

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records*



FIRST COMMITTEE
25th meeting
held on
Friday, 4 November 1977
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 25th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary)
Vice-Chairman

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 TLAHELCO): 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 TLAHELCO) (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.25
10 November 1977

ENGLISH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

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

Mr. LOBO (Mozambique): First of all, I should like to express my delegation's congratulations to the Chairman of our Committee on his election to the chairmanship of the Committee. His election gave us much pleasure, given the friendly relations and co-operation existing between Mozambique and Ghana, relations which, we are sure, were further strengthened during the recent visit of President Samora Machel to his great country. The ability and wisdom which he has shown during the work of the Committee are a guarantee that our work will reach a successful conclusion. To this effect my delegation would like to assure him of its best possible co-operation.

My congratulations are also extended to the other officers of the Committee, whose support has been very useful in the conduct of our work.

The question of disarmament, whose general debate ends today in this Committee, is of particular importance for Mozambique as it constitutes a problem of great concern to all mankind. General and complete disarmament is the ultimate goal for which all peace-loving peoples are fighting throughout the world in order that a new type of relations may prevail based on equality between all countries, big and small, as well as on respect for human rights, sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of every State.

We live in an era when men, instead of tackling the social problems overwhelming mankind, embark on self-destructive efforts. Mankind is more and more in danger of total destruction resulting from the invention of new types of weapons of mass destruction.

We can ask ourselves: Why this race for more sophisticated arms when more than half the inhabitants of our planet live under miserable living conditions, when poverty, hunger, disease and ignorance and the lack of hospitals are every minute that passes afflicting countless lives in the world, while, in sad contrast, billions of dollars are spent on military expenditures all over the world?

(Mr. Lobo, Mozambique)

The escalation of military forces by the big Powers and the immense destructive power of the weapons with which they are armed impose on us new responsibilities which require a firm decision by the international community to put an end to the present threat of a holocaust resulting from a nuclear war. Such a war, which might have very disastrous consequences, and the immense human and material assets involved in the arms race, make disarmament a pressing necessity. All efforts made to prevent the arms race are never too much to achieve the ultimate objective for which mankind is so anxious.

The People's Republic of Mozambique has in its Constitution enshrined the principle of general and universal disarmament of all States. As a non-aligned country the People's Republic of Mozambique joins all other countries which follow a policy of peace and justice among peoples and affirms all people's right to choose their own destiny.

In the meantime, it is with apprehension that we notice the multiplication and spreading of hotbeds of tension to new areas in the African continent, in particular in southern Africa, where the biggest confrontations are developing, already including the threat of a nuclear explosion which may be detonated by the racist minority régime of South Africa.

What is the real aim pursued by the minority racist régimes in introducing this new type of weapon of mass destruction? The answer is that they intend to silence the shots of revolt and muzzle the voices of the oppressed peoples of Namibia, Namibia and South Africa, which are fighting to liberate themselves from humiliation and exploitation and to regain their right to live as human beings.

On the other hand, the racist régimes also intend to frighten all the African countries in an attempt to make them give up the support which they are providing to the just liberation fight being waged there by the peoples.

At a time when the nuclear Powers are trying to find means of reducing armaments, the Apartheid régime intends to test a nuclear device with the help of some of our countries which not only supply it with the necessary know-how but also collaborate with it in the construction of such a device. The explosion of this device would be the second of its type in Africa, after the test carried out by France in the Sahara in 1960.

(Mr. Lobo, Mozambique)

The African continent has been declared a denuclearized zone by General Assembly resolution 1652 (XVI). In this context the introduction of nuclear weapons there would create a highly dangerous situation and escalate tension and make difficult any attempt to find a peaceful settlement in southern Africa. Such an act would be a challenge to the United Nations and the entire world, which should not lose interest in realizing the objectives defined in the United Nations and Organization of African Unity resolutions on denuclearization of that still nuclear-free continent.

I should like to mention here the hopes placed by the international community in the special session of the General Assembly to be convened to discuss the question of disarmament. In fact, we hope that this special session will be the most appropriate forum through which all Members of this Organization will take measures to reduce the arms race, eliminate zones of tension and extend détente to all continents.

The People's Republic of Mozambique will actively co-operate to ensure that the session will yield positive results.

The other problem causing great concern to my country is the proliferation of military bases in the Indian Ocean, which is obstructing the implementation of the United Nations Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. In its Constitution the People's Republic of Mozambique defends the principle of transforming the Indian Ocean into a denuclearized zone of peace. In this regard I should like to quote what my Head of State said in his message to the General Assembly:

"We consider that the peoples of that region who suffered so greatly from the evils of colonial and imperialist domination and who today are engaged in the campaign against poverty, ignorance, disease and all the consequences of underdevelopment in a struggle which is a precondition to achieving true human dignity and true freedom should be spared the threat of a nuclear war and all its attendant destruction.

"The peoples of the countries bordering on the Indian Ocean share a common heritage of relations and culture that they wish to develop; they have a shared desire for progress and peace and a will to preserve their hard-won independence ...

(Mr. Lobo, Mozambique)

"Until a short time ago, the Indian Ocean was safe from involvement in the event of nuclear conflicts. For that reason, although we welcome warmly all those who come to the Indian Ocean with peaceful intentions or for the development of fruitful economic relations, we are extremely apprehensive about, and resolutely condemn, the establishment of any military bases of foreign Powers in the zone.

"In this context we deem it necessary that the international community and, in particular, the countries of the region should dedicate themselves to studying ways and means of prohibiting the presence of any foreign military bases in the area while guaranteeing the dismantling of those already in existence, and enabling the coastal countries to control the presence and movement of foreign military fleets."

(A/32/PV.17, pp. 26 and 27)

From the statement which I have just quoted, one may infer my country's intention and endeavour to see the Indian Ocean free from any military presence of Powers alien to the zone. For that reason, I want to reaffirm my country's readiness to co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in its work, with a view to studying the proposals for the implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean and the convening of a conference on this matter in order that the objectives laid down in the Declaration may become a reality.

(Mr. Lobo, Mozambique)

Disarmament is a fundamental necessity if co-operation between the States is to take place in an atmosphere of peace and security.

We earnestly wish that in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, the two super-Powers will record decisive results for strategic arms limitation.

We equally should like to salute the European peoples for their success with the disarmament policy they have adopted in that great continent. However, we believe this process should not be limited to only one part of the world, but must be applied as a universal rule in international relations.

I want to reaffirm our total support for the convening of an extraordinary session of the General Assembly on the question of disarmament as an important stage towards the realization of a world conference on disarmament.

Mr. KUNDU (India): I am glad to have this opportunity to present India's point of view on disarmament, an important topic of the world today, and to say that while presenting the point of view on disarmament, the mandate and the wishes of the people of my country, who have projected the new spirit of India in the last silent and peaceful revolution in the general elections of March 1977, are committed to a better new world order through peace, friendship and international co-operation. In all humility, I would like to submit that the new spirit of India urges and beckons us to achieve real and substantial peace in the world so that long-suffering humanity can live with hope and confidence to work and build a brave new world, and bury the terrible fear of a holocaust of a global nuclear war which haunts mankind like a nightmare. I come from the land of Mahatma Gandhi and the poet Tagore who, by their words and deeds, have repeatedly warned against the use of destructive weapons to assert the irrational might of the strong against the weak which, again, is the negation of building a happier and harmonious international brotherhood. Today, we are sitting on a keg of dry powder. Though the world has made many advances since drafting of the Charter of the United Nations, it is tragic that the arsenals of destructive weapons have been piling up. The time has come when we must think deeply about the irrational incongruity and paradox

(Mr. Kundu, India)

between the apparently peaceful world which we think we have today and, in a real sense, a disturbing world promising an illusory peace with the stockpiling of large nuclear weapons. The new culture and civilization should be a grand edifice firmly founded on moral and spiritual values, a system and way of life which frees man from the thralldom of the growing anxiety of hunger and war. Gandhiji taught us to be fearless and to strengthen the inner will to fight against the demon of fear.

The paradox through which we are passing in today's world is that, on the one hand, we speak of a world without war, a world of warm, living peace, and, on the other, nuclear stockpiles are accumulating. I feel that this is largely the outcome of fear and distrust of one another among nation States. This is indeed a contradictory and unfortunate development. My respectful submission to the members of the Committee is that they ought to give a new look to the problem and to have a sincere heart-searching so that we can take a firm decision on the problems of disarmament without fear and distrust of one another.

In all humility and with all earnestness, I cannot resist saying that when the annual per capita income of many developing countries is less than \$100 the colossal moneys spent on the armament race is indeed frightening. The Charter of the United Nations should be respected both in letter and, more importantly, in spirit, so that a substantial amount can be diverted from the expenditure on armaments to the development of poorer developing countries. By doing this we will have not an illusory peace, but a meaningful and real peace which will pave the way to a new international economic order which we are determined to establish.

This annual debate on disarmament is a well-established occasion to hear and exchange views with other delegations, particularly those who do not happen to be members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD). We have found these exchanges thought-provoking, stimulating and of great value in our common search for solutions to seemingly unsolvable issues.

The policy of the Government of India on the ever-spiralling arms race, disarmament and related issues has been stated on many occasions in the past.

(Mr. Kundu, India)

I would, at this stage, like to explain the position of my delegation on some of the items before our Committees and to elaborate our basic approach to the problems confronting the international community in this vital field.

The twin dangers facing the world today are the awesome arsenals of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and the enunciation and acceptance of politico-military doctrines which endeavour to establish the indispensability of the existence of such weapons for the maintenance of international peace and security. The development and deployment of increasingly destructive weapons of mass destruction around the world are a grave hazard to the very survival of the inhabitants of our small planet. It is self-evident, and should need no reiteration, that real and lasting peace cannot be achieved so long as nations continue to depend on such weapons for their security. The Government of India has been consistently opposed to the proliferation of such weapons, vertical as well as horizontal. Equally, we cannot and do not accept the thesis underlying the doctrine of strategic deterrence, namely, that nuclear weapons in the possession of the existing nuclear-weapon States are essential to preserve peace.

In recent months, we have heard a great deal about the need for concerted efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. My delegation is in full sympathy with these efforts which, at the same time, would have to safeguard the sovereign right of each State to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. India does not believe in nuclear weapons. My Prime Minister, Mr. Morarji Desai, has declared in unequivocal terms that India will not make nuclear weapons. There is, however, one significant fact that we should not forget. The number of nuclear-weapon States has remained constant since 1964. On the other hand, as pointed out by the Secretary-General, the number of nuclear weapons in the stockpiles of nuclear-weapon States has increased fivefold during the past eight years. Thus, in spite of all the talk about preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons, such proliferation continues at an alarming pace.

(Mr. Kundu, India)

Nuclear weapons are an evil. As the Minister for External Affairs of India said in the plenary meeting on 4 October:

"We believe that nuclear weapons are dangerous whether they are in the possession of one country, some countries or many countries. We are not only against the proliferation of nuclear weapons, we are against nuclear weapons themselves." (A/32/PV.18, p. 91)

Such is the power of international mass media that the world seems to regard nuclear weapons as a necessary, albeit evil, condition for preserving peace. Any attempt to see some good in these inhuman weapons through the so-called doctrine of strategic deterrence or the insane notion of MAD, that is, Mutually Assured Destruction, would be suicidal. We are told that nuclear weapons are necessary to deter war and that it is only the assurance of their use that constitutes the core of deterrence. We do not accept this thesis. It is a historical fact that nuclear weapons were used in the past on grounds of military necessity. There can be no guarantee that they will not be used again on similar grounds in future. Only the total dismantling of the entire armoury of all the nuclear weapons can guarantee peace in the world. If the world has enjoyed comparative peace during the past 32 years, it is not because of nuclear weapons.

My delegation has listened with great interest to the statements made by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States. Their statements have led us to hope that an agreement on the limitation and a small reduction in the number of so-called strategic delivery vehicles could be achieved in a few months. We would welcome such a development. At the same time, I must make it clear that the demarcation between tactical and strategic systems only serves to confuse the issue and conceal the underlying dangers. The agreement would be meaningful only if it is seen as a first and firm step in the direction of the eventual elimination of all nuclear weapons.

The question of a comprehensive nuclear-weapon-test ban has been in the forefront of our agenda for well over two decades. The initiative to bring about a total prohibition of all nuclear-weapons tests was taken by India 23 years ago. Hopes for a comprehensive weapon-test ban aroused by the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963 unfortunately have not been realized to date. Indeed, more nuclear-weapon tests have been conducted after the partial test ban Treaty than prior to it. We

(Mr. Kundu, India)

hope and trust that the current negotiations among the United States, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Great Britain would result in an agreement which could then be taken up in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament with a view to negotiating a generally acceptable treaty on a comprehensive test ban. Experts from my country have actively contributed to the work of the Ad Hoc group of seismological experts in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. India is of the opinion that a comprehensive weapon-test-ban treaty, in order to be truly effective, should have universal adherence, in particular by all the nuclear-weapon States. Any provision whereby one or more nuclear-weapon States would be permitted to exclude itself from the obligations of the treaty would detract from the comprehensive nature of the treaty and, to that extent, make it less effective.

While my delegation is firmly in favour of measures to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons, vertical as well as horizontal, we are equally firmly in favour of the utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. My delegation cannot and will not be a party to any measure which would be discriminatory in its application and which would deny the developing countries access to peaceful nuclear technology. This technology is not merely a technology of the future, it is very much a technology of the present. The need for additional sources of energy will have to be met in a large part by the splitting of the atom, whether we like it or not. It would, consequently, be imperative for most of us to develop our own peaceful nuclear energy programmes, preferably in co-operation with one another, but unaided if necessary. My delegation cannot accept the notion that some countries are more responsible than others. We cannot accept apartheid in the nuclear field.

The question of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of chemical weapons and their destruction has been the subject of our deliberations for several years. In spite of persistent calls by the General Assembly, agreement has still not been reached on this issue. My delegation continues to believe that there should be a comprehensive ban on the development and production of all chemical weapons. We are willing to consider proposals for partial measures on

(Mr. Kundu, India)

the strict understanding that they would be followed within a stipulated period of time by a comprehensive ban on all chemical weapons. We are aware of the complexities involved. However, we are convinced that given the necessary political will, it should be possible to find generally satisfactory answers to all the issues.

Similarly, my delegation has supported in the past and will continue to support in future all the initiatives aimed at preventing the development and production of new weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. My delegation finds the amended draft on the subject presented by the Soviet delegation in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament earlier this year worthy of our support.

I have so far dealt with nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction because my delegation attaches the very highest priority to nuclear disarmament. Nuclear disarmament must be tackled separately, and first. This does not mean that disarmament in the field of conventional weapons is not important or essential. None the less, we believe that the question of conventional weapons must take a comparatively low priority. Apart from the fact that conventional weapons do not threaten the total annihilation of mankind, they are the only weapons available to the developing countries to defend their hard-won freedom and independence. The struggle of national emancipation, as in southern Africa, also has to rely on conventional weapons. There the question assumes particular significance in view of the nuclear-weapon ambitions of the racist régime in Pretoria. Thus, nuclear and conventional weapons cannot be weighed in the same scales. My delegation will view with concern and misgiving any proposal which would, intentionally or otherwise, detract from the overridingly crucial question of nuclear disarmament.

In a few months from now the United Nations General Assembly will meet in a special session to study in depth the various problems relating to the field of disarmament. My delegation, together with other non-aligned countries, is taking an active part in the work of the Preparatory Committee so as to ensure that the special session would lead to meaningful and early measures on disarmament. My delegation feels that the present session of the General Assembly should devote

(Mr. Kundu, India)

its attention to the major issues such as nuclear disarmament, a comprehensive ban on weapon-testing, chemical weapons, prohibition of the development of new weapons of mass destruction. This session should not get involved in comparatively peripheral issues such as conventional measures or regional arms limitation measures which could best be left for the special session to consider in detail. The special session would also give thought to ways and means of strengthening the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and to the need to improve the machinery of disarmament and negotiations. My delegation would give careful consideration to all suggestions that might be made in this regard and will offer its comments to them at the appropriate time. I would only say at this stage that we are in favour of bringing in France and China in the negotiating process at the earliest possible date.

(Mr. Kundu, India)

We are now nearing the end of the eighth year of the Disarmament Decade. Similarly, the Second Development Decade will also be coming to a close in two years. It is a lamentable fact that so far achievements in both these fields have been negligible during the decade. My delegation for one is not particularly enthusiastic about the agreements concluded so far in the field of disarmament for the simple reason that, with the exception of the Convention on biological (bacteriological) weapons, they have not led to any disarmament. The various non-armament or so-called confidence-building measures, which India has supported, are no substitute for concrete and urgent steps towards general and complete disarmament, which, let us not forget, is what we all are supposed to be discussing here. My delegation would be happy to discuss with other delegations the recommendations that should be made to the General Assembly in this regard..

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): I am pleased to join my many other colleagues in confirming how fortunate we are in having Mr. Boaten as Chairman of this prestigious Committee, a fellow African hailing from Ghana, a country with which Liberia has close and historical ties. We feel fully assured that with his diplomatic skill and dedication he will guide us through this important session with credit. I wish also to assure him of my delegation's fullest co-operation. I would also add my congratulations to the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur on their election. Last but not least, I sincerely wish very highly to commend the Secretariat for its untiring devotion and the efficiency with which it continues to perform its irksome responsibilities.

The Liberian delegation at the thirty-first regular session of the General Assembly joined in the general dissatisfaction with the old United Nations procedures in the field of disarmament. Today we are heartened by the new beginnings of 1977 and we believe that this will be our year of opportunity with a new look at the whole field of disarmament.

It is an opportunity which, in the opinion of the Liberian delegation, comes once in the lifetime of this Organization. It is an opportunity for

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

this Committee, the world's primary workshop in this field, which is disgruntled with its meagre results, to explore new initiatives for reversing the arms race which has gone beyond its control and, indeed, beyond the control of all nations and statesmen today.

I refer to the development generated especially in the past few months between the two major military Powers in their efforts to deal with their arms negotiations. There is a new development here. What seems to us to be new is first to move beyond concrete weapon categories and to lift their eyes in the direction of long-range goals; secondly, to move positively in an attempt to shorten the time factor in the attainment of these goals; thirdly, to shift the emphasis from bickering disagreements to a climate of agreement and to acts of accommodation; and, fourthly, as an earnest of their good intentions the Presidents of the United States and the Soviet Union have seemingly bypassed the experts and the lawyers and moved to the fore in major pronouncements at the highest summit - pronouncements which, in our opinion, augur well for a turning-point from talk to what we may hope is a new period of activism.

Only a few days ago the world experienced one example of this spirit of accommodation when President Brezhnev announced an important concession in the negotiations to halt nuclear tests for peaceful purposes. It was immediately hailed by United States Secretary of State Vance as a major step forward towards achieving a comprehensive test ban, one of the major items on our agenda.

In the general debate of the General Assembly President Carter devoted the major part of his statement on 4 October to the disarmament issue.

In those presidential initiatives and in similar statements by other statesmen, we see perhaps a determination to make disarmament the primary issue on the international agenda.

I mentioned the tendency to talks in terms of ultimate goals. In his letter of 28 September to the Secretary-General of the United Nations the Soviet Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Andrei Gromyko, said that the Soviet Union is prepared to negotiate on the most radical measures, "going so far as general and complete disarmament".

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

After many heart-breaking years of frustration and disappointment, we cannot be too sanguine. However, in the light of Secretary of State Vance's statement yesterday, it now appears that the stalemate on the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) may be breaking and that the quantitative snag may soon be resolved.

In this connexion we recall in President Carter's statement at the United Nations that the United States is prepared to reduce the number of its missiles by 10, or 20, or even 50 per cent and from then on to work for further reductions "to a world truly free of nuclear weapons". That recalls a statement in which the Soviet Union was prepared to undertake gradual cuts in its defence budgets.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

In both Brezhnev's and Carter's various statements recently, we find matching homage to the non-use of force. We find intimations of a possible accord in a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

All these are fresh winds blowing in the right direction. But here again we must not be too sanguine after so many years of so much talk and so few results. However, it is sufficient to note that in some ways they are beginning to talk the same language. That is why my delegation feels that this is the year of our opportunity.

General and complete disarmament, once the main goal, has for too long been the foot-note of our deliberations, a far-away goal and something that we may not realistically expect in our lifetime. Some Governments, we are informed, are even making long-term defence plans that will take us beyond the eighties. Prophets and projectors of that time-schedule are only confirming their lack of confidence in what they would have us believe is around the corner.

The response of an impatient world is to have bans - "ban nuclear tests", "ban chemical warfare", and so on - until it is discovered that bans too cannot keep up with the prolific birth of new weapons of destruction.

At this stage of frustration we have no alternative, of course, but to continue to work for piecemeal bans. For Liberia, the ban is another form of total disarmament, and our position is that the only ban worth working for, the only ban that will perform its mission, is a total ban, a master-ban. All else will prove fatal compromise.

Referring to some aspect of this frustration, the representative of Japan - not without some surprise to some of us - also underlined the limitations of existing disarmament treaties, stating that they were not entirely satisfactory

"... particularly when we realize the urgency of the measures that are required for the attainment of complete and general disarmament".

(A/C.1/32/PV.14, p. 32)

The representative of the Netherlands, anxiously preoccupied with the need to press for the non-proliferation of nuclear material, has also come to the conclusion that, in the long run, this proliferation cannot be stopped if the present nuclear-weapon States do not enter into real nuclear disarmament. It is not difficult to guess what he means by the word "real".

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

Those are but two examples. The Committee has listened to many speeches here in the general debate, and many responses to the Secretary-General on the special session, reflecting a growing trend to move on to the final goal of all arms issues before us.

Liberia is already generally and completely disarmed. So are over 100 other nations, barring a few regiments here and there. If total disarmament could be obtained by majority vote the world would even today be a world without arms.

There are a number of important items on our agenda which need urgent support, and we shall vote for them as appropriate. Now is not the time for the proverbial Dutch boy to remove his finger from the wall under the tidal waves of advancing weaponry.

At the same time, my delegation wishes to stress the growing feeling that we shall not disenthral ourselves from the mounting arms burden item by item or weapon by weapon; that the preposterous paradox which has brought mankind to this unprecedented height in the possession of arms, at this historic moment of time when it is attaining new high peaks in the peace objective, is a Gordian knot that must be cut. We might add that, like Alexander's knot, there is no longer time to untie it strand by strand. It must be cut with the sword of peace, or there will be no peace.

There is much new thinking which is moving slowly but at a quickening pace to the formulation of philosophical proportions. If that does not yet emerge with absolute clarity, it is because we are accustomed to seeing philosophy as the product of the intense application of the human intellect, whereas here the philosophy is growing under the impact of compelling events and imposing itself with a force of its own on the new thoughts that we hear expressed, sometimes only parenthetically, in this debate - as, indeed, we had already heard during the session last year.

I am not alone. It was the Yugoslav representative who said that "... conditions are becoming ripe for setting into motion ... the process of disarmament". (A/C.1/PV.13, pp. 53-55)

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

The enormous diversion of \$350 to \$400 billion to national defence is now no longer disputed as an unbearably crushing tax on the world economy.

Nor is it more than a half truth to say that the negative impact is only on the developing nations. That came about only as a striking illustration of how such vast, wasted sums could be used for a better cause. The whole truth is that the impact of such expenditures has fallen with equal maiming force on the affluent nations as well, in the decline of their economies, in their continuing recession and in the bewildering confusion of their social security and welfare systems.

The tragic toll which defence extravagance is taking on the world's millions of hungry, diseased, illiterate and underfed millions needs no elaboration. Studies will be made to prove what is transparent and obvious. When the statistics of this universal misery emerges, we shall see that the war weapons we now forge need no war in order to take human life. They are already doing it in peace - if hunger and poverty can be called peace.

The great industrial Powers are also the great military Powers. They have allocated vast sums for their defence budgets, hoping they can bear the burden. But for the majority of the nations there can be no development without disarmament. If, as is said, that remains to be proved, we can only reply that the rich Powers' contentions are likewise pressed with no water-tight science.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

The special session on disarmament scheduled for next year is now the new hope. We share the hope. We believe its greatest opportunity is to open new horizons and to widen old ones. As technology now accelerates, we cannot settle down to a permanent race between the proliferation of new weapons and the ad hoc procedures we frantically improvise to stop them. In such a race, the weapons, always enjoying the advantage of a head-start, cannot lose. We must stop the race at its origins, perhaps move the scientists from their drawing boards.

It is noted that the new weapons are crossing over to areas not covered by agreements, and even to areas so covered but being progressively rendered obsolete. The new weapons open a new field for our thinking, a new Pandora's box, the contents of which we will always remain ignorant. Should we deal with each weapon as it emerges or shall we destroy Pandora's box itself?

Another pertinent question facing the special session might be the extent to which the whole galloping disease - and it is a disease - of the armaments virus is now running out of the control of man if, as the representative of Sweden, for whom we have the greatest esteem, has called to our attention, "At least 40 per cent of the most qualified scientific and technological manpower devote their skills and energy to bringing the military machine to further perfection".

The new weapons are also undermining our original concepts of so-called deterrence, more brutally defined as the balance of terror, as, indeed, they have already done in the area of nuclear missiles, and threaten to do in the hard-earned agreements on the demilitarization of outer space. The special session should therefore launch an examination of the extent to which non-military technology is entering the arms field.

A greater study in depth is needed in establishing the relation of disarmament to development, the latter itself moving in a new evolutionary process in the new international economic order. In this connexion, my delegation wishes to pay a tribute to the Nordic countries which are bringing this issue for a study in the special session. If, in the 1970s, we have, almost subconsciously, related the decade of development to a decade

of disarmament, simple logic should couple the new international economic order with what I suggest might be the concept of a new international disarmament order.

Last year, in this Committee, reflecting the views of our President, Mr. William R. Tolbert, Jr., of Liberia, I presented as a kind of prologue to a new order in disarmament, concepts in the form of what I called the need for a new philosophy on disarmament. The word "philosophy" may sound somewhat inflated in application to arms which were merely something one gets rid of if necessary. Arms were things to be used for a given purpose - and there was nothing or little to philosophize about.

Today, however, we are faced with a new and fast-moving world. The issue of peace itself is no longer merely the absence of war but is associated with the totality of new life in a new world. Two total wars have evoked the concept of total peace and the indivisibility of peace not only in itself but as an indispensable component of everyday life. And so, our half-measures failing, total disarmament must follow undiminished by an iota.

If we cannot agree on causality we will find ourselves worshipping corollaries painfully detached from an agreed axiom. Thus some hold that in the absence of effective measures to disarm, agreed political accords will begin to deteriorate. This may be true; others would hold that until tensions are resolved, meaningful military agreements are remote. In this area of thinking, we even have a number of nations which hold that should political peace come at last, it can be safeguarded only by a full array of military arsenals.

One can turn to recent history - not so long ago - when the opposite view was fashionable, that excessive "preparedness", as it was then called, must inevitably lead to war and conflict.

Why is it that in these 50 years, which more than in any other period saw two world wars and two mangled peace arrangements, this cause-and-effect equation still remains unresolved? Perhaps it is because no concept of the relation of weapons to modern society was ever evolved. There is now a

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

considerable index to the philosophy of peace, but none to the philosophy of an institutionalized arms edifice, which is inevitably related to any peace idea.

We have too frequently moved from slogans, unexplained, undefined and unelaborated. Political détente for years has suffered from being misunderstood. Our point is that a military détente will also be fated to fumbling and stumbling if pursued with lack of coherent formulation.

All through our debate we encounter repeated expressions of amazement at the yawning gap between the high intelligence of man and the abysmal condition in which he is losing the battle against his own destruction. In these expressions of dismay, we see obviously working with a lack of self-confidence, lost between the dilemma, that the best is often the enemy of the good and that, on the other hand, the good is not good enough. Such uncertainty usually connotes the absence of a plan - one with an elongated agenda but no integrated plan; and an abundance of disarmament items, but no concept of a world without arms.

If we examine our agenda items closely we will find that there progress is measurable in terms of years. In the disarmament field time itself seems to have been absorbed by the endless worship of hopeful expectations. But seemingly time is not on the side of those who indulge in it extravagantly. Let me illustrate. The concept of verification is the biggest leak in our clock. And who will dispense with this now universally-accepted condition of a number of our major agenda issues - in chemical warfare, in the total test-ban and in many items to come in conventional weapons? Verification as a disarmament condition has been an open issue from the days of the Baruch atomic plan in 1947-1948 to the present day. It has wrecked the first attempt to prevent the atomic arming of nations and brought the world to the present brink on which we are now so perilously perched. It has delayed by years the total test-ban, and as we read big-Power statements on concrete agenda items we can see its cancelling role in the years ahead. The best of agreements will always stop short of the verification point.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

Certainly Liberia has no solution to this problem. Perhaps there is no solution. Perhaps the best we can do is to come to the realization that verification is just a synonym of non-disarmament. Perhaps in this one word we are told that partial disarmament - even though policed by verification and even if it becomes acceptable - must remain an illusion. If we cannot divest ourselves of the concept of verification - and it appears we cannot - then the only kind of real disarmament we can aspire to would be "total and general disarmament" where verification would cease to be basic.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

The whole sector of arms is in the field of speculation, groping and improvisations. There is no science of disarmament, none to give us positive guidance. We are all here on an exploring expedition in a dark forest with few paths to guide our steps. Nations live in fear and are groping for security. The big Powers live with big fears, the small ones with their own mini-fears.

In this condition, statesmen seek to allay fears with policies and pronouncements suitable to their national interests but untested and untried and faltering on the international testing ground. When put to the test of acceptance and implementation they frequently collapse.

Here at the United Nations we have tried, through this era of shattered hopes, for 32 years now. It is appalling to admit defeat. Perhaps our hesitation to face the final truth was inspired by a natural fear of hurting the United Nations. But when our efforts to lessen the burden of armaments have ended in a run-away increase, when, as in medicine, a prescription to reduce fever has served only to increase it, then we have indeed come to the end of the old road.

In our statement in this Committee at the last session, we sought to bring this point to the fore. We called for a new compass, for a reassessment, for a complete reappraisal of our past method of work. We call it a philosophy of disarmament. We are banking on the special session to provide the more favourable climate in which such a broad re-examination might be made.

In the meantime, as it has been suggested that Governments come here with some new ideas and some new thoughts, we should be ready to plot a new course. Preceding this, debris must be cleared away - debris in sophisms, speculations and hypotheses. In this initial attempt I wish to assure Committee members that no criticism is directed to anyone. My own delegation claims no immunity from the same criticism.

Our latest emphasis is to reiterate stoutly that the first priority in our disarmament programme must be in the field of nuclear weapons. There is fear that the continued proliferation of atomic weapons will multiply the chances of their use, that they may get into the wrong hands. That danger is, of course, always there. For our part, we believe all weapons of such massive destruction are in the wrong hands; any hands are the wrong hands. Only the other day the Soviet

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

Union and the United Kingdom signed an accord, on a kind of hot line, that would reduce the chances of accidental nuclear warfare between them, for which the world community should go on record as congratulating the two countries.

But as a matter of fact, are the nuclear bombs our greatest threat - bombs not a single one of which has been used in war since Hiroshima and Nagasaki? In the same period, hundreds of thousands of lives have been lost in any number of wars, all fought with so-called conventional weapons. Right on our African continent thousands of men are now dying in a war in which weapons of secondary priority are being used. To those dead and their bereaved it makes little difference by what priority precious lives were lost and bitter tears shed.

To sum up, let us not get lost in the procedure of priorities, lest they become one more obstacle in the years of our protraction. Today it is the nuclear weapons that are flexing their big muscles. Tomorrow it may be a non-nuclear weapon that is just as frightening and just as destructive.

In any event, we may be sure that nuclear priorities will not bring the disarmament the world needs. They will bring only a different style of new arms race.

Let us lance another fallacy. The vast arming of the big Powers stems from the fact that, as they are adversaries, there is always the possibility of a war between them. Once accepted as a truism, today the race between them is regarded as a war threat. Therefore the reverse might be true. If war is possible between them it could best be avoided by abolishing the weapons with which to fight it. It was Ambassador Troyanovsky who said in this Committee that the policy of brinkmanship had become bankrupt. This is only one more statement made in the growing conviction that the balance of terror has lost its balance, perhaps unhinged by the new strategic missiles. It is one more statement reflecting the search, almost subconsciously or in fragmentary thoughts, that a turning-point is developing in the whole area of arms and armaments.

Much is also said about the will to disarm as a factor of the problem. The presumption is that if only some big military Powers would just want to disarm they could do so. It all sounds like nineteenth century metaphysics, when philosophers were probing the will of man against his destiny. It carries an implication of some kind of villainy. There are no villains in our midst, only Governments which are the victims of a life style - if we may call it that - in which

arms and armaments have been accepted for centuries - almost the natural aspect of international survival. I think it was President Brezhnev who recently said that we are sliding towards a nuclear holocaust "as if by inertia".

Thus not will but inertia has us in its grip, and all our efforts operating within this law are affected by the same inertia. There must be a new road. That new road is the highway to complete and general disarmament. To our sorrow, there is no other kind. As in cancer - and the arms growth has become a galloping cancer - shrink it, cut it, or irradiate it, but leave only one or two cells and a new proliferation process begins.

In the desperate efforts to stave off a war brought about by sheer spontaneous combustion the Soviet Union has proposed a treaty on the non-use of force, and there is a growing concept of this in Washington also, we understand. But as long as arms remained piled high, an ultimate agreement on this will be encouraging.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

In the whole concept of armed nations as they are related to national defence and national security, we shall never embark on a viable armaments programme without a scrutinizing look at both. This correlation is particularly true at a time when a vital aspect of disarmament lies in the trade and transfer of armaments from one nation to another.

The Secretary-General in his Annual Report and many Ministers who spoke in the general debate have focused our attention on this problem, especially as it affects the proliferation of conventional armaments.

Here is a field studded with outmoded assumptions and paradoxes that need examination. Nations at one time brought arms to protect their national sovereignty. But in the big Power struggle for regional influence, sales are now often made with conditions which, in effect, constitute a surrender of a big portion of that sovereignty. Today we have no measuring rod by which to determine - under the Charter - how much of its independent personality a purchasing State loses in the transaction.

The massive transfer of arms to a State may not be the business of the United Nations. At the same time, many members have declared their intention to demand, at the special session, greater regulating jurisdiction for the world Organization.

If we are serious about halting or containing the weed-like growth of arms merchandising, we must eventually have some sort of accounting along the lines we now demand for the transfer of uranium and plutonium from one State to another. This is no mere analogy.

To further emphasize the preceding thought, let me say that in the opinion of my delegation, we are doomed to endless talk and abstractions unless we either ban all arms completely or contain the market for their proliferation. In the field of conventional weapons we at present have neither. Without such control, certain States can now fight their wars with other States by proxy - or by sordid and subversive subcontracting. The United Nations cannot tolerate such random traffic and at the same time command the credibility of those striving for international peace and security.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

At one time small as well as big nations armed themselves against a potential enemy across the border. Barring existing alliances, what States can now name their potential enemy, an enemy that is not already under international surveillance? Seemingly some States seek military establishments as a matter of status.

As to foreign danger, a State which will arm for no other reason than that it is part of the tradition of a State to do so, will soon have an enemy on its border.

Generally, in spite of all the alarums and turmoils, by past comparison the world enjoys a reasonable measure of peace and a reasonable international wherewithal to bring a fire under control. And yet shiploads of arms are plowing the oceans and nations which once armed for war, are now astonishingly arming for peace.

On this then, I would add one amendment. As it happens, we in Africa do have an enemy - South Africa - which does have an atomic bomb and openly offered to demonstrate its power in the Kalahari Desert. We in Africa are not intimidated or really frightened. If Mr. Vorster will take a lesson from the formidable empires we Africans have defeated, he will learn that Africans have their own way of defeating their enemies, and they do not need atomic bombs. However, since encouragingly both of the major Powers have expressed some concern about Mr. Vorster's threat, we have a suggestion: let the two super-Powers jointly issue before the whole world a statement to South Africa saying that if it is disposed to use atomic weapons either in the form of missiles or ground weapons against non-atomic nations in Africa - and all African States are non-atomic - then Pretoria must be prepared for retaliatory action by them in particular and by the world community as a whole.

Let us also explain here and now, that we are not asking for such a guarantee, we are too jealous of our very recent independence on the continent of Africa to place ourselves under such obligations, but any positive action on the part of the two super-Powers would certainly be a deterrent to the possibility of bringing nuclear war to our continent, a deterrent which would also serve the best interest of the two super-Powers, and ensure the very survival of mankind everywhere.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

In our search for solutions we are prone to grasp at the straws of procedure when the substance eludes us.

We take the view that perhaps there should be a change in the working of this Committee, or some change in the composition and procedures of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), or more power to the General Assembly or to the United Nations itself. In our preoccupations with arrangements we must never lose sight of the decision-making factors which determine the outcome of any procedure in any organ. In this issue the balance of decision and implementation is, by the very nature of things, with the mighty military Powers. In CCD we have the familiar division - in disarmament as in almost everything else - between the haves and the have-nots, and the haves make the decisions without firing a shot.

A change of bed will not solve the problem of a badly diagnosed patient. This Committee is a committee of the whole. It is the Assembly and the United Nations itself. The panacea, if there is one, is not in procedure but in the political basis of our objectives. If these are clear enough we shall attain them.

In conclusion, with the special session on disarmament in the offing, we shall not endeavour to elaborate our doctrine here. We shall state it there, where other delegations will come forth with a rich harvest of ideas.

We shall elaborate our philosophy in terms of the nature of man and his weapons. We shall seek to develop a system of relativity, of the integration of disarmament, no genuine disarmament except fully, totally and finally - in other words complete and general disarmament.

Liberia does not speak for the whole of Africa. We claim no seniority by virtue of the fact that we are one of the first three African independent States and also a founder of the United Nations. But Africa is now at the crossroads; we are threatened. Our attempt to make Africa a nuclear-free zone has been challenged. We are no longer 49 States, but a collectivity united in our determination to make Africa a zone of peace. Therefore the whole disarmament issue is also Africa's business. We shall make our intellectual contribution. Our voice will be heard - and we hope it will be respected.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

Finally I would add the following: the United Nations must remain the most valuable instrument for the promotion and safeguarding of international peace and security. Let us therefore resolve to give the special session on disarmament in 1978 - into which a great deal of effort and work have been put by the members of the Preparatory Committee so ably presided over by Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, and of which Liberia is a member - a headstart by way of a positive and sincere commitment by the nuclear-weapon States in particular, and the international community in general, and by agreeing to make the results a major contribution to improving international relations and establishing new avenues of peaceful negotiation that will restore confidence, reduce world tension and above all ensure real peace and security in our one world.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to announce that Angola and Chad have become co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.10.

Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): In this my first intervention in the current debate, allow me to associate my delegation with previous speakers in expressing to Ambassador Boaten our warm felicitations on his well-deserved election to the chairmanship of this important Committee. Indeed, we consider his unanimous election as a tribute not only to his country, Ghana, but equally to Africa. His diplomatic skill, wisdom and impartiality, we have no doubt, are guarantees for the successful conclusion of the Committee's work. I should like also to extend our warm congratulations to the two Vice-Chairmen, your good self and Ambassador Pastinen of Finland, as well as to Mr. Correa of Mexico, our Rapporteur. You can rest assured of my delegation's unreserved co-operation in the discharge of your heavy responsibilities.

Turning now to the disarmament items under discussion, my delegation regrets to register its concern over the fact that no progress worthy of mention has been achieved since the last General Assembly considered the group of items that are now before the Committee. World peace and security is still poised on a precarious balance of terror. The arms race, both quantitatively and qualitatively, continues unabated. Vertical and horizontal nuclear proliferation has yet to be halted. The development of new types of weapons is still being pursued feverishly. Military expenditure is said now to be over the staggering figure of \$350 billion. Moreover, since the last session, a number of underground and atmospheric nuclear tests have been conducted. It is unfortunate, indeed extremely disturbing, that despite the untiring efforts of the United Nations, our goal of general and complete disarmament is drawing further away with the passage of time. As the Secretary-General points out in his report on the work of the Organization:

"...the United Nations cannot hope to function effectively on the basis of the Charter unless there is major progress in the field of disarmament. Without such progress world order based on collective responsibility and international confidence cannot come into being. The question of disarmament lies at the heart of the problem of international order, for,

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

in an environment dominated by the 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."

The Secretary-General goes on to say:

"It is now becoming increasingly clear that such an approach is wholly inadequate to stem the tide of an innovating arms race, where technological ingenuity tends constantly to outstrip the pace of negotiations. ... If we continue to try only to regulate or temporize with the arms race, treating the symptoms rather than the underlying causes, we run an increasing risk of temporizing ourselves into oblivion." (A/32/1, p. 12)

Now, therefore, is the time. if it is not too late already, to evolve a more realistic, bold and comprehensive approach to stop the arms race and to make a determined effort to achieve nuclear disarmament. I believe it is equally time for all of us to rededicate ourselves and to redouble our efforts to halt and reverse the arms race before it becomes irreversible. Towards that end, we should immediately enter into an agreement banning nuclear and thermonuclear weapon testing; refrain from refining and producing nuclear weapons and their delivery systems; and reduce and eventually destroy existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons as well as their delivery systems. In this connexion, my delegation is encouraged by the statements of the Soviet Union and the United States, both in the plenary Assembly and in this Committee, outlining the efforts made so far in the bilateral and trilateral negotiations currently in progress. We are hopeful that these talks, which have generated such expectations from all quarters, will soon be crowned with success.

The thirty-first session of the General Assembly, in its resolution 31/66, urged the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) to continue to give the highest priority to the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban agreement and to report on the progress achieved. Need I dwell on the fact that the CCD, far from reporting progress, has so far not even been able to begin negotiations for a comprehensive test ban. I stated last year:

"Unless we manage to prevent vertical proliferations, I am afraid our effort to prevent horizontal proliferation will be doomed."

(A/C.1/31/PV.39, p. 22)

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

My delegation still maintains this view. Conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban Treaty not only would strengthen the non-proliferation régime, but also would be a first step towards nuclear disarmament. We refuse to believe that the much talked-about differences regarding verification, the regulation of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, and the non-participation of the two nuclear Powers are insurmountable difficulties on the way towards a comprehensive test-ban Treaty. We ardently hope that the trilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States will find a realistic solution to all the obstacles that have so far made the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban elusive. In this connexion, my delegation welcomes the announcement by the leader of the Soviet Union, Leonid I. Brezhnev, of 2 November 1977, when he said:

"We state that we are prepared to reach agreement on a moratorium covering nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, along with a ban on all nuclear-weapons tests for a definite period. We trust that this important step on the part of the USSR is properly appreciated by our partners at the negotiations and that the road will thus be cleared to concluding a treaty long awaited by the people."

We believe that that declaration contributes positively to the efforts currently under way in the trilateral talks. We look forward to having a draft comprehensive test-ban agreement submitted soon to the CCD for the necessary multilateral negotiation and its subsequent submission to the General Assembly for approval - we hope during the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The Ethiopian delegation appeals once again in this connexion to the two nuclear Powers to join the current trilateral negotiation and become party to a comprehensive test-ban Treaty which we hope will be ready before the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

The question of banning chemical weapons is an equally urgent matter that should be tackled without further delay. At the thirty-first session, my delegation stressed the great risk that is involved in any further procrastination in banning chemical weapons. We had hoped that the CCD would make considerable progress towards achieving a comprehensive agreement prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their destruction. Although our wish did not materialize, we are, nevertheless, encouraged by the fact that the two major Powers have finally decided to shoulder their responsibilities. The current negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States should be encouraged and we hope that their initiative will result in removing the crucial problems of verification and identification, thus paving the way for the CCD to conduct the intricate multilateral negotiations involved and to submit an agreed text to the eighth special session.

In 1961, the First Conference of the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries recommended to the General Assembly of the United Nations the convening of either a special session of the General Assembly or a world disarmament conference, with a view to setting in motion the process of general disarmament. This recommendation was again reiterated at the second Non-Aligned Conference in 1964. In 1976, the fifth Non-Aligned Conference recommended that pending the convening of a world disarmament conference, a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament be called before the end of 1978. The endorsement, therefore, by the thirty-first session of the United Nations General Assembly of this initiative of the non-aligned countries by its adoption of resolution 31/189 B is truly one of the most important and timely steps the United Nations has taken in its quest for disarmament.

As almost all speakers have stated, my Government also views the special session as a golden opportunity to review and reflect on the urgent disarmament problems and develop a new and comprehensive approach for future negotiations on this extremely complex and difficult problem of our time. My delegation, as a member of the Preparatory Committee, was happy to work under the guidance of

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina. In its three sessions, the Preparatory Committee has done a commendable job. We are confident that its consideration of the more substantive issues at the forthcoming session will meet with equal success.

My Government attaches great importance to the special session and we should like to stress that its success requires the active co-operation of all nations, especially of the nuclear Powers.

In my statement last year, I dwelt on the danger posed by the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. Once again, I should like to reiterate my Government's concern and stress the need to strengthen the non-proliferation Treaty if we are to prevent the ominous consequences of horizontal proliferation.

In this connexion, my delegation is of the view that the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all regions will give impetus to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The international community should, therefore, continue to encourage all regional initiatives to create such zones. In our continent, the African Heads of State and Government, at their Summit Conference in 1964, adopted the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa in which they expressed their readiness to undertake, in an international treaty to be concluded under the auspices of the United Nations, not to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons, and urged the nuclear Powers to respect the Declaration.

Even before the adoption of the 1964 Organization of African Unity Declaration, the question of making Africa a nuclear-weapon-free zone was discussed at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly and a resolution was adopted which called on all States not to carry out nuclear tests in Africa in any form, to refrain from using Africa for storing and transporting nuclear weapons, and to respect the continent as a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

In 1965, the General Assembly endorsed the Organization of African Unity Declaration and has since adopted a number of resolutions urging States to respect the denuclearized status of the continent. Despite this, the racist régime of South Africa is feverishly engaged in the development of nuclear weapons in utter disregard of this wish of the African States. My delegation cannot over-emphasize the gravity of the situation thus created and we appeal most earnestly to all States to prevent South Africa from developing and acquiring this terrifying weapon.

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

For our part, in order to ensure the absence of nuclear weapons from the African continent and thereby enhance the security of our continent, my Government is ready at any time to conclude an agreement making Africa a nuclear-weapon-free zone. I hope others are also ready and willing to co-operate with us in removing permanently the risk of a nuclear arms race in our continent.

A question closely related to nuclear-free zones is the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. Unfortunately, since the General Assembly in 1971 declared the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, progress in the implementation of the Declaration has been slow. We are, however, encouraged by the initiation of talks between the Soviet Union and the United States concerning their military presence in the Indian Ocean. My delegation sincerely hopes that the discussion between the two super-Powers will lead to the attainment of the objectives of the Declaration.

As a number of delegations have stated during the present debate, recent developments in Africa do not portend well. The vicious plan of the South African régime to acquire nuclear weapons, the existence and development of South African military bases in the Indian Ocean and the military co-operation between the apartheid régime and some Powers have rendered the security and peace of our continent extremely hazardous. In the face of these frightening possibilities, the Ethiopian delegation urges all those that have the capability to do so, to desist from helping South Africa in this regard.

My delegation has studied carefully the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in document A/32/29. In endorsing the recommendation contained therein, I should like to express the appreciation of my delegation to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, Mr. Amerasinghe, and the members of the Committee for their untiring efforts. Ethiopia, being a coastal State, attaches great importance to the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. We have, therefore, indicated our interest in serving in the Ad Hoc Committee as members and we hope that this Committee will approve our candidature.

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

The ingenuity of man has forced mankind to live under the shadow of a nuclear holocaust. In the name of peace and security, scientists are engaged in the creation of new weapons to better annihilate man. A case in point is the neutron bomb. While over \$350 billion is expended in perfecting the tools for the annihilation of man, nothing of significance is done to eradicate poverty, hunger and disease. If this trend continues, future generations will not be wrong if they condemn us not only for lacking in good sense but more important for lacking also in concern for the human being.

Let us then, before it is too late, try to change our priorities and become more humane. Let us have the political will and the courage of our convictions to make our planet earth a safer and a saner place in live in. In a little over six months, at the coming special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, we will have an opportunity to demonstrate our good sense and determination to succeed in our quest for a world free from the threat of a nuclear holocaust.

Finally, I would be remiss in my duty if I were to conclude my statement without extending my delegation's profound appreciation to the Secretary-General and his dedicated staff for their contribution in facilitating our work. My delegation has read the report of the Secretary-General and wishes to record its satisfaction at the speedy publication of the first Yearbook on Disarmament which we find most useful and informative.

Mr. JAY (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you, and especially to those representatives whose names are inscribed on the list of speakers for today who have generously made it possible for me to introduce a draft resolution on a subject of critical significance to all Members of the United Nations - the elimination of chemical weapons from the arsenals of all States. Draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.9 has been submitted on behalf of Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Poland, Sweden, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia, and I am delighted to take this opportunity to announce that Bulgaria, Ethiopia and Ireland are to be added to that list. We now commend our draft resolution to the attention of all our colleagues in this Committee.

The composition of the group of sponsors is by itself eloquent testimony to the deep anxieties evoked in all countries by the frightening possibilities implicit in chemical weapons. The international community, through the medium of the General Assembly, long ago reached consensus that a high priority should be accorded to early agreement on effective measures for the complete prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction.

Who can dispute the desirability of achieving such an agreement as soon as possible to supplement the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925?

All of this was widely recognized last year when General Assembly resolution 31/65, introduced by my friend from Poland, Ambassador Wyzner, was adopted without the need for a vote. At this session again many speakers have reiterated their belief in the continuing and urgent need for an early agreement with respect to chemical weapons. Impressed by the nature of this legitimate concern, having examined the work done in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) on the proposals, documents and suggestions submitted in that negotiating forum to meet last year's General Assembly request for action, and being aware that the two parties primarily concerned

(Mr. Jay, Canada)

are engaged in close consultations aiming at the desired objective, the sponsors mentioned above have sought to develop a draft resolution that would take into account recent developments and rally a consensus in support of a call for early elaboration of an agreement on chemical weapons. Everyone in this room knows that negotiation of such a treaty, even with the benefit of the valuable work in the CCD and elsewhere, cannot be accomplished overnight. The subject is immensely complex. Still, we do believe it to be important to exhort the CCD to press on and to undertake the elaboration of a convention and to report on the results of the negotiations to the special session next May. Obviously, the more tangible and conclusive the CCD report can be at that time the more all of us will rejoice.

A number of speakers have indicated a degree of optimism that was not present in our deliberations at this time last year. Certainly, if there is any sound ground for such a feeling at this juncture, we would wish it to be a spring-board for purposeful action and not an excuse for complacency. This is especially true as regards the need for early agreement on a complete prohibition of chemical weapons. That is the essential purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.9, which I have been honoured to introduce on behalf of all the sponsors.

I should like here to pay a special tribute to Ambassador Wyzner for his invaluable contribution in this as in so many other disarmament aspects. We the sponsors of this draft proposal believe that it responds to the interest of all Members of the United Nations, and it is our collective hope that there will be no difficulty in achieving consensus on it. I shall therefore not take up more of the Committee's time to expand on its various paragraphs at this stage.

Princess ASHRAF PAHLAVI (Iran) (interpretation from French): Each year for more than 30 years we have deplored here at the United Nations the multiplication of nuclear and conventional weapons. The system of security which we thought we had developed in 1945 has proved powerless to hold back the flow of the weapons of destruction which threaten to engulf us all; the system itself is in danger of being swept under. The fact that the hopes born in 1945 have been dashed has caused such an erosion of confidence in the institutions entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security that States, large and small, have found themselves obliged to look to their own defence.

The great Powers do not spare their resources in equipping and re-equipping their arsenals. They have taught us that the first requirement for ensuring national survival is to build a strong defence system and to renew it at ever shorter intervals so as to have available the most advanced military equipment. In this kind of business no one can afford to lag behind.

(Princess Ashraf Pahlavi, Iran)

For its part, Iran now remains faithfully committed to the purposes and principles proclaimed by the United Nations Charter and to the goal of general and complete disarmament. At the same time, until a reliable system for the maintenance of international peace and security is instituted, Iran, like other countries, has no choice other than to equip itself with the weapons it considers necessary for the defence of its people, its political independence and territorial integrity. Of course, we would much rather devote all our resources to peaceful objectives. However, as long as there is no assurance of world security we, in keeping with other sovereign States, shall make our own decisions on our defence requirements and we shall continue to reject any interference, from no matter what quarter.

To ensure peace, the world must disarm. To disarm it must have peace. While we are caught in this cruel dilemma, we see a threat looming which makes us fear for the very existence of the human race. Previous generations also found themselves in the same difficulty and, unable to overcome it, were engulfed in two world wars. We are sworn not to repeat that experience, but to bridge the gulf between protestations of faith on the importance of disarmament and the measures we are willing to take to achieve it.

The dangers we face and the sacrifices imposed on us by the arms race are concerns not only of my country; they are dangers and sacrifices common to all members of the Organization. We have common aims and concerns, as shown by the many resolutions of the General Assembly deploring the waste of world resources in the acquisition of arms, instead of being used profitably for development. From its earliest days, the United Nations has recognized the world-wide mutual fear of the dire potential of modern weapons. Over 30 years later, when we are more than half way through the Disarmament Decade, that fear has grown as the number and sophistication of modern weapons have increased. The possible consequences of these uninterrupted refinements in weapons are terrifying.

The contest in sophistication tends in the first place to obliterate the difference between conventional and nuclear warfare. It was thought that this clear distinction would enable States to perceive the danger ahead more clearly and to exercise self-restraint. But once that clear demarcation line is removed, it can be assumed that of necessity all major conflicts in the future will be nuclear.

(Princess Ashraf Pahlavi, Iran)

In the second place, constant refinements in weapons are outstripping the capacity to create control mechanisms which can guarantee compliance with disarmament obligations.

Finally, the system of mutual deterrence, the so-called "balance of terror" upon which we were told we could rely for assurance that nuclear weapons would not be used may be - if it is not so already - a casualty of technological progress. That is the outcome to be the most feared. Fear of strategic disadvantage accounts for the cautious nature of current negotiations. If a technological breakthrough were to enable calculations based on the equation of mutual deterrence to be set at naught, boundless changes in the world would be likely to follow.

It is against that sombre backdrop of growing insecurity and of increasing arms expenditure that we have to review the course of disarmament negotiations since last we met.

The general pattern of disarmament negotiations and the distribution of nuclear weapons in the world are not dissimilar; that is, in the main they are bilateral. Until quite recently, non-nuclear Powers which were neither in NATO nor in the Warsaw Pact had no place at the negotiating table. Some of them take part in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) to which they bring considerable expertise and provide the necessary critical input. My country became a member of the CCD in 1975. We soon learnt that such membership did not mean automatic participation in the negotiations on critical disarmament issues. They remained, as before, a private preserve of the nuclear Powers. Therefore, in the handling of disarmament matters, there is nominal recognition only of the principle of equality of States; in fact two States are more equal than the rest.

Thus despite the fact that in any major nuclear war involving the nuclear Powers all of us would suffer, the vast majority of us are permitted a peripheral role only in this most vital of all the problems that beset us. The frustration which this inequality induces is reinforced by the disparity between words and deeds in the CCD. It is dispiriting to find such a contrast between fine words and deeds in the same body. It is extremely disquieting to find those same brave words followed by a tendency to opposite action. Even

(Princess Ashraf Pahlavi, Iran)

outside the CCD, in connexion with matters on which non-nuclear States can take initiatives, the nuclear Powers occupy a position of special importance. Indeed, they appear to be more intent on restraining the others than on curbing their own appetite for arms, or they try to appease us with arrangements on peripheral matters. Thus we have had the Convention on biological weapons and the Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques. All of those seem aimed at preventing matters from getting worse, yet as these Powers are in technological competition on weapons it makes them worse all the time. They have virtually ignored calls by the General Assembly for a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Since the Security Council has abandoned its responsibility under article 26 of the Charter to plan the regulation of armaments, and since the attempted circumvention of the functions of the General Assembly under article 11 of the Charter, the CCD remains the only body related to the United Nations with a continuing role in the planning of disarmament. Its effective operation depends primarily on the nuclear Powers; its efficient functioning is a test of the will of the nuclear Powers to make progress towards disarmament. They will not meet that test until they make full and open use of the CCD to seek agreement instead of proceeding, as is now the case, outside the orbit of that Committee.

Whether inside or outside the CCD, it is obvious that nuclear disarmament - that is, vertical non-proliferation which was envisaged in the 1968 Treaty - must begin with the nuclear Powers. The cessation of nuclear-weapons tests and the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty must take the highest priority. A measure of hope for progress may be derived from the recent statements by the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union, as well as from the undertakings by three major nuclear States - the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States - to negotiate an agreement. In the CCD itself, a draft treaty submitted by Sweden contains new proposals that may help to overcome some of the more persistent difficulties in the way of concluding a test-ban agreement. Here I should like to remind the General Assembly, however, that the 1974 threshold test-ban Treaty, as well as the 1976 Treaty governing peaceful nuclear explosions, await ratification.

(Princess Ashraf Pahlavi, Iran)

Eventually a test ban must extend to research leading to technological innovations. Concern with that aspect of the matter is already evident in the previous and present Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. In this connexion, I note that the General Assembly has an opportunity to express its views on the subject in the item originally proposed by the Soviet Union at the thirtieth session of the Assembly entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons". The qualitative aspect of armaments has been discussed at some length in the CCD this year. I have indicated earlier the importance my delegation attaches to a full and vigorous effort to deal with this threat.

(Princess Ashraf Pahlavi, Iran)

We note with satisfaction the expressions of confidence by the parties to the SALT talks that they expect in the near future to overcome the difficulties which have stood in the way of concluding a new treaty. We are pleased that they have announced their intentions to continue in the meantime to abide by the 1972 agreement which expired on 5 October this year.

I shall touch only briefly on the vexing question of the prohibition of chemical weapons. There is no achievement to report at this time, but the two super-Powers have increased the pace of their exchanges on this subject and seem to have a positive position in this regard.

The first report of the Preparatory Committee of the special session devoted to disarmament is before us. I should like to pay a tribute to its Chairman, Ambassador Carlos Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina, whose competence, vast experience and negotiating abilities have contributed greatly to the success of the deliberations of the Preparatory Committee on the difficult problems involved.

To ensure that the special session will function smoothly and yield useful results, it is important to agree on rules and procedures that are generally accepted. It is also necessary to have a general understanding on the structure of the objectives that we shall begin to establish at that crucially important special session.

The work completed so far by the Preparatory Committee affords us the assurance that through the continuation of its constructive and methodical efforts the Committee will make it easier for us to succeed in our task. In the three meetings which the Preparatory Committee held, it discussed some important problems and laid down some useful ground rules for its future work. Greatly aided by the Secretariat, it assembled an important body of background information which will be of considerable value for the work of the special session.

I come now to questions which concern us more directly, questions which involve the establishment of zones of peace and nuclear-free zones in the regions of which we are a part. These are questions on which we share the views of many States Members of this Organization.

(Princess Lili'okalani Pahlavi, Iran)

Iran had the honour of originally introducing a draft resolution, of which Egypt became a co-sponsor, whose object was the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. At the last session of the General Assembly, that resolution was adopted by a nearly unanimous vote. In due course, we shall present a further draft resolution to meet some of the basic concerns expressed with regard to the original resolution. The vital importance of excluding nuclear weapons from the Middle East has received unanimous recognition. The time has come to adopt, to that end, appropriate practical measures for an effective system of safeguards. I need not dwell further on this question, except to observe that the idea is consistent with the growing interest in the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones as a means of removing apprehension over the possible diversion to military purposes of nuclear fuels intended for peaceful purposes.

I turn now to a related question, namely, the effort of the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean to give effect to the 1972 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. Iran was among the first to advocate co-operation between the countries which abut the Indian Ocean so as to keep the region peaceful and free from great Power rivalry. We have placed special emphasis upon the proposition that the stability of this vitally important area is far from promoted by the military presence of outside Powers. My delegation has repeatedly urged the establishment of regional mechanisms for co-operation along with the development of stronger economic and cultural ties among the countries of the region.

We have no illusions about the complexity of the problems involved in efforts to establish zones of peace and nuclear-free zones. Nevertheless, our conviction that it offers a valuable contribution to world peace that may serve to facilitate the adoption of general measures of disarmament has not weakened. We are gratified to note that the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones is now a well-established policy of the General Assembly, which in adopting it has responded to the wishes expressed by a large number of States in various regions of the world.

(Princess Ashraf Pahlavi, Iran)

Having painted the picture of the situation in rather dark colours, I should like nevertheless to add some brighter tones, not so as to embellish what is to be seen in the foreground but to emphasize that the background offers a view of the general desire for peace as well as the perspective of a changing world in which co-operation, justice and equity for all peoples seems to be emerging. Eventually the changes may affect the immediate prospects and transform them.

The special session of the General Assembly will afford us a valuable opportunity to see all these relationships more clearly and to act to strengthen them. What is essential is that we should persevere.

Iran is deeply dedicated to the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control and is ready to co-operate constructively with all States that wish for the success of this noble collective undertaking.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to announce that the Ivory Coast has become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.1/32/L.5 and L.9.

Guinea, Mauritius and Zambia have become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.10.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.