

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records *



FIRST COMMITTEE
17th meeting
held on
Monday, 31 October 1977
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 17TH 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 TLATELOLCO): 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 TLATELOLCO) (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)

AGENDA ITEM 45: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH ASIA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (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.17
3 November 1977
ENGLISH

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. RAZAFINDRATOVO (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): Since this is the first time that I have spoken in this Committee, may I first of all address to you the warmest congratulations of the Malagasy delegation on your election to the chairmanship of this important Committee. This is only a proper recognition of your diplomatic competence and your human qualities. These congratulations are equally addressed to the other officers of the Committee.

When on 3 October last His Excellency Mr. Christian Remi Richard, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, spoke to the General Assembly of the United Nations, after having analysed the international situation, he stated, inter alia:

"The conflicts and crisis situations which I have mentioned - grave in themselves - would not be that dangerous for international peace and security if they were not set against the background of a world armed to the teeth possessing the necessary means to self-destruct several times over, which is not safeguarded against an accident or an error in judgement that can at any moment bring about its annihilation. That is a state of affairs that hardly gives cause for optimism, particularly since we are only two years away from the end of the Disarmament Decade." (A/32/PV.17, p. 112)

(Mr. Razafindratovo, Madagascar)

Therefore, like the speakers who have spoken before me, we cannot but voice our feelings of discouragement and frustration in view of the absence of any real progress in the field of disarmament.

Quite to the contrary, are we not witnessing the devising of even more death-dealing weapons and the accumulation of impressive arsenals of new strategic weapons of all kinds which the imagination can hardly encompass?

The developing countries themselves, although they are confronted by tremendous economic and social development problems, are also the prey of fratricidal struggles with their neighbours and are also engaged in this demented arms race, to the delight of those who manufacture arms in the developed world. It is particularly discouraging and disappointing for the representative of a developing country to see massive sums invested every year in armaments when he sees the defective infrastructure, the inadequate education and the lag in the health services in his country. The Nigerian representative in this Committee gave a particularly impressive example when he indicated that the equivalent of half-a-day of world arms expenditure might completely wipe out malaria, which still claims numerous victims in the third world.

Furthermore, scientists in all countries, particularly those in the developed countries, continue through the Pugwash movement to alert world public opinion and Governments on the dangers of an over-armed world, particularly in the nuclear area. These warnings, which are considered to represent the profound conscience of nations, are unfortunately not heeded, while each year we meet here to express the position of our respective Governments. One might therefore ask a question which some may regard as naive: Why does the whole world seem to agree about disarmament and why has no concrete step been taken to implement it?

The mutual mistrust which prevails between the super-Powers, which was referred to here the other day, is undoubtedly one of the underlying reasons. Therefore, we welcome the suggestions made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines when he spoke in this Committee, particularly when he proposed the progressive reduction of arms sales by the supplying countries, a halt to the improvement or production of new systems of arms, and the outlawing of the most deadly weapons, such as chemical and biological weapons, neutron bombs, etc.

(Mr. Razafindratovo, Madagascar)

The proposal made by the Romanian representative to establish a time-table for taking specific steps, starting with the simplest problems and then taking up the more complex issues to be solved, also appeared to us a very constructive one.

The painstaking negotiations which are going on between the two super-Powers on the limitation of strategic weapons, however useful they may be, in effect simply lead to the stabilization of the notorious balance of terror which has threatened the world for so many years because these agreements generally contain a numerical ceiling - which is very high in itself - that does not however prevent the further perfecting of existing weapons.

Naturally it goes without saying that the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, a member of the non-aligned movement, will actively participate in the discussions of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament, which is, furthermore, in accordance with the wishes expressed by the Summit conference of non-aligned countries held in Colombo, Sri Lanka, in August 1976. We all hope that this special session will yield specific results which will bring us closer to general and complete disarmament.

If we earnestly urge the establishment of general and complete disarmament in what we hope will be the not-too-distant future, we must necessarily also favour, as an intermediary step, the denuclearization of our own continent and the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

In Africa, the attempts of South Africa to arm itself with nuclear weapons - in an area which is already disturbed by the inhuman practices of apartheid and by the dying convulsions of colonialism - underline even further the solemn declaration made by the Heads of Government and State in Africa on the denuclearization of Africa announcing their desire to conclude an international treaty, under the aegis of the United Nations, in which they would pledge neither to manufacture nor to acquire nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Razafindratovo, Madagascar)

The Democratic Republic of Madagascar would like to reiterate here the solemn terms of the Declaration on the denuclearization of Africa adopted by the Heads of State and Government, as well as the successive General Assembly resolutions 1652 (XVI) of 24 November 1961, 2033 (XX) of 3 December 1965, 3261 E (XXIX) of 9 December 1974, 3471 (XXX) of 11 December 1975 and 31/69 of 10 December 1976. We are deeply convinced that such a denuclearization would not only help to guarantee the security of the African States but would also prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The Democratic Republic of Madagascar is a large island anchored off the coast of Africa, but it also looks out towards the far continent of South Asia, with which it has numerous cultural and ethnic links, and would equally welcome the creation of a denuclearized zone in South Asia. We would also like to see such a denuclearized zone established in the Middle East.

Finally, situated as it is in the middle of the maritime routes along which are borne the precious petroleum products of developed countries, the Democratic Republic of Madagascar is deeply concerned at the conflicts and confrontations that are arising in this strategic area. My delegation cannot overemphasize its desire to see a zone of peace effectively set up in this region, or the need to attain the objectives of the solemn Declaration of the General Assembly on that subject.

In this connexion, I should like to recall briefly the conclusions reached by the Conference of religious leaders in support of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, at Tananarive, the capital of my country, last April. After having analysed the steady withdrawal of colonialism and the important and swift political changes that have occurred in Asia, Africa, and in the islands of the Indian Ocean, which have shaken the old order and have called into question the interests of the wealthy States, this Conference, which was attended by representatives from various religions - Christians, Muslims, Hindus, and Orthodox - concluded, inter alia, that it was necessary to support the following actions to create the conditions for peace in the Indian Ocean:

(Mr. Razafindratovo, Madagascar)

First, the dismantling of all military, air and naval bases in the Indian Ocean, particularly those of Diego García, and in the surrounding regions; secondly, the prohibition of any nuclear explosions in that area; thirdly, the progressive reduction, on a mutual and concerted basis, of military activities of the non-coastal States as a prior step to the dismantling of foreign military bases; and fourthly, the struggle of the peoples of Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe against racism and apartheid.

Unfortunately, the situation prevailing at present gives little grounds for optimism. Instead of remaining the haven of peace which it should never have stopped being, the Indian Ocean is unfortunately becoming the arena for rivalry among the major Powers. Many warships are sailing this ocean, and the military bases installed there are becoming more and more powerful. The great American newspaper The New York Times recognized a few weeks ago that Diego García is on the point of becoming an "unsinkable aircraft carrier".

But these findings should not discourage us, should not prevent our Organization from continuing to work, along the lines which it has laid down, towards the implementation of its own solemn Declaration. The Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, which has met frequently - and my delegation would like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to its Chairman and to its members for the work they have carried out - in its report gives us some very useful indications. We should recall that that Ad Hoc Committee, of which my country is a member, has the main task of "... formulating a programme of action leading to the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean; ..." in particular to call upon "the great Powers and the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean, to co-operate ..." in the Committee's work. (A/32/29, p. 1, para. 1)

(Mr. Razafindratovo, Madagascar)

It is interesting to note that the United States of America and the Soviet Union are prepared to co-operate with the Committee, even if they do not yet wish to participate as fully-fledged members in the work of the Committee. On the other hand, it seems that in the present state of affairs only the principle of a preliminary meeting on the conference has been agreed to.

To the extent that such a meeting would make it possible to seek a conciliation between the views of the littoral countries and those of the hinterland on the future of the region, the Democratic Republic of Madagascar will subscribe to it willingly. But it is clear, according to the report, that bilateral talks between the two super-Powers are still far from fulfilling the long-term purposes of the demilitarization and the total denuclearization of the Indian Ocean and the more immediate goal of dismantling the military bases in the area.

How could we accept such a military restriction when strategic bombers with the most sophisticated weapons on board are stationed barely a few hours away from our coasts?

The arguments of realpolitik are unlikely to satisfy us because it was those same ideas that long served to keep us under the colonial yoke and in neo-colonialist servitude.

Talks which are held outside the interested countries, namely, the littoral countries and those of the hinterland, could hardly meet with our agreement therefore. We cannot consider the limitation of arms a synonym of demilitarization and denuclearization and our delegation, for its part, refuses to agree to the distortion of the true meaning of the concept of a zone of peace.

In conclusion on this particular point, I shall once again quote the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar when he spoke before the General Assembly during the present session:

"Furthermore, the coastal States believe that the maintenance of peace and security in their region in the final analysis fall within their authority and their competence, without being subject to the interests of Powers foreign to the region. Any bilateral or multilateral negotiations

(Mr. Razafindratovo, Madagascar)

on the maintenance of peace in the Indian Ocean cannot be crowned with success if they aim only at a compromise between the interests of those Powers; what is important is to ensure real guarantees of independence and security for the countries of the region.

"Like other coastal States, the Democratic Republic of Madagascar refuses to admit that the notion of a zone of peace can be distorted to justify any military presence or activities incompatible with the Declaration on the Indian Ocean.

"Indeed, history has taught us how the notion of the freedom of the oceans has been invoked by the imperialist Powers of Europe to ensure maritime supremacy. Any idea of supremacy in the Indian Ocean, whether exercised by a single super-Power, or by two or several Powers with opposing interests that counterbalance one another, must be rejected; it is in this conviction that we reaffirm the validity of all the objectives of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean." (A/32/PV.17, pp. 109-111)

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, may I first of all congratulate you on your election as Chairman of this Committee.

The word "disarmament" has been used and heard perhaps more than other word here at the United Nations. It would be an understatement to say that at the United Nations and in other organizations interminable discussions on disarmament have been going on for years. Now it would be more accurate and more practical to count in terms of decades. In the verbatim records of meetings devoted to disarmament problems all kinds of ideas and proposals have been recorded. The voluminous files of resolutions and of innumerable documents do not stop growing. But, as for results, we must say that they are disappointing, even disquieting. As has been rightly emphasized by the representatives of numerous democratic and progressive countries in the course of this debate, the unprecedented stockpiling of arms by imperialist Powers and reactionary régimes is a serious threat to peace-loving peoples and States, a threat that grows daily worse, creating further tension in the world.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

In view of the history of the discussions on disarmament, we can rightly affirm that these discussions not only have not led to the expected results but, on the contrary, have been taken advantage of by the adversaries of disarmament to conceal their designs and actions. After all we have heard so far on disarmament and after all we have seen that has been done for armament, we can perceive how important it is to redouble our efforts to reveal to the peoples and to public opinion the causes and factors which prevent the process of disarmament from getting under way and progressing and to dispel the confusion created by the imperialists, socio-imperialists and other reactionaries. It is in this sense that our deliberations could be useful.

It is certain that disarmament problems are today very complex and that the imperialist Powers by their policies complicate them further by making their solution more difficult. The imperialist Powers seek to make us forget that the positions of the different States and different political forces regarding armament and disarmament problems are objectively different. They strive to give the impression that they are as interested as the peoples and States that prize peace and freedom in getting disarmament under way and liquidating armaments.

But we must emphasize that the arms possessed by the freedom-loving peoples and States to enable them to recover and defend their freedom and to fight occupiers and foreign aggressors are not in any way means of aggression. They represent no danger to international peace and security. On the contrary, it is the arms of the imperialist Powers which they have stockpiled for the needs of their policies of war and aggression which constitute a real danger to the freedom and independence of peoples and to international peace and security. It is precisely this kind of armament which we must oppose and which it is fair to oppose.

Imperialism and socio-imperialism mean war and aggression and to wage war and commit aggression they need arms. That is why the term "disarmament" in the declarations of the American imperialists or the Soviet socio-imperialists is fallacious. It would be a dangerous illusion to believe that the two super-Powers can evince goodwill and work for peace.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

The enormous quantities of conventional and modern arms stockpiled in the arsenals of the two imperialist super-Powers, and the unbridled arms race which they relentlessly pursue are not phenomena which have appeared by chance, nor the spontaneous result of certain unforeseen developments and, still less is it merely an undesirable consequence of the development of science and technology today. In fact, it is a result and a brutal manifestation of the aggressive policy of the two super-Powers and other imperialist Powers which have placed even science and technology at the service of preparations for war while mankind needs that science and technology so badly in other fields.

The constant increase in arms, the uninterrupted arms race, the increase from year to year in military budgets, and the development of new weapons of mass destruction are facts which prove that the United States of America and the Soviet Union intend by force to extend their domination and hegemony throughout the world in order to exercise permanent pressure or blackmail against the peoples.

The major imperialist Powers speculate on the aspirations of the peoples to achieve genuine and real disarmament. They have raised and continue to raise obstacles to efforts undertaken to seek just solutions to the problems. It is those same Powers, and particularly the United States of America and the Soviet Union, which seek to make use of the discussions which take place here at the United Nations or elsewhere to justify their arms race and to impose their views and theories about disarmament.

The two super-Powers unceasingly preach that they are extremely concerned about the fact that in the field of disarmament the results are insufficient and that they are doing everything they can to contribute to an improvement in the situation by making proposals and recommendations and even advocating specific measures to be taken. This is really the height of cynicism; they are armed to the teeth, they continue to arm themselves further and, at the same time, claim that all this is only to promote disarmament. If we were to believe the two super-Powers we would say that their arming is an important step towards disarmament and, thus a service they are rendering mankind.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

It is well known that it is mainly the two super-Powers which are manufacturing incalculable quantities of weapons, which are making preparations to use even the environment and natural phenomena for military purposes, which are perfecting new monstrous, deadly weapons whose names the rest of us often do not even know. But, strangely enough, it is those same super-Powers which would have us believe that they are the most innocent countries in this world. They seek to argue that if we continue to mark time in regard to armaments, it is not their fault at all; they are not responsible in any way. According to them, it is the fault of those countries which do not seem to understand that if the two super-Powers were entrusted with the task of dealing with disarmament problems, everything would be perfectly all right.

Every time the representatives of the democratic and progressive States try to highlight the true disarmament problems, to oppose all this abstract phraseology and demagoguery and these misleading slogans, the representatives of the imperialist Powers start accusing them of pessimism, scepticism and a lack of will to face the difficulties in the path of a solution to the complex problem of disarmament.

The two super-Powers would like to force the peoples to close their eyes to the dangers entailed by their armaments, and, from time to time, they make promises with a great deal of noise, that in the very near future they will make us a gift of the paradise of disarmament. But they cannot succeed in this hoax; the whole world knows that true disarmament disappears farther beyond the horizon with the passage of every day. Moreover, the two super-Powers continue to emit threats that if we do not take them seriously and if we do not accept their ideas and their plans, mankind will pay dearly, will suffer all the horrible effects of the use of modern weapons. Thus, the imperialists and the socio-imperialists brandish their weapons in the war of nerves against the peoples, to bend their will and their determination, to crush their resistance to the aggressive and expansionist policy pursued by the imperialists and the socio-imperialists.

All the demagoguery and manoeuvres of the imperialists and the socio-imperialists on the subject of disarmament are designed to hide the aggressive and expansionist nature of their policy, to disarm the peoples and the other countries and to enable them to continue their own preparations for war, to increase their military budgets and to expand the arms race.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

At present the two super-Powers, on the one hand, picture their bargaining in regard to armaments as a great contribution to disarmament and, on the other, make accusations against each other, each referring to the guilty behaviour of the other whenever difficulties arise in their attempts to establish a military balance between them. To mislead the peoples, the American imperialists accuse the Soviet socio-imperialists of not agreeing to their so-called serious proposals, while the Soviet socio-imperialists, with the same aim, reply that the United States of America, by submitting premature and unrealistic proposals, wishes to place them in an inferior position. While the American imperialists loudly proclaim that the Soviet Union has a larger army and more aircraft and tanks, the Soviet socio-imperialists plead their cause by expressing concern about the fact that the United States is insisting on maintaining its nuclear-weapon superiority. Thus, the two super-Powers continue to play hide-and-seek in order to camouflage their aims and actions behind a smokescreen and to convince other countries that the establishment of an acceptable military balance between them would certainly lead to world peace and security, would constitute an achievement for all countries and would open a wide path to disarmament.

Of course, the peoples cannot allow themselves to be caught in the traps set by the American imperialists and the Soviet socio-imperialists. The peoples are becoming even more aware than ever before that the two imperialist super-Powers are their main enemies, that they are dangerous to the same extent and degree when they are in conflict with each other as when they are engaged in making deals, either in regard to disarmament or in regard to other subjects.

The danger of their policy does not change and the threat that they pose to the world does not decrease even if they engage in a token reduction of the numbers of their troops, their tanks or their missiles. The two super-Powers have such quantities of weapons at their disposal that even if, for propaganda reasons, they decide on some reductions, they still have more than enough to wage several large wars and to commit many acts of aggression. The two super-Powers, when they want to demonstrate their strength and create panic, make statements themselves to the effect that they have a sufficient quantity of arms to destroy the world several times over. Nevertheless, the two super-Powers would like also to distract the peoples'

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

attention from the major problems and dangers and to engage them in completely useless mental exercises about which of the two super-Powers has more soldiers and more weapons, which should reduce the numbers of soldiers and weapons and which should increase them.

The American imperialists and the Soviet socio-imperialists have made up slogans about so-called nuclear disarmament, the limitation and prohibition of nuclear weapons, the non-proliferation of nuclear armaments: the preferred subjects of their propaganda. They also have fine words about the prohibition of chemical, bacteriological and radiological weapons, about the need not to modify the environment for military purposes. They constantly make pompous statements to remind us that on all those aspects of disarmament they have concluded or are in the process of preparing special agreements. But there is no propaganda that can disguise the fact that all the types of weapons they have perfected or manufactured are a constant threat hanging over humanity.

All this racket about the horrors of nuclear weapons and the urgent need for nuclear disarmament is often designed to make people forget the dangers entailed in stockpiling conventional weapons and to obtain, in some way, the legalization of the race in armaments of that kind. Experience shows us that it is precisely conventional weapons that imperialist Powers and all aggressors have used to launch wars of aggression, inflicting incalculable damage and suffering on mankind. When the United States and the Soviet Union proclaim that they are interested in and support the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world, they do not have in mind saving the peoples from the horrors of war; rather, these are calculated attempts to dampen the peoples' indignation somewhat and to relax their vigilance in regard to the danger of the conventional weapons that the aggressors find more convenient for use in local wars.

The cessation of the arms race is undoubtedly one of the key issues in the disarmament question. But we can only note that the arms race is becoming ever more frenetic. Not only do the United States and the Soviet Union continue the arms race between them; they are also involving other countries. The countries members of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, controlled respectively by American interests and the Soviet socio-imperialists, have been following that course for a long time now. The uninterrupted strengthening of the military machine of these aggressive

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

blocs, the many offensive military manoeuvres carried out by them, and the vast networks of military bases that the United States and the Soviet Union have established in the world are all significant factors that contradict the propaganda racket made by the two super-Powers and those who follow them.

If these evils are not liquidated, there can be no thought of serious progress in disarmament.

Within the framework of the frenzied arms race between them, the United States and the Soviet Union create regional arms races, making great use for this purpose of trade in and provision of weapons; they thereby create hotbeds of war and tension. The imperialist Powers seek, at the same time, to use the provision of arms as a means of political or military integration and as a means of achieving economic gains and alleviating the burden of their economic and financial crisis. Looting by means of arms trading is another factor which proves the deceptiveness of the promises of imperialism and socio-imperialism that the funds freed by means of disarmament would be used for the economic development of the poor and non-industrialized countries.

The imperialist Powers have always sought to complicate the machinery of the disarmament discussions, both for propaganda purposes and in order to engage in bargaining between themselves.

The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, the Geneva Conference on Disarmament and the Conference on the Mutual Reduction of Armaments in Central Europe, which have been going on for many years now, are the best proof of the ineffectiveness of any machinery created or directed by the two super-Powers or other imperialist Powers.

In the past few years the Soviet socio-imperialists claim that they have found the key to solving the disarmament problem - that is, the convening of a world disarmament conference. According to them, that conference is so important that even the special session of the United Nations General Assembly envisaged for next year must be regarded as merely a preparatory stage.

The facts prove that the two super-Powers seek to place the disarmament problem in an impasse. As Comrade Enver Hoxha, the leader of the Albanian people, said:

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

"The campaign regarding disarmament being waged by the super-Powers, the innumerable plans and drafts, the conferences and talks that have been going on for years now, are hoaxes and fraudulent manoeuvres designed to hide their arms race. The super-Powers wish thereby to oblige the other peoples and States to recognize, to permit the legalization of their nuclear monopoly and their modern weapons, to admit that they have the right to engage in uncontrolled and limitless armament and to go on for ever perfecting the technology of weapons of mass destruction."

In that state of affairs, we find it necessary to unmask the illusions and the myths constantly expounded by the opponents of true disarmament. Today more than ever it is indispensable that sovereign peoples and countries maintain their vigilance, that they firmly oppose the aggressive policy of imperialism, socio-imperialism and reaction, that they ensure progress in the struggle for genuine and true disarmament. All the peoples and all the States that wish to defend freedom, independence and national sovereignty have the undeniable right to take all the measures necessary to discourage and repulse foreign aggression.

Mr. SATTAR (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, this Committee is most fortunate to have a person of your qualifications and wide experience to preside over its deliberations during this important session. The Pakistan delegation would like also to congratulate the other officers of the Committee on their election.

The concept of universal collective security contained in the United Nations Charter is premised on the achievement of substantial progress towards general and complete disarmament. In fact, however, there has been little progress. On the contrary, ever more deadly weapons continue to be produced. As the Secretary-General noted in his annual report,

"... the number of nuclear warheads has increased fivefold in the past eight years." (A/32/1, p. 12)

Diversion of resources to military ends has escalated so that now the rate of expenditure is \$1 billion a day.

A peace which is premised on a balance of terror, on concepts of mutual assured destruction and on ambitions of global hegemony and domination is bound to remain fragile and insecure. So long as the peril of nuclear annihilation persists, the international atmosphere will continue to be characterized by tension and insecurity and the hope that substantial resources can be freed to promote economic progress, particularly in developing countries, will not be realized.

It is axiomatic that the primary responsibility for disarmament rests with those States which possess the power to destroy not only each other but the entire world. They have been engaged in negotiations for many years. But so far the results have been meagre. It is our hope that the promise of progress held out in the declarations made by the President of the United States and the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union when they spoke in the General Assembly will be achieved. The world expects, in particular, that the second agreement of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) will actually reduce the deployment of strategic weapons. Nor should there be any obstacle of a technical nature to the conclusion of a nuclear test ban agreement. It is appropriate to expect those Powers which possess overwhelming preponderance in nuclear weapons technology to accept a moratorium on any further testing.

(Mr. Sattar, Pakistan)

Among other confidence-building and arms control measures which can be achieved in the near future are the proposed treaty on the prohibition of chemical weapons, a convention prohibiting the development of new weapons of mass destruction and a convention on the limitation, for humanitarian reasons, of incendiary and certain other conventional weapons.

The consideration of these matters cannot, however, divert attention from the fact that the primary threat to international peace and security, especially the security of non-nuclear States, arises from the nuclear arsenals of the major nuclear Powers. Until those arsenals are dismantled and all further production of nuclear weapons prohibited, the non-nuclear-weapon States have the right to be assured that their security will not be jeopardized by the use or threat of use of such weapons.

Last year the Soviet Union proposed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries an agreement for the non-first-use of nuclear weapons. In his address to the General Assembly President Carter also declared that the United States would not use nuclear weapons except in the event of aggression against it or its allies. Those pronouncements, while welcome in the context in which they have been made, are primarily designed by the super-Powers to reassure each other. They do not deal with the problem of the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States.

Neither super-Power faces any threat from non-nuclear States, particularly not from those which are not members of NATO or the Warsaw Pact. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect them to respond positively to the General Assembly's invitation, in its resolution 31/189 C of last year, to give an undertaking not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against States which are not parties to the nuclear security arrangements of some nuclear Powers. Such an undertaking by nuclear-weapon Powers would, without affecting their own security interests, give some reassurance to non-nuclear States about their security from the nuclear threat. It would also give greater credibility to current efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Pakistan's commitment to the objectives of non-proliferation has been consistent and unreserved. My country was among those which from the beginning actively advocated the idea of a non-proliferation treaty, despite the

(Mr. Sattar, Pakistan)

inherently discriminatory nature of such a treaty. It was our conviction, however, that the treaty could succeed only if effective measures were taken simultaneously to safeguard the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, to ensure the adherence to it of all countries without exception and to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race among the nuclear-weapon Powers. None of those conditions has been fulfilled. On the contrary, the situation has become more complex. A number of countries for one reason or another have declined to adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty, and among them there are many which are described as threshold nuclear Powers. Without entering into an argument about the distinction between a peaceful nuclear explosion and a weapons test, I must say that the fact is that the situation in this regard has become ambiguous because of India's nuclear explosion, provisions relating to this matter in the Treaty of Tlatelolco and the ambivalence of the super-Powers' own position in this regard in the threshold Treaty. Furthermore, it is no longer possible to ignore the fact that two countries - Israel and South Africa - may have covertly acquired a nuclear capability which, in view of the secrecy which surrounds their programmes and their refusal to accept any form of safeguards or inspection, is widely and probably correctly assumed to be a nuclear-weapon capability. The non-proliferation Treaty has been subjected to criticism on grounds which were reiterated at the Review Conference of the Treaty held in April 1975. It was notable at that Conference that all proposals made by the non-nuclear-weapon States were ignored by the nuclear Powers.

In the circumstances, it is necessary to examine the situation in the light of existing realities in order to find ways of attaining the objectives underlying the non-proliferation régime. In the first place, attention must be turned to bringing under international scrutiny the nuclear programmes and facilities of those States which are not subject to safeguards and have therefore accumulated unaccounted-for fissile materials. Only thus can we ensure that those materials have not been diverted to the development of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Sattar, Pakistan)

A realistic approach to non-proliferation cannot ignore the immediate danger. It should not merely address more remote and perhaps theoretical possibilities, such as the use of nuclear weapons by terrorists. Today, the nuclear danger in the Middle East arises from the mystery which surrounds the nuclear programme of Israel, a country which is reported to have used unorthodox means to acquire nuclear capability, and which has refused to accept international safeguards or even to open its nuclear plants to inspection by the United States. In Africa, it has not been the Namibian freedom fighters or the Soweto schoolboys who threaten the continent with the nuclear menace, but the racist régime of Mr. Vorster, which has proclaimed that it would develop nuclear weapons in order to perpetuate the apartheid régime.

Those manifest breaches are the real threat to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) régime and to the peace and security of the world. It is that danger which should be the focus of attention. Instead, international concern has turned to the transfer of nuclear technology to non-nuclear-weapon States of the third world, almost all of which have accepted safeguards for their peaceful nuclear programmes and have given every possible assurance of their intention to eschew nuclear weapons. We find it difficult to understand why the development of nuclear energy in the developing countries should be considered a specially dangerous proposition. Is it seriously believed that the developing countries are less responsible than others?

During the past two years some of the nuclear Powers and their allies have sought to impose onerous and unilateral conditions for the transfer of nuclear technology to non-nuclear-weapon States, despite the acceptance by those States of international safeguards. Some supplier countries have resorted to unilateral embargoes and political pressures to impose their policy. A proposal has been mooted to create a cartel of nuclear suppliers in order to retain control over advanced nuclear technology and to ensure that the developing countries remain dependent for their nuclear fuel supply on external sources under the control of supplier countries.

(Mr. Sattar, Pakistan)

Many developing countries, as well as some of the supplier nations, have expressed themselves here and in other forums against discriminatory restraints and conditions on the transfer of nuclear technology. The development of nuclear energy is vital to the economic and social development not only of the industrialized countries, but even more so of developing countries, which have rapidly increasing energy needs and are deficient in conventional energy resources. A policy of denial and deprivation will jeopardize their development and thus run counter to the whole concept of the new international economic order. The objective of non-proliferation is better served by the application of non-discriminatory and universally applicable safeguards through the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Neither in the Statute of the IAEA nor in the NPT is there any stipulation that any technologies should be denied to non-nuclear-weapon States, so long as they are subject to the application of safeguards. On the contrary, there is a clear balance in these documents between the provisions for the promotion of peaceful uses of nuclear energy in non-nuclear-weapon States and a commitment not to divert nuclear technology to military purposes. The IAEA Statute goes further in assuring the developing countries of special consideration for their needs. It is therefore a matter of grave concern to developing countries that the activities of IAEA no longer reflect the statutory balance between safeguard activities on one side and technical assistance on the other.

The developing countries are concerned at the whole trend away from a non-proliferation régime based on co-operation to one which would use coercion and which, not satisfied with international safeguards, would attempt to impose restraints on the non-nuclear-weapon States.

The representative of Finland submitted a resolution the other day in this Committee which is illustrative of his country's concern about the danger of proliferation. Pakistan shares this concern which, for reasons too well known to require recounting here, has specific as well as general aspects. Also, the Pakistan delegation has great admiration and respect for Ambassador Pastinen, who has made valuable contributions to the objectives of disarmament, particularly non-proliferation. For all these and other reasons we have given the draft in document A/C.1/32/L.3 the very careful consideration it merits, and would like to offer some observations on its approach and on specific provisions.

(Mr. Sattar, Pakistan)

It is not clear to us in the first instance what particular situation the draft resolution is meant to address. Its stated objective is to prevent "any further proliferation". The question arises: further from what stage - the NPT or the situation which obtains at present? That is not an academic question, in view of the well-known breaches of the non-proliferation régime. Secondly, to say, as the draft text does, that proliferation is more dangerous in some areas than in others implies that proliferation in those other areas is to be viewed with less concern. Clearly, that implication in the Finnish draft is at variance with the generally accepted position, according to which proliferation of nuclear weapons anywhere is a global danger. If the intention is to point out that the real danger of proliferation lies in the areas of the Middle East, Africa and south Asia, then an entirely different approach is needed to deal with the problem. Thirdly, the draft refers but perfunctorily to the question of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States and the responsibilities of the major nuclear Powers to reverse the nuclear arms race and bring about nuclear and general and complete disarmament.

Another stated premise of the Finnish draft is that the spread and development of nuclear energy would be detrimental to the goal of non-proliferation. On this basis, the draft does not merely advocate the strengthening of safeguards, but goes beyond that to call for the virtual imposition by nuclear suppliers of what are termed "effective non-proliferation restraints". Who is to judge what is "effective" restraint? But besides that, that basic approach cannot be accepted by States which believe that the objective of non-proliferation can be reconciled with the objective of accelerated use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Nor would the imposition by supplier States of unilaterally devised restrictions or the creation of a suppliers' cartel be the best way of achieving the objective.

Moreover, the "restraints" proposed in the draft resolution are confusing and contradictory. It suggest in some parts the application of "effective and comprehensive" safeguards; in other parts, "full-scope safeguards"; and yet again elsewhere, it refers to safeguards applicable to the "complete fuel cycle".

(Mr. Sattar, Pakistan)

All those are by no means interchangeable terms, nor are they all precise. Even in the IAEA so far there has been only a limited discussion of the possibility of some States not parties to NPT desiring what are called NPT-type safeguard agreements.

In sum, my delegation feels that the Finnish draft resolution ignores the reality of the immediate danger of nuclear proliferation and gives insufficient attention to the security interests of the non-nuclear-weapon States. Most important, we are concerned that its adoption would give international sanction to the coercive and restrictive approach unilaterally adopted by some of the supplier countries.

(Mr. Sattar, Pakistan)

Approval of the proposal put forward by Finland would also undermine the work launched at the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation Conference in Washington two weeks ago. That Conference recognized that the urgent need to make nuclear energy widely available for peaceful purposes can be reconciled with the objective of non-proliferation through a co-operative effort between the suppliers and the recipients of nuclear technology. Some 40 countries which participated in the Conference were convinced that effective measures could be taken to minimize the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons without undermining the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Technical experts of both industrialized and developing countries will now participate in a two-year study that is to be carried out in a spirit of objectivity without jeopardizing the respective fuel-cycle policies of various countries or international co-operation, agreements and contracts for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, provided that agreed safeguard measures are applied.

For all these reasons the Finnish draft resolution would not be an appropriate basis for an integral approach towards non-proliferation and the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

It is our view that at this juncture the General Assembly should not delve into technical aspects. Instead, as was done in the final communiqué of the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation Conference, the Assembly should set out certain broad principles that could help the suppliers and recipients of peaceful nuclear technology to find a common ground for international co-operation and for the acceleration of the contribution of nuclear energy to economic and social development. It is desirable that the General Assembly affirm that nuclear energy is of vital importance for the economic and social development of all countries, particularly the developing countries; that all States have the right to develop, acquire, transfer and use without hindrance nuclear technology for peaceful purposes and to determine their peaceful nuclear programmes in accordance with their policies, needs and interests; and that access to nuclear technology should be available to all States without discrimination under international safeguards.

In the context of the immediate threats to the non-proliferation régime, the proposals for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in Africa, the Middle East and South Asia have assumed critical importance.

(Mr. Sattar, Pakistan)

We are happy to note that both the United States and the Soviet Union have recently pronounced themselves in favour of the creation of nuclear-free zones and zones of peace in various regions. We hope that those declarations will be reflected in a more positive and forthright attitude to the creation of such zones in Africa, the Middle East and South Asia, and that those Powers will no longer insist on the precondition that prior agreement among all States of a region is necessary for their support for the objective of denuclearizing those regions. Such a condition is tantamount to passive acceptance of the inevitability of proliferation, if not encouragement of nuclear ambition on the part of certain States.

The aim of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia is both real and practical. Each and every country of that region has committed itself to not acquiring or developing nuclear arms. Prime Minister Desai of India has publicly reiterated that India will not manufacture nuclear weapons. Also, at the fifth meeting of this Committee the representative of India stated that India is a non-nuclear-weapon State and that "for all practical purposes ... India is a nuclear-weapon-free zone". (A/C.1/32/PV.5, p. 37) In the circumstances we hope that India will not oppose consultations regarding the denuclearization of South Asia. India has repeatedly given assurances that it will not develop nuclear weapons. Pakistan, for its part, is prepared not only to give such an assurance but to enter into a multilateral undertaking to that effect along with the other States of South Asia. We are flexible about the modalities by which such a regional undertaking can be made. Meanwhile, the General Assembly should continue to lend encouragement and support to the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and to consultations among the States of South Asia as well as with other interested neighbouring non-nuclear States in order to find an appropriate and mutually acceptable modality to achieve that objective.

The proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia is complementary to the objective of establishing a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. In order to achieve that objective, equal attention must be given to eliminating great-Power rivalry from the Indian Ocean and to ensuring conditions of security within the region. Recently bilateral talks have been initiated between the super-Powers regarding their military presence in the Indian Ocean. An equilibrium between the super-Powers in the region would not necessarily meet

(Mr. Sattar, Pakistan)

the interests of the littoral and hinterland States or conform to the objectives of the proposed zone of peace. We consider that decisions concerning the peace and security of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean should not be taken without full consultations with those States.

In this context, Madagascar has made a timely proposal to convene a conference of the littoral and hinterland States in order to evolve a common position on the régime for a peaceful zone in the Indian Ocean. Such a meeting should address itself to the measures required to ensure conditions of security within the region such as the commitment of regional States to the principles of peaceful coexistence, the settlement of outstanding disputes, the renunciation of nuclear weapons and the maintenance of a reasonable military balance among the littoral and hinterland States.

Pakistan endorses the objective of reducing expenditures on armaments both globally and in various regions, and has been prepared to consider this in our own region. Obviously, reductions in arms expenditures should be brought about in a manner that does not promote instability or disequilibrium in any region. In this context, we must point out that the policies of some supplier countries ignore this important consideration and would limit the transfer of arms without taking into account their indigenous production. This would accentuate the military imbalance in various regions.

We hope that all these issues will be dealt with comprehensively at the forthcoming special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament. The Pakistan delegation commends the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session, Ambassador Ortiz de Rozas, on the expeditious manner in which its proceedings have been initiated. We are confident that in its future sessions the Committee will lay a sound foundation for the success of the special session on disarmament.

We attach great importance to the special session and feel that the occasion should be seized for genuine progress towards disarmament. The world can no longer be satisfied with exhortations or the enunciation of general principles. While the adoption of a declaration and programme of action would be useful in giving a direction to disarmament negotiations in the forthcoming years, the special session would provide an opportunity to reach meaningful and

(Mr. Sattar, Pakistan)

tangible agreements on specific areas of disarmament. The Pakistan delegation believes that the following concrete goals should have been achieved by the time the special session convenes: first, the conclusion of a second agreement in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) with actual reductions in strategic arms deployment by the two super-Powers; secondly, the finalization of a convention for a ban on nuclear-weapons tests providing, inter alia, for an immediate suspension of nuclear tests by the two super-Powers; thirdly, the conclusion of a chemical-weapons-ban treaty; fourthly, the formalization of an undertaking by the nuclear-weapon Powers not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States; fifthly, measures to ensure substantial progress towards the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in Africa, the Middle East, South Asia and the South Pacific; and sixthly, the initiation of consultations for regional arms control.

(Mr. Sattar, Pakistan)

The inadequate progress in disarmament is not due to any fundamental shortcoming in the negotiating machinery. What has been lacking is the mutual trust and confidence among States, great and small, required to halt and reverse the arms race. Nevertheless, the special session could provide for consideration of measures to improve the machinery for discussions and negotiation of disarmament issues.

We do not expect that the special session will resolve all or even most of the complex and diverse problems in the field of general and complete disarmament. Further international efforts, including a world disarmament conference, may be necessary to accelerate progress in this field. However, the desirability of a world disarmament conference can be judged after the results of the special session are known and evaluated.

Since the creation of the United Nations, the peoples of the third world have succeeded, through persistence, sacrifice and collective effort, in dismantling and almost completely eliminating the colonial structures of domination and exploitation. At present, the international community is engaged in an effort to create a new international economic order which would strengthen the political independence of States by complementing it with the essential dimension of economic justice. The achievement of general and complete disarmament is another element of the concept of a new world order - an order in which peoples will be free from the threat of nuclear annihilation or the use of force and where they could devote their resources and energies to improving the conditions of life and broadening the horizons of human progress.

All nations and every people, therefore, have a vital stake in bringing about the cessation of the arms race and general and complete disarmament. This goal is not outside our grasp if there is an appreciation that power provides only transient assurance of security, that pride in the possession of power is ultimately self-destructive and that, in the final analysis, adherence to the principles of equity and justice and to the concept of universal collective security enshrined in the Charter, is in the common interest of all States and peoples.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.