

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records *



FIRST COMMITTEE
24th meeting
held on
Thursday, 3 November 1977
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 24th 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 TLAHELLOCO): 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 TLAHELLOCO) (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.24
9 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 3.10 p.m.

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

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): The problem of disarmament, which has appeared on the agendas of successive United Nations sessions under various titles, has indeed bedevilled the international community and now more than ever before seems intractable notwithstanding innumerable declarations on the part of leaders of major Powers that they are all committed to world peace.

World peace! Had it not been for the deterrence of terror I am afraid there would have been a global holocaust beside which the two world wars would have appeared like child's play.

But who can guarantee that fear of the future is adequate to save mankind from annihilation? There is no guarantee whatsoever so long as the major Powers are engaged in research and development to create without let-up new - the emphasis is on new - weapons of mass destruction while their leaders profess dedication to world peace.

At this point I should like to emphasize that those who are in the seat of power, regardless of the ideology to which they belong, are human beings and as such are subject to the weaknesses and frailties of man - and of the man in the street, who is subject to their rule.

How did those who are in the seat of power attain their position? In other words, what qualities do they possess which made them leaders? I submit that politicians - and let us not forget that leaders are politicians - must possess two qualities: charisma, to appeal to the masses, or the people they seek to govern, and a talent for manipulation. And if they have a combination of both charisma and a talent for manipulation they succeed in establishing themselves in the seat of power for quite some time.

But let us not forget other factors that enter into the picture of leadership. While in some States power need not be dependent upon wealth, we find that in many modern States money is instrumental in pushing a candidate into the seat of power. That is what we are witnessing in many countries,

(Mr. Barcody, Saudi Arabia)

so-called democracies that have come into being, what I call democracies by subscription and contribution.

And let us not forget the mass media. In many countries, regardless of ideology, the mass media quite often act as mercenaries for the powerful and the wealthy.

Concerning all I have mentioned it might be said, "Well, this has been the case since the dawn of history, unless we go back to the pristine form of leadership that was found in the ancient clan and tribe, in which the leader of a people was their servant - not in name, but in fact." The concept of the good shepherd, which was put into practice in ancient times, not only is not but could not be applied to the modern State, which is indeed a composite of very complex structures.

Why have I given this preface? Because peace and war are in the hands of the so-called leaders. We shall salute them all, and continue to call them leaders, if they can ward off a future global conflict. But remember what I have said: they are all human like the man in the street, and they suffer from certain weaknesses and frailties. They can be under tension. And when I say "they", meaning leaders, I do not mean one person but the oligarchy, the group that runs the State. They are subject to pressure from groups within the State regardless of their ideology, and anyone continuously under pressure may become frustrated, and a frustrated leader cannot act normally. He is not immune to frustration just because he is a leader. Therefore, in connexion with all the declarations on world peace, let us take it into account that leaders are subject to frustrations and subject to what I call depression, and subject to moods. Because, after all, as we have established, they are human.

(Mr. Baroodi, Saudi Arabia)

And, by miscalculation, we may still have a conflict. Remember that in Sarajevo - and I remember that day as a child because I am a contemporary of two world wars - it was one bullet that began the chain reaction which paved the way for the First World War - one bullet in Sarajevo.

You would say the deterrent of terror is sufficient. I would agree if the leaders have nerves of steel - not only they as persons - and if they are surrounded by wise men who would rather give up their advantages than throw the world into a holocaust.

But is this the case? I submit it is not the case. And I am not talking now about the leaders of the super-Powers or the major Powers. I am talking about all those who are in the seats of power, whether they belong to super-Powers, major Powers or, let us say, small Powers. They are human.

What shall we do? Year in and year out - and remember I have been here since the beginning - we profess that we are all committed to peace. But surreptitiously the oligarchies, the leaders and those who surround them are suspicious - not that they do not want to show goodwill towards others but they are obsessed by the feeling of mistrust, that somebody is conniving to overthrow them and take over the country which they rule.

We have to turn to the anthropologists perhaps in order to delve deeply into the causes of why man behaves not like an animal but like a brute. Remember, having been descended from hominids, we are related to the primates - the monkeys, the gorillas and all those who also could stand erect on two feet. But whether they are primates or not, animals are guided by the wisdom inherent in their instincts, which one finds in man with his animal instincts. But man has perverted his instincts because he has become creative and manipulative on account of his thumb meeting the four fingers.

And then he began to invent things for his material well-being. Instead of weaving cloth by hand, he invented the machine. Instead of plowing the fields by hand with the plowshares, he invented the tractor. And then he invented diabolical weapons, many of which perhaps will bring about his end.

But he started as a hunter; he needed proteins. So here comes the perversion of instinct. He was out to kill. When there was a dearth of game sometimes, he thought, "Well, I am chasing the same hare, the same rabbit, the same deer as

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

the other fellow living in the cave. If I kill him, well, I might get more for myself." He became a killer.

And then as time went by he became a farmer. He plowed the fields. By virtue of his new profession, he wanted peace because, to raise food, he needed peace. Once in a while he was threatened by the hunter, and so he gave the hunter some of his produce. As we know, this dates back about seven or eight thousand years. Finally he began to live in communities and law and order evolved. Man began to be what is called civilized.

But still he perverted his own instincts. The animal eats until he is satiated and no more: the instinct of hunger. He copulates to procreate and not to seek perpetual pleasure, as many human beings do in sex. He is afraid when there is a reason to be afraid, either to defend himself or sometimes by virtue of his hunger: the instinct of fear. He is afraid and he does things which perhaps are not in harmony with his idealized notions of himself.

A lion, after he preys on an animal, say a deer, relaxes. The other deer, by instinct, pass peacefully in front of him. They have no fear and he does not molest them: he has had enough. But man is afraid that he will be hungry not a week from now but a year from now. He is greedy. He wants more food, more material things than are good for his well-being.

As I said, he not only copulates to procreate - look at the pornography now in the so-called civilized countries - but he makes a fetish of sex, which the animals do not do. And then he seeks vainglory, distinction. Every now and then you read about awards. We used to have aristocracies; now they are fading out of the picture. But what do we have? Awards for distinction, medals. This is man. And the leaders are men. The leaders we have are men! They have the same frailties.

And where is the morality of the ancients, as spelt out by religion or by the prophets? Nobody heeds them. Only ritual remains.

And we have societies in the world who are not behaving according to the moral code or ethics - except those you find here and there - but permissive societies that want to grab all they can and do what they want. Permissive societies mistake licence for freedom, and the leaders are part of those societies.

(Mr. Baroodi, Saudi Arabia)

(Spoke in Arabic)

What you are, so shall you become.

(Continued in English)

People deserve the government they have. It is a reflection of their social order.

What does this have to do with disarmament? I submit that it has a lot to do with disarmament. So far we are behaving like the primitive hunter who lived in the cave. We are afraid that, if we do not kill our fellow man, something is going to be subtracted from our wealth or from our well-being or, rather, that something will vitiate our well-being. We are greedy - not by instinct. We are acquisitive - not necessarily, by instinct, to the point of killing one another.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

We want, it is true, recognition. When we are born they give us a name. This is identification. Then, we are recognized for what we do in the family, in the school, and out in the world. Then we begin to fight for privileges, not for equal rights. When we are denied those equal rights we try to be privileged like the few are privileged, either in wealth, in power, or in what comes after recognition - distinction, glory, vainglory.

This is man, and our leaders are neither better nor worse than we are. Many a time when they become subject to greed, to the love of wealth - and wealth and material things are interchangeable - or to glory, when they get into that rut, by having gone against their instincts they have to pay a stiff price. They become more pugnacious, they become more acquisitive, they get more drunk with power, and they activate the people whom they rule. In the past, through songs, beating the drums, sounding the trumpets, hoisting the flag, the people, and the young even more so, are marched, through mass psychology, to war, like sheep to the slaughterhouse.

Shall we depend upon what we would call the deterrence of fear when we look around us and find that we have not yet reformed ourselves, either as individuals or as nations, from that pattern which we should shed so as to have a new approach to well-being, to coexistence, and to the maxim of live and let live? Is there a way? Of course there is a way, but it will not come overnight. It will come through education. And our education is faulty because in many so-called civilized countries they are assaulting their teachers. I read it in the press. I am not inventing it. The moral code, whether religious or ethical, is cast by the wayside. Many of us, I dare say, act like gangsters in gentlemen's clothes. A gangster is a gangster, no matter what he wears.

That is the sad state of society on a global basis, better in some countries, worse in others. In those countries where tradition still exists and is revered for some of its good features, perhaps things are a little better. But we are now living globally, not regionally. The bullet that may kill a famous man or a man of distinction here, instantly echoes in the jungles of Africa and on the heights of the Himalayas. Distances have contracted and we live in one world.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

What, then, should be the approach? What is the remedy? If we care anything about the young - I am speaking as one who is in the twilight of his life - shall we leave the world worse than we found it? Allegedly, those who waged the First World War wanted to save the world for democracy. Slogans! They did not wage war in order to save the world for democracy. They waged war to serve their own petty national interests. I am not saying that national interests should not be served, but I am speaking of dangerously petty national interests.

The Second World War allegedly was fought, as a very famous President of the United States said, to safeguard the Four Freedoms; freedom from want. There is more want after the First World War than there was before. Freedom from fear. There is more fear. Freedom of speech. There is freedom of licence, freedom of propaganda, freedom, again, to serve petty national interests through the mass media.

Whom are they fooling, those leaders, unwittingly sometimes, unintentionally - I don't say maliciously? They are neither better nor worse than those who preceded them. Once in a while we have a statesman who rises over petty interests in his own country. But how often do we have them? Very rarely. I mentioned persons who may not be revered today; Asoka, Gandhi, Jesus of Nazareth, the prophet who taught mercy and love. Their followers established religions. They themselves were teachers. Who heeds them? Only the rituals and ceremonies are heeded. The husk remains, the kernel, the moral code, has been devoured by the worm of greed, love of power, and vainglory.

Well, this is an unorthodox way to deal with this subject. For two nights I have been reading the speeches of my colleagues, allegedly technical, as to what to do with this situation, with the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). They are all mere technicalities. The major Powers profess to love peace. Their intelligence services are conniving to wage war by proxy in our own spheres. They have spheres of influence. And just let anyone dare to trespass on the other's sphere of influence.

Yesterday I thought and thought for three hours, about whether we could have a new approach. When Mr. Tarabanov of Bulgaria occupied the Chair of this Committee a few years ago, we discussed the same question. I had a few suggestions to make, and I have amplified them now. I mentioned education, but education is not enough.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

The leaders do what their Defence Ministers and the hierarchy in the Ministries of Defence tell them to do. And rightly so. They are specialists in the art of defence or in the waging of war. Sometimes we wonder whether defence is not aggression and aggression is not defence. We are misled by slogans.

I submit a plan for the consideration of this Committee. From now on, wherever possible - and it should be possible - the super-Powers should engage mothers in their service. We have had Ministers of Defence who have the mentality of the hunter, of the caveman. It is a warped mentality. They are always thinking, not of defence, but of how to counter the possible aggression of another country, or how to take advantage of it.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

I shall not go into this; I do not know. But I for one know that many in the Ministries of Defence have failed because, without knowing it, they had the caveman mentality. Why do I suggest mothers? Going back again to nature, a mother naturally protects life; otherwise we should not be here. Not until they learned from man have mothers, on rare occasions, used weapons. Mothers are the protectors of life. That is my first point.

Secondly, we should hang posters in schools, especially in class-rooms where would-be scientists are taught. The teachers should tell them to swear that they will not use their knowledge to create arms of mass destruction. Impossible? Why is that impossible? These things are feasible. It is an educational process.

Thirdly, I do not like the word "summit" as in "summit meeting". We make use of the word "summit" as if our leaders were above others. I think that when they walk upon this floor, their feet are at the same level as ours or that of the man on the street, whether he be a garbage collector, a clerk or chairman of a company. As human beings we are all on the same ground.

Starting with the major Powers, let their representatives meet and bring their children and, if they are old enough, their grandchildren, and take a holiday together - the Americans, the Russians and the Chinese. And, who knows, their sons and daughters might fall in love and get married. What is wrong with that? I am suggesting that they should meet not only in conferences, but should become gregarious, with others and not only within their own individual groups in order to get to know each other better. The Russians and the Americans could hold meetings on what might be called a communal pattern, although they come from different nationalities, instead of holding summit meetings to talk about politics. Remember that there are women in the Pentagon now, and in the Ministries of Defence.

What are we talking about here? Just look at the documents which I spent two days reading. That is all very well as regards what can be done and what cannot be done. I was really heartened at what Mr. Brezhnev proposed two days ago with regard to a halt to nuclear testing even for peaceful purposes. All that is very heartening, but it is not enough. We find that the Americans

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

are developing neutron devices, and we do not know what the Russians are secretly trying to do to counteract that new weapon or other weapons of mass destruction.

It is the height of hypocrisy to talk peace and surreptitiously prepare, not for war, but for a holocaust, by miscalculation if not by intent.

I mentioned those three points, but I should like to add something before I conclude my statement, which is, as I said it would be, unorthodox, because orthodoxy is getting us nowhere. People have lost faith in us, both in our respective countries and throughout the world - they see paper work, conferences, mistrust, and no goodwill.

My last point is perhaps also a novel point. Let the leaders not pick on one another as they are now doing over human rights. Let each country set its house in order and be an example to others, instead of diverting the attention of its people to the alleged misdemeanors or so-called crimes of another State, using this ploy as do cheap politicians to divert attention from their own defects.

Finally, I was saddened when I went through, word for word, the statements of my colleagues, our brothers, from China. They seem to have lost all faith in both the Soviet Union and the United States. I was not present when Mr. Chen spoke, but I have read every word of his statement. Now, China is a country to take into account. It has 20 per cent of the world's population, apart from the wisdom which many peoples in the ancient world sought in China. As the saying goes: Seek wisdom and go as far as China to get it. But, unfortunately, it is frightened of the two major Powers, or super-Powers, as they call them, because they do not seem to trust them. Years ago

I tried to have a private talk in order to smooth things over between my good friend Jacob Malik and our erstwhile colleague Huang Hua, who is now Foreign Minister of China. I got nowhere, because the distrust is so deep. And remember that I do not support communism, as I happen to be a monarchist. But they are all brothers, human beings. Why should they be at each other's throats? They are afraid that if they should begin hostilities millions of lives would be lost, both in China and in the Soviet Union.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

Some tell me that the United States is watching to see how the wind blows. Again, that is balance of power and power politics. How can we have disarmament when we have balance of power and power politics, and each country watching the other to see whether it will align itself with this or that other country in order to isolate its opponent. And they are all human beings, whether American, Chinese or Russian.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

Whom are we fooling here: the world outside the United Nations? Or are we fooling ourselves? If those leaders - who often become misleaders of their peoples - would only learn from us here in the United Nations how we feel as all belonging to one family, regardless of our diverse national or ethnic origins. But they do not. That is why I suggested they should meet at a picnic for several days. I am thinking out loud, but it seems to me that, year in, year out, we submit draft resolutions, while mistrust is still paramount and there is no goodwill. I have the right, as one who has reached the age I have, to tell you that this is not the way.

Do not think I have a monopoly on ideas. I am throwing these ideas out at random. If there is soil in which they can germinate, I welcome other seeds. That may be novel. But let us not engage in deceptive methods. Politics is not a science: it is an art. A statesman, for that matter, is one who, on the national level, can harmonize the interests of the various groups in the nation. Once in a while we have a statesman. But we need world statesmen who can harmonize the interests of all nations, and not try to act surreptitiously, covertly, waging wars by proxy, conniving against one another.

Finally, I would suggest this - but not by way of a resolution. I have proposed many resolutions, and many people have come to me on their knees - I feel sorry for their knees - asking me to withdraw them. But I would suggest to the three Powers, the United States, the Soviet Union and China, that they should - and indeed I plead with them to - have serious thoughts, because they are the key to disarmament. Incidentally, it should not be called "disarmament"; I would settle for a new epithet: I would say, rather, "the progressive reduction of armaments", because the more we talk about disarmament, the more we find people arming - if not by manufacturing the arms themselves, by acquiring or purchasing them, which is just as bad.

I want the Chinese, the Russians and the Americans to get together before we meet at a conference on disarmament, for how futile it would be if those three major Powers did not come to an agreement; how futile it would be for us to be like false witnesses.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

There could be no better statement than that made by our colleague from Sweden - she is a lady - but who is heeding what she says? I do not say we men do not have good ideas, but remember that mothers should be incorporated in the ministries of defence. Remember that human beings suffer, no matter what their colour or ethnic origin. Remember that we are all committed to humanism, and that humanism transcends petty nationalism. So, for heaven's sake, heed my voice and do not think it a voice in the wilderness, because, after all, who are the young but our children and grand-children? And we should be committed seriously to leaving the world better than it was when we found it.

Mr. KARIM (Afghanistan): At the outset, allow me, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of office as Chairman of this important Committee. Likewise, I avail myself of this opportunity to extend our felicitations to the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur. My delegation is confident that under your able leadership, and with the co-operation of the Bureau, the work of the Committee will be conducted in a desirable manner.

Having made those remarks, I now wish to state briefly the position of my Government on some of the items at present under the consideration of the Committee.

I should like to reiterate the view mentioned by the speakers before me that one of the most crucial issues that we are confronted with today is the question of disarmament. Although there are many complex problems that threaten world peace and security, the fact that we have not as yet achieved constructive steps towards solving the disarmament issues that would effectively prevent tensions and conflicts from becoming full-scale wars leads us to believe that the precious little that has been achieved, when comparing our deeds with our words during all these lengthy years, has made us miss the opportunity, as well as man's ideal, of not alleviating our planet and future generations of the holocaust of war and destruction. Nevertheless, maybe this sense of failure, together with the human will and desire for survival, will give us a new impetus in reducing the distance that separates us from our most sought-for but elusive goal: universal and complete disarmament.

It is the view of my delegation that only by general and complete disarmament in the nuclear field, brought about through effective international control, can we eliminate the dangers that threaten peace and security in different areas of our globe. My Government is firmly committed to this vital issue. Afghanistan is aware and fully cognizant of the role that all nations have to play for the achievement of general and complete disarmament, and we are determined to play our part. But, on the other hand, it is also our firm belief that the main responsibility lies with the major nuclear Powers for the success or failure of all bilateral or multilateral negotiations and talks in the field of disarmament and arms limitation, as well as the prohibition of environmental warfare.

(Mr. Karim, Afghanistan)

Nuclear disarmament being the most important issue preoccupying the international community, my delegation reaffirms the Political Declaration of the Fifth Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Countries in this respect: that universal peace and security can only be assured by general and complete disarmament, and that a cessation of the nuclear arms race is the first indispensable step towards disarmament. But the accelerated rate of advanced technology for the production of new and more sophisticated nuclear weapons and their means of delivery has rendered somewhat meaningless the partial and limited agreements reached in the field of nuclear disarmament.

The nuclear weapons-producing countries, specifically the super-Powers, have the undeniable responsibility to attain agreements for the prohibition of the development and production of new and more devastating weaponry as well as the destruction of its existing stockpiles. Bold action and a genuine demonstration of their political will to reach an agreement is, in our view, the only assurance that rapid progress can be achieved towards nuclear disarmament.

The conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty could be of significant importance for the attainment of this purpose. Though progress has been achieved in this field, an international agreement banning all nuclear tests for military purposes in the environment, in our view, will serve as an important step for reaching an agreement on the nuclear arms race and disarmament.

(Mr. Karim, Afghanistan)

Many countries, mostly developing nations, including my own country, having adhered to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, have renounced the nuclear option in their right of self-defence. Therefore, having deprived themselves of this option by abiding by an international treaty, they have the right to seek assurance, through an equally binding international treaty, that nuclear-weapon countries will never make use of or threaten them with the use of nuclear weapons. Any agreement on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty should not restrain and hinder the developing nations from obtaining free access to the benefits derived from peaceful uses of nuclear energy for the achievement of their socio-economic development. I should also like to add that since security and stability are for developing nations the leading factors for economic progress, an agreement that would lead to a limitation of conventional arms and arms trade would enhance the significant reduction of military expenses as well as reduce the stockpiling of conventional weapons and would thus eliminate the danger of an arms race among those countries.

Rational non-political, non-discriminatory limitation of the arms trade by the arms-producing countries would undoubtedly play an influential role and enable the developed nations, especially the major Powers, to release additional financial assistance to the developing nations, an achievement that would be in full conformity with the Declaration of the fifth summit of the non-aligned countries in Colombo, paving the way for the much sought-after new international economic order with which the arms race is totally incompatible.

It is for the above reasons that developing nations are equally eager to witness realistic progress in the field of disarmament as well as the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world such as the Middle East, the Indian Ocean and the continents of Africa and Latin America. A concept to which my country fully adheres, which should be viewed in the same context, is this: through the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, non-nuclear-weapon countries are seeking to prevent a nuclear arms race among themselves. Therefore the nuclear-weapon-producing countries have the moral obligation to prevent the introduction of such weapons into those areas as well as to co-operate in creating such nuclear-weapon-free zones.

(Mr. Karim, Afghanistan)

In the field of non-nuclear disarmament, my delegation's considered view is that it is of the utmost importance that an agreement be reached for the effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. Therefore we call upon those countries producing and stockpiling these lethal weapons to take effective action to reach a comprehensive agreement on this issue.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate that my delegation has always been of the conviction that durable peace can be attained only if general and complete disarmament under effective control is achieved and a significant part of the resources thus released is devoted to the economic and social needs of the developing countries, and the least developed in particular. For the arms race not only threatens world peace but squanders human, financial and material resources urgently needed to alleviate the poverty and suffering of two-thirds of humanity, which has for so long been engaged in an arduous struggle for mere survival.

We believe that inasmuch as the suspicion and fear characteristic of the cold war are receding, no occasion could be more auspicious than this to put a halt to the spiralling arms race. The delegation of Afghanistan, together with other non-aligned countries, supports the convening in 1978 of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to issues related to disarmament. We believe that by convening such a special session and undertaking a comprehensive review of the issues involved, it would be possible to take the necessary effective measures to achieve the goal of general and complete disarmament.

It is also our view that a special session of the United Nations General Assembly, followed by a world disarmament conference, would be the most appropriate way to awaken world public opinion and focus its attention on the awesome development and expansion of devastating nuclear weaponry and would draw attention to the undeniable need for purposeful and effective measures in the field of disarmament. We are also of the view that the United Nations task will be strengthened and enhanced in the negotiation and attainment of solutions to all issues relating to disarmament.

Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): In my statement today I wish to deal with two items of our agenda, namely item 52, on the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and item 53, on the World Disarmament Conference. In linking these two items I should like to emphasize that in our opinion the two forums are not mutually exclusive but are complementary and organically related.

Everyone is aware of the underlying reasons for the convening of a special session. My delegation is firmly of the view that not a single avenue should be left unexplored that is likely to halt the arms race and to promote disarmament, and we believe the special session will provide an opportunity to make a considerable contribution to the attainment of the objectives I have just mentioned.

(Mr. Hollai, Hungary)

Together with other socialist countries, Hungary has supported all initiatives that have contributed to strengthening international peace and security and to curbing the arms race. This policy stems from the very existence of our socialist system, as in my country no one is interested in producing greater numbers of ever costlier and increasingly sophisticated weapons.

My country has further increased its activity in disarmament diplomacy ever since it became a member of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in 1969.

In this spirit we take seriously our membership in the Preparatory Committee set up in accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/189. We were among the first to reply to the relevant note of the Secretary-General, we participated in the meetings and discussions of the Preparatory Committee, and we co-sponsored two working documents submitted by the socialist countries.

We may say that the Preparatory Committee has done successful work so far by agreeing on the proposed agenda, date and duration of the special session and on a series of other important procedural matters. Its meetings so far have been marked by a business-like atmosphere and an intention to co-operate in bringing the diverging views closer together. A great role in creating and maintaining such an atmosphere has been played by Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas, the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee, who has guided the meetings and consultations in a fair and correct manner, has properly combined formal and informal meetings and has been in close contact with all groups.

While it is fitting to recognize the results already achieved, it should be borne in mind that the more complicated part of the work, that of drafting the documents to be adopted by the special session, is yet to be done.

The Preparatory Committee arrived at a consensus that the principal document of the special session should contain the following main elements: first, introduction or preamble; secondly, declaration on disarmament; thirdly, programme of action; and, fourthly, machinery for disarmament negotiations.

The introduction should, in our view, contain a brief analysis of the present international situation with special regard to disarmament and mention both the dangers of the unresolved issues and the positive results that will have been achieved by the time of the special session.

(Mr. Hollai, Hungary)

The declaration should contain, inter alia, such widely accepted principles and goals as general and complete disarmament, to be reaffirmed as a standing objective; recognition of the importance of partial measures seeking to limit the armaments race; renunciation of efforts to obtain unilateral advantages; non-use of force in international relations; importance of the universality of disarmament agreements and measures, and so forth.

The programme of action should define the areas that call for international agreements in the different fields of disarmament. Particular emphasis should be laid in this respect on nuclear disarmament and on the need for States to limit or reduce other weapons and armaments. It should also devote special attention to the prohibition of the development of chemical weapons and of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

As regards the machinery for disarmament negotiations, my delegation has stated on various occasions that the reason for the slow progress in the field of disarmament is not, in our view, due to the allegedly imperfect machinery, but, rather, in many cases to the lack of adequate political will. Therefore, the main task of the special session should not be, in our view, the modification of the existing machinery. The existing system of negotiations is capable of handling the various problems - bilateral, regional and multilateral - before it.

We are, of course, looking forward with interest to the views and positions of other countries on these questions, all the more so since they will have to be analysed, compared and brought closer together in the next phase of the preparatory work, a task which at times will surely not be simple.

That work will require the extension of the term of office of the Preparatory Committee, which will surely be approved by the General Assembly. May I, in this connexion, recall the claim of the socialist countries for two additional seats to be allocated to the Eastern European group, as is also mentioned in the report of the Preparatory Committee. We are convinced that the contribution of these countries to the work of the Committee would be positive and constructive.

With regard to the second part of my statement on the convening of a world disarmament conference, the Hungarian People's Republic is still convinced of the advisability and necessity of holding such a conference. As my delegation has had

(Mr. Hollai, Hungary)

occasion to state at the meetings of both the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference and the Preparatory Committee for the special session of the General Assembly, it is our conviction that these two forums do not exclude each other, but, on the contrary, are mutually complementary and organically interrelated. We expect, among other things, that the special session will contribute greatly to the improvement of the international atmosphere, which in turn will make it possible for States to get down to implementing the principles and the programme of action to be adopted by the special session. With the necessary conditions prevailing, the world disarmament conference would be a suitable forum for working out effective measures to curb the arms race.

A large number of countries support convening a world disarmament conference, as has also become clear from the general debate at the current session of the General Assembly. We are sure that the special session, too, will devote great attention to the question of convening the world disarmament conference in view of its importance, all the more so since this issue is a specific item on the agenda of that session. All this points to the need to extend the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference.

Another point worth mentioning is the proposal contained in the report of the Preparatory Committee that the General Assembly should request the Ad Hoc Committee to prepare a report on its work and deliberations for the special session. Evidently the role of the Ad Hoc Committee cannot be restricted to preparing and submitting such a report since in the discussion of this item at the special session a number of comments and suggestions are expected to be made in connexion with the world disarmament conference, which should be studied, analysed and reported upon to the thirty-third session of the General Assembly. Also to be taken into account is the unique feature of the Committee, namely, that it is the only disarmament forum maintaining formal contact with all the five nuclear Powers.

For all these reasons, my delegation is convinced of the need to extend the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee and is firmly in support of a draft resolution to that effect.

May I conclude by thanking Mr. Hoveyda, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, for his eloquent presentation of the Committee's report and for his efficient guidance of the Committee's work.

Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland): Mr. Chairman, I fully realize that, in accordance with the rules of procedure, I ought not to express my delegation's congratulations to you and the other officers of the Committee. But I hope, nevertheless, that I may be allowed to voice our warmest good wishes to you, Mr. Chairman, to the Vice-Chairmen, and to the Rapporteur, and to assure you of the full co-operation of the Irish delegation in carrying out your important duties in the First Committee.

In his Report on the Work of the Organization submitted to this thirty-second session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General pointed out (A/32/1, p. 12) that the problem of finding a "workable balance", as he described it, between national fears and preoccupations, on the one hand, and the long-term interests of the world community, on the other, is nowhere so acute as it is in the field of disarmament. And I would fully agree. For, on the one hand, in the 32 years of the United Nations existence, it is true that substantial progress has been achieved through multilateral negotiation within the Organization's framework, to which, indeed, my own country has sometimes been able to bring a constructive contribution. The Non-Proliferation Treaty, the partial test-ban Treaty, the Antarctic Treaty, the outer space Treaty, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the sea-bed Treaty, and the Biological Weapons Convention, all have played significant roles in fostering confidence among nations and in strengthening international peace and security. Indeed, during the current year, heartening progress has been achieved by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) in the signing of the Convention on the Prohibition of Environmental Modification Techniques on 18 May in Geneva, which, incidentally, became the first disarmament agreement to designate the Secretary-General as depositary. Then, again, the Review Conference of the sea-bed Treaty was held successfully in June of this year in Geneva and it was able to note that no violation of the Treaty was reported during the period under review, and that the Convention had therefore achieved its primary purpose. Furthermore, encouraging movement has been made in the current year in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament towards the final formulation of a chemical weapons Treaty. Hopes have been further buoyed by the tripartite consultations in progress by the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union towards a complete and general prohibition

(Mr. Kennedy, Ireland)

of nuclear-weapons tests, which could effectively lead the way at last towards genuine nuclear disarmament. Indeed, I am sure we have all noted with encouragement that only yesterday the head of State of the Soviet Union, President Brezhnev, made a most important statement about the destruction of nuclear weapons and the observance of a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. I am sure that we will all wish to study this significant statement which seems to us to constitute a major step forward towards a complete test-ban treaty. And finally, my delegation and, I feel sure, many others have been encouraged by the constructive statements made by the two nuclear super-Powers, both in the plenary Assembly and in the First Committee, during this session about the possibility of genuine progress in the limitation of strategic arms. The representative of the United States described the present situation in this Committee on 18 October as "a period of ferment of a very hopeful sort" (A/C.1/32/PV.7, pp. 54-55) based on new drives towards the realization of many long-held hopes "across the entire range of disarmament issues". Should the recent meetings in Washington between President Carter and the Soviet Foreign Minister lead forward to the achievement of a second agreement in the context of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) and a breakthrough in nuclear arms control, it would not only contribute to world security but provide further encouragement for rapid arms limitation and control. Our debate in this Committee, therefore, is taking place in a time of genuine encouragement and rising expectations.

And yet, as we review the achievements of our Organization in this United Nations Decade of Disarmament, it is quite impossible to avoid a sense of dismay at the immensely wide range of arms control and limitation problems yet to be faced and yet to be tackled. As the Secretary-General has reminded us, we are very far from achieving the results which were hoped for when the United Nations Charter was written 32 years ago. We have not succeeded in establishing a system which would ensure, as was then said, "the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources". On the contrary, the waste of mankind's precious resources in the steadily spiralling arms race has become a scandal crying out for urgent reform. This Committee has been reminded every day in our general debate that military expenditure has stood, for a number of years, at about \$350 thousand million at today's prices, at a time when we are more than half way

(Mr. Kennedy, Ireland)

through the United Nations Disarmament Decade and the Second United Nations Development Decade. The figure has been repeated here so often that it has almost ceased to shock us. But let us pause just for a moment to sense what it really means. It really means that every year military activities absorb a volume of resources equivalent to about two thirds of the total gross national product of the poorest half of the world's population. It means that the resources devoted to the arms race since the end of the Second World War are roughly the equivalent of the total 1976 gross national product for the entire world. It means that half of what is spent every day for military purposes would provide enough badly needed funds for the world health programme to eradicate malaria on a global basis. In a world where scientific and technological capability is the touchstone of future prosperity, 25 per cent of the world's scientific manpower and 40 per cent of all research and development spending is engaged in military purposes. And all this is happening in an international community which has accepted the goal of creating a new and more equitable international economic order and which urgently requires its available energy and resources to meet basic human needs.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that all over the world there is a rising tide of expectation that the special session next spring will be able to stimulate and channel public concern and generate genuine momentum in the direction of urgent international action? For there is, in our view, something encouragingly new in the present situation, as we sense it here at the United Nations, which is worthy of mention in this debate. What is encouragingly new, as compared even with the beginning of this decade, is a much greater world-wide awareness of the interdependence of global problems. People and their Governments, all over the world, are realizing that the solution of these global issues will require an approach based on international solidarity and concern for the common good. They realize that we need to mobilize the world's energies and resources in the interest of all mankind and that the tragic waste of scarce means of production in the arms race, on anything like the present scale, is quite incompatible with those aims. The special session will offer us a most useful opportunity to analyse this subject in depth and to clarify important aspects of the connexion between disarmament and economic and social progress. In this connexion, I should like to welcome the

(Mr. Kennedy, Ireland)

Nordic initiative submitted to the Preparatory Committee of the special session, suggesting a United Nations study of this question and, in particular, of how the resources released by disarmament can best be used for needed economic development. We appreciate that there is no automatic link and that this vital subject therefore requires further study.

(Mr. Kennedy, Ireland)

Accordingly, we in the Irish delegation very much hope that the special session next spring will become an important milestone not only in disarmament but also in the solution of interdependent global problems. Yet, we must face the fact that it could so very easily become just one more well-attended international conference at which resounding principles are eloquently expressed but little real action is generated. Yesterday the representative of Australia quite rightly appealed to all delegations not to approach the special session with the intention of reiterating established positions but, instead, to seek fresh avenues of approach with the firm political will to make substantial progress. For that reason, I feel that we should during this general debate in the First Committee try to outline, even now and even in a tentative way, the results which we earnestly hope that the special session will achieve.

In the first place, we would expect that the special session will be used to focus public attention on urgent, basic, central problems and to establish a set of realistic workable priorities. As the Foreign Minister of Ireland expressed it in the general debate in the plenary Assembly on 5 October:

"We need to speak plainly and we need to elaborate a precise programme if the world public is not to regard the special session as another ritual meeting irrelevant to their real concerns." (A/32/PV.20, p. 7)

A fundamental objective, therefore, should be the elaboration of an attainable programme of practical disarmament measures within which workable priority objectives would be clearly identified, which will have the understanding and the widespread support of public opinion. In this respect the United Nations non-governmental organizations will, I feel sure, have a vital role to play if the special session is to be a success.

In the second place, it goes without saying that the reversal of the nuclear arms race among the two major Powers is an essential prerequisite for breaking the political restraints inhibiting disarmament progress. Accordingly, we welcome the development of a specialized dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States on strategic nuclear weapons, and the effort in the second round of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) for the first time actually to reduce intercontinental strategic nuclear systems on both sides.

(Mr. Kennedy, Ireland)

As the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom said in the general debate in the Assembly on 27 September:

"It would have been inconceivable, even 10 years ago, that military and scientific personnel from these two countries would share such detailed and highly classified information about their own national security.

We need now to widen and build on this important dialogue." (A/32/PV.9, p. 49-50)

Let us therefore hope that the crucially important discussions between the two super-Powers in the SALT negotiations will result in concrete quantitative and qualitative limitations of nuclear weapons systems and the progressive curtailment of military research and development.

Thirdly, may I express the hope that, even by the time the special session begins, substantial progress will already have been made in the tripartite United States, United Kingdom and Soviet Union negotiations on a comprehensive test ban treaty, and here again I would refer with encouragement and hope to the important statement made yesterday by the Head of State of the Soviet Union, to which a number of delegations have already made reference. A complete ban on all tests is crucial for at least two reasons: on the one hand, it would be an essential reinforcement of the existing Non-Proliferation Treaty and an encouragement to other States - nuclear and near nuclear - to make this Treaty into a régime of universal nuclear responsibility; and, on the other, a complete test ban is vital both to the credibility and to the further development of bilateral arrangements such as the SALT Treaty, to which I have already referred, particularly if these arrangements are to progress beyond arms control to actual arms reduction.

The international community will also expect that the special session will give a new impetus to the Non-Proliferation Treaty itself and that, as a minimum, countries which have not adhered to the Treaty will be encouraged to accept other workable arrangements, such as the application of verifiable safeguards to their complete nuclear fuel cycle, which would provide reasonable assurances to the international community against the dangers of proliferation. It is of course an essential aim of the Non-Proliferation Treaty to make the benefits of nuclear energy widely available, while minimizing the spread of nuclear weapons. But the lack of satisfactory progress in this direction is all too

(Mr. Kennedy, Ireland)

well known and we have accordingly noted with encouragement in this connexion that an organizing conference was held in Washington from 19 to 21 October to initiate an International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation whose aim would be to make the benefits of nuclear energy proliferation-resistant while at the same time facilitating the diffusion of nuclear energy. This important work should further the task of the special session in developing a practical, international programme to assure the availability of peaceful nuclear technology to non-nuclear Powers, particularly those in the developing areas of the world, the cost of whose energy needs is rapidly becoming prohibitive.

In the fourth place, may I also express the hope that by the time of the special session late next spring the current negotiations in the Working Group of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) will enable substantial progress to be made towards a ban on chemical weapons. The intensified negotiations in the CCD have of course been facilitated by the United Kingdom draft convention of August 1976, and we agree with the recent statement of the Secretary-General that the situation seems "to be more encouraging than at any time in the past because of fresh approaches to the problem".

We would also agree with the hope expressed in this Committee on 18 October by the representative of the Soviet Union that this current session of the General Assembly might give a new momentum to negotiations on chemical weapons. We should like to express our appreciation, in this connexion, to the Canadian and Polish delegations, which have worked hard and successfully towards an agreed resolution in this field.

A fifth area in which the special session may also be able to give a new impulse and momentum to our work is in relation to the immense expenditure on conventional weapons, which absorbs about 80 per cent of the world's resources now devoted to military expenditure. There is, I feel, a widening consensus here that the time has come to study the problem of conventional arms transfers and to seek feasible ways of formulating international agreements to deal with it. It could well be that the regional approach might be of particular value in dealing with this problem. The Secretary-General has recently called attention to the tenth anniversary of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which created such a zone

(Mr. Kennedy, Ireland)

of regional arms control in Latin America and thereby demonstrated that progress towards disarmament could be achieved on a regional basis if the political will to do so existed. My delegation also took careful note of the valuable proposal put forward by the Foreign Minister of Belgium in the general debate on 26 September in this Committee regarding the possibilities offered by the regional approach.

(Mr. Kennedy, Ireland)

We fully appreciate that this method is in no way intended to replace the global approach, but rather to complete and complement it on the regional level, and that it also relates to nuclear weapons. I should, however, like to suggest that the important proposals of the United States President for tighter controls on transfers of conventional weapons could perhaps best be tackled on the regional level.

I have referred to five main areas in which the Irish delegation hopes that constructive progress can be generated by the special session. But I should like to make one further point before I conclude. It is the obvious, but essential, point that what will be needed at the coming session is genuine disarmament, not only in quantity but in quality as well. We urgently need to halt and reverse the arms race, and not merely to regulate it and institutionalize it within an accepted legal framework. It is no longer enough, as the Secretary-General has recently reminded us in his report:

"... to try only to regulate or to temporize with the arms race, treating the symptoms rather than the underlying causes". (A/32/1, p. 12)

Such an approach, the Secretary-General has stated,

"... is wholly inadequate to stem the tide of an innovating arms race, where technological ingenuity tends constantly to outstrip the pace of negotiations". (Ibid.)

Governments, indeed, appear to be coerced by a peculiar logic which dictates that when technology makes a new weapon or a refinement of an existing one possible, this fact combines with the implicit mistrust of the adversaries' intentions to make development, production and deployment almost inevitable.

In the same way, similar pressures, together with the economic demands of mass production, require the building of more and more conventional weapons and their sale throughout the world. My delegation has in recent years spoken frequently about this frightening phenomenon, the tyranny of technology, which in itself is an affront to human reason. But it is also in practice a serious and potentially fatal obstacle to current efforts at arms control and disarmament when, as the representative of Italy reminded us in this Committee on 20 October, the international community is in fact engaged in a race against

(Mr. Kennedy, Ireland)

time, between negotiations and military technology:

"a race" - he said - "in which the odds seem stacked against the negotiators" (A/C.1/32/PV.9, p. 8)

To try to cope with this problem through a series of bilateral and multilateral arrangements regulating competition is not enough. A genuine effort must be made to subordinate weapons development, production and deployment to rational political choices, rather than to technological and commercial imperatives. Surely it is not too much to ask that mankind should control the technology, instead of technology controlling our destiny. We must, in the Secretary-General's words, find that elusive "workable balance" between national fears, on the one hand, and the long-term interests of the world community, on the other.

I am sure that none of us in this Committee has any real doubt as to where those long-term interests of the world community lie. Surely they lie in curbing the arms race by effective acts of real disarmament so that the massive diversion of the world's precious resources to military ends can at last be checked, controlled and rechannelled. They lie in mobilizing human energies and scarce means of production so that we can at last face up to a whole range of interrelated problems of development, based on international solidarity, co-operation and concern for the common good. If the coming special session can generate genuine disarmament and real progress along those lines, the United Nations Disarmament Decade will have responded at last to the bright hopes of humanity which accompanied its inception.

Mr. MUTUKWA (Zambia): Mr. Chairman, my delegation joins others in congratulating you, the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur, on your well-deserved election.

I speak almost at the end of the general debate. Therefore I do not propose, at this stage of the debate, to delve into the multifaceted aspects of the proliferating list of disarmament items of which this Committee is seized. My delegation cannot even pretend that it is humanly possible to understand all these items, some of which would appear to be extremely complex as man perfects the tools of his own destruction. What we understand, and indeed what bothers us most, is that, in spite of this impressive list of items on disarmament, a horrifying arms race, nuclear and conventional, continues unabated. We remain seriously concerned about both the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the arms race. We are equally dismayed by the heavy toll that the arms race continues to claim on the vital financial and material resources which mankind could put to better and more sensible use, particularly in the field of economic and social development.

The importance of genuine measures for disarmament cannot be over-emphasized. Not one nation is on record as being opposed to disarmament. While all nations profess verbal commitment to this objective, the actions of some belie their true intentions. For disarmament to become a reality, it seems to my delegation that certain false and dangerous notions and illusions will have to be discarded. Indeed, as my Foreign Minister put it in his statement during the general debate in the plenary of the General Assembly:

"Unless and until States abandon the notion that military might guarantees their security, however defined, the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control will remain a pipe-dream. The arms race will continue and even intensify, so long as States entertain the illusion that military superiority is a yardstick for power, prestige and influence. Indeed, for as long as actual and potential causes of conflict in the world are not eradicated, the arms race can be neither abated nor reversed." (A/32/PV.27, p. 13-15)

MP/vr

A/C.1/32/PV.24

49-50

(Mr. Mutukwa, Zambia)

The Non-Aligned Group, of which Zambia is a member, has recognized the due importance of disarmament and rightly made it one of its major pre-occupations. The positions expressed at various non-aligned conferences and the initiatives taken by the non-aligned countries in the field of disarmament, constitute, in the view of my delegation, a realistic basis for genuine disarmament.

(Mr. Mutukwa, Zambia)

The forthcoming special session on disarmament is an initiative of great significance. We look forward to the special session in the hope and expectation that it will provide an opportunity for the world community as a whole to renounce those perceptions which have blocked progress towards genuine and complete disarmament and to agree on enlightened general principles of disarmament with clearly defined priorities. The tendency to adopt half-hearted measures of disarmament and to seek equilibrium in the possession of weapons of mass destruction, as opposed to their complete prohibition and eradication, is dangerous to human existence. It must be discouraged because such an approach is an academic exercise in the balance of terror. Terror, like fear, must never be balanced; its root causes should be eradicated.

It does not make sense to talk about a State's capacity to destroy the world 40, 30, 20, 10 times or even twice over. Once is enough, and it is that dreadful prospect which must be prevented. After all, man can only die once. The central issue cannot be whether nuclear weapons are acquired as a result of atmospheric or underground testing. Indeed, the central issue cannot be whether there should be a proliferation of nuclear weapons or whether they should be the preserve of certain States. In the view of my delegation nuclear weapons, regardless of how many, how they are acquired and by whom, must be prohibited and eradicated from the face of this earth. And because of their devastating character we believe that nuclear disarmament should receive utmost priority.

My delegation, like many others, has always emphasized the link between disarmament and development. The Secretary-General's report on the economic and social consequences of the arms race in document A/32/88 is eloquent testimony to the sheer madness that this race to oblivion has assumed at the expense of economic development, nutrition, health, education and other basic human needs. We commend the Secretary-General on his report, and we urge that it be given the widest possible publicity so as to mobilize public opinion in favour of disarmament.

Disarmament is also inextricably linked to world security and in particular to the need to establish a new world security order based on justice, equality, peace and development. The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is of utmost importance in this regard. The implementation of this Declaration, in all provisions, would certainly facilitate efforts at general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

(Mr. Mutukwa, Zambia)

In the view of my delegation, the great Powers should not remain insensitive to the aspirations of the peoples of various parts of the world to live in an atmosphere of genuine peace and security. The littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean have made abundantly clear their abhorrence of great-Power rivalries in the Indian Ocean and their wish that it remain a true zone of peace. Yet to this day we are faced with the reluctance of the great Powers to co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in a meaningful way. My delegation deplores the negative attitude of the great Powers and urges them to co-operate fully with the Ad Hoc Committee in its efforts to seek implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. We view the proposed conference of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean as an important step towards realization of the objectives of the Declaration, and we hope that it will be convened soon with the full co-operation of all concerned.

Another important regional initiative is that taken by the Organization of African Unity towards the denuclearization of Africa. It is important that the desire of the African States to have their continent as a nuclear-free zone be appreciated and respected by all States. The United Nations should encourage such regional initiatives and co-operate in every possible manner in the realization of these important objectives, which obviously contribute in no small measure to international peace and security. But let me sound a note of warning that this positive attitude of the members of the Organization of African Unity may be undermined by the aggressive nuclear ambitions of the racist régime of South Africa.

We take seriously the report that the racist régime of South Africa is at the threshold of developing nuclear weapons. The acquisition of nuclear weapons by South Africa would be a grave development with serious consequences for international peace and security. If that were to happen, African countries would justifiably wish to consider their position and keep their options open in response to the South African challenge. It is common knowledge that the Boers of South Africa could not acquire this technology on their own. Their nuclear technology and material have been generously supplied by certain Members of the United Nations, some of which still remain arrogant on this insidious collaboration.

(Mr. Mutukwa , Zambia)

What the collaborators must know is that they are arming a madman who will use his weapons to terrorize captives and neighbours. The lessons of trigger-happy maniacs in large cities of the industrialized world should provide useful parallels.

Finally, a South Africa armed with nuclear weapons is a dangerous threat to international peace and security. It poses a dangerous threat to the security and independence of neighbouring African countries, of which my own country, Zambia, is one. Moreover, South African nuclear power will be used to blackmail the world. South Africa may even use the nuclear weapons to commit suicide. Unfortunately, in this probable suicidal act South Africa will want to carry the whole world with it in a nuclear holocaust. Rather than abandon its policies and practice of apartheid, South Africa may thus wish to provoke a world war in which all humans would perish and all civilization would be lost.

In the view of my delegation it is imperative that all hot-beds of tension in the world be eradicated. To resolve regional conflicts such as that which is mounting and escalating in southern Africa, we must eliminate the root cause. And the sooner the better.

Mr. VUNIBOBO (Fiji): Mr. Chairman, as this is the first opportunity I have had to participate in the deliberations of this Committee, may I be allowed to extend our warm congratulations to you and to the other officers of the Committee on your election to your high office. We are confident that under your eminent and distinguished leadership this Committee will carry out its mandate efficiently. On our part, we pledge our support and co-operation.

As in past years the question of disarmament is again being debated by us and, judging by the number of items devoted to this question, one is painfully aware of the complexity and magnitude of the task before us, the urgency of which cannot be overstressed, more particularly in view of the high hopes that we and the world attach to our efforts on this matter. Despite the years of efforts at the United Nations and in other forums - which incidentally have resulted in the accumulation of a voluminous amount of literature on the subject - we are no closer than we were 30 years ago to our ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Whatever progress has been achieved has been largely offset by technological innovations, particularly of the type that continue to be devoted to the production and deployment of even deadlier and costlier weapons of mass destruction. And such destructive innovations continue, thus significantly heightening the possibilities of triggering further global tensions and conflict. It is a regrettable commentary on the contemporary world, particularly when we are confronted with the situation of ever-increasing arms stockpiles in the arsenals of States both in the East and West. The situation becomes worse when such arms filter through to areas of conflict. This accumulation and proliferation of arms is capable of destroying man many times over and is a disturbing reality that has been alluded to by the many speakers who have preceded me in the debate on this subject. In the context of this grave situation, one finds the Secretary-General's observations in his annual report timely and pertinent:

"The question of disarmament lies at the heart of the problem of international order, for, in an environment dominated by international arms race, military and strategic considerations tend to shape the over-all relations between States, affecting all other relations and transactions and disturbing the economy." (A/32/1, p. 12)

(Mr. Vunibobo, Fiji)

Despite the negative trends that have rendered past disarmament efforts largely meaningless, it is nevertheless reassuring to note some current efforts at both bilateral and multilateral levels designed to curb the proliferation of arms, perhaps with the further view to their eventual elimination. Those recent initiatives have once again raised our hopes that we might still be able to contain the problem of uncontrolled proliferation which in turn is inexorably linked to life and death. Only time will tell the sincerity or otherwise of these endeavours. However, it might well be worth repeating that intransigence or lack of genuine political will on the part of those involved, particularly the nuclear-weapon States, to disarm effectively could only lead to increased dangers of further armed conflict and possibly total annihilation for all of us.

While some positive but partial agreements for the limitation of certain strategic and tactical armaments have been achieved, comprehensive agreements for halting nuclear and conventional weapons still only appear as remote possibilities. That is largely because of the continued arms race that is made more acute by continued efforts to create newer generations of improved nuclear and conventional arms.

In the nuclear field, even though we achieved the partial test ban Treaty in 1963, which prohibited nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, nuclear tests unfortunately have continued. For instance, we in the South Pacific continue to be subjected to underground testing despite numerous protests. This is a sad reminder to us that the 1963 arrangements are indeed partial and incomplete. We are however somewhat encouraged in that possibilities for curbing the vertical proliferation of arms and the attainment of a comprehensive test ban treaty appear, albeit dimly, within sight. One of the considerations influencing such optimism could be attributed to the negotiations between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union which have positively improved the scope for the realization of this important goal. We also note, with appreciation, the initiative of the Soviet Union which was publicized recently. We believe, for instance, that the achievement of even a limited moratorium on future nuclear tests for a specific period of time will be a welcome first step. We hope that such initiatives will continue

(Mr. Vunibobo, Fiji)

through further discussions in such forums as the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD). Having said this, we are regretfully aware that it has not proved possible for others, particularly those with nuclear weapon capabilities, to join this vital initiative but we should still like to express the hope that they would join the "trilateral" discussions in the not too distant future. The ending of nuclear tests should indeed curb further perfecting of destructive nuclear devices and consequently the arms race itself. In this regard, we also sincerely welcome President Carter's statement to this Organization when he said:

"the time has come to end all explosions of nuclear devices, no matter what their claimed justification - peaceful or military ...".

(A/32/PV.18, p.6)

While we by no means underestimate the dangers of the unrestricted proliferation of conventional weapons, our concern about spiralling nuclear armaments must continue to be reiterated in the strongest of terms. How can it not be so in view of such alarming statistics as for instance the existence of more than 12,000 strategic warheads, or four times as many "tactical" nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the leading Powers, the unleashing of which could prove suicidal? And despite all this, our energies and limited resources continue to be devoted to the creation of newer generations of weapons.

The economic and social consequences of the arms race are, to say the least, disconcerting. For instance, we are aware that the world's total annual military budget is now in excess of \$300 billion. While our scientific and technological capacities could and should be devoted to human progress and development, we find with dismay that:

"... 25 per cent of the world's scientific manpower and 40 per cent of all research and development spending is engaged for military purposes".

(A/32/1, p. 13)

One can go on citing examples of what might be described as the gross misuse of scarce resources. But suffice it to mention that savings resulting from disarmament could, we hope, be usefully utilized for accelerated economic development and, more especially, for the alleviation of the condition of the world's poor and suffering. Indeed, we believe that such steps could bring us nearer to the realization of an equitable and humane international economic order.

(Mr. Vunibobo, Fiji)

In view of this, we would like to associate ourselves with the proposal of the Nordic countries for an

"in-depth United Nations study to clarify the implications of military spending on all relevant aspects of the economy and to planned reallocation of resources for civilian purposes".

It is imperative that disarmament efforts should not only be aimed at certain aspects of the arms race, such as the prohibition of a few categories of destructive weapons, the restriction of nuclear testing or the demilitarizing of selected geographical areas, but also to the long-term goal of the total elimination of arms as well, for we too subscribe to the belief that "the way to disarm to to disarm". To make further disarmament agreements viable, appropriate enforcement machinery, including that at the international level, will be necessary to verify compliance with the appropriate agreements during and after the process of disarming. We should like to believe that, given mutual trust engendered by an amicable resolution of divisive international influences, appropriate and workable disarmament agreements could be achieved. In this regard, we feel that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the CCD can and should continue to make significant contributions.

We hope, however, that further negotiations between major Powers will result in an early agreement on such issues as a comprehensive convention prohibiting the use of chemical weapons. Similar sentiments could be expressed regarding the need to reach appropriate international agreements to eliminate the danger of radiological warfare and to curb the dangers of radiation. That would not only call for the elimination of all nuclear tests, since they are the largest single source of radio-activity, but also for assurances that nuclear wastes would not be disposed of in the sea. Since Fiji is an island developing country, these are areas in which we would monitor future progress with a great deal of anxiety and interest, since our oceans are the key to our sustenance and economic well-being.

(Mr. Vunibobo, Fiji)

Among other disarmament measures, we have observed a growing interest within the international community for regional efforts in the field of disarmament. This includes nuclear-weapon-free zones designed to discourage further proliferation of nuclear armaments in regions where suitable conditions exist for the creation of such zones. Such efforts could also secure concerned States from dangers of nuclear conflict. Against the background of these considerations, the zonal efforts of States in different parts of the world become increasingly clear. To cite but a few examples, the 1967 Treaty of Tlatelolco establishing the nuclear-free status of Latin America, the Organization of African Unity Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, the 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, the Treaty prohibiting nuclear explosions in Antarctica, and the endorsement by the General Assembly, in 1975, of the idea of a nuclear-free-zone in the South Pacific. These efforts could be interpreted as a desire for nuclear disarmament and for the promotion of international peace and security. Additionally, these measures, in our view, are complementary to the objectives of the 1968 non-proliferation of nuclear weapons Treaty, whose major objectives also include the reduction of threats of nuclear war and the encouragement of effective progress in the search for nuclear disarmament.

In conclusion, our view has been that despite our continued efforts at general and complete disarmament, the nuclear and conventional arsenals have increased at an alarming rate, thus increasing areas of potential conflict. This trend is particularly regrettable on our planet where there is so much interdependence among nations, where the developing world is struggling to improve the quality of life of its people, and yet such huge economic sums and expertise continue to be used annually for military purposes. Yet, we believe that there is some hope, as certain multilateral and bilateral efforts are being made to improve the prospects for disarmament. Sometimes we feel, though, that small countries like ours have limited opportunities for influencing the course of the global arms race. But we have to express our disappointment on the meagre achievements in the past, and particularly when negative trends emerge, because even though we do not produce or dispose of arms, we are the victims of the consequences of the arms race.

(Mr. Vunibobo, Fiji)

Having said this, we still would like to believe that the special session on disarmament next year could provide us with new opportunities to move towards real disarmament. In this regard, while we look forward to the forthcoming special session, it is only with a sense of guarded optimism. For time will be short, but we hope it will provide one further step in a continuing disarmament process. We believe that the special session will be followed by periodic sessions of the General Assembly to review progress enunciated at the special session, leading ultimately to a meaningful world disarmament conference.

Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): Among the documents submitted to this session on disarmament questions, an essential place belongs to the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and its work in 1977. The report faithfully reflects the work done by the Committee in preparing international agreements on questions of great importance for the cessation of the arms race and for disarmament. The report also highlights the fact that the Committee on Disarmament has examined all the questions on its agenda.

The Committee gave the correct priority to the various questions entirely in keeping with the decisions of the General Assembly. A considerable amount of work was done at official and unofficial meetings, with the participation of experts, in order to clarify the most important and complicated questions upon the solution of which depends the preparation of the respective international agreements.

In this sense, the Committee achieved good results. It is true, however, that negotiations are not proceeding at the pace we would have hoped for, and the Committee has not been presenting a new agreement in the field of disarmament to each session of the General Assembly. But it would be, to say the least, naive to look for the causes for this in the terms of reference, composition or even the organization of the Committee's work. The statute of the Committee and its composition reflect the specific nature of the purpose of its work, the political realities in the world today, and the contribution of the different groups of States to the strengthening of international peace and disarmament.

(Mr. Todorov, Bulgaria)

The results hitherto obtained by the Committee show that its terms of reference are not the reason which underlies the difficulties it is encountering. This is particularly true because the Committee has already taken measures to improve the organization of its work: for example, holding informal meetings with the participation of experts, including experts from non-members of the Committee, distributing its documentation to all members of the United Nations, and other measures.

We are firmly convinced that the reasons for the slow progress in the Committee's work on a number of questions do not lie in defects of structure or organization in the Committee but, rather, in the absence of the political will on the part of certain States to find solutions acceptable to all for these complicated questions which are of such vital importance for the security of States. Furthermore, the non-participation of two nuclear Powers in the Committee's work is something which cannot be overlooked and which has a negative impact on the effectiveness of the work of the Committee on Disarmament. We share the general view that in the circumstances of détente, particularly favourable prospects exist to enable the Committee on Disarmament in the near future to achieve substantial progress in the important areas of disarmament. The decision of the Soviet Union, announced by the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the General-Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, just two days ago, to the ceremonial meeting held on the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of the October Revolution, to give its consent to an extension of a future moratorium on nuclear tests for peaceful purposes is irrefutable proof of this.

(Mr. Todorov, Bulgaria)

This decision of the Soviet Union is a manifestation of its goodwill based on the constant and unswerving policy pursued by the first socialist State ever since its founding 60 years ago, a policy inspired by the sincere wish to safeguard and consolidate international peace and to bring about general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria has already had occasion to set forth Bulgaria's position on certain vitally urgent disarmament questions which have been discussed in the disarmament Committee. We should like this time to dwell on some other questions which, in our view, are of acknowledged priority and occupy a vital place in the sustained efforts of our Organization and its Member States to achieve genuine results in the field of disarmament.

It is generally acknowledged that, along with the total banning of nuclear-weapon tests and a limitation on nuclear armaments, the prohibition of chemical weapons is one of the most urgent questions of disarmament. Furthermore, this is no accident. This kind of weapon of mass destruction, with its special characteristics and effects, has morally and politically been condemned for a long time now. For many years efforts have been made to put an end to their development and manufacture as well as to abolish them from the arsenals of States. The accession of new States to the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and also the entry into force of the Convention prohibiting bacteriological weapons have opened up genuine prospects of an early conclusion of an international treaty on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. Intensive negotiations are now under way within the framework of the disarmament Committee on this question. A number of draft treaties have so far been submitted, including the draft of the socialist countries, of which Bulgaria is a co-sponsor.

Last year the Committee held a number of informal meetings attended by experts. These meetings help a great deal to elucidate the scope of the prohibition and control over implementation of obligations assumed by States under the treaty.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria, acting jointly with other countries, continues to consider the total banning of these weapons as an urgent, radical and feasible measure. However, since several countries are not yet

(Mr. Todorov, Bulgaria)

ready to go as far as the total prohibition of these weapons, our country declared that it was willing to support a stage by stage prohibition of chemical weapons beginning with the prohibition of the most dangerous and lethal chemical substances. The discussions held at the last session of the Committee highlighted a certain narrowing of differences over the question of the scope of the prohibition. We welcome this development.

The problem of controlling the implementation of the treaty has itself been the subject of extensive consideration. Informal meetings held so far with the participation of experts have done a great deal to shed more light on the technical aspects of control. The idea that the present development of science and technology has made it possible to exercise effective national control is enjoying ever wider support. The statement of the Soviet Union that it was ready to examine the possibility of using supplementary control procedures, particularly to discuss methods of verifying the destruction of stockpiles of chemical weapons to be eliminated from the arsenals of States, represents an important contribution to the solution of the control problem. Reference has even been made to the possibility of using satellites for these purposes. There are circumstances in which a formula acceptable to all, offering a proper balance of political, economic and other interests of all countries, can be found.

Statements made in our Committee by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States on this subject give us grounds for hoping that those two countries will very soon be submitting to the disarmament Committee a co-ordinated draft which could serve as the basis for the drafting of a treaty on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons.

Over the last few years world public opinion has become increasingly concerned not only at the increased stockpiling of already existing weapons - nuclear and conventional - but also because of the prospect of the creation of new types of weapons of mass destruction. In the circumstances of an arms race, the temptations to use new scientific and technological discoveries for military purposes are becoming stronger.

(Mr. Todorov, Bulgaria)

We have received alarming news arousing our concern about the real danger of the development and manufacture of new types of arms of mass destruction which we hear not only from politicians but also from scientists and research workers in various areas of science in all countries. The justified concern of world public opinion aroused by this news found eloquent expression in the condemnation and firm opposition to the policy of producing the so-called neutron bomb. That is why the proposal of the Soviet Union to conclude an agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, a proposal which found widespread support among Members of the United Nations, has assumed growing urgency and importance.

As we are well aware, this year the Soviet Union submitted to the disarmament Committee a revised draft agreement which takes account of a number of opinions and views expressed by different Governments in the debate and a further measure of clarification was introduced therein concerning the definition of the notion of new types of weapons of mass destruction. However, we must point out that, in spite of the widespread support of this idea in principle, and indeed for the draft agreement itself, implementation has been impeded for the time being. Delegations of certain countries continue to view with scepticism a proposal to conclude a treaty on the general prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction, preferring a stage by stage solution to the problem. Instead of concluding a general treaty, it is proposed that the General Assembly adopt a resolution condemning the creation of such weapons and that the disarmament Committee examine the possibility of concluding treaties or specific agreements when a given type of new weapon is well identified.

The question then quite rightly arises: does the choice of such a course not mean that an attempt is being made to ignore or, at best, to reassure to a certain extent world public opinion? Surely, that is tantamount to closing one's eyes to the danger which is clearly manifesting itself. Who could deny the major difficulties in prohibiting the use of and in eliminating new weapons once they have been developed and manufactured? The significance and the merit of this idea lies in its preventive character.

(Mr. Todorov, Bulgaria)

The draft proposed by the Soviet Union, in article 1, makes sufficiently clear the scope of the prohibition. The problem of control, in this case, is much easier to resolve, because this would be a preventive treaty. The conclusion of a Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques has shown that, given the necessary political will, difficulties which people invoke can be overcome.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria is still convinced that the draft submitted by the Soviet Union does provide a solid basis for the conclusion of a general agreement on the prohibition of the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. The presence of such an agreement should not be allowed to constitute an obstacle to the conclusion of specific international agreements on the prohibition of a given type of new weapon when such a weapon begins to emerge in concrete form.

That is why we consider it indispensable for the thirty-second session of the General Assembly to call on the Disarmament Committee to accelerate its work on producing an international agreement on the basis of the draft submitted by the Soviet Union.

There is general agreement that regional measures in the field of disarmament are of vital importance for the cessation of the arms race and for disarmament. Many ideas and initiatives of great importance have been put forward with regard to the creation of zones of peace in various parts of the world. The proposal most often heard is for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones, which is considered to be an effective measure that could help reduce the danger of recourse to nuclear weapons.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria whole-heartedly supports the proposals for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones of peace. A necessary condition for the creation of such zones is that States which do not belong to the region in question should refrain from establishing military bases therein. It is of vital importance too for agreements on the creation of demilitarized zones to be in keeping with universally recognized norms of international law and to contain no loop-holes. Initiatives for the creation of such zones should be taken by the States of the zone and should take into account the global character of the problems of international peace and security.

(Mr. Todorov, Bulgaria)

It is on the basis of these considerations which I have set forth briefly that my delegation will determine its attitude towards the draft resolutions submitted on the various agenda items relating to the creation of such zones.

It is with entirely justified interest that world public opinion has been following the Vienna negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. It is indeed there, surely, that the two World Wars started, and that is the region with the greatest concentration of armed forces and of armaments, including nuclear armaments. Although those negotiations are now in their fifth year, genuine results have not so far been achieved. An objective analysis of the course of those negotiations so far shows that the causes of the present impasse lie in the positions of the Western partners. They have been striving to seek unilateral advantages, to the detriment of the security of the socialist countries. Moreover, their positions are in contradiction with the principles upon which the participants agreed at the beginning of the negotiations.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria, which participates as an observer, unreservedly supports the proposals of the socialist countries which are full members - proposals which take full account of the interests of all European countries and which do not aim at obtaining any unilateral advantages. Together with proposals relating to the specific reduction of armed forces and of armaments in Central Europe, the socialist countries have proposed that all direct participants in the negotiations should refrain from increasing the strength of their armed forces in the course of the negotiations. Acceptance of that proposal would create a favourable atmosphere for the consolidation of trust among States and also for the attainment of concrete results in the near future.

An essential contribution to the strengthening of confidence among European States would be acceptance of the proposals of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty of November 1976, addressed to all signatories of the Final Act of Helsinki, with regard to the conclusion of an agreement not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against any other State party to the Treaty.

(Mr. Todorov, Bulgaria)

Of vital importance too is the appeal of the parties to the Warsaw Treaty to all States to refrain from doing anything that might lead to an expansion of the closed military-political groupings or alliances, or to the creation of new ones. Compliance with these two initiatives would do a great deal to help the consolidation of peace and détente in Europe and in the world at large, and would greatly facilitate a solution to the problems connected with a reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to express once again its satisfaction at the fact that, at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, questions of disarmament are the focal point of the attention of Member States of our Organization. The general debate in our Committee has given us grounds for optimism: it would appear that there are favourable prospects for achieving the necessary results in the early future. We must strive, however, to seize these favourable opportunities, and we hope that all States will honour the words they have uttered in this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of the Holy See has asked to be allowed to speak. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to hear the representative of the Holy See.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Holy See,
Mrs. Boucher.

Mrs. BOUCHER (Holy See): Mr. Chairman, the delegation of the Holy See, speaking for the first time in this Committee, wishes to offer its congratulations to you and your collaborators for the efficient manner in which you are conducting the business of the Committee, which more than amply justifies the confidence placed in your leadership when you were elected to this important position.

Receiving the Secretary-General of the United Nations during his official visit to the Vatican on 9 July 1977, Pope Paul VI stated:

"We are following with interest the preparations for the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, designed to make disarmament more effective, within the global framework of the efforts already undertaken to the same end. We express the hope that the potential for action of the United Nations may be further enhanced, through the establishment of judicial machinery better suited for effectively achieving, subject to legitimate respect for the peoples' sovereignty, what is required for the common good."

It is this deep abiding concern of the Holy Father, indeed of the entire Church, for the common good of mankind that prompts my delegation to speak on a few points during this general debate of the First Committee on items related to disarmament.

(Mrs. Boucher, Holy See)

The Holy Father has on many occasions expressed his deep abhorrence of violence, especially the indiscriminate violence against the most fundamental of human rights, that of life itself, which would reach unprecedented proportions in the event of a nuclear war. He has also consistently offered the co-operation of the Holy See in the work of the United Nations to achieve disarmament under effective international control.

In this same vein my delegation would like on this occasion to express the appreciation and congratulations of the Holy See to all those who are genuinely working towards the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament in order to establish a firm basis for dynamic peace in the world. The whole community of man is encouraged by the signs of creative ferment towards some measure of control in the escalating arms race. There appears to be quickening progress in negotiations towards the conclusion of agreement between the two major nuclear Powers in strategic arms limitation, an agreement that could signal restraint in the vertical proliferation of nuclear arms. The trilateral talks at present going on between major nuclear Powers that may make possible in the near future formulation of a treaty for a comprehensive ban on nuclear and thermonuclear testing are a further encouraging sign. The apparent progress being made towards a treaty to ban the use of chemical weapons is another positive aspect of the current situation. These are all important steps forward in mankind's uncertain progress on the path of peace.

At the same time it is disturbing and disheartening to witness the continuing use of technological advances not for the benefit of man but to make possible the production of even more terrible weapons geared to the indiscriminate destruction of human life. The Church unequivocally condemns such weapons of mass destruction as a crime against God and man.

The preparations now being undertaken for the special session of the United Nations General Assembly can provide the impetus needed to catalyze substantive disarmament, hopefully stimulating the successful outcome of major items that have been under discussion for a number of years. It can also give the nations an opportunity to formulate an over-all comprehensive plan for disarmament and a plan of action whereby this can be achieved through a succession of definite short-term realizable goals.

(Mrs. Boucher, Holy See)

It is encouraging to see that one of the proposals submitted for consideration by the Preparatory Committee for the special session is for an in-depth study by the United Nations of the relationship between disarmament and development, a study that would broaden the scope of previous studies to include the redeployment of resources released as a result of disarmament measures and would be relevant to efforts to attain the goals of a new international economic order.

The Church has long asserted the close relationship between disarmament and development, the relationship between the prodigal use of the world's resources in stockpiling arms and the lack of resources to institute development projects in all nations, but especially in the developing nations. Disarmament is seen not as a separate reality but as a part of the whole.

In his prophetic 1964 Bombay address Pope Paul VI called for the reduction of military spending and the establishment of a world fund for development. In his 1967 encyclical letter "The Progress of Peoples" he drew attention to the temptation to violence occasioned by injustice. He said:

"When whole populations destitute of necessities live in a state of dependence barring them from all initiative and responsibility, and all opportunity to advance culturally and share in social and political life, recourse to violence, as a means to right these wrongs to human dignity, is a grave temptation."

However, he concludes that such violence produces new injustices, throws more elements out of balance and brings on new disasters.

By reducing the enormous amounts of economic and human resources that are yearly wasted in producing the tools of death and redeploying some of these savings to provide food, clean water, shelter and education for those deprived of the most basic needs of life, it would be possible to reduce this temptation to violence spawned by intolerable living conditions. Truly it could be possible to beat swords into ploughshares and spears into pruning hooks.

The dynamic potential for peace in such action can begin to be understood when we realize, for instance, that less than 1 per cent of the yearly global expenditure on arms could procure hygienic water supplies towards the goal of clean water for all humanity by 1990, could save daily an estimated 25,000 people who die from water-borne diseases.

(Mrs. Boucher, Holy See)

Also worthy of note in the preparations for the special session is the opportunity being given to non-governmental organizations to participate in this important work. Such organizations, composed of informed and interested people, have a special role in supplementing the efforts of Governments, of translating into lay terms the complex technical aspects of disarmament. Through their particular constituencies they can reach out into their communities to produce a well-informed, articulate public opinion that can refine consciences and open hearts to help provide the firm political will necessary to achieve the goals of disarmament.

In his 9 July audience with the Secretary-General the Holy Father called upon the United Nations to be a bulwark of human rights, stating:

"A heightened consciousness is needed to make these rights the touchstone of a really humane civilization and truly to achieve, without excluding any race or any people, the solidarity which is essential between brothers all created in God's image."

True and lasting peace is a basic component in attaining the most basic of human rights, the right to live without violence in a manner befitting the dignity of man.

Mr. WYZNER (Poland): In my general statement concerning disarmament items of 20 October I referred to the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof, a Conference which concluded its work in Geneva only a few months ago. I also indicated at that time that my delegation, along with a number of like-minded delegations which actively participated in the Conference, intended to submit an appropriate draft resolution at a later stage.

As a result of extensive consultations with many delegations - mostly members of the bureau of the Conference - which were facilitated by a spirit of co-operation and common purpose, I now have the privilege of introducing the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.6 on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, Canada, Denmark, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Tunisia, USSR, United Kingdom, United States and Poland.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

I am happy to announce that after the draft resolution had been submitted Nicaragua joined as a co-sponsor. Consequently, all States Members of the bureau of the Geneva Review Conference without exception are now sponsoring the draft resolution.

Many speakers who have addressed the First Committee in the course of the general debate on disarmament have referred to the Review Conference, which was convened five years after the entry into force of the sea-bed Treaty, in accordance with its article VII. That Conference was the second in the series begun by the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons held in 1975. Each of those review conferences brought a new important framework and continuity to arms reduction and disarmament negotiations. Each of them also confirmed the validity and effectiveness of the respective treaties, as well as need for their further strengthening and universalization.

As was recalled during the Review Conference, the sea-bed Treaty was concluded on the eve of the Disarmament Decade of the 1970s. It represents a major step towards preventing an arms race on the sea-bed and the ocean floor - an area which constitutes over two thirds of the globe. At the same time, due to its provisions prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear weapons in that environment, the Treaty is an important contribution to the implementation and expansion of the régime of non-proliferation established two years earlier by the NPT. The Treaty's effectiveness has been confirmed by the fact that some 90 States can be numbered among its parties or signatories.

The Review Conference on the sea-bed Treaty was successful in reaching its decisions and recommendations in full unanimity, largely due to the efforts of its drafting committee and its excellent and skilful Chairman, Ambassador Jay of Canada. As a result of deliberations in June in Geneva, the Conference unanimously approved its Final Declaration, together with other parts of the final document. In my capacity as its President, I was requested by the Conference to transmit that final document for distribution to all Member States of the United Nations at the present session of the General Assembly. Accordingly, representatives will find it before them issued by the Secretariat as document A/C.1/32/4.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

It will certainly be noted that the leading and, indeed, underlying notion of the draft resolution which I am privileged to introduce to the Committee, is to give the General Assembly's positive reaction to the findings and conclusions of the Review Conference, as well as to assure the undertaking of further measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed and the ocean floor for, regardless of its usefulness and effectiveness, the sea-bed Treaty is certainly not the last word on disarmament in that vital area of the earth.

Another general comment which I should like to make with respect to our draft resolution is that it tends to reflect faithfully findings and conclusions reached by the Conference and contained in its Final Declaration. Since the draft resolution has been meant to be non-controversial and subject to a consensus approval by the First Committee, it is only natural that in many instances it is based on the actual wording of the Final Declaration, which has been collectively elaborated and approved by all participants of the Conference. The co-sponsors believe therefore that our text reconciles and reflects, to the greatest extent possible, the views of delegations around this table.

It is not my intention to tax the Committee's patience by going into a detailed presentation of the draft's provisions, which are largely self-explanatory. Permit me, however, to present a few comments at least on the operative part.

The first operative paragraph stems from the very effectiveness of the Treaty, to which I referred a few moments ago. The positive assessment by the Review Conference of this fact, as contained in its final document is certainly encouraging and satisfying for the international community. We believe that it should be reflected in the resolution.

The second operative paragraph is actually a logical follow-up of the first paragraph. The Treaty has proved to be useful and effective; it is therefore only natural for the Assembly to invite all States to become parties to it. The language of the second paragraph is based on the wording of General Assembly resolution 3484 E (XXX) and of the Final Declaration of the Conference.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

The third operative paragraph affirms the "... strong interest [of this body] in avoiding an arms race in nuclear weapons or any other types of weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed..." environment, which, as I have stressed before, constitutes over 70 per cent of our globe.

Operative paragraph 4, based on the wording of the final declaration, is certainly one of the most important of the whole text. The request, addressed to the "... the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in consultation with the States Parties to the Treaty ... to proceed promptly with consideration of further measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race in that environment ...", would emerge as a crucial new step for disarmament in the realm of the sea-bed, namely, conventional disarmament. At the same time the fifth paragraph contains another parallel and consequential appeal "... to all States to refrain from any action which might lead to the extension of the arms race to the sea-bed and the ocean floor...". That paragraph is indeed consequential with regard to the previous one for, while taking steps directed towards effective disarmament, the Assembly must rest assured that no one takes the opposite action meant to promote the arms race in that area.

Finally, the sixth and seventh operative paragraphs are of a procedural nature, but at the same time - in particular the seventh paragraph - underline the interest of the General Assembly in following closely negotiations undertaken as a result of our resolution.

The sea-bed Treaty, as the Review Conference has proved, has well withstood the test of time as a worth-while arms limitation agreement. Still, it is only a partial measure in that field - yet one step in the long process. That is why the draft resolution which we have presented is not only a reflection of positive achievements, but also a blueprint for further and decisive action. Therefore, I speak for all the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.6 when I commend it for adoption by consensus of the First Committee.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

In concluding, may I express to the sponsors and to other delegations concerned appreciation for the support and goodwill which they have extended to my delegation in the process of preparing the draft resolution. In their actions and co-operation I have unmistakably recognized the same spirit of confidence and friendship which was so crucial in the successful conclusion of the Review Conference itself.

Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (interpretation from French): Allow me to begin my statement with a confession. I am speaking so late in this debate on disarmament problems because I debated at length whether it was necessary for me to speak or not. My hesitation and delay must not, of course, be understood as being signs of any lack of interest or negligence on the part of my country regarding disarmament. But I am bound to recognize that the negative experience of the last years in this field has taught me to depart from a certain misplaced enthusiasm. In fact, it seems to me to be difficult not to be sceptical regarding the chances of arriving at a final objective, namely, general and complete disarmament, when one realizes the gap that exists between the speeches of States and what they do, between the statements made both within the framework of the United Nations and in other negotiating structures and the facts of life characterized by a rise in military budgets and the invention of devices increasingly terrifying for the future of mankind. One would be led to believe that the forces of evil compete in the mind of man to produce self-destructive devices, increasingly sophisticated and ever more alarming, so as to hasten his own end. Some of my colleagues will perhaps accuse me of being pessimistic, but how can one fail to succumb to pessimism when one knows that, for 30 years, debates on this question have pathetically dragged on without arriving at tangible results.

We are, in fact, compelled to recognize that the political will to disarm is absent from the minds of the major military Powers. Nationalism in its narrowest form, chauvinism, the lust for power, cupidity, distrust, as well as the policy of aggression and zones of influence unfortunately continue to govern international relations to a large extent. Also, we must not forget certain results obtained by direct negotiations among the great Powers and particularly those regarding the strategic arms talks between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Along this same line of thinking, we must also note with satisfaction the evolution in the attitude of the great Powers regarding the need to arrive at a complete prohibition of nuclear tests as well as the prohibition of chemical weapons. We must also hail the efforts undertaken at the Vienna negotiations on the reduction of armaments in Central Europe. Finally, we must note that plans to establish denuclearized zones in various parts of the world are such as to strengthen the climate of confidence which is necessary for a genuine start to the disarmament process.

(Mr. Azzout, Algeria)

While we rejoice at this progress, we must not exaggerate its importance and lose sight of the fact that, in any case, they are but an insignificant step toward the final objective of general and complete disarmament. Furthermore, the context in which this progress took place, among some Powers outside the United Nations, is the very expression of its limitations.

Indeed, since these advances do not involve all Member States of the United Nations, they must be insignificant, bearing in mind the need for the participation of the entire international community in the disarmament process.

In this spirit, my delegation wishes to affirm once again that the United Nations must remain the supreme body for the settlement of questions relating to disarmament. In fact, we consider that the United Nations can make a valuable contribution in determining the principles of negotiating a programme of agreements, in implementing measures adopted as well as in controlling their implementation. In this respect, the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, convened on the proposal of the non-aligned countries, will, we hope, act as a catalyst for future disarmament actions and constitute an important milestone in the taking over of the disarmament process by the entire international community.

Algeria, which is a member of the Preparatory Committee for that session, sincerely hopes that every means will be made available to that Committee to enable it to discharge its duties and guarantee the success of the special session.

In this respect, I wish to pay a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina for his leadership as Chairman of the Preparatory Committee, and thank him for all he has done to make a success of the meetings of that Committee.

The forthcoming special session must also be an opportunity to reaffirm the world-wide nature of disarmament and the need to put an end to factors of tension which exist in various parts of the world, whether it be in Africa, in the Middle East or elsewhere.

(Mr. Azzout, Algeria)

In the same connexion, it is fitting to emphasize the danger to the entire African continent if South Africa eventually were to have atomic weapons. In this respect, the initiation of any disarmament process cannot be entertained as long as certain Western military Powers continue to co-operate militarily with the racist Pretoria régime.

It has become commonplace to establish a link between disarmament and development, and the figures are certainly there to show the enormous advantages humanity could derive from genuine disarmament. Indeed, the immense potential resources, both human and material, which disarmament may release could be used for the well-being of all men and, in particular, to lessen the sufferings of the people of the third world, "those peoples excluded from the great feast of mankind, who inhabit the peripheral areas of history", to paraphrase a writer from a developing country.

The scant results registered so far in the field of disarmament should not cause us to lose hope. The importance of the work of disarmament and our responsibility in regard to our peoples compel us not to sit idly by but to continue tirelessly to explore every avenue likely to bring us closer to our objective.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.