

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**



THIRTY-SECOND SESSION
*Official Records**

FIRST COMMITTEE
12th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 26 October 1977
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VETBATIM RECORD OF THE 12th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 33: ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ARMAMENTS RACE AND ITS
EXTREMELY HARMFUL EFFECTS ON WORLD PEACE AND SECURITY: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
(continued)

AGENDA ITEM 34: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 3473 (XXX) CONCERNING THE
SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL I OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF
NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TIATELOLCO): REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERA
(continued)

AGENDA ITEM 38: INCENDIARY AND OTHER SPECIFIC CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE THE
SUBJECT OF PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS OF USE FOR HUMANITARIAN REASONS: REPORT OF THE
SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 39: CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE
CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 40: URGENT NEED FOR CESSATION OF NUCLEAR AND THERMONUCLEAR TESTS AND
CONCLUSION OF A TREATY DESIGNED TO ACHIEVE A COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN: REPORT OF THE
CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 41: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 31/67 CONCERNING THE
SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL II OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION
OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TIATELOLCO) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 42: EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO IMPLEMENT THE PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE
DISARMAMENT DECADE (continued):

(a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 43: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE DENUCLEARIZATION OF AFRICA
(continued)

AGENDA ITEM 44: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN THE REGION OF THE
MIDDLE EAST (continued)

/...

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of
the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief,
Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

Corrections will be issued shortly after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for
each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/32/PV.12
1 November 1977

ENGLISH

AGENDA ITEM 45: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH ASIA:
REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 46: PROHIBITION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND MANUFACTURE OF NEW TYPES OF
WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND NEW SYSTEMS OF SUCH WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE
CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 47: REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
(continued)

AGENDA ITEM 48: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A
ZONE OF PEACE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 49: CONCLUSION OF A TREATY ON THE COMPLETE AND GENERAL PROHIBITION
OF NUCLEAR-WEAPON TESTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 51: GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (continued):

- (a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY;
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 52: SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT:
REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 53: WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON
THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 33, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45,
46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52 and 53 (continued)

Mr. DYVIG (Denmark): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time that Denmark has spoken in the First Committee during this session, I should like on behalf of the Danish delegation, to congratulate you and your colleagues on your election to your high and burdensome posts. I wish you every success in the performance of your significant tasks.

Coming to the subject-matter before us, Denmark, too, would like to make its voice heard in the disarmament debate of the First Committee as this is the only forum where all Member States of the United Nations are afforded the opportunity to assess, on a regular basis, a question of vital importance to all mankind.

It is therefore also of crucial importance that disarmament should not become merely an expert exercise on kilotons, enriched uranium, seismology, chemical agents and other such technicalities, as the impression left by the many disarmament meetings, votes and so on easily suggests. We must take care that we do not get to the point where we cannot see the wood for the trees. Permit me, in this connexion, to repeat the Danish Foreign Minister's warning against using the disarmament cause for the submission of endless numbers of new proposals designed to demonstrate a particularly peaceful attitude. What we lack is not disarmament proposals but realistic disarmament efforts. It is not the number of resolutions that determines the outcome. If that were the case, the world would already be well off.

It is often said that disarmament is a must today because of the large numbers of awesome weapons now existing. What we have in fact achieved so far is basically some degree of arms control. There is much good to be said for that, for instance about the confidence-building aspects of such control. But disarmament in the proper sense of the word is and remains the central challenge.

(Mr. Dyvig, Denmark)

The need for a break-through in disarmament is getting increasingly urgent, for many reasons. The economic reasons are quite obvious, seen in the North-South perspective. But the serious risks posed to world peace by the spiralling arms race are even more obvious. How dare we believe that the enormous quantitative and qualitative arms race which we are witnessing in many different parts of the world can be controlled even in the somewhat longer perspective, however great the arms control efforts may be. In that process so many technical precautions will be required that even a minor device, if it failed, could unleash a nuclear holocaust.

(Mr. Dyvig, Denmark)

Nor must we forget that only a few years ago the picture of individuals equipped with sophisticated but manageable nuclear weapons was pure science fiction. How is that picture today, and what will it be like in only a few years' time? And how much more alarming has that picture become because of the escalating terrorism which is now an international problem of the most appalling character.

Arms control is therefore not enough. Nor can we take it for granted that détente in its political aspects can evolve in the somewhat longer term without a parallel development within the military aspects of the concept. There is a danger that the credibility of détente will be undermined if acts in the military field also are not seen to match words.

Denmark very much welcomed the meeting opened at Belgrade a couple of weeks ago to follow up the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. If that meeting is to pave the way to further détente, it is however necessary simultaneously to breathe new life into real disarmament. That is the purpose of the mutual and balanced force reduction talks in Vienna, where progress is therefore so essential.

In the field of détente, a dynamic process has been set in motion because all parties have come to realize their common interest therein. Likewise the entire world community must come to realize its vested interest in a dynamic disarmament process.

Speakers before me have pointed to the sad picture which the cause of disarmament has presented over the last few years. It is, however, incontestable that the principal achievements in the field of disarmament, namely, the partial test ban Treaty and the non-proliferation Treaty, signify some measure of progress.

Similarly important treaties have been concluded covering areas where technological developments could have created new avenues for an arms race of enormous dimensions; examples are the Treaty prohibiting the placement of weapons of mass destruction in outer space and the Treaty prohibiting the emplacement of such weapons on the sea-bed. Those Treaties do at any rate demonstrate the will to set certain limits to a further arms build-up.

(Mr. Dyvig, Denmark)

My Government hopes to see among these bright spots constructive efforts on all sides to make the special session on disarmament next year a decisive turning point in the dealings of the world Organization with this central question.

We hope that the special session, in the face of the gravity of the situation, will become a catalyst for substantive arms control and disarmament negotiations at the global, regional and bilateral levels and a source of inspiration for each and every country, whether big or small, allied or non-aligned and for both nuclear or non-nuclear weapons States.

As for my country, let me say that we are aware of the limits to our influence, but there should be no doubt that at the special session and where otherwise possible we shall make our contribution to move developments in a positive direction. There are at any rate two ways in which countries like Denmark, which do not belong among the major military Powers, can make a contribution: first, by constantly stressing the need for effective disarmament measures and, secondly, by contributing to a constructive and realistic approach, based on a better understanding of the extremely complicated subject-matter of the international disarmament negotiations.

Even such a contribution requires considerable knowledge and effort. With this in mind, the Danish Foreign Ministry has been strengthened within the last few months through the establishment of a special secretariat for disarmament, a development which should be seen also as a symptom of a growing recognition of the necessity of now making real and effective efforts to achieve détente in the military field.

We see the recent decision of the French Government to present a comprehensive disarmament plan as a reflection of similar considerations. The same is true of the fresh efforts that are being put into the second round of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), the Soviet-American workinggroups which have been set up to deal with difficult aspects of the disarmament problem, and the serious negotiations to reach agreement on a comprehensive nuclear test ban which are being conducted by the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States.

(Mr. Dyvig, Denmark)

Generally speaking, we should like the special session on disarmament to formulate a disarmament policy based on the following desideratum. As it has become generally recognized that there is no rational or desirable alternative to détente, it must become generally recognized that there is no alternative to real disarmament. If that can be achieved I think we will have created a basis on which to form a dynamic disarmament process.

Having tried in more general terms to explain Denmark's views on the problem of disarmament, I hasten to add that we are prepared to follow a pragmatic approach including, of course, arrangements to secure the necessary international control. However, we must never lose sight of the vital dangers that we are up against.

As I have already stated, we are all exposed to the ominous dangers inherent in the nuclear arms build-up. Therefore, as a first priority, the growth of nuclear arsenals must be halted and reversed and the qualitative arms race brought to an end. As the Secretary-General has pointed out, we must "... stem the tide of an innovating arms race" (A/32/1, p. 12). In this connexion, the dilemma of how to prevent technological developments for military purposes without interfering with legitimate civilian research must be solved.

Measures to halt the vertical proliferation of nuclear arms include the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks between the two super-Powers. Real progress in those fundamentally important talks - which, it seems, is now being made - would create a climate facilitating solutions to the fundamental problems of bringing about a comprehensive test ban treaty and of preventing the horizontal proliferation of nuclear arms.

Even without a SALT accord, it would be fortunate if the trilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States on a comprehensive test ban could result in a draft treaty in time for the special session. In that connexion we find that the recent Swedish draft convention contains much useful material for consideration. The principal outstanding questions are, of course, the problem of verification, the problem of peaceful nuclear explosions and the problem of whether all or only some nuclear weapon States should participate from the outset.

(Mr. Dyvig, Denmark)

The Non-Proliferation Treaty plays a central role in efforts to halt the spread of nuclear arms to additional States. The present number of adherents to the Treaty is already of major political significance, but universal adherence would definitely close the door on further proliferation. We should, therefore, explore how we can motivate additional nations to accede to the Treaty.

One such incentive might be arrangements for closer co-operation among participating States in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, a topic which might be dealt with by the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation (INFCE), which began its work last week. We commend the new United States Administration for having taken the initiative in this evaluation in an attempt to solve the nuclear proliferation problem in the face of the mounting risks inherent in the increased demands to make greater use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Denmark finds this work most important, and we hope to be able to play a constructive work in it. The evaluation will not duplicate the important work which is being carried out in this field by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

In any case, if a State does not accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, it should at least be persuaded to meet the necessary safeguard requirements. States which have accepted effective non-proliferation restraints have the right to enjoy fully the benefits of peaceful uses of nuclear energy. In this connexion, we are studying with interest the draft resolution recently submitted by Finland (A/C.1/32/L.3) regarding the report of the IAEA.

Prospects for a ban on chemical weapons seem to be improving as a result of the deliberations in the United States-Soviet Union working group and the verification studies in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and a useful draft convention has been submitted by the United Kingdom.

The nuclear issues should, however, not be given exclusive attention at the expense of efforts at conventional disarmament. On the contrary, nuclear and conventional disarmament must go hand in hand. It should be borne in mind that the bulk -- four-fifths -- of the total world military expenditure goes on "vast and increasing arrays of conventional armaments". We therefore feel that

(Mr. Dyvig, Denmark)

there is a growing interest in the idea of a United Nations study on conventional arms and conventional arms transfers. At any rate, we believe that general restraint on the part of recipient countries within a given region might help to promote conventional arms control if it is respected by external States.

The special session will inevitably focus public attention on the intolerable burden which massive arms expenditure imposes on the economic, social and scientific development of nations. Substantial progress in the field of disarmament could release for more constructive use vast material and human resources which are now being absorbed for military purposes. Therefore, Denmark has joined with the other Nordic countries in proposing an in-depth United Nations study to clarify the implications of military spending on all relevant aspects of the economy, and to examine methods of planned reallocation of resources for civilian purposes. Universal and comparable reductions in military budgets could be a step towards the release of resources for civilian purposes.

I should like to conclude my statement, in the same vein as I started, with some general observations. It is difficult to achieve disarmament without an international climate of trust and confidence. But as I have just pointed out, we cannot sit back and wait for that situation to come about. The continuing arms race makes it imperative to move ahead in all fields and at a greater speed than in the past. Only by doing so can we maintain the present degree of confidence that has brought about the present degree of détente. The furtherance of that process, or in other words, the attainment of comprehensive disarmament as part of a dynamic evolution, will depend on greater confidence and mutual trust among nations. The chances of achieving that would be enhanced to the extent that countries do not develop their forces and armaments beyond their strict defensive requirements and security needs. Confidence would also be strengthened if States, in the mutual interests of all, would allow international control and effective verification within their borders when undertaking commitments for disarmament. This is how we look at the disarmament issue, and how we view the United Nations special session on disarmament scheduled to be held next year; we all have a responsibility to turn it into one of the most significant sessions in the history of the Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Denmark for the words he addressed to me and to the other officers of the Committee.

Mr. BOYA (Benin) (interpretation from French): The essential mission of the United Nations, as set forth in the Charter, is to build and to preserve a collective security that is mutually beneficial to all States in the international community, States large or small, rich or poor. This collective security is essential to the maintenance of peace; it is essential to achieving the proper solutions of the human condition in a world of justice.

My delegation notes with some bitterness that instead of progressing towards the building of that collective security, of which so much is said, States blindly seek to preserve and to strengthen collective insecurity. Contemporary international relations are characterized by headlong flight from the most serious responsibilities when it comes to disarmament and related questions. The contemporary world is characterized by an aggravation of tensions, repeated aggressions, political domination and economic exploitation, the establishment of a régime of violence and terror and increasing the degradation of the conditions of life for most of mankind.

That is the present situation. To describe it otherwise would be to conceal or to distort the truth. The basic cause of this collective insecurity is the failure to solve the main problems related to disarmament. Our Organization has been seized of this question ever since its foundation. Every year, every country comes here to express its concern on the subject. Bilateral talks are held outside the framework of our Organization. We have established many committees and devoted many meetings to this question. The record is largely negative. War may break out at any time; we know of no legal machinery to prevent it.

The threat of a nuclear war looms menacingly over mankind. The race for arms of all kinds, which absorbs \$US 350 billion annually, has increased the dangerous régime of collective insecurity to a disturbing extent. This insecurity is all the more threatening because reactionary régimes are now in possession of certain weapons of mass destruction, namely, the Zionist régime of Israel and the racist régime of Vorster.

(Mr. Boya, Benin)

Conscious of these grave problems, the People's Republic of Benin has not stinted its active co-operation. The People's Republic of Benin is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Last May my country signed the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques. My country is a member of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament. As such, my country has been able to study all the proposals made so far and has reviewed the excellent work done by the various subsidiary organs responsible for this matter within the United Nations system.

Disarmament and all the issues connected with it are undoubtedly difficult and complex, but this complexity is artificial and derives from the failure to comply with the rules of peaceful coexistence which must prevail between the two opposing concepts in the world. The Government of the People's Republic of Benin has noted that the Soviet Union has made many relevant and useful proposals in an attempt to solve all the problems related to disarmament. Those proposals, seen in this context, deserve careful study. But a policy of flight from responsibility and the honeyed words of international imperialism are at the root of the present deadlock.

While we speak of disarmament and the interests of all mankind in curbing the arms race, the Western imperialists do not hesitate to assist the minority racist régimes in southern Africa to acquire weapons of mass destruction. Vorster, powerfully aided by certain European Powers, is building an atomic arsenal in the Kalahari desert in Namibia, in violation of the resolutions of our Organization on the denuclearization of Africa. My country once again condemns all those countries for their hypocrisy and their crimes against the African peoples. It is obvious that the resolution on the subject to be adopted this year will be more specific as regards the manoeuvres of those countries. It is obvious that the resolutions on the subject to be adopted will be more explicit in denouncing the supporters of Vorster who are provoking the nuclear threat in Africa. The proposal of the non-aligned countries for a special session of the General Assembly on disarmament opens a new avenue for the honest discussion of these problems which are of particular significance for the third world.

Mr. von WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany). In defiance of the rules of procedure, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on behalf of my delegation on your assumption of the high office of Chairman of this very important Committee. All of us in this room are familiar with your skill, experience and tact and your abilities as a mediator and I am quite sure that this Committee will be able to complete its work on time under your able guidance. I should like to extend similar congratulations to the other officers of the Committee also and to the able members of the Secretariat, who were kind enough to assist me when I was helping as a Vice-Chairman of this Committee two years ago.

The subject at present before the First Committee is as topical as ever. The problem with which we are dealing is of crucial importance. Whether mankind will be exposed to even greater dangers or whether we shall be able to come nearer to a world of partnership will depend not least on whether we can master the problem of disarmament. We agree with the United Nations Secretary-General, who stated in his 1977 report that

"... the United Nations cannot hope to function effectively on the basis of the Charter unless there is major progress in the field of disarmament." (A/32/1, p. 12)

On soberly reviewing the situation in the last third of the 1970s, which we once declared a decade of both disarmament and development, we find that in all parts of the world armament expenditure has continued to rise. We have not succeeded in breaking the vicious circle of mistrust and the arms race. The arms race devours enormous resources in a world which ought to be concentrating its strength on putting an end to hunger and distress. The expenditure of \$330 billion on arms over the past year is a challenge to the common sense and moral conviction of all nations. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Genscher, pointed this out in his speech before the General Assembly on 29 September this year.

My Government hopes that the forthcoming special session on disarmament will find ways and means of meeting this challenge and that it will open up a world-wide dialogue on disarmament problems and lend new momentum to the policy of arms control, thus ushering in a development that would lead to a

(Mr. von Wechmar, Federal
Republic of Germany)

strengthening of confidence among nations. On that basis the community of nations could then consider how they could help to reduce the gap between North and South by appropriate and meaningful defence economies.

The initiative for a special session on disarmament has had our support from the outset. We were co-sponsors of the relevant resolution adopted by the thirty-first session of the General Assembly and have played an active part in the Preparatory Committee, which concluded its third meeting a few weeks ago. We reckon that all Governments will support specific proposals which can serve as a basis for the debate on disarmament and the negotiations on important matters. The special session must not be allowed to get stranded in non-committal phraseology.

I gladly avail myself of this opportunity to express my thanks to the Preparatory Committee and its Chairman, Ambassador Ortiz de Rozas, for the progress so far achieved.

Our co-operation in the special session does not at all lessen our activities in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), or our interest in its work. To us, the CCD remains the body specially qualified for negotiations on matters of world-wide disarmament and arms control. With its considerable expertise it has helped in past years to keep the debate on disarmament to the point and has played an active part in numerous individual measures. This does not mean, of course, that proposals for structural improvement should not be considered with the care they deserve.

Among the subjects occupying us here problems of arms control in the nuclear sphere continue to be in the foreground, our prime concern being the limitation of horizontal and vertical proliferation. Here a large measure of responsibility falls to the nuclear Powers, in particular the two countries that have been negotiating for years on the limitation of strategic weapons systems.

ET/vpd

A/C.1/32/PV.12
19-20

(Mr. von Weckmar, Federal
Republic of Germany)

Strategic arms limitation has come to be the main subject of negotiation between the two world Powers and thus the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) are one of the most important political means of ensuring stability and peace throughout the world. My Government attaches great importance to these talks. In the second round of SALT, for the first time ever, efforts are being made to reduce the intercontinental strategic nuclear systems of both sides. We welcome the progress made recently which has brought the conclusion of the negotiations nearer.

(Mr. von Wechmar, Federal
Republic of Germany)

Like all other States conscious of their responsibility, the Federal Republic of Germany regards the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as an essential prerequisite for safeguarding peace. It renounced the manufacture of nuclear weapons even before a non-proliferation Treaty existed. It has ratified the non-proliferation Treaty and strictly observes all its provisions, and it expects the same of its Treaty partners. At the same time, the Federal Republic of Germany once again appeals to all States still standing off to accede to the Treaty, which, in our view, is the indispensable foundation for world-wide non-proliferation.

As hitherto, we shall on that basis make every effort to secure the further development of an effective non-proliferation policy. We believe, however, that any non-proliferation policy, if it is to be effective, must be adopted by a broad consensus. We have therefore always recommended that there should be an international consultation framework including as many countries as possible for a thorough study of the problems surrounding effective non-proliferation in connexion with the peaceful use of nuclear energy. The Federal Republic of Germany accords priority to the drafting of comprehensive international control measures. It vigorously supports the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

We are keenly interested in the progress of the trilateral talks on a comprehensive test ban and hope that the CCD will soon be in a position to set about the drafting of a convention for the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests. The Federal Republic of Germany has long been pleading in favour of such a convention, since it would constitute an important step towards limiting vertical proliferation. We have always taken the view that it should not be necessary to wait for all nuclear-weapon States to become parties to a comprehensive test ban but that such a ban should enter into force much earlier, and we would appreciate an early consensus on this issue.

We believe that satisfactory arrangements on verification are essential, and we are actively participating in the work of the Geneva group of seismological experts whose findings are expected next spring. We consider that within the framework of a comprehensive test ban a solution should be found that would correspond to article V of the non-proliferation Treaty without permitting any

(Mr. von Wechmar, Federal
Republic of Germany)

abuse of peaceful nuclear explosions for weapons purposes. We are, of course, quite aware of the problems involved and therefore suggested in this same forum a year ago that a temporary moratorium on peaceful nuclear explosions might be worth considering if it would facilitate agreement on a comprehensive test ban.

Notwithstanding the importance we attach to checking the nuclear arms race, we should not forget that the race is taking place to a large extent in the field of conventional weapons. Every year valuable economic resources go into the build-up of conventional armaments. The Federal Republic of Germany exercises the greatest restraint as regards weapons exports. Its proportion of weapons exports to countries outside the Atlantic Alliance is negligible compared with the total volume of German exports. The Federal Government will abide by this restrictive arms export policy. It has with great interest taken up the proposal of the United States President for tighter controls on world-wide transfers of conventional weapons. We shall support the efforts to find an international solution to this problem, and we feel that a regional approach could be the answer.

The growing burden of armament expenditure in all parts of the world makes it more and more urgent to undertake a serious attempt to reduce it. This requires the mutual disclosure of actual armament expenditures, and we therefore welcome the report by the expert committee appointed by the United Nations Secretary-General which contains essential elements for making national armament expenditures comparable. We hope that all countries will seriously consider the proposed step towards greater comparability as a basis for trimming their military budgets. Less military spending could provide additional production capacity which could be used to foster economic and social progress in the world.

The Federal Republic of Germany was one of the first to sign the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques - on the very first day that it was opened for signature, in fact. We regard the Convention as an additional attempt to preclude from the outset the use of certain potential methods of military conflict between States.

(Mr. von Wechmar, Federal
Republic of Germany)

In principle we welcome the notion of preventive arms control and are willing to help to carry it out. On the whole, however, it will not be possible to deal a priori with the complex of so-called new weapons of mass destruction in a single global convention. In fact, before the effect of a weapon can be fully covered by an agreement the technical possibilities of its further development must be clearly discernible. As soon as that is the case it would appear appropriate to draft a special agreement relating to the particular weapon and taking into account its specific properties. Such an agreement should not only clearly define what is to be prohibited but also be adequately verifiable. Under those circumstances, we feel it would be appropriate to prohibit radiological weapons.

However, priority should be accorded to the prohibition of chemical weapons which, with the exception of A-, B- and radiological weapons, were defined as weapons of mass destruction in a United Nations resolution adopted in 1948. In our estimation the year 1977 - though it has not brought any substantial progress - has improved the chances that a chemical weapons ban will materialize. The intensified deliberations in the CCD are due not least to the British draft convention of August 1976 which has proved to be a valuable contribution. That draft is largely in keeping with our own ideas of a C-weapons convention and we hope that it will continue to have a favourable influence on the work of the CCD.

Meanwhile the United States and the Soviet Union have stepped up their efforts in the CCD to agree on a joint chemical weapons initiative.

We hope that after many years of patient effort the first substantial results can now be expected; however, in view of the complex nature of still unresolved problems and the measure of disagreement so far, this is as yet no occasion for euphoria.

This is the very time when we should not lose patience. The CCD discussions have shown that this year there has been a marked convergence of views as regards the scope of the prohibition and definition, whereas the differences over the important question of verification are still considerable.

(Mr. von Wechmar, Federal
Republic of Germany)

The Federal Republic of Germany believes that a convention on C-weapons should make allowance for the security interests of all countries, which means above all that it must satisfactorily guarantee observance of the obligations agreed upon.

An efficient international verification system must, in particular, provide for routine on-site inspections in order to ensure that available warfare agents are destroyed and no new ones produced. We believe that a system of that kind can be designed so as not to prejudice legitimate economic interests.

Efforts to safeguard peace are a fundamental task of the United Nations. However, in my Government's view, the international efforts in pursuit of that aim need not and must not be confined to the United Nations. World-wide endeavours to achieve disarmament and arms control should be supplemented by specific and regional efforts to safeguard peace. My Government therefore actively participates in the Vienna talks on mutual and balanced force reductions which are aimed at establishing a more stable military relationship in central Europe.

(Mr. von Weizsäcker, Federal
Republic of Germany)

We hope that the participating members of the North Atlantic Alliance and of the Warsaw Pact will be able to achieve results capable of reducing the dangers of military confrontation in Europe. To this end the Western participants have proposed the establishment of a common collective ceiling for the ground forces on both sides in Central Europe. They are convinced that the resultant parity would correspond to the defence requirements of both sides and help to strengthen peace and security in Europe.

To ensure peace in Europe is also the aim of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. We hope that the present deliberations in Belgrade will lead to agreement on ways and means of implementing still more fully the contents of the Final Act of Helsinki.

Like the work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and arms control, that of the Geneva Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), and the bilateral talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic arms, these multilateral efforts in Europe are called upon to carry into effect the principle of the renunciation of the threat or use of force in international relations embodied in the United Nations Charter and reaffirmed in the Final Act of Helsinki.

My Government believes that the renunciation of the threat or use of force is a cornerstone for the peaceful development of a world which is characterized by growing interdependence and the ever increasing need of co-operation. This principle, which in the Charter is supplemented by the right to individual and collective self-defence, must apply to all types of weapons. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany regards the observance of the principle of the renunciation of the threat or use of force as enunciated clearly and in binding form in the United Nations Charter, and its practical application in the many spheres of disarmament and arms control, as the logical consequence of United Nations membership.

(Mr. von Wechmar, Federal
Republic of Germany)

Disarmament and arms control are an integral part of the policy of the Federal Republic of Germany. It will do everything in its power in helping to ensure that the efforts to curb the arms race will produce concrete results. To strengthen confidence and security, agreements on the limitation of the arms race must be adequately verified.

My Government is convinced that measures of disarmament and arms control must and can be designed to enhance security and strengthen peace and that the elimination of political sources of tension and of military confrontation must go hand in hand.

The balance of the achievements in disarmament and arms control reveals how much remains still to be done. But resignation is not an alternative open to us. Former generations may have seen peace as a break between wars. Today, as the German physician and philosopher, C. F. von Weizsaecker, put it: "Peace is the condition of life in the technological age".

Mr. NEAGU (Romania): Mr. Chairman, may I, on behalf of the Romanian delegation, congratulate you, a distinguished representative of Ghana - with which my country entertains the best of friendly relations - on your election to the high and responsible office in which you will guide the work of this important Committee.

Our warm congratulations go as well to the officers of the Committee, Mr. Pastinen of Finland, Mr. Hollai of Hungary and Mr. Correa of Mexico. The Romanian delegation pledges its fullest co-operation with you, Mr. Chairman, and the officers of the Committee, and with all delegations in the Committee, for the success of our deliberations.

As every year, the problem of disarmament has come under the scrutiny of the Political Committee of the General Assembly and is now being discussed with the participation of all States Members of the United Nations.

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

On considering the matter, we think that the results and the progress achieved in the disarmament negotiations should be compared with the arms race developments during the last 12 months. Only this objective criterion would allow for a basic and meaningful assessment of the stage reached by disarmament.

The discussions on disarmament have been conducted within the framework of different bodies which are well known to all of us, comprising not less than 14 organizational structures, some of which, mainly those dealing with nuclear disarmament, do not belong to the United Nations system. The question is, what has in fact been the practical outcome of the discussions, their real impact on the arms race?

The statements made by the heads of States and Governments, the reports of the Secretary-General and the views expressed by representatives in plenary meetings and before this Committee, unanimously come to the same conclusion.

As emphasized by the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu:

"Although lengthy discussions have been held in recent years and a great number of resolutions on disarmament have been adopted, we must acknowledge that, unfortunately, the arms race, far from losing momentum, less, on the contrary, reached unprecedented proportions."

The level of military expenditures which is close to \$400 billion is a striking indication of the high proportions attained by the arms race. Nuclear armaments, which steadily enjoyed quantitative and especially qualitative improvements, continue to be the driving power of the arms race. At the same time, we are witnessing the continuous sophistication of means of delivery.

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

In view of the ever more pronounced technological character of the arms race, the figures expressing the increase in military expenditures only partly reflect the truth about the accumulated destructive power which in fact is much greater. Along with this, the development and stockpiling of classical armaments goes on.

Deploing this situation, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, has stated in his report this year that:

"We have become used to living in a highly unnatural state of affairs where the shadow of nuclear weapons and of vast and increasing arrays of conventional armaments has virtually come to be accepted as the normal light of day." (A/32/1, p. 12)

More than ever before, this shadow darkens the horizon of all nations, whatever their level of development or the geographical area to which they belong. Moreover, the arms race is one of the main factors accounting for the maintenance and fostering of the imperialist policy of force and diktat, of interference in the internal affairs of other peoples, of feeding the hotbeds of tension and conflicts in several parts of the world.

Military expenditures also represent a heavy burden on the shoulders of all the peoples, with extremely harmful effects on the efforts aiming at the development of, and the assistance to be provided to, countries engaged in liquidating their under-development, a heritage of imperialism. This makes disarmament an essential element in building up the new international economic order.

It is quite obvious that the partial agreements concluded so far, notwithstanding their importance, have failed to stop or even to slow down the armaments drive and have not removed the spectre of a devastating thermonuclear war.

It would therefore be an unforgivable error to give people the illusion of being able to live in peace and security while more and more weapons of mass destruction are ceaselessly being built up all over the world.

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

The present situation requires a firm will on the part of all States to initiate a genuine disarmament process in order to try to overcome, within adequate negotiation structures, the inertia imposed by the technological arms race.

Of course, we cannot overlook the fact that the problems of disarmament -- and above all of nuclear disarmament -- are complex and closely interrelated with the security of States; nor can we forget that another world war has so far been avoided on the basis of a sort of balance of terror. Conversely, we think that the arms race, both in its proportions and rate, contains the germs of a possible disruption of the military balance and of the aggravation of international tension. This fact, as well as the vast squandering of material and human resources we are now witnessing, are by no means liable to offer an adequate solution for maintaining peace and building up security in the world. That is why we believe, as stressed by President Nicolae Ceausescu, that:

"It seems more logical and natural to try to achieve a military balance, not by speeding up the arms race but by slowing it down, by firmly taking concrete steps towards disarmament and, first of all, nuclear disarmament, and by relieving the peoples from this heavy burden and threatening spectre."

Bearing in mind the complexity of the problem, and its paramount importance for the security of all the nations of the world, we take the view that the disarmament process should be conducted on the basis of a global strategy, of a complex programme of disarmament measures to be taken, starting with the big, strongly-armed countries.

All of us are aware that reference is often made to the dynamics of armament. Can we not build up the dynamics of disarmament which, taking into consideration the co-ordinates of the escalation of the arms race over a number of years, should reverse the trend by reducing and eliminating, step by step, the stockpiled armaments and, above all, the nuclear weapons, and which would lead to general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international supervision?

Starting from this analysis, the Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania has submitted a comprehensive programme aimed at attaining this goal

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

through concrete measures which are listed in document A/C.1/1066, dated 30 October 1975, entitled "The position of Romania on the problems of disarmament, and particularly nuclear disarmament, and the establishment of lasting world peace".

These steps include: the freezing and gradual reduction of military budgets; the banning, gradual reduction and, in the long term, the liquidation of nuclear weapons; the creation of nuclear-free zones of peace and co-operation; the adoption of partial and regional measures of disarmament and military disengagement; the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament; an enhanced role to be given to the United Nations and the General Assembly in the field of disarmament; the banning of all forms of war propaganda; and the mobilization of all the forces of society to achieve disarmament.

In the Romanian Government's view, a part of the funds saved as a result of the reduction of military budgets should be placed at the disposal of a United Nations development fund for the support of the economically-backward countries, priority being given to those with a national per capita income below \$200.

This approach is based on the fact that the substance of the negotiations as conducted at present reveals a lack of perspective and a character of improvisation. Issues which on all the evidence should be given high priority, such as the problems relating to the nuclear field, are left on a secondary plane, whereas particular attention is given to issues which, notwithstanding their value for the improvement of the international climate, pertain however to marginal or futurological, often hypothetical fields.

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

The Romanian proposal concerning the elaboration of a disarmament programme stems precisely from the desire to overcome these drawbacks by launching a broad attack on disarmament problems on the basis of a timetable providing for concrete measures. A certain degree of generally positive interconditioning will occur between those efforts and their potential results. The purpose of setting up a programme is to correlate the different disarmament measures so as to get a single coherent whole permitting a step-by-step and simple-to-complex approach in time, with each new and more comprehensive measure being thoroughly prepared in advance.

Being convinced that the present unsatisfactory structures are also accountable for the disquieting situation prevailing in the field of disarmament, Romania considers that the time has come for these structures to meet the requirements of the democratization of international life by ensuring the participation in the solution of this important international problem of all States on an equal footing. The gradual withdrawal of disarmament negotiations from the competence of the United Nations has contributed to the lack of progress and of prospects in the negotiations. These talks should certainly be brought back under the aegis of the Organization, and resolute steps must be taken to strengthen the role of the United Nations in this field. In our opinion, the Organization should exert direct competence in the negotiation, adoption and supervision of the application of disarmament measures.

As far as disarmament is concerned, the political decision, which is a prerogative of States, has absolute priority. Since the whole problem has to be considered in the light of a general strategy, in the establishment of which the United Nations, as a body where all States participate on an equal footing has a prominent role to play, Romania attaches particular attention to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament which will be held in May-June of next year. We believe that the present situation in the field of disarmament and disarmament negotiations requires the joint efforts of all States to ensure that the special session will be a landmark and an authentic starting point for disarmament negotiations intended to initiate effective and practical measures capable of putting an end to the arms race and of bringing about disarmament. We therefore believe that the special session should finally

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

adopt the following three instruments: first, a declaration on disarmament which, beginning with the present situation in the field of the arms race and disarmament negotiations, should cover the principles of disarmament negotiations, their aims and priorities and the tactics and strategy to be followed in all disarmament talks; secondly, a programme of action, to be spread over a period of time and embodying specific measures that should be taken in the area of nuclear and conventional disarmament in order to strengthen confidence and co-operation among States and, in the long run, lead to the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international supervision, thirdly, a document concerning negotiating structures, which should provide for the establishment of viable structures, invested with full authority, which would be flexible and follow democratic rules and methods. These structures should give all interested States an opportunity to participate in disarmament negotiations on an equal footing.

In our view, these documents should represent a single whole, a genuine strategy of disarmament in coming years. We therefore consider that they have to be worked out and agreed upon as a primary task of the Preparatory Committee of the forthcoming special session on disarmament.

Wishing to contribute to the attainment of this goal, the Romanian delegation has submitted to the Preparatory Committee three draft documents on these questions.

These are the considerations of principle that the Romanian delegation wished to present at this stage of our debate.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.