

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records *



FIRST COMMITTEE
16th meeting
held on
Friday, 28 October 1977
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 16th 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-GENERAL (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.16
3 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 3.25 p.m.

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

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Today the Soviet delegation would like to dwell on the matter of the special session of the General Assembly which will take up the questions of disarmament and of convening a world disarmament conference.

One year ago the General Assembly unanimously adopted an important resolution on the convening in May-June 1978 of a special session on disarmament. In that way the international community expressed its deep concern at the ongoing arms race and its conviction that new and urgent efforts would have to be made to bring about disarmament. The Soviet Union, to which those feelings are very dear, supported that resolution.

In its desire to encourage any initiative that can promote efforts in the field of disarmament, our country was, from the very outset, an active participant in preparations for the special session. As early as March of this year, the Soviet Union had occasion to explain its views about the purposes of the special session, its tasks and its possibilities. We consider - and this was reiterated by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, in his statement to the plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 27 September - that a special session would have not only to have a far-reaching exchange of views regarding fundamental approaches to the whole problem of disarmament at the present stage but also to determine jointly the basic lines along which the priority efforts of States in this area should be directed. The Soviet Union intends to do everything in its power to ensure that the discussion of these matters leads to positive and concrete results that will help to achieve progress in solving the problems of disarmament.

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

That position was further developed in two working documents - setting out basic provisions of the declaration on disarmament and the programme of action on disarmament - which the Soviet Union, together with other socialist countries, recently submitted for consideration by the Preparatory Committee for the special session. I am referring to documents A/AC.187/81 and 82 of 7 September 1977. In preparing those documents, the socialist countries took as their premise the fact that the bringing about of disarmament is a matter of priority for all mankind, and that for it to be achieved and for an end put to the arms race, which is fraught with tremendous dangers for international peace and security, the Members of the United Nations are required to make constant and purposeful efforts and have a high sense of responsibility. In their anxiety to co-operate with other delegations, the authors of those documents also took into account the wishes and ideas contained in the replies received from a large number of States to the questionnaire on the special session sent out by the Secretary-General.

I would recall that we proposed that the declaration should contain an objective analysis of the contemporary situation as far as restricting the arms race is concerned and also summarize the experience that has been gained in disarmament talks. Taking that experience into account, it would be possible to formulate a number of fundamental ideas which should serve as guidelines when holding talks and when elaborating agreements on disarmament matters.

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

What were these ideas? Inter alia, the need to supplement political détente by military détente; that the main and end purpose of all efforts of States should be general and complete disarmament under strict international control; the question of the extreme importance of the universal confirmation and development of the principle of non-use of force in international relations; the principle of the non-violation of State security; the use of scientific and technological achievements exclusively for peaceful purposes; having the largest possible number of States become parties to negotiations and agreements, and others.

The formulation and confirmation of these principles at the special session of the General Assembly, we believe, would create a sounder basis for holding talks on many and varied problems of disarmament. The range of these issues is rather broad, and this was evidenced by the discussions we have had in our Committee.

We believe that the programme of action should include provisions on the halting of the arms race in both nuclear and conventional weapons; prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests; consolidation of the system of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons; the prohibition of chemical weapons and new forms and systems of weapons of mass destruction; the creation of non-nuclear zones and zones of peace, and the reduction of military budgets.

An important place in the work to be done and the decisions to be taken by the special session, in view of their urgency, should be given to the problem of preventing nuclear war and, since the main task of the United Nations is to ensure international peace and security, the special session of the General Assembly will have to make a substantial contribution to bringing about détente in international affairs and preventing the dangers of a nuclear war.

During the past year a considerable amount of work has been done in preparing for the special session. Three sessions of the Preparatory Committee have been held at which agreement was reached on recommendations on virtually all the questions of procedure and organization of the work of the special session. We have carefully studied the report, and we consider

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

that it and all the work done by the Preparatory Committee is worthy of our commendation. In this connexion, I should like particularly to highlight one peculiar feature of the activities of the Preparatory Committee, and I am referring to the fact that all the decisions taken by it, without exception, including the draft agenda of the special session, were adopted on a consensus basis. It would be wrong to say that it was easy to reach agreement on those matters; however, the members of the Committee were able to evince a sufficient spirit of co-operation and understanding of the interests of their partners in those talks. Very constructive in this connexion was the decision adopted on 28 March of this year on the procedure to be adopted by the Committee in its work, which emphasized the need for every effort to be made to achieve consensus. We are gratified to note that a similar procedure for the taking of decisions has been recommended for the special session itself.

We must preserve the serious mood prevailing and the desire to achieve generally acceptable decisions which were so characteristic of the activities of the Preparatory Committee since, in the very near future, it will have to tackle even more serious tasks. At the regular sessions, which are planned to be held in January, February and April of 1978, the Committee is going to get right down to the elaboration of drafts of the final documents for the special session. I have already had occasion to refer to those documents which have been tabled in this connexion by the Soviet Union and by a number of other Socialist countries. The Committee also has before it the official and unofficial working documents presented by a number of other States. The Soviet Union is very carefully perusing those proposals which have been made and intends to make every effort to ensure that in the final analysis excellent and realistic documents are produced which enjoy the widest possible support - primarily, of course, among those States on which disarmament depends. That is one of the prerequisites for the decisions on questions of disarmament to have any weight or to be effective.

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

In commending on the whole the results of what has been done by the Preparatory Committee, the Soviet delegation sees fit once again to remind the Assembly of the unsatisfactory decision on the question of the membership of that body. When it was formed at the beginning of this year discrimination was practised against the Socialist countries, whose role and experience in disarmament talks hardly needs any commentary. The countries of the East European group have frequently stated that the so-called "ECOSOC formula", on the basis of which the places were allocated in the Preparatory Committee, cannot be applied in those cases when we are talking about questions of disarmament. As you know, the genuine role played by the group of Socialist countries in tackling those problems is taken into account in the structure of other bodies which deal with matters of disarmament. Therefore, having agreed to the participation in the Preparatory Committee of six east European countries on a temporary basis, we believe that the thirty-second session of the General Assembly should take a decision to give two additional places to the East European regional group.

The Soviet Union is profoundly convinced that the task of implementing those decisions which are to be adopted at the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament could best be brought about through a world disarmament conference. That is borne out by the fact that the question of the convening of such a conference will be considered by the special session under item 12 of its agenda. Universal membership of the world disarmament conference guarantees the participation in the specific consideration of disarmament matters of all countries of the world. At the same time, it is intended that the work of the conference will be organized to ensure that, in considering any particular problem, first and foremost participation should be granted to those States which are directly concerned. This would make it possible to use the most effective means to find mutually acceptable solutions. At the same time, in the consideration of specific issues all other States could be invited to participate - all those particularly concerned about their speedy solution.

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

The combining of various working methods would help to promote speedy progress. An important feature of the world disarmament conference would be to give participating delegations the necessary authority to draft specific documents and, if necessary, to call on the services of qualified experts. Thus, the world disarmament conference should be the sort of forum that would make it possible to proceed from the general declarations and appeals that are normally adopted at General Assembly sessions to practical work on agreed disarmament measures. Naturally, the convening of a world disarmament conference would not mean that the already well tested method of holding discussions on disarmament matters would be abandoned.

I should like to refer to one other point. In the report of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament there is an important recommendation that

"the General Assembly... should request the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference to submit a special report... on the state of its work and deliberations". (A/32/41, para. 18)

This would not only ensure that the question of a world disarmament conference is considered at the special session in sufficient depth but should also help to step up preparations for the conference itself.

A reference to this recommendation is to be found also in the regular report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference (A/32/28).

We should like to voice the hope that it will have broad support at the present session of the General Assembly as well.

The Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference is continuing to do useful work and is maintaining contacts with the five States that possess nuclear weapons. We believe that it would be desirable for the Ad Hoc Committee to continue this work. A great deal of material could be provided to it by the discussions at the special session of the General Assembly.

In view of all these reasons, the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference should, we believe, be instructed to present its regular report to the General Assembly at its thirty-third session.

Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the delegation of Peru, I am very pleased to congratulate you most warmly on your election as Chairman of the First Committee, certain as we are that under your skilful and experienced guidance our work will be crowned with success. We also wish cordially to congratulate the other officers of the Committee.

This is the third time that I am speaking in the First Committee's debate on disarmament items.

As on past occasions, my delegation starts, as is natural, from the point of view that the statements we have heard and shall hear from the representatives of many Member States in support of international disarmament represent most genuinely the sincere hope of their respective peoples that mankind will take the first steps towards disarmament.

But on this particular occasion, my delegation, like many others, senses a fresh climate of expectancy because, within the ever complex panorama of the disarmament problem, there are some indications that we find ourselves now in special circumstances, marked by a possible change of direction in prevailing trends, a change that may pave the way to a qualitatively different and better stage in the boring history of disarmament efforts.

And yet once again it seems to us appropriate to add a note of warning, because 1977 is not the year in which mankind began to worry about the unbridled growth of the arms race nor is this the year when Governments have declared their willingness to make every effort to halt the arms race and begin the disarmament process. Because it is a fact that never before has mankind devoted itself with such dedication to an endeavour - which we euphemistically call "self-defence" - and never more than today at a time allegedly of peace, have the war machineries been in a greater state of readiness.

And nevertheless, no country can maintain today, however sad it may be to recognize this, that it is more secure than it was three decades ago; but practically all must recognize that they are in a far worse situation and consequently their peoples are more deprived of well-being and economic security. They are caught in a vicious circle from which they do not know

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

how to escape, because, quite apart from the financial, scientific and material resources invested, a point to which we shall return later, it is obvious that the levels of the arms race are such that they constitute in themselves a new and graver element of international insecurity. This means that, because of this irrational process, mankind today faces a greater degree of insecurity than that represented throughout history by the worst catastrophes that threatened it.

This is not the time for disquisition on who are mainly responsible for a situation that satisfies no one and worries everyone. This is no time to pronounce judgements on the painful extremes to which a distorted perception of security have led us because, as I said at the beginning, we should like to think that we may now be in a position where it might be feasible to start a new and different treatment of this fundamental problem, with the possibility of altering the course that we have been following in favour of one that is more in accord with the true feelings of millions of men, women and children - that is, with the vast majority of mankind - whom, in all truth, no Government has ever consulted as to what they felt their security should be.

For decades, efforts have been made to lull the anguish that people have felt by making them believe that it was, in fact, a time of relative security since the atomic deterrent between the super-Powers was so compelling that neither of the two Governments would subject the other to such pressures as to make recourse to atomic weapons possible, and that a kind of "superior reason" then governed the most critical aspects of that bilateral relationship.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

The fact is that the confrontation was transferred to other areas of the world and to other levels of interrelationship. We have not had a nuclear war but the developing world has felt in its own flesh and blood the horrors which the wars which are still called conventional inflict on peoples subjected to foreign domination, to various forms of colonialism and neo-colonialism, and on those who, often without valid examples, are not yet able to solve in peace the problems of every kind which derive from an imperfect world.

The concept of guaranteed mutual destruction, the initials of which in Spanish spell the word "mad" and should give us food for profound and disturbing reflection, for a time served to make us think that the world was protected from a direct nuclear confrontation among those Powers. Yet we seem to note that while that concept of a nuclear deterrent and therefore the security of the world and ultimately the very survival of the human species was based on a precarious balance, now we are living in a more dangerous situation. As several speakers have pointed out, this is because of the increase in nuclear weapons both in number and in what we must call paradoxically improvement in quality, which is pushing the great Powers towards what the experts call "first-strike capability", which is tantamount to recognizing that there are those who think, and think very seriously, that a nuclear war can be conceived of, planned, prepared, carried out and even won.

Certain news also points in this direction, news published by the information media with alarming continuity on the possibilities of certain weapons intended no longer for reprisals but for a successful surprise attack the use of which would require environments such as the oceans and outer space.

In these circumstances should not we, the medium-sized and small countries, consider that the era of the balance of terror is being superseded rapidly by the search for strategic capability which will make it possible to settle by concrete acts what apparently continues to be the same ideological contest of political and social systems? We fear that the reply may be in the affirmative. Quite rightly, this possibility causes disquiet in our delegation and also to all members of the international community. Nothing would make us happier than to be informed that the daily news on these preparations is not in fact true and that on the contrary the great Powers have embarked on a process of lessening the danger of nuclear war and consolidating international peace and security.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

Regretfully, we believe that this is no easy task because all that can be cited as an achievement in recent years is not sufficiently significant if compared with the tasks that should have been carried out and that have not yet even been started, because the agreements reached are in fact relatively modest forms of organizing the growth of the arms race rather than an immediate limitation of arms.

Together with political ambition there is technological capability, which even supersedes it and seems to have become an end in itself. It is impressive to note the fascination which technology appears to exercise when it comes to destruction. No instrument is sufficiently quick, precise, versatile, powerful, ingenious, to satisfy those who plan this peculiar security.

Nevertheless, I repeat that we would not wish these observations to be understood as being substantially negative because there are other factors which lead us to believe that in certain circumstances a new course could be taken towards goals of real disarmament which would mean more security.

We have listened most attentively to the statements of representatives who have spoken before us and have taken due note of the various aspects of this picture which they consider to be positive. We have in mind in particular the statements made by the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union regarding the status of negotiations on the signing of a new strategic arms limitations agreement as well as other items which are being actively discussed in bilateral and trilateral talks, the latter including the United Kingdom. It could never be our intention to detract in any way from the merits of those efforts, nor can we fail to recognize that all negotiations relating to disarmament questions are in themselves complex, lengthy and likely to reach a deadlock in view of the many obstacles of all kinds which exist. We are therefore encouraged by the present speed of that work and the sense of urgency with which it is being conducted, and we hope that the results will be in accordance with the optimism they are arousing.

Here I should like to recall that at the time my delegation, together with others, pronounced itself on the shortcomings of the previous strategic arms agreement. We therefore hope to be told now that the second strategic arms limitation agreement will constitute an effective measure of arms limitation and that it will be followed promptly by other arrangements of a broader scope and greater protection that will mean genuine disarmament commitments, which are

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

imperative in the case of States that really have exclusive responsibility for saving mankind from the real threats to its survival.

The forthcoming special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament items, when for the first time the international community will concentrate its attention on this topical task, which brooks no delay, must be an opportunity for all States to participate fully and actively in a debate which we hope will shed light on the subject and from which programmes and directions must emerge representing the beginning of a qualitatively different era in the universal promotion of disarmament, security and development. This will constitute a special chapter in dealing with disarmament questions and we are ready to prepare for it with decisiveness and optimism.

We therefore wish to place on record here our appreciation of the work of the Preparatory Committee. We shall continue to co-operate enthusiastically with it, under the wise guidance of its Chairman, Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas.

In our opinion there are other elements which deserve a place in that far-reaching meeting. The first of these is the mobilization of international opinion which believes that the reasoning whereby the largest number of weapons and the greatest power are equivalent to the greatest security is already bankrupt.

Another important aspect is the opinion of Governments themselves that the growth of resources for the purposes of war cannot continue indefinitely without even more seriously affecting the legitimate aspirations to well-being of their peoples, whatever their level of development. In this connexion, efforts to restrict or eliminate certain kinds of weapons are undoubtedly received with general satisfaction and are supported by vast sectors of the international community.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

All of this is necessary because the imperative of disarmament derives not only from the rational observation that the arms race has not made possible the security of anyone because, in every corner of the earth, even among the most privileged, there are urgent human needs which cannot be postponed indefinitely.

When so many countries, like mine, point to the link between disarmament and development, it is not because we think exclusively of the additional resources which might eventually be made available to us, nor are we only thinking that, according to recent study, \$5 million would make it possible to provide a supplement of vitamin A which would protect 100 million children from blindness brought about by vitamin deficiency of that kind; nor are we thinking only of the difficulties encountered in establishing the new international economic order.

We are also thinking that the most valuable scientific and technological capabilities, the largest financial resources, vast amounts of raw materials and the priority efforts of so many countries are practically without question devoted to the fateful race to prepare the destruction of all, in circumstances which mean that countries with the highest military expenditures are not able to show the best indices for social development.

While the danger of the arms race is real for all, the benefits of disarmament would in no way be reserved for the poorest peoples and societies.

At this time we have before us, as in past years, a long and complex agenda to be considered. The need for the immediate halt to nuclear weapons tests continues to be the essential priority. Nothing could more encourage the new spirit required for disarmament negotiations than to start from that premise. We therefore welcome the statements made by the United States and the Soviet Union, as well as their negotiations on the subject, and we hope that very soon they will submit the result of their work to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD).

Establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones continues to be of paramount concern for various areas of the world which wish to outlaw from their respective environments the presence of such instruments of destruction. We were therefore

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

pleased to receive the news that the United States of America had signed Protocol I of the Tlatelolco Treaty, and once again we urge France and the Soviet Union respectively to sign Protocols I and II of that Treaty, as an earnest of their practical support for the establishment of such nuclear-weapon-free zones, the advantages and desirability of which they too proclaim.

The gradual reduction and future elimination of atomic weapons; the prohibition of chemical, incendiary and other specific weapons; the gradual limitation of conventional weapons and armed forces; the channelling of resources towards the priority goals of development and well-being for mankind, are some of the aspects that ought to be envisaged in a comprehensive disarmament programme, the urgent consideration of which we, like many other delegations, firmly support.

Other important items will also be debated in this Committee. We are certain that all its members will consent to bring their best efforts to bear to ensure that the result of our labours will be commensurate with the seriousness of our tasks and with the growing urgency of giving practical effect to our desire to promote disarmament.

Within the general framework which I have endeavoured to outline, my delegation will participate in the consideration of those items in the same spirit we have shown in the past, that is to say, actively seeking to promote those matters which we consider to be of special importance and urgency, with full respect for the opinions of all delegations, and with a mind open to those compromises which will make possible an adequate balance between political realism and support for principles which are impossible to renounce.

Mr. YOUSUF (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic):

Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time I have spoken in this Committee, may I congratulate you very warmly on your election to the chairmanship of this important Committee. I should also like to congratulate the other officers of

(Mr. Yousuf, United Arab Emirates)

the Committee. I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that your eminent qualities as a diplomat and your practical experience, as well as your knowledge of the topics discussed by this Committee, will ensure the success of our work.

There can be no doubt that the disarmament items are among the most important and complex discussed at every session of the General Assembly. This is quite obvious in view of the increase in the number of disarmament items on the agenda, without there having been any progress on this subject. However, what makes us optimistic is the increasing part being played by the developing countries and the effort being made, since the creation of the United Nations, to implement the targets of the Charter relating to the safeguarding of international peace and security in order to ensure that the international community will not be exposed to such dangers.

The arms race, however, is continuing at a rapid pace, particularly among the great Powers, which are sparing no effort to develop and improve their arms and to devise weapons of mass destruction at a time when every year millions of people are dying of malnutrition, and at a time when unemployment is spreading throughout the world. If a portion of the funds which are used for devising weapons of mass destruction were to be utilized to resolve the problems being experienced by the developing countries in particular, we should have taken a positive step towards the stability and well-being of the entire international community and the peoples of the world. What is regrettable is that the enormous sums spent on armaments are far greater than those devoted to much more useful ends.

A number of speakers in the plenary meeting or in this First Committee have expressed their deep disquiet at the danger which threatens the human race and which derives from the arms race, not only in conventional weapons but also nuclear weapons. I cannot fail to express the deep concern of my delegation at this threat which is levelled against the entire world and its civilizations. The future seems bleak, since the devising of weapons of mass destruction without strict international control means that the production of those weapons cannot be halted.

(Mr. Yousuf, United Arab
Emirates)

I should like to refer especially to the neutron bomb, which represents a danger for the entire human race and even for all the animals existing on the earth. Halting the arms race depends on the limitation of nuclear weapons and this goal can only be achieved by the total prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests. The countries which possess and produce nuclear weapons are limited in number. If a serious appeal were made that an end be put to the present situation those States would have to commit themselves not to make use of nuclear weapons, because the danger inherent in the use of nuclear weapons is not confined to one particular area of the world but is applicable to the entire surface of the earth.

I would add that we should prohibit the transfer of nuclear weapons to other countries in order to circumscribe the use of those weapons so that the fate of all mankind may not be in the hands of a limited group of countries which act merely to serve their own interests.

We have learned that the racist and colonialist régimes in occupied Palestine and southern Africa possess nuclear weapons. Since we are aware of the nature of the Zionist and racist régimes, since we are informed of their acts of oppression against the African and Arab peoples, and in view of the fact that the Tel Aviv Government does not shrink from using prohibited weapons and perpetrating acts of genocide against the people of Palestine, we should like to express our deep disquiet at the possibility of those weapons being used against the Arab nation in the Middle East. The behaviour of the colonialist and imperialist régimes and the fact that those régimes make available to the racist and Zionist régimes various kinds of dangerous equipment are entirely unacceptable. This will only help to maintain tension in those areas and intensify it to a point where it becomes explosive and endangers the entire world.

The General Assembly has adopted a resolution on the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. All the countries in that region were very much in favour of that resolution and supported it, but Israel, which claims to desire peace and possesses nuclear weapons, did not join those countries which gave their support to that resolution. We would request the United Nations to take effective and immediate steps to ensure that all countries in the region observe the provisions of that resolution.

(Mr. Ycusuf, United Arab Emirates)

We must make sincere efforts to stop the arms race in nuclear and conventional weapons and to put an end to nuclear and thermonuclear weapons tests. We must impose restrictions on trade in arms if we want the contemporary world to make progress and to live in prosperity. In the same way, we have to overcome the problem of under-development and starvation which affects many developing countries if we wish to improve their living conditions so that all peoples may live in a world of peace and harmony. We cannot hope to create stability throughout the world if the sources of tension continue to exist. The Treaty prohibiting nuclear tests has not been signed and ratified by all States. It is our hope that those that have not acceded to it will shortly do so. Now, when we are appealing for the ending of the arms race and calling for the prohibition of the transfer of nuclear weapons to other countries, we consider that nuclear technology can and should be used for peaceful purposes only so that the peoples of the world may enjoy prosperity and well-being.

Among the problems which we are facing today, the increase in the production of chemical, biological and incendiary weapons is very much in the forefront of our minds. We hope that a draft treaty on the general and complete prohibition of biological weapons will be completed very shortly. We listened to Mr. Fisher, the United States representative, when he said that the bilateral negotiations between his country and the Soviet Union were making progress. It is our hope that the special session of the General Assembly which is to be held in May 1978 will discuss this aspect of the matter. We also hope that an agreement will be reached on the prohibition of the stockpiling and use of incendiary, chemical and biological weapons. We are aware that this requires time but we are convinced that such a convention would contribute to reducing international tension and strengthening security and stability throughout the world. This would undoubtedly constitute an effective step towards general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Yousuf, United Arab Emirates)

Among the matters on which no specific action has been taken despite lengthy discussions in the past few years is the question of prohibiting all nuclear-~~weapons~~ tests. We hope that the world conference on disarmament will succeed in concluding a treaty pursuant to the resolution adopted by the General Assembly.

The reduction by 10 per cent of the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council would be a very effective step in the field of disarmament. We attach great importance to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 3093 (XXVIII) concerning the channeling of the funds thus saved for development purposes. We are convinced that this would make an important contribution to the well-being of mankind as a whole.

The countries situated in the Indian Ocean area suffered for a long time from the domination and hegemony of imperialist-colonialist countries, but after their accession to independence they bent their efforts to eliminating under-development and achieving progress in order to ensure the dignity of their peoples. In order to guarantee the security and peace of the countries in that region, of which my country is one, we supported the resolution declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. We are opposed to the installation of any military bases in that area and we should like to reaffirm once again the need to make the Indian Ocean a nuclear-free zone. We consider that the countries in that area, in co-operation with the other countries concerned, should take immediate and effective steps to eliminate military bases from that region so that the Indian Ocean may become a genuinely denuclearized zone. The countries of the world should refrain from using that area in order to demonstrate their military strength. The declaration which would turn the Indian Ocean into a nuclear-free zone would contribute to strengthening world peace and security.

My delegation, while supporting a declaration which would make the Middle East a denuclearized zone, would also support a General Assembly resolution declaring that Africa and Latin America should also become denuclearized zones.

ET/ld

A/C.1/32/PV.16
29-30

(Mr. Yousuf, United Arab Emirates)

My delegation attaches great importance to the special session of the General Assembly to be devoted to discussing disarmament questions which is to be held in May 1978.

(Mr. Yousuf, United Arab Emirates)

While we hope that this special session of the General Assembly will be crowned with success, we feel at the same time that every Member State should make sincere and joint efforts to ensure that effective resolutions are adopted in the field of disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: Two Members have expressed their wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call first on the representative of Israel.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): We heard this morning from the representative of Syria the kind of unbridled attack on Israel which is more appropriate to a council of war than to a Committee of the United Nations. To this Committee, dedicated, as it were, to the achievement of disarmament and international harmony, there comes a representative of a Member State of the United Nations who has the audacity to demand "the elimination" of a fellow Member of this Organization.

The representative of Syria is well placed to discuss the elimination of States from a position of some expertise. It was only a year ago that Syrian forces invaded Lebanon, sowing death and destruction in the wake of their unprovoked invasion. The charred remains of much of what once was Beirut speak eloquently of Syria's interpretation of the principle of non-use of force in international relations.

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

Mr. JAZZAR (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The question on the agenda of this Committee is "Disarmament items". I do not believe that we have on the agenda of this Committee, or even on the agenda of the General Assembly, any item regarding the situation in the Lebanon. That is why I would request you, Sir, to see to it that the representative of Israel confines his remarks to the item on our agenda.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Israel.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): Having invaded a neighbouring country, Syria then proceeded to bombard Palestinian refugee camps, with total disregard of every international convention governing the conduct of war. Thousands of Palestinian civilians were killed and maimed as a result of the Syrian bombardment of the refugee camp of Tal Azar on 12 July 1976.

The sincerity of Syria's championship of the aims of disarmament -

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic on a point of order.

Mr. JAZZAR (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of Israel continues to speak on a question which is not on the agenda of this Committee. I have already requested you, Mr. Chairman, to be so good as to ask the representative of Israel to confine his remarks to the disarmament items on our agenda, which are now being discussed here.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Syria. The representative of Israel will confine himself to the question as it relates to disarmament and not tell us a long history of Syria's attack.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): Mr. Chairman, I am at present discussing the sincerity of Syria's championship of the idea of disarmament, and I should be grateful if I could be allowed to continue. I am conscious of being outnumbered in this Committee, but I still hope that the right of a sovereign State to express its views is not being impeded by a majority. Thank you very much, I shall continue.

As I said, the sincerity of Syria's championship of the aims of disarmament can best be judged by the manner in which it furthers the cause of the Palestinians - and the Palestinians were mentioned by the representative of Syria in his statement. It seems to be Syria's way to clamour for the rights of the Palestinians in the United Nations and to kill them in the Lebanon.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

It is the kind of statement made by the representative of Syria this morning that destroys whatever credibility the United Nations still enjoys as a forum of peace. Had the proceedings of this Committee not been recorded in full, I would have proposed that the Committee reproduce them in extenso. They deserve the widest possible publicity, to dispel whatever illusions may still be harboured in certain quarters about Syria's intentions in the present international effort to bring peace to the Middle East.

Israel's position on the question of disarmament is going to be fully stated in the course of the general debate. I do not believe that the cause of disarmament in general or peace in the Middle East would be particularly well served if I were to allow myself to be drawn into a further exchange of rights of reply with the representative of Syria or the United Arab Emirates. I have no intention of assisting the Arab attempt to lower the deliberations of this Committee to the level of vituperations of a market square.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic in exercise of his right of reply.

Mr. JAZZAR (Syrian Arab Republic)(interpretation from Arabic): I would have wished to limit my remarks to the points I raised in my statement, but since the representative of the Government of Tel Aviv has spoken of Lebanon, I feel that I am bound briefly to mention the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lebanon when he expressed his gratitude to Syria for the constructive role it has played in his country, which was the largest contribution to the halting of the blood-letting and the restoration of peace in that brother country.

(Mr. Jazzar, Syrian Arab Republic)

Members of this Committee are invited to refer to the General Assembly verbatim record of the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Lebanon. That, I believe, is the best reply to the allegations and slander of the representative of the Zionist entity.

In my statement this morning, I said that disarmament required the elimination of hotbeds of tension throughout the world, as clearly represented by the Zionist régime of Israel and the apartheid régime of South Africa. In that statement I mentioned the policy of aggression and the plots hatched and carried out by the alliance between the Governments of Pretoria and Tel Aviv in the Middle East, in pursuit of their imperialist designs.

Indeed, how can Israel, whose economy is suffering a major crisis, produce weapons of mass destruction such as aircraft, missiles and other weapons? It would have been impossible for Israel to achieve such progress in the production of weapons of mass destruction without imperialist support.

Incidentally, all of the information I mentioned in my statement is known to the entire international community.

There can be no doubt that the production and stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction, and indeed imperialism itself, constitute a threat to international peace and security, and are contrary to the efforts of the United Nations to lessen tensions throughout the world and to limit the arms race. Many have stressed these facts during the present debate.

As regards the Israeli representative's remarks about peace, our reply is that the desire for peace requires conduct in compliance with the spirit of the Charter and with all the resolutions adopted by this Organization. Since his Government flagrantly defies United Nations resolutions and refuses to discharge its obligations as a State Member of the United Nations, he should certainly not speak of a desire for peace. In fact, the model for peace mentioned by the representative of Israel is precisely the same as that invoked by Vorster and Smith: peace based on the use of force as a means of self-determination. That is obviously the course being pursued by the ruling circles of Zionism and racism. Plundering the wealth of others, the use of weapons of mass destruction, the escalation of tension, the exploitation of the Arab and African peoples with a view to ending their development in favour of Israel's imperialist plans - these policies are at the root of every decision taken by Israel.

Mr. ABOU-ASSI (Lebanon) (interpretation from Arabic): The statement made by the representative of Israel does not serve any purpose. In this regard, my delegation has nothing to add to the statement made by our Minister for Foreign Affairs at the General Assembly during the general debate, and would like therefore to commend what has been just said, in this respect, by our colleague from Syria.

The CHAIRMAN: According to the decision taken by the Committee at its seventh meeting, the Committee will conclude its general debate on disarmament items on 4 November; the remaining 14 meetings will be devoted to the discussion of draft resolutions.

Therefore, I would suggest to the Committee that we set as the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions 9 November, at 12 noon. That would give ample time to all those delegations intending to submit draft resolutions to do so and also to obtain instructions from their respective Governments, if required. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to my suggestions.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I would also suggest to the Committee that we devote our meetings on Monday, 7 November, and Tuesday, 8 November, to the introduction of all draft resolutions that have already been submitted, as well as to discussion of any or all of those drafts. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that this suggestion also is accepted.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.