page 109:

"An over-all comparison of the nuclear potential of the East and West reveals that deterrence today exists in the form of the conceptual and structural combination of the central nuclear strategic forces of the USA with the nuclear forces in Europe, in conditions of approximate over-all balance."
An integral element of this course is the broad programme of modernization of conventional weapons, expansion of existing and creation of new military bases on the territory of African, Arab, Asian and Latin American countries, demonstrations of military force in the Caribbean and the Persian Gulf, and the creation of an operational group as an instrument of threat, intimidation and intervention in the internal affairs of other States. Such a policy is detrimental to those very countries from which it emanates, and its results can be only a reduction of security for all, including the NATO countries. A typical example is the NATO decision of 12 December 1979 to manufacture and deploy on the territory of certain Western European countries new medium-range missiles.

I cannot fail to point out that preparations for that decision were started in autumn 1977. That NATO decision constitutes a dangerous attempt to achieve military supremacy. It only complicates the international situation, blocks negotiations on disarmament relating to medium-range weapons in Europe, and constitutes a serious obstacle to progress on questions related to reducing the arms race and bringing about disarmament. If that decision is put into effect it will only increase the danger of nuclear war in general and convert the populations of the Western European countries in particular into nuclear hostages.
Another purpose of the growth in armaments is the imposition on socialist countries of new economic burdens and the preservation for many developing countries of conditions of economic dependence, which helps to satisfy the desire for profit. But the astronomical sums in military expenditures sharply exacerbate the crisis phenomena in capitalist countries and impede solutions to urgent economic problems. The well-known American politician George F. Kennan quite rightly likened the initiator of this policy, the United States military-industrial complex, in terms of the national economy to a man suffering from drug addiction and needing more and more millions of dollars in order to indulge that fatal passion, which, in the end, will of course destroy him.

In the face of these facts, it is quite natural that representatives of the communist and workers' parties of Europe, meeting on 28 and 29 April this year in Paris, should have appealed to the peoples of Europe to act in the spirit of Helsinki to promote détente and reduce armaments.

Surprise and concern have been caused by attempts to spread assertions about the reasons for the deterioration of the international situation — assertions which fly in the face of the facts. This can be clearly appreciated if we listen here to the representative of China. What I have in mind are assertions which are not only unfounded but actually contravene the norms of international law inasmuch as they constitute intervention in the internal affairs of States — assertions concerning, for example, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and its sovereign right freely to resolve the question of its own bilateral relations.

From the statement of the representative of the Far Eastern Power, it is clear that the ruling circles in that country fear proposals for disarmament as the devil fears holy water. We should put an end to these worthless attempts to ascribe to socialist States intentions which they do not have. We should embark on constructive dialogue around the negotiating table and display a willingness for mutual understanding in the cause of halting the arms race and bringing about disarmament.
The delegation of the German Democratic Republic favours a constructive approach to disarmament matters, and my delegation would like once again to draw attention to the decisive role of negotiations in achieving disarmament measures. How else can we translate into concrete measures the important proposals whose purpose is to implement the programme of action unanimously adopted at the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly? For this reason we recall resolution 34/83 C, in which the Members of the United Nations call for talks to be held on disarmament without delay with a view to achieving concrete results.

Firmness of purpose and determination are required in the conduct of talks and in concentration on the subject of the talks; a beginning or a resumption of talks is also called for on questions with regard to whose solution consensus was achieved at the special session on disarmament. The organs in which these talks will be held - in particular, the Geneva Disarmament Committee, should deal exclusively with the consideration and preparation of disarmament agreements. We must exclude the consideration of questions that are not relevant to the purpose or object of the talks.

As we know, in two years' time a second special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament questions is scheduled to be held. But the results with which we come to that session will determine in large measure the extent to which we will succeed in converting into real action the demands contained in resolution 34/83 C.

The letter of the Foreign Minister of the USSR to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, dated 11 April 1980 (A/35/175) contains a comprehensive programme of steps towards disarmament. The German Democratic Republic fully supports that programme and confirms its readiness, along with all other States, to take energetic, practical steps in the disarmament field. There is no kind of weapon on whose limitation or banning it would be impossible to come to agreement if all this is done on the basis of reciprocity, and provided that we ensure the right to equal security.
The German Democratic Republic is convinced that a world disarmament conference, which should be held after the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament, would substantially promote genuine fulfilment of the idea of the 1980s as the decade of disarmament.

In the next stage, pride of place should be given to the ending of the nuclear arms race and bringing about nuclear disarmament in order to create an effective shield against the launching of nuclear war. Furthermore, we must embark upon the solution to the problems of nuclear disarmament on a broad front and come to agreement on the halting of the manufacture of all forms of nuclear weapons and on the gradual reduction of stockpiles of such weapons, up to and including their total elimination.

The conclusion of a treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapon testing by all States and at all times is closely interrelated with nuclear disarmament. Further measures aimed at the creation and preservation of conditions for comprehensive nuclear disarmament are urgently called for. Such measures would include, first and foremost, prevention of the further spread of nuclear weapons, particularly by further strengthening of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and making it universal; the conclusion of a convention on the strengthening of security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States; an agreement on non-deployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of States where they do not exist at present; and also the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world.
The conclusion of a treaty on the non-use of force in international relations and the prohibition for all time of the use of nuclear weapons would to a considerable extent enhance security guarantees for all States and would be an indispensable complement to the process of nuclear disarmament.

Along with nuclear weapons we must eliminate and prohibit all other types of weapons of mass destruction. This relates primarily to chemical weapons. A comprehensive convention should bar the way to the development and operational use of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. Of particular importance in this regard is the prohibition of the manufacture and use of the nuclear neutron weapon.

Apart from the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction, of great significance is the prohibition of the manufacture of new types of conventional weapons having great destructive power and the conclusion of work on an agreement on the prohibition or limitation of the use of conventional weapons that cause unnecessary suffering or are indiscriminate in their effects.

Without any doubt, an important contribution to the cessation of the arms race would be the renunciation by all States permanent members of the Security Council and States linked to them by military agreements of any increases in their armies or arsenals of conventional weapons. The same goal would be served by the reduction in absolute or percentage terms of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council and other militarily important States. Precisely as a result of the implementation of those measures resources would be freed that could then be used for the economic and social development of all countries, particularly developing countries.

Measures for the limitation and halting of the arms race are necessary both on a world scale and within regional frameworks. Regional measures of disarmament could be of the greatest possible importance for the achievement of progress on global disarmament questions. This particularly applies to Europe, where measures of military détente would not only strengthen the situation in that region but would even have a good effect on the whole international climate. It is precisely in Europe that there has been a convincing demonstration that the atmosphere of détente is to the advantage of all States and peoples. Everything positive that has been achieved in this regard over the
last few years in the continent of Europe should be consolidated. The
German Democratic Republic is in favour of effective understandings on the
reduction of troops and armaments in central Europe so that, while preserving
a balance of forces in a military sense, we could achieve a lower level of
military potential on both sides. The conclusion among all States parties
to the European Conference held in Helsinki of a treaty committing themselves
never to be the first to use nuclear and conventional weapons against the others
would lead to an appreciable improvement in the security of all States of that
region. It would be extremely important to expand measures to strengthen
trust and confidence in Europe - as, for example, the establishment of a
maximum troop strength limit for manoeuvres and giving notice
of major military training exercises, including air force and naval exercises,
and movements of land-based troops, and the expansion of measures to
strengthen trust in the Mediterranean area.

There is growing understanding of the fact that, in order to consider
these and other measures to strengthen trust and concrete steps for
disarmament, a pan-European conference should be convened on military détente
and disarmament in Europe. That would make it possible for all European
States, as well as the United States and Canada, to come to agreement on
effective measures to stabilize security and peace in Europe, and that would
doubtless have a beneficial effect on a world scale.

The German Democratic Republic also supports similar efforts in other
parts of the world. In view of the stepped-up military preparations of the
United States and other NATO countries in the area of the Indian Ocean, measures
to convert the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace have become ever more urgent.
All foreign bases in that area should be eliminated. In this sense the proposed
colference on questions of the Indian Ocean should be given the most effective
possible preparation.

In setting forth its views on the major goals in the field of disarmament
the delegation of the German Democratic Republic wishes to confirm its readiness
thoroughly to study the views of other States on this question. We once again
express our conviction that neither confrontation nor the ambition for military
supremacy is in keeping with the interests of the peoples; the only way to conform
to those interests is by coming to agreement on one of the most urgent problems
of international relations - that is, disarmament.
Mr. Cu Dinh Ba (Viet Nam): Mr. Chairman, first of all, on behalf of the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, I should like to extend our congratulations to you in your capacity as Chairman of this Commission. My delegation would like through you to convey our Warm greetings of friendship to the Indian people, with which the Vietnamese people has entertained friendly relations.

I should like also to extend our congratulations to the other members of the Bureau.

In September 1972 the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Havana, Cuba, reaffirmed the central role and the increased importance of the United Nations in the realization of the objectives of general and complete disarmament. The Conference also attributed particular importance to the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission for the preparation of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

Before expressing our point of view on the question of disarmament, my delegation would like to make a brief remark on the situation we are now facing.

The policy of reviving the cold war has poisoned the international political atmosphere. Now we are at the beginning of a new spiral in the arms race both in quality and in quantity. The warmongers are stepping up war preparations and ceaselessly threatening to use force against the world's peoples. One should not ignore the fact that the deployment of a new generation of nuclear weapons in a number of Western countries, the increase in military budgets, the establishment of new military bases, the further refinement of new types of arms of mass destruction, the demonstration of force in the Persian Gulf and in the Caribbean Sea, the intensification of military strength in the Indian Ocean, and so on - all pose a serious threat to the peace and security of mankind. In addition, in our area the Asian hegemonists and expansionists, calling themselves an Eastern NAKC Power, are in a hurry to build a strategic nuclear force, to seek an all-round alliance with imperialism, to speed up the modernization of their armed forces with a view to realizing their ambition to become a first-rate nuclear Power by the end of this century.
In the face of such a situation, the Disarmament Commission has the urgent task of achieving concrete measures that will lead to general and complete disarmament. Its main function is to make recommendations on various problems related to disarmament and to examine the situation regarding the decisions taken at the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament - in particular to consider the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament and the elements of a draft resolution entitled 'Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade'.

For many generations now it has been the primary concern of mankind to maintain peace and security because peace is closely related to the vital interests and the peace of development of all nations. Realities have further strengthened our confidence in the possibility of preventing a new world war, preserving lasting peace on our planet and saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has on many occasions stated its point of view on the disarmament question. We support every endeavour towards peace and general and complete disarmament as one of the major methods of preserving peace and security in the world. But so long as imperialism and reactionary forces have not disarmed, the peoples of the world must be constantly vigilant, must strengthen their defence capability and must be ready to repulse victoriously all imperialist and reactionary forces.

Today we are witnessing an ever-accelerating nuclear arms race. It is the main danger to the cause of peace. Therefore, the keystone here should be the question of how to halt the nuclear arms race and achieve nuclear disarmament. Our delegation attaches great importance to that question. We are in favour of any initiative which ensures that nuclear weapons will not be used by nuclear-weapon States to attack or threaten to attack non-nuclear-weapon States. We welcome any initiative aimed at strengthening guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States, both guarantees of security and guarantees of the development of nuclear energy for peaceful uses. We are in favour of any initiative aimed at limiting, halting and reversing the nuclear arms race and of any initiative aimed at prohibiting the production of new systems of weapons. Those matters are connected with the rights and obligations of
nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States, and both are equal in rights and obligations in nuclear disarmament as well as in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. At the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam voted in favour of resolution 34/44, entitled "Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States", and of resolution 34/85, entitled "Conclusion of an international convention to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

My delegation deems it necessary to stress the fact that last year, at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, the overwhelming majority of delegations warmly welcomed the signing of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II) and considered it an important development in the struggle for the relaxation of the international situation, leading to general and complete disarmament. Now, in my opinion, every one of us shares the concern over the postponement of the ratification of SALT II. This postponement reflects the cold war policy of imperialism.

We are in favour of the early conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. We strongly believe that the conclusion of such a treaty will certainly contribute to the improvement of the climate of international relations and to the consolidation of international peace and security.

We are also in favour of the creation of nuclear-free zones and zones of peace. We fully support the just struggle of the peoples of the countries in the Indian Ocean region to establish the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace and to demand that the United States dismantle its military bases, particularly on Diego Garcia.

As far as the zone of peace in South-East Asia is concerned, I should like to refer to the statement made by our Deputy Prime Minister, Chairman of the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, at the plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 4 October 1978. He said:
For many years in the past, imperialist and colonialisit aggression created instability and hostility among many South-East Asian countries. It is now necessary to eliminate this situation in order to restore peace and stability and to achieve reconciliation and co-operation."

(A/33/PV.21, p. 32)

At the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in Havana, Cuba, in September 1973, our Prime Minister, Pham Van Dong, declared:

'With regard to the South-East Asian countries, we should like to reiterate once again that it is our constant policy to live in peace and develop relations of long-term, many-sided co-operation and friendship and respect the principles mentioned in the joint statements of Viet Nam and the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries. We are ready to hold discussions with other South-East Asian countries with a view to establishing a zone of peace, stability and neutrality in this region.'

Recently my Foreign Minister, Nguyen Co Thach, during his visit to Malaysia, made a similar statement regarding South-East Asia as a zone of peace.
We are in favour of the prohibition of chemical weapons as well as that of the development and production of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

We fully share the views expressed here on the urgency and importance of negotiating an international convention prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their destruction. In keeping with the consistent and firm policy of my Government, my delegation is ready to co-operate with other delegations in order to reach positive and constructive results on this particular subject.

As members know, the Vietnamese people were for 30 years the victims of war, in which the imperialist aggressors used our country as a laboratory for the testing of their modern chemical weapons. That is why my country has always stood for the complete prohibition of chemical weapons.

We are also in favour of the early convening of a world disarmament conference after the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which will take place in 1982. The idea of convening such a conference has enjoyed widespread support in the world. It would be one of the most effective and significant measures to enhance the mobilization of the efforts of States to achieve general and complete disarmament.

It is our hope that if the Disarmament Commission comes to a common agreement on concrete measures to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons, to halt the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually to reduce their stockpiles until their total destruction, to halt and prohibit the manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction, to halt the manufacture and to prohibit the use of chemical, biological and radiological weapons, to halt and to prohibit the production of new conventional weapons having great destructive power, to strengthen the guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States and so forth, those measures, once carried out, will certainly constitute an important contribution to the cause of the consolidation of international peace and security.

In this connexion, my delegation welcomes the measures put forward by the Soviet Union in a letter dated 11 April 1980 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Secretary General (A/35/175).
We believe that they constitute the main elements for the second disarmament decade.

In concluding, my delegation would like to stress the particular responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council - the nuclear-weapon Powers - for disarmament, international peace and security. My delegation would like to take the liberty of drawing the Commission's attention to the fact that over the past three decades the Vietnamese people have been victims of wars of aggression launched by some countries permanent members of the Security Council. And recently China, another country permanent member of the Security Council, launched a war of aggression against my country, a country that had freshly emerged from a large-scale war of aggression waged by imperialism of the United States another permanent member of the Security Council. And yet China is still threatening, as it has claimed many times, to "teach Viet Nam another lesson".

By embarking on a large-scale aggression against Viet Nam, the Chinese rulers have laid bare their true nature. They are the biggest traitors of our times. They are war criminals. They are now engaged in full collusion with the imperialists and other reactionary forces in the world in opposing the liberation movement, the revolution of the oppressed peoples everywhere in the world. As I just said, this constitutes the real danger to the peace and security of nations. Certainly, no one has forgotten that, following his trip to Peking, the United States Secretary of Defense, Harold Brown, affirmed:

"The Sino-United States co-operation is a strategic, military co-operation, which implies an alliance. We have parallel interests in many places around the world, and we intend to act in parallel." 

The following should be pointed out: those who allegedly profess concern for the right of nations to self-determination are precisely the imperialists and colonialists in collusion with the international reactionaries who have in various ways, been dominating most countries of the world, who have grossly trampled upon the independence and freedom of various countries and have committed the most odious crimes against humanity. And those who are being slanderously accused by them of aggression and interference in the internal
affairs of other countries are precisely those who have upheld the banner that proclaims that "nothing is more precious than independence and freedom", waging an extremely hard and glorious struggle for the cause of independence, freedom, and peace in the world.

One should note that the statement delivered by the Chinese representative on Tuesday, 13 May 1980, is a provocative one; it totally runs counter to the spirit of understanding and accommodation, and really does harm to the work of this Commission.

Last year, my delegation jointly with other delegations did its best to contribute to the success of the work of this Commission. In the same spirit, my delegation will co-operate closely with other delegations and contribute its part to the success of this session.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): The thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly held last year declared the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. At the beginning of the new Disarmament Decade, I wish to reiterate my country's firm determination to seek the promotion of disarmament and to express the hope that all countries will make greater efforts during this decade to achieve realistic and concrete disarmament measures.

Japan places importance on the breeding of trust among nations as the foundation for promoting disarmament and wishes to appeal strongly to all countries, in parallel to their pursuit of disarmament measures, to refrain from actions that cannot but cause distrust among other countries. Military intervention and military invasions that infringe upon international law and, notably, the United Nations Charter, as well as faith among nations, invasions such as have been witnessed in Afghanistan, are totally unacceptable to Japan and we maintain that the foreign military forces and other elements employed in the recent invasion should be withdrawn unconditionally. Such acts which increase mutual distrust among nations can only be regarded as grave challenges to the disarmament efforts of the international community.
At last year's session of the Disarmament Commission, Japan appealed for the exclusion of political propaganda from disarmament discussions. Were this Commission to degenerate into a forum for exchanges of such propaganda, not only would we be wasting valuable time but we might give rise to doubts about the wisdom of having revived this Commission.

My delegation strongly hopes that the Commission will live up to its character as a deliberative organ for disarmament and will conduct serious discussions on the various items on the agenda, keeping its feet firmly implanted in the real world of today, with a view to presenting meaningful proposals to the General Assembly and the Committee on Disarmament.

In order to contribute to our work, I now wish to express the basic thinking of Japan on items 3 and 4 of our agenda.

Under a resolution adopted at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, this Commission has been requested to prepare elements of a draft resolution entitled "Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade". My delegation hopes that the Commission will respond to that request by seeking for a realistic "disarmament strategy" for the new disarmament decade, taking into consideration our experience under the first Disarmament Decade. As to the main disarmament measures to be achieved during the Second Disarmament Decade, which would constitute an important element of the draft resolution in question, Japan wishes to mention a comprehensive nuclear test ban, the strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation régime, a chemical weapons ban, and confidence-building measures that take into account regional characteristics, which we have already listed in the Japanese response to the Secretary-General's request on the subject.

The first special session devoted to disarmament held in 1978 adopted a Final Document that sets forth our future objectives in the field of disarmament. Last year's session of this Commission adopted a document entitled "Elements of a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament". These documents emerged as a result of co-ordination of the different views of Member States and can be said to indicate the consensus of the international community regarding the basic principles that should be taken into account and the various measures that are to be realized in the field of disarmament. Consequently, these two documents
should be fully respected in our current discussions. To repeat discussions on
items on which consensus did not exist during the deliberations on these two
documents and to fix target dates in our eagerness to achieve specific disarmament
measures would not only be futile but could lead this Commission into
international discredit.

Nuclear disarmament has been the concern of the international community ever
since the first appearance of nuclear weapons in 1945. The reduction and
elimination of nuclear weapons has been the focus of discussions at the
United Nations and other disarmament organs since the days when the General Assembly
established the Atomic Energy Commission by its very first resolution 1 (I). Without
any need for me to quote from the Final Document of the special session devoted to
disarmament, I am sure that it is the common recognition of all countries represented
on this Commission that nuclear disarmament is the task of the highest priority in
the field of disarmament. However, it seems that countries have differing views
regarding the ways and means of achieving nuclear disarmament. This is one of the
reasons that progress in nuclear disarmament has been so slow and has stagnated.

My delegation is convinced that the most realistic and effective approach
towards nuclear disarmament is, first, to achieve the cessation of the nuclear arms
race, then to continue with actual reductions in the existing nuclear arsenals,
to be followed by a succession of feasible measures step-by-step. Based on this
way of thinking, we believe that we should start with the strengthening of the
nuclear non-proliferation régime and the early conclusion of a comprehensive test-
ban treaty. It is upon this recognition that Japan has been offering its positive
co-operation to the Ad Hoc Group of Seismic Exports established under the Committee
on Disarmament, with a view to contributing to solving the question of verification
under a comprehensive test-ban.

The Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty is
to be held in August this year. My country considers the Non-Proliferation Treaty
as the most important international legal framework within which nuclear
non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy can be made compatible
with each other. Japan will therefore be participating actively in the work of
the Review Conference in the hope that the Conference will provide the momentum
for a further strengthening of the non-proliferation régime based on the
Non-Proliferation Treaty. May I add that my Government welcomes the conclusion
last February of the work of the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation (INFCE)
that began in October 1977 and hopes that international efforts will be continued
on the basis of the results of the INFCE.
I wish to conclude my remarks on nuclear disarmament by saying that my delegation strongly hopes to see the early advent of an international situation in which the SALT II agreement, signed by the Soviet Union and the United States in June last year, can enter into force and that up to that moment those two States will refrain from any action that would be contrary to the purposes of the SALT I interim agreement and the SALT II agreement.

Improvements in the precision and destructive force of conventional weapons, as well as the fact that it is these conventional weapons that are being put to use in areas of conflict, all point plainly to the importance of disarmament in the field of conventional weapons. One cannot exclude the possibility that progress only in the field of nuclear disarmament may actually destabilize the framework of a given regional security situation. This is why, while according the highest priority to nuclear disarmament, we must also promote disarmament in the field of conventional weapons.

My delegation is of the view that, while taking into account the fact that the great majority of countries in the world rely on conventional weapons for their national security, realistic approaches towards conventional disarmament must be considered on the basis of paragraphs 81 to 88 of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament.

In this connexion, Japan recognizes the importance of the mutual balanced forces reduction negotiations in Europe, the initiatives of the Latin American countries in the field of conventional disarmament and the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons as realistic approaches towards conventional disarmament. Japan looks forward to further progress in these negotiations in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to close my remarks by expressing my delegation’s warm regards to you in the chair, and its readiness to contribute positively to the work of this Commission in order that we may achieve meaningful results.
Mr. de LAIGLESIA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I should like at the outset to say how pleased the delegation of Spain is that you are once again guiding the work of our Commission. We have very good memories of your work during the first substantive session, and we are convinced that your presence in this very important post guarantees that we shall again be able to achieve positive results.

Our Commission is meeting at a time which in the view of many may not be the most propitious for the examination of disarmament measures. It is undoubtedly true that the institutional machinery of the United Nations, as restructured following the tenth special session of the General Assembly, cannot be a substitute for the political will of States to negotiate and agree upon effective measures of arms control and disarmament. But the fact that this may not be deemed the most appropriate time to discuss these items should not be an obstacle to continued progress by all the bodies dealing with disarmament - in this case the Disarmament Commission - on the necessarily long path which in time will lead to the implementation of measures that depend on that political will alone.

In accordance with that approach, the delegation of Spain deemed it appropriate to submit to this Commission for its consideration a working paper on certain aspects of the question of conventional disarmament. That working paper has been distributed as document A/CN.10/12.

As is known, General Assembly resolution 34/83 H requested, in its operative paragraph 3, that the Disarmament Commission continue the consideration of the agenda items contained in section II of resolution 33/71 H, with the aim of elaborating, within the framework and in accordance with the priorities established at the tenth special session, a general approach to negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament. That request by the General Assembly is covered in item 4 (b) of our Commission's agenda.
Everyone is aware of the importance Spain attaches to the subject of the limitation and control of the production and transfer of conventional weapons; indeed, at the last session of the General Assembly we stressed this on several occasions. We therefore feel that when the Commission prepares general criteria for the negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament, due importance should be attached to the latter, to which - in our view - sufficient attention has not been paid - above all, as a comprehensive and separate issue.

In our working paper we outline the principles that should determine the norms for halting the arms race in this sector. They include the need to take into account the security of nations and the regional approach that should be taken to the measures to be adopted in this field. We refer also to the importance of irregular transfers and their causes. Finally, we propose a series of measures that we believe should be taken into account in the studies to be carried out with a view to making progress in this aspect of disarmament.

My delegation believes that the Commission could usefully devote some of its time to a broad discussion of conventional disarmament, within the framework of agenda item 4 (b), to which I have already referred. The participation in the Commission's work by all the States Members of the United Nations will make possible a broad exchange of views on an item that directly affects everyone.

In the Spanish delegation's view, this debate would be facilitated if several factors were taken into account. First, in the preparation of the general criteria on nuclear and conventional disarmament, a distinction should be made, for practical purposes, between those two aspects of the arms race. Secondly, it would be appropriate to consider the establishment of a working group which, in the light of the various proposals made, could effectively study possible recommendations for inclusion, in accordance with the Commission's mandate, in the Commission's report to the General Assembly. In order to draw this distinction between nuclear and conventional disarmament, the working group could perhaps agree to split up into two sub-groups to deal with, respectively, nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament.
What the Commission may recommend in its report will of course depend on the course of our debates. In the Spanish delegation's view - and we do not wish to prejudge the outcome of our discussion - a useful contribution to a proper consideration of conventional disarmament would be the inclusion among the recommendations to the General Assembly of a recommendation that the Assembly should decide at its next session to call for the preparation of a broad study on all the aspects of conventional disarmament, along the lines reflected in our working paper.

We wish once again to stress that, without overlooking the importance of nuclear disarmament - which we all agree is the primary objective of our work - we must pay due attention to conventional disarmament because, as we state in our working paper, this is the major factor in the arms race, from the point of view of volume.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.