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81-61126
The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS (continued)

The CHAIRMAN. Before we hear the next speaker in the general exchange of views, I call on the representative of the German Democratic Republic, who wishes to make a statement.

Hr. KAHN (German Democratic Republic): My delegation has asked to speak to make a short statement on what was reported in Press Release DC/1396 of 20 May 1981 regarding the statement of the head of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic at yesterday's meeting of the Commission.

We should like to point out that, first, the press release omitted any reference to conventional disarmament and did not reflect the position of the German Democratic Republic on the necessity for conventional disarmament in the context of nuclear disarmament; and, secondly, the press release did not rightly summarize that part of the statement dealing with certain aspects of the communiqué of the session of the NATO Foreign Ministers in Rome. Instead of "leaders of those countries", the press release should read "leaders of this country".

My delegation requests you, Hr. Chairman, to convey this statement to the officer responsible for the press release.

The CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat will take due note of the remarks of the representative of the German Democratic Republic.

I would now refer to questions raised in past meetings regarding some documents of the Disarmament Commission. In this regard I understand that the Secretariat has a statement to make. I call upon the Secretary of the Commission.
Mr. ALIN (Secretary of the Commission): In response to queries and references made in the Commission regarding some official documents related to the Commission's agenda items, in particular the report of the Committee on Disarmament, the comprehensive study on nuclear weapons and the report on South Africa's plan and capability in the nuclear field, the Secretariat would like to draw to the Commission's attention the fact that those reports, as well as all other official documents of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, have been transmitted to the Disarmament Commission pursuant to resolution 35/152 F, in a note by the Secretary-General contained in document A/CN.10/22 of 18 February 1981, with the notation that those documents have already been circulated. May I add that document A/C.10/22 was the first document to be issued as a Commission document this year.

With regard to particular reference to the wide publicity to be given to the report of the Secretary-General on South Africa's nuclear plan and capability under resolution 35/146 A, the Centre for Disarmament has, inter alia, arranged for the publication of the report in the form of a fact sheet. The publication of the report in full is under preparation by the services of the United Nations, and it will be out shortly.

The same information applies to the comprehensive study on nuclear weapons, as well as the report on regional approaches to disarmament, which was transmitted to the Commission by the General Assembly under operative paragraph 6 of resolution 35/156 D.

Finally, I should like to draw the attention of members to a new document, issued today. It is document A/CN.10/27, which contains a working paper by India on essential elements for deciding on the scope and structure of the proposal for a study on disarmament related to conventional weapons. The document is out in English and perhaps one other language. It was distributed only in those languages with the permission of the delegation of India. We therefore waive the simultaneous distribution of the document in other languages. It is to be hoped that it will be out tomorrow in view of the short time available to us and the fact that India might introduce the document tomorrow.
Mr. STEENBJERRE (Denmark): Yesterday the representative of the Netherlands made a statement on behalf of the ten member States of the European Communities, outlining our general approach to the pertinent items of the agenda of the Commission at this session.

With reference to that statement my delegation would today like to make the following additional remarks on agenda item 6, concerning the study on conventional weapons.

In document A/CN.10/25 Denmark has circulated a working paper on this subject. We hope that that paper will become part of the basis for the discussions in the working group that will be set upon this agenda item.

As was approved in principle by the General Assembly in its resolution 35/156 A, the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of qualified experts, is to carry out a study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces. The General Assembly further required the Disarmament Commission at its present session to work out the general approach to the study, its structure and scope.

In the working paper we have stated our views concerning the recommendations the United Nations Disarmament Commission is requested to make on the guidelines for the study.

Paragraph 10 of the working document should be seen as our proposal for such guidelines as might be included in the report of the Commission. I should like to give a brief explanation of the reasoning behind some of the provisions contained in this draft mandate.

In the first clause of paragraph 10, reference is made to the long-standing tradition of consensus reporting, which should also guide the members of the expert group. Unanimity in reporting is precisely what makes it possible to allow the experts a certain degree of freedom to choose their own ways and means for carrying out the study.

The second clause reads:
It should be guided by the principles and perspectives set forth in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament. (A/ CN.10/25, para. 10)

Since it is the most important internationally agreed document dealing with disarmament to have been adopted, the Final Document should assume a particular role as a point of departure for the experts. In this respect, paragraphs 22 and 28 of the Final Document are especially central. Paragraph 22 reads:

"Together with negotiations on nuclear disarmament measures, negotiations should be carried out on the balanced reduction of armed forces and of conventional armaments, based on the principle of undiminished security of the parties with a view to promoting or enhancing stability at a lower military level, taking into account the need of all States to protect their security. These negotiations should be conducted with particular emphasis on armed forces and conventional weapons of nuclear-weapons States and other militarily significant countries. There should also be negotiations on the limitation of international transfer of conventional weapons, based in particular on the same principle, and taking into account the inalienable right to self-determination and independence of peoples under colonial or foreign domination and the obligations of States to respect that right, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, as well as the need of recipient States to protect their security."

(General Assembly resolution S-10/2)
Paragraph 28 reads:

"All the peoples of the world have a vital interest in the success of disarmament negotiations. Consequently, all States have the duty to contribute to efforts in the field of disarmament. All States have the right to participate in disarmament negotiations. They have the right to participate on an equal footing in those multilateral disarmament negotiations which have a direct bearing on their national security. While disarmament is the responsibility of all States, the nuclear-weapon States have the primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament and, together with other militarily significant States, for halting and reversing the arms race. It is therefore important to secure their active participation". (ibid.)

In the third clause of paragraph 10 of the working document (A/CN.10/25) we propose that the draft should call for an ascertainment of "the facts of the conventional arms buildup, the risks and costs involved and the prospects for disarmament, including the size of present conventional arsenals, the capabilities and effects of present weapon systems and foreseeable developments". (A/CN.10/25, para. 10)

By this wording it is our intention to propose that the descriptive parts of the study should consist of a comprehensive and in-depth examination of the pertinent aspects of the conventional arms race. The study should be based on open material as well as such further information as Member States may wish to make available. Consideration should be given not only to the size of present arsenals, but also to the types and capabilities of weapons now being developed or deployed as well as the implications of foreseeable trends in technological developments and their consequences for disarmament.

By stating in the fourth clause that the study should "examine the different importance and the different implications of the conventional weapons and forces existing in various parts of the world" (ibid.), we have intended to point to the fact that, although effective measures of conventional disarmament must be seen in a comprehensive perspective, the regional dimension is of considerable importance.
The fifth clause underlines the existence of a close relationship between conventional arms build-up and the development of the nuclear-arms race, as stated in the Final Document of the tenth special session. The experts should take full account thereof.

Among those relevant United Nations studies referred to in the sixth clause of paragraph 10 are, besides the regional study, obviously, inter alia, the study of the interrelationship between disarmament and international security, the comprehensive study of confidence-building measures, the study on the reduction of military budgets and the study of the relationship between disarmament and development.

The seventh and eighth clauses request the experts to consider the general principles and guidelines which are applicable to conventional disarmament and to seek out areas in which measures to curb the conventional arms race and to achieve conventional disarmament are most urgent and seem most feasible. These clauses ask for a forward looking analysis of conceivable measures for conventional disarmament.

By stating in the last clause that

"It should take account throughout of the principle that the adoption of disarmament measures should take place in such an equitable and balanced manner as to ensure the right of each State to security and that no individual State or group of States may obtain advantages over others at any stage, of the right of each State to protect its security, of the special responsibility of States with the largest military arsenals in pursuing conventional armaments reductions, and, generally, of the need to achieve an acceptable balance of the responsibilities and obligations of all States in the disarmament process." (ibid.)

we have tried to point, inter alia, to the right of all States to security and to the special responsibilities of States with the largest military arsenals. These principles should, in our opinion, be fundamental points of departure for the experts when considering possible future initiatives in the field of conventional disarmament.

May I add that today we received document A/CN.10/27, issued by India. My delegation has not yet had an opportunity to study this closely, but I should
like to say - and it should not be necessary to state it - that the Danish delegation will participate in the deliberations of the working group in a spirit of co-operation.

**Mr. MUTUKWA (Zambia):** Sir, on behalf of the Zambian delegation, I should like to congratulate you warmly on your election to the chairmanship of this important body of the United Nations. As an officer of the Commission, we pledge our fullest co-operation with you in fulfilling the tasks ahead.

My delegation would like to make a few general and specific comments with regard to the agenda item before this session of the Commission.

As we meet here, international peace and security hang in a precarious balance because of the prevailing international situation. The situation is that the arms race among the nuclear-weapons Powers, in particular the nuclear arms race, has escalated further, both vertically and horizontally. Furthermore, international peace and security are threatened by such deliberate acts as the use or threat of the use of force against the sovereignty, national independence and territorial integrity of States; military intervention and occupation; interference in the internal affairs of States and by the denial of the right of self-determination of peoples and nations under colonial and alien domination which are seeking to exercise their inalienable right to independence. The escalation of the arms race based on the misperceptions of military superiority is also neither conducive to peace nor to the lessening of tensions.

It is evident that, if this drift towards disaster persists and no tangible efforts are made to reverse or halt the trend, international conflicts will be exacerbated and the danger of a full-scale war greater.

My delegation is aware that this Commission is operating within a narrow framework, but little could be achieved if we were to ignore the realities of the prevailing situation. Suffice it for me to state that the agenda for this session offers a general framework for reflecting on the complex issues which threaten man's existence and civilization on this planet. This Commission therefore should devise strategies for encouraging meaningful dialogue for disarmament.
In the view of my delegation, efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament should be accorded top priority. This item should be inscribed on our agenda for as long as the arms race in the nuclear field persists. Halting and reversing the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, are also recognized as a priority in the Final Document of the tenth special session. Nuclear disarmament is indeed a priority area which has been included among the goals of the Second Disarmament Decade for the 1980s, and this is as it should be.

In the decade of the 1980s, it would be advisable also for the international community to elaborate and encourage the study of all aspects of the arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons, as suggested in agenda item 6.

The Zambian delegation is also of the view that notwithstanding the division of labour in the approaches to disarmament matters within the United Nations system, the Disarmament Commission should be open-minded and receptive to studies from elsewhere, as was proposed the other day by the representative of Brazil. Even if a particular study has not been inscribed on our agenda for deliberation, it would help the work of the Commission if, on request by a number of delegations, certain studies or specialized reports were to be provided. I have in mind, for example, the comprehensive study on nuclear weapons and some of the reports which emanate from the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies. I should stress that the proposal is for documentation, and not for duplicating deliberations.

Let me now turn to the dangerous situation which has been created by the development of nuclear weapons in South Africa, which is the substance of item 9 on the agenda of this session. I am referring at the outset to the development of nuclear weapons "in" South Africa - and not "by" South Africa - to emphasize the fact that it is not by its own ingenuity that South Africa acquired a nuclear capability. It is imported military technology which has enabled that unique régime, which is an international outlaw, to develop its modern arsenal of weaponry, including a nuclear capability.
This is happening in a volatile region of southern Africa, and in a
continent in which all independent African States, supported by the
international community, have opted for Africa to be a nuclear-weapon-free
zone.

In a letter dated 8 March 1979, the Chairman of the Special Committee
against Apartheid requested the Secretary-General to transmit a report, in
document S/13157, on nuclear collaboration with South Africa to the
Disarmament Commission for its attention.

According to paragraph 23 of the Disarmament Commission's report in 1980
to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, it is stated that:

"Since the Disarmament Commission was unable to consider items 6
and 7 of its agenda ... it recommends that those items should be included
in the agenda of the Commission's session of 1981." (A/35/42)

The item 7 referred to is the new item 9 of our present agenda, and my delegation
is grateful that this serious issue has been brought before the current
session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. It is our expectation that this
important deliberative organ of the General Assembly will accord due weight
to this matter.

The report of the United Nations Seminar on Nuclear Collaboration with
South Africa reached very important conclusions on the subject, details
of which we should all have. However, let me highlight a few aspects which
are drawn from that report.

It has been proved that South Africa has acquired a nuclear capability:
South Africa could produce a nuclear device either from plutonium or from
enriched uranium. Since that report was written, South Africa has exploded
test devices in the South Atlantic - on 22 September 1979, among those tests
which have been widely publicized. Other important insights have been provided
by the report of the Group of Experts (A/35/402), in addition to the research
paper by Mr. Barnaby, of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
(SIPRI), entitled "Nuclear South Africa". Both reports, I believe, should be
available to the Disarmament Commission.
Now, the seminar to which I referred earlier concluded that the development of nuclear weapons in South Africa presented an enormous danger to international peace, not only regionally but globally, adding that:

"It was not merely a question of proliferation of nuclear weapons but the acquisition of nuclear capability by a racist régime which is illegitimate and criminal and which has a record of violence against the great majority of its people and of constant aggression against neighbouring States. The situation was therefore unique."

Their recommendation is that it is essential that all importation of uranium from South Africa be ended; that South Africa be denied all technology for uranium enrichment and that its enrichment plant be dismantled. Ending collaboration would at least slow down the rate at which South Africa can increase its capacity, and would lower the level of sophistication of the types of weapons which South Africa could produce.

Concern about the prospect of South Africa acquiring a nuclear capability has a long history among peace-loving States - and in Africa in particular. It has been a preoccupation of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity since the founding of that organization, as reflected in the 1964 resolution adopted by the first ordinary Summit of the OAU. Alarm has repeatedly been expressed by Africa about South Africa's increased sophistication in the nuclear field, including the advanced processing and enrichment of uranium as nuclear-weapon fuel and its advanced nuclear technology. Africa has always been aware of the source of this technology, as has been proved irrefutably by independent sources, such as in the recent study by Mr. Barnaby, to which I referred earlier. The culprits are well known, and, of course, certain of these countries are represented here in the Disarmament Commission. I do not need to go into detail about this matter, for the documents speak volumes for themselves.
The development of nuclear weapons by South Africa is a higher component of the systematic programme of militarizing that country. After all, South Africa's nuclear energy activities have developed steadily since the Second World War. South Africa is amassing more weapons as a means of seeking to shield apartheid - or institutionalized white supremacy - from inevitable destruction. South Africa is amassing nuclear weapons in a bid to intimidate Africa into submission and thereby make South Africa safe for apartheid for ever. The fact of the matter is that no amount or arsenal of nuclear weapons will save South Africa from the internal uprisings and revolts which are rapidly becoming the spectre of the political theatre inside and within South Africa.

The South African nuclear programme is more ominous for Africa because it represents an ever-present danger of aggression and annihilation in the event of the Pretoria régime's facing the danger of collapse. The régime of Pretoria is recklessly aggressive. Concern has been voiced about the steady ascendance of the military to political power in Pretoria, with all the consequences which this new power matrix entails.

The United Nations and its organs, as the representative of the international community, cannot afford to pay - and should not pay - scant attention to proven reports about South Africa's nuclear capability, its nuclear tests, be it in the Kalahari or in the South Atlantic. Attempts to falsify records or to engage in cover-ups about South Africa's nuclear tests or its nuclear programme could be a dangerous development. The world must know the facts to avoid surprise discoveries which could endanger international peace and security even further.
Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would like to use the opportunity afforded it to speak in the general debate in order to make known its views on certain particularly topical aspects of the problem of disarmament and the fundamental items on the agenda of this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

As stated in paragraph 118 of the Final Document of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Commission is a deliberative body and not a forum for negotiations. However, even within the framework of that competence, it could promote the cause of disarmament if all the participants evinced a constructive approach to the tasks facing the Commission.

At the present time, in circumstances of a serious deterioration in the international situation, a constructive approach of this kind is more necessary than ever. While in the 1970s efforts to restrain the arms race began to proceed at an encouraging rate, on the threshold of this decade there was an acceleration of the process of the accumulation and creation of new types of armaments, including the most dangerous of them - nuclear weapons. No one can refute the fact that the means of waging war and of mass destruction have now assumed such proportions that their use would pose a threat to the very existence of many peoples. It follows very clearly, therefore, that to attempt to win the arms race, to count on a victory in a nuclear war, is dangerous folly. It also follows from this that halting the arms race and beginning the process of disarmament is the paramount issue for all the peoples of the world and is the paramount issue also for the United Nations.

Banking on the force of arms and on military superiority over others cannot ensure a stable and lasting peace or universal security or, accordingly, the security of any given State. History has frequently yielded examples of a situation where action has given rise to counteraction; the possession of a new form of weapon by one side inevitably has led to a situation where the same weapon, even more sophisticated, comes into the possession of the other side. The arms race then moves on to a new and higher level and becomes ever more dangerous and destructive. And, now, the situation has reached the point where a veritable Damocles' sword of nuclear war is hanging over contemporary civilization.
What should be done to protect against the danger of war and to achieve practical progress in the field of disarmament and thus an easing of international tension? In the view of the Soviet Union, in the present complex international situation, it is extremely important not to slacken but rather to step up the efforts of all States to achieve concrete measures in the field of curbing the arms race and disarmament. This approach of the Soviet Union was once again confirmed with the utmost clarity by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Comrade Brezhnev, who, at the recent Twenty-sixth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, stressed that:

"The key area of the foreign policy work of the Party and the State has been and remains the struggle to ease the threat of war and curb the arms race."

In recent years the Soviet Union has put forward a considerable number of proposals aimed at halting the arms race. They were set forth in a concise and general form in a letter of the Foreign Minister of the USSR, Comrade Gromyko, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 11 April 1980, relating to the tasks of the Second Disarmament Decade in document A/CN.10/10/Add.1, and also in a memorandum submitted to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly entitled "Peace, disarmament and international security guarantees" in document A/35/482.

At the Twenty-sixth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union a broad range of constructive new proposals were put forward on questions of armaments limitation and military détente. Those proposals relate to nuclear missiles, conventional types of weapons and land, naval and air forces; they relate to measures of both a political and a military character. All those proposals have one common aim - to do everything possible to banish from the lives of the peoples the threat of nuclear war and to preserve peace on earth.
In our view, States must utilize all possible channels for negotiations and also exploit all possibilities for a broad exchange of views on these matters within the framework of the United Nations. It is precisely from that standpoint that the Soviet delegation approaches the work of the Disarmament Commission and its own participation in that organ's work.

The Soviet Union is not only proposing a broad programme of measures for curbing the arms race; it is also ready to sit down in a businesslike spirit at the negotiation table to discuss all or any of them. Furthermore, we have no claim to a monopoly on disarmament. Any constructive idea, whatever its source, meets and will continue to meet with understanding from us. We by no means always like the conduct or course of action of some of our partners in any given political matter. But that does not mean that we have created, or will create, any conditions for our participation in disarmament negotiations.

It is our firm conviction that disarmament is a problem common to the whole of mankind, and if we make its solution dependent on other complex international questions that will be tantamount to deliberately blocking progress in this area of such vital importance to all peoples.

The Soviet Union categorically repudiates any attempts to place equal responsibility for the arms race and the lack of progress in restraining it on all great Powers, that is to say, including the Soviet Union.

Since the end of the 1970s negotiations have been halted or broken off on a number of concrete issues relating to the limitation of armaments and disarmament. In no case has the Soviet side been responsible for this; nor have we been responsible for the fact that the SALT II Treaty, which has already been signed, has not come into force. It is not we who have been openly proclaiming our aim of achieving military superiority over the other side. In these circumstances how can anyone talk of any kind of equal responsibility for the arms race?
In the belief that nuclear weapons constitute the most serious threat to the existence of mankind, the Soviet Union has consistently championed the consideration of the problem of halting the nuclear arms race and of nuclear disarmament as the question of highest priority.

In our view, the proper way of resolving this problem is the earliest possible initiation of negotiations on halting the manufacture of all types of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of stockpiles of such weapons up to and including their total elimination. As will be recalled, the Soviet Union, together with other socialist States, has submitted for consideration by the Committee on Disarmament concrete proposals with regard to beginning such negotiations and the way in which they should be conducted.

Within the context of efforts to halt the nuclear arms race, the proposal for general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons testing is of particular importance. In the mid-1970s we were able to discern certain positive moves in the direction of solving this important question. A start was made on trilateral negotiations with the participation of the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom. In an attempt to ensure the most rapid progress possible in reaching mutually acceptable agreement, the Soviet Union at these talks took some important steps to accommodate its partners, thus creating conditions for reaching agreement without delay.

However, the absence of the necessary goodwill on the part of the other two participants in the talks was the reason why a treaty has not so far been concluded. The Soviet Union continues to attach considerable importance to the trilateral talks and, at the same time, believes that the Committee on Disarmament should have an important and active role in resolving the problem of prohibiting nuclear weapons testing.

In our desire to give a further impetus to negotiations on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapons testing, the Soviet Union at the last session of the General Assembly proposed that all nuclear Powers should declare a one-year moratorium on all nuclear explosions. A step of this kind would undoubtedly have a very good effect on international efforts to prohibit nuclear weapons testing.
The banishing of the threat of nuclear war in large measure depends on efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. No one can possibly harbour any doubts about the threat to peace that would be posed by nuclear weapons coming into the possession particularly of those countries that are situated in an area where the danger of war is especially great and other States that are seeking to acquire these weapons for aggressive purposes. Realizing this, the Soviet Union has consistently striven for the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime.

In the interests of achieving that goal, the Soviet Union in 1978 made a declaration that it would never use nuclear weapons against those States that renounce their manufacture or acquisition or have no such weapons in their territories.

We attach great significance to the problem of strengthening security guarantees for non-nuclear States, and the Soviet Union believes that one of the most effective means of solving this problem would be the conclusion of an international convention on the subject. However, in the light of the negative stance taken by certain States in this regard, the Soviet Union, while remaining a very firm supporter of the idea of an international convention, has also expressed its readiness to consider another possible alternative. In particular, it has proposed that all nuclear States should make solemn declarations identical or similar in content to the effect that they would not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States that do not have such weapons in their territories. If such declarations are in keeping with the goal I have mentioned, they could be buttressed by an authoritative decision of the United Nations Security Council.

The Soviet Union has also proposed that agreement should be reached on the non-deployment of nuclear weapons in the territories of States where such weapons do not exist at present. Such an agreement could provide for a simple and clear-cut obligation for nuclear States not to deploy nuclear weapons in the territories of those countries where there are no such weapons now, regardless of whether or not those countries have relations of alliance with any particular nuclear State.
In resolution 35/156 C the General Assembly at its last session requested
the Committee on Disarmament to proceed without delay to talks with a
view to elaborating an international agreement on the basis of this proposal.
It is important now for the Committee on Disarmament to give due attention to
this matter.

In the view of the Soviet Union, those are the main areas on which effort
should be focused within the framework of the United Nations in order to resolve
the problem of limiting the nuclear arms race and bringing about nuclear
disarmament.

As members are aware, in the Final Document of the special session of
the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, it is stressed that progress in
the limitation and subsequent reduction of nuclear weapons would be facilitated
both by parallel political or international legal measures and by
progress in the limitation and reduction of armed forces and conventional
armaments of the nuclear-weapon States and other States in the regions concerned.

The question of the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons
was considered comprehensively at various stages of negotiations on disarmament.
Soon after the end of the Second World War - as long ago as 1948 - the Soviet Union
made a proposal in the United Nations that, along with the prohibition of nuclear
weapons, States permanent members of the Security Council should in the course
of one year make a substantial reduction in their land, naval and air forces.
Concrete proposals on questions of reducing armed forces and conventional armaments
of States were also made subsequently by the Soviet Union and other parties
to the Warsaw Treaty.

In May last year in a joint declaration of the States parties to the Warsaw
Treaty it was confirmed that there is no kind of weapons which they would not be
ready to limit and reduce on a reciprocal basis. Of course, in this there should
be strict observance of the principle of no detriment to the security of anyone.

We take an extremely favourable view of the signing last month of a
Convention on the prohibitions or restrictions on the use of certain
conventional weapons. This fact clearly demonstrates that, even when a difficult
situation exists in the world, it is possible to come to agreement on measures to
curb the arms race and on disarmament.
However, so far there has not been any decisive progress in the matter of solving the question of reducing conventional armaments. That is why the Soviet Union believes it necessary to confirm once again that its proposal which was put forward two years ago remains fully valid, that is, to halt the production of new types of conventional weapons of great destructive force. Equally valid to this very day is the Soviet proposal put forth at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly to the effect that all States – primarily the States permanent members of the Security Council and countries associated with them in military agreements – should assume the obligation not to increase, with effect from a certain date, their armed forces and conventional armaments as a first step towards their subsequent reduction.
Some time ago efforts were undertaken to achieve agreement on limitations of the sale and delivery of conventional weapons, which are now in the order of many billions of dollars, leading to the saturation of crisis areas with dangerous means of waging war. At the Soviet-American talks in 1978 a start was made on producing political, legal and military-technical criteria for the admissibility or inadmissibility of arms deliveries. The achievement of agreement, it appears, was within the realm of the possible but the talks were halted by the American side, which subsequently refused to continue them.

In its approach to solving the problem of carrying out research in disarmament matters, including the area of conventional armaments, the Soviet Union proceeds from the belief that the need for and usefulness of such studies should be determined primarily by the extent to which they practically promote the elaboration and conclusion of concrete agreements on limiting the arms race.

As regards the position of the Soviet Union on the question of reducing the military budgets of States, our views on this have been set forth repeatedly, most recently in the letter sent by the USSR Mission to the United Nations in reply to an inquiry from the Secretary-General of the United Nations in connexion with General Assembly resolution 35/142 A on that question. The Soviet Union is a consistent supporter of the reduction of military budgets. The Soviet Union is not increasing its military budget; on the contrary, in recent years it has several times reduced it on a unilateral basis.

It is our firm conviction that in place of the present constant increase of military expenditures in the world there should be a practice of systematic reduction. All States, permanent members of the Security Council, as well as other States that possess major economic and military potential, should take a primary part in the work of reducing military budgets. The reduction of military expenditures of States is something which could also be carried out on a regional or some other basis, but of course, in this context, the reduction of the military budgets of some States should
not be offset by an increase in the military expenditures of their allies in blocs.

The reduction of military appropriations would make it possible to divert additional funds to the peaceful goals of economic and social development and to improve the well-being of peoples of the world. Some of the funds saved as a result of the reduction of military budgets should be earmarked for assistance to developing countries. In that case it would be possible to create machinery, within the framework of the United Nations, for distributing the designated funds among recipient States.

Over the last few years the Soviet Union has proposed various different ways of overcoming the stagnation in the matter of reducing military budgets and it has shown itself ready to look for flexible, mutually acceptable solutions, in particular with regard to the size of the initial reduction.

Nevertheless, the matter of the actual reduction of military budgets has so far not moved from dead centre. The reason is that a number of States, including certain permanent members of the Security Council, have refused to achieve practical agreements or understandings and have furthermore adopted a course of unprecedented and unrestrained inflation of military budgets. Experience has shown that attempts to produce a system of control and comparison of military budgets and machinery for standardized accounting systems are frequently exploited by certain States as camouflage for their reluctance to agree to a reduction of military expenditures.

The Soviet Union is ready to embark without delay on the work of defining concrete dimensions for reductions, either in percentage or absolute terms. We are ready to begin work also on freezing military budgets.

Having set forth our views on questions on the agenda of this session of the Disarmament Commission, the Soviet delegation would like to express the hope that the forthcoming debate will be conducted in a business-like spirit and that the results of the session will make for progress towards the limitation of the arms race and towards disarmament. The Soviet delegation is ready to co-operate with other delegations to achieve that goal, in the belief that in our day there is no task more important for the future of the whole of mankind.
Mrs. GREATHIER (Seychelles): Please accept my delegation's warmest congratulations on your election, Sir, as Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. We know that your skills will guide us through our work.

At a time when hunger is killing thousands of people every day around the world, half a million scientists are devoting themselves to the perfecting of techniques to exterminate the human species. That sad reality compels us to question ourselves on the future of humanity, which is being faced with the terror of nuclear power changed into a world order.

The imposition of the coexistence of an international order of poverty with an international order of terror - is that not a situation which should compel us to do more thinking about the urgency of the search for a better way of utilizing the large resources that are devoted each year to the industry of death? No one contests the fact that phenomenal sums of money are dedicated to the race for armaments and that the notion of international solidarity is in fact but an expression without any meaning.

Here are some statistics that make one shiver. In 1962 military expenditures in the whole world amounted to $120 billion, in other words, 8 to 9 per cent of the yearly world production of goods and services. That figure at that time represented by itself two thirds of the global national revenue of all developing countries together.

In 1976, according to the figures given by Mr. Kurt Waldheim, Secretary-General of the United Nations, those military expenditures had reached a total of $350 billion. These days they would be close to $500 billion.

Generally speaking, the twentieth century has seen an unprecedented increase in military expenditures and the race for armaments. According to recent statistics the world has spent $7,500 billion on armaments since the beginning of the century.
Our civilization is one full of mistakes. Among those mistakes, writes Josué de Castro in his *Study on Hunger*, the most serious one, without doubt, is to have left hundreds of millions of people to die of hunger while the possibilities of increasing food production are almost endless in a world which has at its disposal the required technical means for increase.

It is, then, hardly necessary to mention that the race for armaments is incompatible with the efforts aimed at establishing a new international economic order.

The developing countries believe that the energy and the fabulous resources now used for those purposes should be made available for the needs of economic and social development of the entire human race.

Most of the 140 or so armed conflicts which have exploded since the Second World War have happened in developing areas. Tensions are fostered in the developing world to protect the interests of the arms industry for the profit of industrialists, and experiments are conducted far away from areas where those arms are manufactured.

The human and material potential used in the armaments industry could have been devoted to reducing the gap that exists between the world of the rich and that of the poor or to seeing to it that it does not continue to widen.

Some countries use a big proportion of rare metals, calling them "strategics" in that industry of death. Such is case as far as bauxite, copper, zinc, nickel and so on are concerned. And because of so-called "strategics" tensions are being fostered in those areas of which the Indian Ocean forms part of the scheme of things as far as those Powers are concerned. Even apartheid in South Africa, which all profess to abhor, is upheld because of the "strategics". And therefore certain Powers refuse to impose sanctions to punish South Africa for its terrorist acts.

There is once more, then, a reason to stress the unnatural character of the imposed coexistence of the race for armaments with the search for a new international economic order.
We cannot at the United Nations debate issues in various committees without seeing how interrelated they are. Thus the work of the Ad Hoc Committee to create a Zone of Peace in the Indian Ocean has a bearing on this Commission; so do discussions on the New International Economic Order, and South-South talks have connexions with this Commission. When we the Indian Ocean States cry out for the elimination of tensions in their region, we do so with a sense of purpose and because we are serious. When we cry out for a conference which has the support of United Nations resolutions, this Commission should condemn those who are blocking the convening of that conference.

The third world countries and the Non-Aligned Movement have not ceased to stress the threat that the race for armaments represents for the future of humanity.

The press confirms that disarmament, which is at a deadlock, could stay thus in the absence of a new concerted strategy. We must press harder for dialogue and negotiations to resume. A report published during the last 10 years by a group of United Nations experts emphasizes that

'a general reduction of 20 per cent of military expenditures could contribute not only to satisfying urgent economic needs, but also to tangibly reducing the economic disparities between the two groups of countries'.

The reduction of armaments will inevitably free human resources as well as material ones which could be used to promote development and the improvement of international economic relations.

The international scientific community has responsibilities which should not be put aside. It is of the highest importance that this community here appeal to the half million scientists who are undertaking research for the destruction of people - I say “people” and not “men” because women and children too die in this madness - to devote their efforts more towards the improvement of the plight of the poorest.

Disarmament is very closely linked to the restructuring of international economic relations. In so far as everybody agrees that the future of humanity depends to a great extent on a deep change in the organization of
the world, it is logical to think that disarmament is one of the objectives of the New International Economic Order.

If humanity succeeds in this, it will be a new achievement leading to a better transfer of resources from rich countries to poor countries. If it fails, its future will be dangerously mortgaged, because the wheat seed cannot coexist with the nuclear seed.

We do not have hunger or human suffering in the Republic of Seychelles. It is our deep compassion for humanity and the desire for decency that has compelled us to make this statement. The South-South Conference in Caracas has just taken place. Would it have been necessary if the unnecessary armadas in the Indian Ocean and monstrosities like Diego Garcia did not exist? I think not.

**Mr. PFLEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany):** Mr. Chairman, first I should like again to express my delegation's satisfaction that the United Nations Disarmament Commission can convene under your chairmanship.

Let me also express my delegation's sincere thanks and best wishes to our outgoing Chairman, Mr. Vellodi, who presided with skill and determination over two substantive sessions. Mr. Vellodi was in fact instrumental in giving the United Nations Disarmament Commission its present shape.

The positive results reached by the Commission at its previous substantive sessions were extremely encouraging as they fully corresponded with the concepts laid down in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament while establishing the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body entrusted with, *inter alia*, the task of designing the general outlines of the process of disarmament. The Disarmament Commission, which is open to all Member States of the United Nations, has its own significant role to play as a forum in which every State may contribute to the progress of arms control and disarmament. Yesterday the representative of the Netherlands delivered a statement on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Communities. That statement fully represents my Government's positions. My delegation would, though, like to add a few further remarks.
The agenda for the present session is long and ambitious considering that there is less time available than at previous sessions. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we fully support your suggestion regarding the organization of the work to be done - that is, that two open-ended working groups should be set up. Basically, this session has to deal with two substantive items on which recommendations are expected: the question of the reduction of military budgets and the general approach to the study on all aspects of the conventional arms race. Both subjects have met with great interest on the part of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.
As for the reduction of military budgets, we believe that reducing the burden of military expenditures in the world is one of the most important goals of all efforts to establish, through concrete and balanced negotiated results, enhanced security and stability for all States at lower levels of military potential.

In connexion with the question of reducing military budgets, the first concrete problem to be solved is that of making military expenditures of different States comparable. The Federal Republic of Germany has contributed to and supported the United Nations activities in this field and will continue to do so. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 35/142 B, a group of experts has now been asked to refine that reporting instrument further. This group of experts has also been asked to examine and suggest solutions to the question of comparing military expenditures among different States, as well as to problems of verification that will arise in connexion with agreements on the reduction of military budgets.

My Government continues to support fully this ongoing work of the expert group. The availability of a reliable reporting instrument constitutes a precondition for agreements on the freezing and reduction of military budgets. Wider participation by States from all regional groups and different economic systems in the further development of the reporting instrument is necessary.

An important step towards enhancing the necessary transparency in the field of military expenditures would be the establishment of United Nations registers, as suggested by the Vice-Chancellor and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

The Federal Republic of Germany believes also that the reduction of military budgets can be dealt with only as a complementary measure in connexion with other steps towards disarmament. It cannot take the place of other steps.

With regard to conventional weapons we welcome the fact that the overwhelming majority of Member States have by accepting resolution 35/156 A proved that they give the question of conventional weapons the attention it deserves. Although listed in the Final Document as one of the priority items in the field of disarmament, so far it has not been dealt with in a comprehensive manner.
Our task in this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission will be to provide the expert group with a workable, realistic mandate to assess past and ongoing efforts to achieve arms control and disarmament in the conventional field aiming at the strengthening of international peace and security at lower levels of forces and armaments, taking into account the necessity of preserving the undiminished security of States at each and every phase of the disarmament process. The results of several previous United Nations studies will have to be taken into account when tackling this task.

According to various international peace institutes, world-wide expenditures on conventional weapons make up 80 per cent of all military expenditures. This should be reason enough to provide the expert group with a mandate that allows further examination of the whole field of conventional weapons.

My delegation shares the view expressed in India's working paper (A/CN.10/27) that any partial, discriminatory study of conventional disarmament would lack credibility and serve no useful purpose. The study should be global and comprehensive.

As I mentioned before, the task is an ambitious one, but my delegation is optimistic that, with our collective efforts and the initiative of all Member States for full participation, this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission will contribute to preparing the second special session devoted to disarmament, which will take place next year. My delegation will come back to the questions I have referred to in a more specific and detailed manner during the meetings of the working groups.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Sir, I should like first of all to convey the sincere congratulations of my delegation on your well-deserved appointment to the chairmanship of this Commission. I believe that that wise decision is due both to your personal qualities as well as to the prominent role that your country has played in the area of work on disarmament.
My delegation's appreciation is also extended to your distinguished predecessor, Ambassador Vellodi, who so ably guided the first steps of the Disarmament Commission.

Among the principles which form the basis of the United Nations and which in 1945 were clearly defined in the Charter of the Organization, a prominent place is given to the following two: that of sovereign equality of all Members of the United Nations and that of the prohibition against recourse to "the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations". (Article 2 (4))

There were only and exclusively two authorized exceptions to this crucial principle of the prohibition of the threat or use of force in the San Francisco Charter - that of individual or collective self-defence in the event of "an armed attack" and that of collective action, which, under a decision of the Security Council, would be exercised "in order to maintain or restore international peace and security" pursuant to the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter.

A quarter of a century later, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, the General Assembly adopted by consensus a "Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations", which, among other things, set forth that "No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State" (General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), annex), stating clearly that that principle prohibits not only "armed intervention but also all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements" (ibid.), which is the reason that "No State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights and to secure from it advantages of any kind". (ibid.)
Four years later, at its sixth special session, the Assembly — also by consensus as in the previous case — adopted a Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order which, inter alia, proclaimed that that Order "should be based on full respect for" various principles, one of which are defined as follows:

"Full permanent sovereignty of every State over its natural resources and all economic activities. In order to safeguard these resources, each State is entitled to exercise effective control over them and their exploitation with means suitable to its own situation, including the right to nationalization or transfer of ownership to its nationals, this right being an expression of the full permanent sovereignty of the State. No State may be subjected to economic, political or any other type of coercion to prevent the free and full exercise of this inalienable right." (resolution 3201 (S-VI), para. 3 (e))

Lastly, in the Final Document of its first special session devoted to disarmament, which, as is well known, was adopted in the spring of 1978 and which — as is true of the two previous cases I have mentioned — was adopted by participating States by consensus, the General Assembly, in referring to the adoption of measures relating to the curbing and reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces, emphasized that: first, in the adoption of those measures it is essential to take into account:

"the need of States to protect their security, bearing in mind the inherent right of self-defence embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and without prejudice to the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in accordance with the Charter";

Secondly, that:

"Real progress in the field of nuclear disarmament could create an atmosphere conducive to progress in conventional disarmament on a worldwide basis."
Thirdly, that:

"States with the largest military arsenals have a special responsibility in pursuing the process of conventional armaments reductions". (resolution S-10/2, paras. 83, 55 and 81 respectively)

I have thought it appropriate to make this brief summary because the facts I have recalled I find extremely relevant for the purposes of our agenda item 6 which consists in an "Elaboration of the general approach to the study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces, as well as its structure and scope", and also because we are convinced that they provide an excellent backdrop for an appropriate evaluation of some recent international studies whose premises and conclusions have been widely publicized.

I am referring to the report which was prepared jointly by four of those institutions that are customarily called "think-tanks", which devote their time to analysing international affairs and which are based in various countries of one of the two major military alliances respectively. That report was published simultaneously early this year in English, under the title Western security: what has changed? What should be done? by the Council on Foreign Relations in New York and the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London; in French, under the title of La sécurité de l'Occident: bilan et orientations, by the Institut Français des Relations Internationales in Paris; and in German under the title Die Sicherheit des Westens: Neue Dimensionen und Aufgaben by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik in Bonn.

The report in question starts out from the premise contained in its first paragraph:

"On the threshold of the decade of the 1980s which threatens to be difficult, Western nations face frightening challenges, some of which have no precedent."

As may be seen in subsequent paragraphs of the report, the main challenges to which it refers may be grouped into two major categories: those which are due to a re-emergence of tensions between East and West which threaten to produce a new stage of the cold war, on the one hand, and, on the other, those which the report defines in its third paragraph by saying that "the West
will find itself faced with an increasingly unstable and changing third world on which it will depend in an ever higher degree for its economic survival".

It is not up to me to comment on relations between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact, and I shall therefore not refer to all the comments which the report contains on the first category of challenges which I have just described, even though I do feel compelled to state for the record that my delegation does not share the enthusiasm of its authors over nuclear weapons since, as we have expressly made clear several times, we think that, as stated in the report of the Secretary-General entitled "General and complete disarmament: comprehensive study on nuclear weapons":

"Nuclear weapons are the most serious threat to international security." (A/35/392, annex, para. 500)

"So long as reliance continues to be placed upon the concept of the balance of nuclear deterrence as a method for maintaining peace, the prospects for the future will always remain dark, menacing and as uncertain as the fragile assumptions upon which they are based." (Ibid., para. 520)

But in relation to that question I shall rest there. I should like nevertheless to go into greater detail with regard to the considerations contained in the "think-tank" report about what is entitled in the relevant chapter "Security problems in the third world", with regard to which some conclusions are also included in the last chapter which is entitled "Consultations and co-ordination".
(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The basis, or point of departure, for the various statements and recommendations seems to be the one which is defined as "the instability of developing countries in the course of the last decade", together with "the increased dependency of developed countries on the raw materials and the energy supplied by developing countries".

An example of one of the possible reasons for greater instability is "internal revolutions", on the subject of which it is stated that "at least half a dozen countries in the Gulf region have régimes which, in the next 10 years, may be described as precarious".

Further on it is added that "in the event of national uprisings threatening Western interests, we should also have the means of intervening on the side of any friendly State requesting our support. Moreover, there are many other possible situations in which the rapid deployment of forces would be necessary to protect the oil wells." Furthermore, "it is not in the interest of the West as a whole to continue to depend so heavily, in terms of economic security, on a single region alone". The first condition for attaining this is for "the United States, Europe and Japan to agree to undertake greater efforts to increase their stockpiles and to agree to share other sources of oil supplies, especially in crisis situations". For that purpose "the allied Governments should, at the highest political levels, prepare a comprehensive approach aimed at protecting their interests - an approach which would not be based solely on considerations relating to strictly military threats".

Since the "institutional changes" in NATO would give rise to certain awkward results - for example, the need for "15 parliaments" to ratify, which would be a constant "source of polemics" - the report suggests a more discreet procedure which would nevertheless enable the military alliance in question "to take due account of the growing threats to Western security posed by events in the Third World". To that end, NATO should expand its joint evaluation and consultation procedures to cover third-world developments having a direct impact on the security interests of its member States".
In order to do this effectively, a mechanism would have to be set up to include "a small but permanent secretariat", and some limited groups would have to be set up, which would be termed "groups of principal nations", the nucleus of which would be formed, in general, by the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany and Japan, which could act as "watch-dog groups" or "crisis groups". Their activities are defined in the report in the following terms: "The groups of principal nations would have two essential functions: crisis management and the joint evaluation of specific situations. In the course of a crisis, the group would serve to co-ordinate policies and to prepare measures to be taken; military responsibilities would frequently attach to these tasks. In the absence of a crisis, the role of these groups would be that of conducting a joint evaluation of the evolution of the political and security situation in critical areas of the third world. To that end a calendar of regular consultations would be drawn up, and crisis plans to cover various regions of the third world would be prepared".

As I said before, the texts I referred to at the beginning of this statement, in addition to their obvious usefulness in connexion with the task defined in item 6 of the Commission's agenda, could provide an excellent backdrop for the correct evaluation of the recommendations contained in the report prepared by the four "think-tanks" I have mentioned on the question of "Western security" as they visualize that security.

I should now wish to add that, in our view, recommendations such as those I have outlined here seem obviously incompatible with those texts, which are taken from the United Nations Charter, from the Declaration on Principles of International Law, and from the Declaration on the New International Economic Order, both of which Declarations were adopted by consensus - and I wish to stress that once again - in 1970 and in 1974, respectively.
It is also noteworthy – and this is particularly relevant in connexion with our agenda item relating to the study on conventional disarmament – that the implementation of those recommendations would inevitably result in rendering much more difficult, if not impossible, the adoption of disarmament measures by third-world countries. Actually, an analysis of the recommendations leads to the inescapable conclusion that their implementation would entail the establishment of a new and particularly sophisticated colonialism and of a revised and up-dated form of the Holy Alliance which would in the twentieth century serve purposes similar to the ones served in the nineteenth. Of course, that would give new dimensions to the need of third-world States to "protect their security", bearing in mind – as the Assembly stated in the Final Document of its first special session devoted to disarmament, which was the fourth text I referred to at the beginning – both the inherent right of self-defence and the Charter principles of sovereign equality and the self-determination of peoples, as well as the need to prevent any violations of the "full and permanent sovereignty" which they should legitimately enjoy over their natural resources.


The *International Herald Tribune*, in a quite comprehensive critique of the report to which I have been referring, published in its issue of 26 February 1981, noted that the four directors of the institutions which prepared the report "are all men very close to the major political leaders" and that the report as a whole "is an articulate presentation of a ferment of ideas about new formulas for consultations among the allies and for military intervention outside of Europe" which are supposedly being discussed in private by the respective Governments.

In view of the serious implications which that statement could have for conventional disarmament in the third world, we would like the representatives of the States referred to in that *Herald Tribune* article to state clearly in this debate the exact position of their Governments on the question.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.