

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records *



FIRST COMMITTEE
26th meeting
held on
Friday, 4 November 1977
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 26th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

CONTENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

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

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

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

/...

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/32/PV.26
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 3.15 p.m.

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

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, at the outset it is my pleasure to congratulate you on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. We are certain that the work of this Committee will be fruitful and successful thanks to your diplomatic experience and skill. It is indeed an honour for us to have an African of such international repute and efficiency guiding us in our work.

I should also like to congratulate Mr. Pastinen of Finland and Mr. Hollai of Hungary on their election as Vice-Chairmen and Mr. Correa of Mexico on his election as Rapporteur.

The international order is based on various political, economic, social and legal elements, a fundamental element crucially linked to the essence of international order is certainly disarmament. The arms race affects the development of relationships among countries and nations since it constitutes a threat of destruction and a menace to the independence and safety of nations, and it encourages resort to the use of force.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Despite what the world has achieved today in terms of possessing arms both from a qualitative and quantitative standpoint, its achievements have so far been limited to measures adopted to organize armaments, to legalize competition and to eliminate certain weapons which by the standards of military strategy have become obsolete and undesirable or are unable to help achieve military supremacy.

In a world where the vast majority of peoples suffer poverty, hunger and disease and where developing countries strive for a better material standard suitable to mankind, military expenditure is escalating incessantly. At a time when developing countries seek to establish the basis for an international economic order based on justice and equity the most developed countries attempt to undermine those efforts by using arguments which throw the blame on the poor who every day suffer from the dangers threatening their political and economic security.

Behind all this is the arms race, the network of alliances and their attempts to transgress against the independence and integrity of nations. Interdependence has become a characteristic feature of the age and this is further strengthened by economic and technological development.

If we in the United Nations are to be equal partners, we should keep in mind the fact that the major Powers shoulder a responsibility commensurate with the military power the Charter itself laid upon the shoulders of those States, responsibilities just as great as the rights it granted them. The major Powers should not be proud of their ability to destroy mankind several times over but should seek to channel that power into serving the interests of humanity, consolidating world security and implementing United Nations resolutions. Then and then only can we beat the swords into ploughshares.

The international order was envisaged by those who devised the Charter so that peace, security and prosperity could reign in our community and it is the fundamental basis on which the United Nations was founded and constitutes the framework of its Charter, and we believe that they were right. Accordingly, the United Nations should be the appropriate forum for every international activity and should be the centre of all activities directed towards disarmament, for it is the Organization which represents the international community and reflects its various views and opinions.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

After this general review of what my delegation considers to be the fundamental factors on the basis of which our discussions should be conducted, I should like to refer to some of the disarmament items on our agenda, starting with questions related to nuclear disarmament.

It is not by sheer coincidence that I begin my statement with the question of nuclear disarmament, for despite the fact that the world has fortunately not suffered a nuclear war since 1945, this does not lessen the danger of nuclear weapons, whether used in a world war or in a regional war. If I may use the term agreed on since the signature of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1968, I should like to state that both vertical and horizontal proliferation are a menace to mankind, so much so that it is difficult to decide which is the more dangerous.

The best solution would be to establish a balance of responsibilities on the part of both nuclear and non-nuclear countries. By balance I do not mean monopoly by a certain group or the imposing of certain commitments on one group without imposing similar commitments on another. Whether we like it or not we are partners in our future destiny.

While on the subject of vertical proliferation I should like to refer to the two most appropriate criteria by which we can measure the degree of commitment of nuclear countries to the principle of non-proliferation and to the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty which has been in force for over six years.

The first is the bilateral talks between the Soviet Union and the United States, for despite a profusion of press reports, the treaty period has expired and the two parties are still engaged in lengthy negotiations. Despite the statements issued by both parties, the goal to which we aspire is still out of reach. The strategic criteria based on supremacy and the ability to destroy humanity several times over is still a decisive factor. The question is not that of disarmament but of organizing the arms race. Under the guise of "national security", certain factors unrelated to disarmament are concealed.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

The second criterion is the urgent need to put an end to nuclear and thermonuclear tests and to conclude a treaty on a general and complete test ban. A wave of optimism prevailed at the beginning of the session of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) this year, but by the end of the meetings in Geneva there was a general feeling of disappointment. The subject was one of two referred to the Committee in Geneva because they were priority items and had been for several years. Where are we now? Despite the volume of paper and the bilateral and trilateral talks, the situation has still not reached a stage where there have been serious negotiations likely to lead to a safe solution. Various questions have been asked but the reply is always the same.

Nuclear countries, headed by the two major Powers, should seek as urgent objectives the goal of general and complete disarmament, a goal declared since 1959, putting an end to the arms race and to vertical proliferation.

As we approach the special session of the Assembly devoted to disarmament, we should like to propose that a new fillip be given to steps that would lead to a complete and general ban on nuclear tests.

As to horizontal proliferation, I should like to refer to the establishment of nuclear-free zones and peace zones. That method of nuclear disarmament would be in implementation of article VII of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and completes the provisions listed in the Treaty. The position which has always been adopted by Egypt - besides its continued support of the non-proliferation provisions - is to encourage the establishment of nuclear-free zones. Our past support and continuing support of the Treaty of Tlatelolco is an indication of our position.

Three years ago Egypt and Iran undertook an initiative to establish a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. The initiative was supported by the international community as a whole. I will not here go into detail on this matter, for that will be done in the discussions on this item during the course of the next two weeks, but I believe it is appropriate to refer to the general lines which we follow.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

The conditions prevailing in the region, which are well known to the world, make it one of the regions most worthy of consideration and concern because it suffers from aggression, Israeli occupation and nuclear intimidation, supported from various sources. We have laid down the principles which ensure safety for the region from the danger of nuclear proliferation by calling upon the countries of the region to pledge not to acquire or possess nuclear weapons, to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to place all activities under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

But Israel seeks to maintain its occupation of Arab territories and its denial of the right of the Palestinian people, and seeks to use nuclear intimidation. The representative of Israel comes here to shed crocodile tears, calling for direct, unconditional negotiations. Israel seeks peace but it seeks the peace of the grave, a peace based on the subjugation of all those surrounding it. We do not doubt what has been said about Israel's theft of the uranium shipment and what is being said about Israel's possession of nuclear weapons. The source of this repeated information is above suspicion and we are inclined to believe it.

The representative of Israel would be better off if he were to realize that he is addressing representatives who have intelligence and intelligent minds, and who can read and analyse.

Have the leaders of Israel issued any statements denying their acquisition of nuclear weapons after they had implied such possession earlier? Does Israel's intention regarding peace, if it is a real intention, keep it from being committed to the resolutions of the General Assembly in the course of the past three years concerning the establishment of a nuclear-free-zone in the Middle East? Israel's was the only voice which stood against the consensus of the international community.

Speaking about the Middle East leads me, by virtue of the situation and the geographical location of Egypt, belonging as it does to the continent of Africa, to deal with the subject of declaring a non-nuclear Africa. Since 1964, we have been seriously seeking to implement such a declaration, but the racist régime in southern Africa not only seeks to impose its domination on this part of our continent and to suppress liberation movements, denying the African people its legitimate rights, but depends on nuclear weapons and arms to subjugate the continent of Africa. It is no strange matter, therefore, that there should be military co-operation in the nuclear field between the racist régime in southern Africa and the Tel-aviv authorities, for the aim of both régimes is one and the same - that is, nuclear intimidation to perpetuate occupation and domination. The Security Council has just adopted a resolution banning arms shipments to South Africa. It considered that the acquisition of weapons by this racist régime constitutes a danger menacing international

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

peace and security. We wonder whether this resolution adopted unanimously by the Council will be included on the list of resolutions adopted by our international Organization only to be disregarded by Israel.

I should like to reaffirm the position of my country in supporting the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. Egypt, as one of the countries near the Indian Ocean, will continue to pursue the lines laid down together with the non-aligned countries which have staunchly supported the Sri Lanka initiative throughout the past six years. We hope that the conference will be held in the near future. Although we should like to observe here that any international efforts concerning the Indian Ocean should be **channeled** through the Committee concerned with the Indian Ocean and in accordance with the line adopted by all countries of the region, without **permitting any outside intervention.**

If I have limited my observations until now to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, vertically and horizontally, this is not at all to underestimate the importance of traditional weapons, the arms trade or the non-realization of our views concerning the regional limitation of armaments. These are, indeed, important issues, and we cannot possibly achieve the aim of complete disarmament except after considering examining and arriving at agreements on those issues.

But as I have mentioned before, nuclear disarmament should be the basic aim and the beginning for achieving the first step towards general and complete disarmament. Strategic balance in the world today is based on nuclear intimidation and blackmail and nuclear cover which protects countries which are allied with major Powers, whereas the majority of countries in the world have no possible means of protecting their territories against aggression or occupation, except by adhering to the principles of the United Nations Charter and the system of collective security which has remained unimplemented since 1945. Furthermore, there are certain regions of the world exposed to nuclear blackmail, intimidation and occupation as a result of aggression, finding no nuclear cover to protect them since they are not allies of any of the two camps.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

From this we conclude that it would be better during the current stage to concentrate on priorities to be given to the most destructive weapons, leaving to every region the proper manner of acting in accordance with its own conditions. It is premature to propose an examination of this new question at the present stage.

If we fully believe in disarmament and in giving priority to nuclear disarmament, we should call to mind here what the Secretary-General said in his report of 1 September 1977 on the activities of the Organization:

"It is now 10 years since a United Nations study was made of the most awesome of all weapons, nuclear arms. In this period we have seen a continued, not to say accelerated development in this field, bringing new concepts and applications into public focus. It would seem high time for the international community again to undertake a comprehensive study and assessment of nuclear-weapon problems in the light of the developments of recent years." (A/32/1, P. 13)

We are not arguing from a theoretical angle but our position is determined by a global outlook concerning the establishment of an international disarmament strategy aimed at general and complete disarmament through the safeguarding of peace and security for all the continents of the world. However, we believe that priorities should be based on logic and on the extent of the threat.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

The Foreign Minister of Egypt, in his statement before the General Assembly on 28 September 1977, in referring to real peace in the Middle East, said:

"... real peace cannot be ensured unless there is agreement on the following:

"A. The establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. We believe that a nuclear threat from any source will jeopardize the prospects of peace in the Middle East and would make peace only an empty word. How are we to feel safe with the knowledge that Israel in co-operation and collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa is determined to become a nuclear Power? This indeed is not a manifestation of the desire for peace but only indicates the continued aggressive intentions of Israel, based on the fallacy of military superiority. I should like to declare solemnly from this rostrum that if Israel ever obtains nuclear weapons, no one could expect us to stand idly by in the face of that development, which would create a grave situation militarily, politically and morally. Thus, we insist in the context of a peace agreement that Israel should adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, for it is inconceivable that Israel should be the only State in the Middle East not acceding to that Treaty. Egypt, for its part, having already signed that Treaty, is willing to abide by it.

"B. It is necessary to regulate conventional armaments, since a race in this field is likely to increase tension, thus increase the possibilities of the situation exploding in the future." (A/32/PV.10, pp. 52-53)

Our agenda includes items of equal importance, but time does not allow for their consideration. I should like here to refer to the subject of chemical weapons for this was one of two important items concerning which we had hoped the CCD would arrive at concrete results. We may well remember that last year in the course of discussing the ENMOD treaty, one of the justifications for calling for an agreement on this treaty was to pave the way for the conclusion of a treaty banning the use of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

By reviewing the activities of the CCD in Geneva we come to the conclusion that the question of chemical weapons emphasizes the fact that the task entrusted to it by the General Assembly during its thirty-first session has not been achieved. I should like to reiterate here that the CCD should submit concrete results to the special session of the General Assembly. A great deal of time has been lost in talk and the time has come to negotiate on the objective questions under consideration. The two major Powers should shoulder their responsibilities and fulfil their promises and commitments and set a good example.

Another subject to which the delegation of my country attributes capital importance is that of incendiary weapons and other conventional weapons which could be banned or at least restricted for humane reasons. The humane aspect and the humanitarian element is to be considered in all matters related to disarmament, for disarmament seeks only the continued existence of man and his peace and prosperity. We all realize the importance of the decision by the Diplomatic Conference on International Humanitarian Law to convene a conference to be held not later than 1979. Egypt, together with a group of countries concerned, is following the present consultations on an organizational formula that would allow sufficient preparation for the conference so that the countries which do not enjoy the protective cover of an alliance may be fairly represented.

The issue of development has become of prime importance and concern to developing countries today. We appreciate the argument put forth by some concerning the relation of development to disarmament. But in our view we believe that it is not a matter of security and bread. The statement made by some who claim that developing countries overburden their budgets by armaments and impede their own development by their military efforts is too generalized and is not sound. The reason these countries do not enjoy peace and security is that they are exposed to aggression and occupation. It is wrong to jump to that conclusion and use it as a criterion.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Have the major countries which are developed and advanced lived up to their commitments in safeguarding international peace and security, in accordance with the Charter? The answer is that they have shirked their responsibilities and have tried to adopt their policy of power and alliances.

The second point is, who profits from the arms race? The answer is the major Powers and the developed countries. The matter requires an intensified and in-depth study to be followed by concrete measures to make disarmament a useful element in two sectors of a just international order, namely, security and development. If I say that we cannot profitably achieve any progress in terms of reducing military budgets and releasing resources now absorbed by the arms race without the co-operation of the major countries, I must also point out that our view concerning this subject derives from the suffering experienced by developing countries and the difficulties they face in trying to safeguard their own security and to achieve their own development.

The important event we look forward to with hope is the convening of the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament scheduled to be held in May-June 1978. This is what the non-aligned countries have sought for several years. On this occasion I should like to express my appreciation of what Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas has said in making a success of the work of the Preparatory Committee and in arriving at an agreement concerning all the organizational matters before it. Much work remains to be done, but as a first step we must have a special session free from empty and sterile arguments. We prefer to concentrate on important disarmament issues vital to the continued existence and safety of the human race. The special session should give an impetus to all activities in the field of disarmament, whether at the bilateral, regional or multilateral levels, with follow-up discussions and a review to take place later.

I should appreciate an opportunity to address the Committee again at a subsequent stage.

Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal): Having heard the statements of representatives in the First Committee during the general debate on disarmament, we feel that a consensus seems to have emerged on the importance and usefulness of the forthcoming special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. No doubt, the special session is going to be the most important step towards multilateral efforts to lay down agreed principles for disarmament. Against the background of frustration at the slow pace of disarmament negotiations, the limited performance of arms control measures, the growing realization that time is against us if some positive step to de-escalate the arms race is not taken and the hopeful utterances of the world's leaders, especially those of the super-Powers, the importance and usefulness of the special session can hardly be exaggerated.

The special session can become an effective forum to devise effective mechanisms for carrying out further negotiations in the field of disarmament with a view to achieving general and complete disarmament. It is essential that that session not be reduced to a mere forum to exchange views and thus duplicate the function of the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly. In order to work as a catalyst to achieve general and complete disarmament, the special session has to be in a position to determine the basic lines along which the priority efforts of States towards disarmament should be directed. It must be in a position to recommend certain guidelines and principles to be followed by States in future negotiations. It must be in a position to recommend a time-table for action which would ensure that the implementation of recommended measures would minimize the danger of war, alleviate the burden of the arms race, encourage a reduction in military budgets and military arsenals of Member States and create an atmosphere of trust and relaxation of tension. Moreover, it must be in a position to institute, if necessary, new forums to accelerate further the process of negotiations with the objective of achieving general and complete disarmament or, at least, of recommending improvements in the structure and composition of existing forums for the same purpose.

While there seems to be no dearth of statements of good intentions and honest feelings to gain arms limitation and control, paradoxically enough military technology is advancing much more rapidly than the rate of negotiations in the field of arms limitation and control.

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

Although we have no reason to be happy at the past performance in the field of bilateral or trilateral negotiations, we cannot ignore and remain indifferent to those efforts in spite of the very limited achievement. We acknowledge the importance of such efforts by the big Powers, and especially the super-Powers because they are the ones which can meaningfully contribute to the efforts towards achieving disarmament. It is the super-Powers which have between them the biggest stockpile of weapons of mass destruction - nuclear as well as conventional. The total arsenal of the rest of the world in quantitative terms is still less than the total between the super-Powers; and in qualitative terms no third nation is in a position to catch up with their sophisticated armament. It will take years for the other members of the nuclear club to catch up with the super-Powers in terms of explosive power as well as delivery systems. Hence we have welcomed the initiative of the super-Powers.

Partial measures have been quite important in their own right, but it is necessary that the remaining obstacles to achieving a break-through be removed with maximum effort. What is needed at this juncture is to create a better atmosphere of trust in the international community which will have a chance to review disarmament efforts with wide participation in a large forum like the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Similarly, among other trust-generating and tension-relaxing arms control measures which could be achieved before the special session are the proposed treaty on the prohibition of chemical weapons, a convention prohibiting the development of new weapons of mass destruction, a convention on limitation of incendiary and certain other conventional weapons and, possibly, a comprehensive test ban treaty. The achievement of those treaties would greatly enhance the role of the special session by providing it with a suitable atmosphere for constructive activity.

The problem of disarmament, while it is the most important and urgent, is also exceptionally complex and delicate. The problem of disarmament, as it is directly related to the interest of national security of States, gives rise to the need for caution in every move. We should therefore endeavour to appreciate the difficulty involved in the negotiations for strategic arms limitation.

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

We do acknowledge that largely the negotiations could be started as a result of the process of détente between the super-Powers, and so we recognize the important role which détente plays in the field of disarmament. Hence we stress the need to strengthen détente. However, détente between the super-Powers is not enough. It has to be expanded to all parts of the world. A positive approach towards the expansion of détente is essential. The observance of the principle of national independence and security, non-interference in the domestic affairs of other States, full equality of rights, non-resort to force or the threat of force and the right of all peoples to decide their own course of socio-politico-economic development is an essential prerequisite to expanding détente world wide. The involvement of every nation, as well as democratization of international relations, are very important factors for creating a tension-free world. Similarly, the involvement of all nations of the world in the negotiations on disarmament is essential for the achievement of talks on arms limitation and control. If positive results in the field of disarmament cannot be attained, the credibility of détente will be grossly undermined. Therefore, although we attach great significance to the bilateral talks and look forward to bold initiatives from the super-Powers in the wake of the special session, the special session itself has to be made the chief vehicle to surmount the present obstacle in the achievement of general and complete disarmament. Universal peace and security can best be guaranteed only by general and complete disarmament.

Under the competent guidance of its Chairman, Ambassador Carlos Ortiz de Rozas, the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament has so far carried out useful work, and during its meetings next year it will prepare final documents for the session. The final documents are likely to contain an appraisal and analysis of the current state of negotiations in the field of disarmament, as well as the elaboration of the fundamental principles to be implemented to conclude agreements to halt the arms race, and to recommend priority tasks and viable mechanisms for disarmament negotiations in future. The Preparatory Committee, composed as it is of representation from all geographical areas of the world, has been working on the basis of consensus. That ensures objectivity in its work as well as comprehensiveness in its approach to the problems of disarmament. An encouraging atmosphere created by the conclusion

RG/6

A/C.1/32/PV.26
24-25

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

of certain agreements on the prohibition of a number of weapons will definitely contribute to the success of the special session, and we trust that the big Powers will exercise the political will to conclude them.

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

Nuclear disarmament has always been accorded priority by the United Nations. The Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) has been acclaimed, in spite of its limitations, as a very important step towards nuclear disarmament. We were quite aware that by itself the NPT could not eliminate the danger of war. Nevertheless, it was the beginning of a step in the right direction. We would have welcomed any step towards vertical non-proliferation. Unfortunately, the Non-Proliferation Treaty was not followed by other measures of arms control and disarmament, with the goal of attaining complete nuclear disarmament. Moreover, the question of co-operation in the field of research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes has been quite discouraging. The pledge to promote the development of peaceful nuclear energy in non-nuclear countries by the nuclear Powers has not been given proper attention. It was hoped that the nuclear Powers could co-operate with those anxious to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and provide services in relation to explosions in a non-discriminatory manner and at an advantageous cost.

But there is a growing frustration in the third world countries at the technical gap between the developed and the developing countries. The technical gap in the use of nuclear energy is further raising doubts among the third world countries about the justification of restrictions imposed upon them. It is eroding their faith in the usefulness of the NPT and casting a shadow over the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). That situation has to be dealt with effectively.

It is a matter of regret that all the articles in the Non-Proliferation Treaty have not been given equal importance and similar treatment. While the articles, particularly articles I to IV, have always been invoked to justify restrictions, the implementation of the provisions of article V has been far from satisfactory. The balance of mutual obligations and responsibility called for in the NPT, especially the obligation of nuclear-weapon States under article VI of the NPT, has not been reassuring. The SALT talks aroused high hopes that the two super-Powers were genuinely going forward to meet their obligation under article VI of the NPT. Unfortunately, we have witnessed wanton expansion of strategic arms rather than their limitation in the last eight years.

During my last statement I categorically advocated the cause of the legitimate aspiration of many countries in the world to use nuclear power as a

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

source of energy. That the energy needs are genuine cannot be overlooked or ignored, so conditions must be created quite expeditiously to provide assistance to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

We are positively in favour of a complete ban on any kind of nuclear tests and so we are opposed to any move under any pretext to link the question of peaceful nuclear explosions with the question of the development of energy per se, without giving emphasis to safeguard measures. We are convinced that the proliferation of nuclear weapons would endanger the security of all States and make more difficult the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

We cannot therefore, treat the question of the peaceful use of nuclear energy as a separate question, a question of development strategy unrelated to that of disarmament. The use of nuclear energy cannot be considered in isolation from the over-all question of safety. We are therefore in favour of strict adherence to the NPT, of the implementation of all its articles with equal emphasis and of co-operation among the nuclear and non-nuclear States in the development of nuclear energy, but we are strongly in favour of strengthening safeguard measures so that the non-proliferation régime is not endangered.

Before concluding, my delegation would like to express its warmest congratulations to the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the very important statement made by President Brezhnev in Moscow on 2 November. We warmly welcome the proposal made by Mr. Brezhnev to declare a moratorium on all underground nuclear detonations. We acclaim it as a major step forward in the direction of a comprehensive test ban. Undoubtedly, that declaration by President Brezhnev has once again highlighted the important role that the Soviet Union can play in the field of disarmament.

We are also happy to note that the Secretary of State of the United States of America, Mr. Cyrus Vance, has shown a positive reaction to the Brezhnev declaration. That augurs well for the generating of an atmosphere conducive to the adoption of other bold initiatives by the super-Powers.

Mr. CHALE (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. Chairman, allow me to associate myself with other delegations in congratulating you on your election to the chairmanship of this Committee. My delegation remains convinced that this Committee is once again fortunate in having a diplomat of high calibre like yourself to preside over its deliberations during this important session. Similarly, I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to extend our most sincere congratulations to the other officers of the Committee, on whom the burdensome work of this Committee greatly depends.

It has been put forward bluntly that if the number of items on the agenda of the General Assembly were indicative of the Organization's accomplishments in any one area, measures related to arms control and disarmament would win the contest hands down. This year again, no fewer than a score of items on the agenda hinge on disarmament. Ironically, however, set against that record of item proliferation is the general view shared by many delegations that disarmament represents the area where the United Nations has made the least progress.

As we meet today, the world is even more aware of the dangers of the arms race. By our adherence to the Charter of the United Nations, we committed ourselves to the duty of bringing peace to the world through the prevention of war, to the maintenance of fundamental human rights and to the promotion of "social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom".

The arms race has worked only to frustrate all these efforts and thus the world today finds itself confronted with a potentially explosive situation unprecedented in human history. The Secretary-General in his report on the work of the Organization put it clearly, as follows:

"In this profoundly unhealthy situation there can be no guarantee that national independence and sovereignty, equality of rights, non-resort to force or to the threat of force, and the right of every people to decide its own destiny will in fact be honoured as the principles on which we have long agreed that the international order should be based". (A/32/1, p. 12)

(Mr. Chale, United Republic of
Tanzania)

That is why we in Tanzania believe that the Member States of this Committee and the Organization as a whole have a moral obligation to fulfil. The people of the world need and want peace, and their Governments representing them here must sincerely reflect the genuine wishes of their people. Just as much as we are anxious for peace through disarmament, we hope that we shall all honestly and equally pledge our commitment to this goal.

This world will not be saved from war by deliberations of intent. It will not be liberated or saved by pious declarations on the will to live at peace with each other, but rather by translating them into action. The Charter enshrines the concept of universal collective security based on the achievement of substantial progress towards general and complete disarmament. Hence, it is progress that counts and not rhetoric.

Disarmament negotiations are as old as the United Nations itself, yet the spectre of Hiroshima and Nagasaki has only become more devastatingly ominous. Today, the world rests on a shaky peace hinged on the balance of terror, the balance of fear, the balance of power and the balance of forces, and on the concepts of mutual assured destruction. Nuclear-weapon States have the primary obligation to demonstrate to the world that they are genuinely serious in pursuing disarmament.

No less than eight multilateral agreements related to disarmament have been reached since the last world war - and still the world justifiably feels that very little, if anything, has been done to curb the arms race. The arsenals of the nuclear Powers continue to swell up with even more perfected weaponry of mass destruction. Vital human and economic resources continue to be gobbled up by the arms race while the majority of the world population languishes in misery from disease, ignorance, hunger and poverty. The Secretary-General in his report on the work of the Organization pointed out (A/32/1, pp. 12, 13) that while "the World Health Organization has spent about \$83 million over 10 years to eradicate smallpox in the world - a sum insufficient to buy one modern supersonic bomber", the world military expenditure is now totalling well over \$300 billion. He further pointed out (ibid.)

(Mr. Chale, United Republic of
Tanzania)

that while the World Health Organization's programme for eradicating malaria needs an estimated amount of \$450 million - half of what is being spent daily for military purposes - the Organization is dragging for lack of funds. What tragic irony that some United Nations Members can afford to waste such enormous resources on this highly suicidal game of extinction - a suicidal game of extinction, about which Shakespeare might have said, "that men play such fantastic tricks before high heaven as make the angels weep". They play such fantastic tricks before high heaven that even the angels weep. Have we lost our reason? And this while most people in the developing world can hardly be provided with even the very basic necessities of life. The developing countries wonder why the Members of this Organization, which have consistently reiterated their commitment to the welfare of mankind, hesitate to acknowledge the strong relationship between disarmament and development.

The preoccupation of this Committee must be focused, therefore, on genuine and concrete steps towards disarmament. If we were to be honest with ourselves, we would agree that we have aggressively embarked on circumlocution. The subject in question is disarmament and not merely non-armament. Is that not circumlocution? When we talk of disarmament, we should be able to back what we say with factual evidence of our activities since the nuclear Powers' policy of building up military arsenals and the gap between their words and deeds pose considerable difficulties in attempting to talk of limiting the arms race.

With or without the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), nuclear tests have been conducted and we have no reason to convince ourselves that they will stop, unless the nuclear-weapon States can see and appreciate the evilness of those weapons and their destructive and annihilating effects. What the world community wants to see is a complete test ban and not the localization of those tests. The partial test ban Treaty and the NPT have not abolished those tests but localized them. The sum result of all those partial measures related to disarmament has been to give undue glorification to those measures and slacken the momentum of disarmament negotiations.

(Mr. Chale, United Republic of
Tanzania)

The foregoing remarks and conclusion do not make me less conscious of the threat posed by conventional weapons. It is evident that the demarcation line between the use of nuclear and conventional weapons is increasingly being eroded. Those weapons have become more sophisticated to the extent that they are as much a threat to international peace and security as are nuclear weapons. Incidentally too, these are the commonly used weapons and what is considered as their less dangerous nature has permitted them slowly to take away lives of millions of innocent civilians everywhere in the world in circumstances of armed conflicts. As has already been pointed out by those who spoke earlier, no nuclear weapon has been used since the Second World War but millions have died at the merciless hands of those conventional weapons, and even today men are dying. These are the problems of our peacetime, and we subscribe to all efforts towards eradication of those weapons.

(Mr. Chale, United Republic of Tanzania)

Of equal importance to us is the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the world. The non-aligned Heads of State and Government, the African Heads of State and the United Nations have in various forums by various resolutions expressed the urgency of this matter. The session of the Organization of African Unity in Libreville once more expressed the need to respect the continent of Africa, which includes the continental African States, Madagascar and other islands surrounding Africa, as a nuclear-free zone. We hope that this year this Committee will take a stride towards realization of this goal, as contained in General Assembly resolution 31/69, adopted at the last session of the General Assembly.

Similarly, my delegation is opposed to any manoeuvre by the big Powers to continue their presence in the Indian Ocean. We are strongly opposed to the establishment of military bases in the Indian Ocean and elsewhere. That is why we call upon these Powers to work towards achieving practical solutions in promoting and strengthening peace in the Indian Ocean area.

We believe that the principles enunciated in Chapter I of the United Nations Charter can best be guaranteed in an atmosphere of general and complete disarmament under close and effective international control. The world is very optimistic concerning the partial measures related to disarmament, but its confidence continues to be eroded by the fact that these measures have actually provided broad avenues to the arms race. Disarmament must be total to be genuine, and this rests on mutual trust among all States alike coupled with the political will to facilitate this exercise. Trust is the corner-stone. This is a political fact which has left its imprint on the post-war debate concerning all kinds of weapons, because, just as the nuclear Powers recall the concept of undiminished security for themselves, similarly, the consequence should not be diminished security for smaller and weaker countries.

In about six months the world will assemble for the special session devoted to disarmament. We do not expect miracles to happen, but we hope all nations will give that important session most favourable consideration. We have a common denominator, and that common denominator is the common danger, the danger of extinction. That common denominator is our survival. Hence, we hope all nations will give that important session most favourable consideration. Appropriately and adequately prepared, the special session will provide a singular occasion

(Mr. Chale, United Republic of Tanzania)

to put the problem and the hitherto attempted measures into the proper perspective and put our finger on the problem as well as on the solution. We hope the world will have occasion collectively to pronounce itself unambiguously against this situation.

This is the eleventh hour, and we must be very serious in discussing this question.

The special session must be well prepared but, and this is most important, those big Powers that are chiefly responsible for the unrest in the world must be genuinely prepared to accept change - not a slight change but a complete change, the kind of change the Greeks used to call metania. A complete change - that is what is wanted.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General and his colleagues on the steps taken to implement General Assembly resolution 31/90 on the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. We have noted with appreciation the establishment of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament and the launching of the Disarmament Yearbook. We are convinced that these mechanisms will serve to enlighten the world on the dangers of the arms race and to stimulate public opinion in favour of disarmament.

Let some come and say later, "O Judgement, thou has not fled, and man has not lost his reason."

Tan Sri ZAITON (Malaysia): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time my delegation has spoken in this Committee, allow me at the outset to congratulate you warmly upon your unanimous election to the chairmanship of this very important Committee.

I also wish to extend the congratulations of my delegation to the two Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur.

The year 1976 was characterized by a visible lack of progress in efforts to slow down the arms race and to limit the qualitative and quantitative increase in nuclear armaments. On the contrary, the improvement of new weapon technology, particularly in the field of nuclear weapons, has led to the enhancement of nuclear overkill capabilities, in turn provoking the race for superiority in

first-strike capability between the two super-Powers. Indeed, as we continue to live in a world haunted by the spectre of nuclear annihilation, the peace we now have undoubtedly hangs on a thin thread, and ironically it is sustained by the existing balance of nuclear terror.

(Tan Sri Zaiton. Malaysia)

The advancement of such lethal weaponry has certainly not helped to ease tensions but rather has served to heighten mutual suspicion and distrust. This is an alarming phenomenon of our time. Indeed, it is principally mutual fear and suspicion between the super-Powers that have brought about a costly and dangerous race in armaments.

If this arms race has not so far reached the point of disastrous armed conflicts, it is only because it has managed to maintain the power balance which constitutes a deterrent against aggression. But the maintenance of this balance of terror can hardly be regarded as a comforting assurance for peace because to live in this kind of peace is to live in constant fear. The international community is yearning for a real and lasting peace, a peace completely free from fear of total annihilation and destruction. What mankind needs today is peace in a disarmed world.

The primary concern of the international community must necessarily be directed at the dangers of the nuclear arms race. The priority accorded to nuclear disarmament dictates that we must quickly reach agreement on how we are, in concrete terms, to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, to prohibit their production and stockpiling, to put a moratorium on the research to advance nuclear weapon technology and ultimately to destroy all nuclear weapons altogether. Quantitatively the United States and the Soviet Union each has an enormous strategic nuclear arsenal. But what is more dangerous is the qualitative development in offensive and defensive strategic weapons that of late has become deadly accurate. It is estimated that the nuclear warheads available in the mid-1980s may have an accuracy of about 18 miles at a range of about 7,500 miles.

In highlighting the danger of the nuclear armaments race, my delegation on the other hand does not wish to give diminished importance to the dangers of the conventional arms race. This is indeed a complex problem which has been politicized because it impinges on the security interests and sovereign rights of States. Nevertheless the conventional arms race is a matter of increasing universal concern. In the first place, the vast economic resources that developing countries have to spend on their arms build-up are diverted from the promotion of much needed projects for social and economic development.

(Tan Sri Zeiton, Malaysia)

My delegation in this regard is deeply concerned at the enormous amount of money the world is at present spending on military weaponry. The Secretary-General's report on the work of the Organization noted that a much smaller and a far more negligible amount was spent by the subsidiary organs of the United Nations in their programmes to eradicate malnutrition, illiteracy and diseases throughout the vast majority of the world's population. We need to reverse this sad trend. A progressive global disarmament would eventually release resources in both the developed and developing countries to supplement the efforts of the international community in realizing the establishment of a new international economic order. In this connexion, it is pertinent that the United Nations should undertake an in-depth study of the relationship between disarmament and development to draw attention to ways and means whereby resources released through disarmament could be reallocated to economic and social development purposes. We commend the Nordic countries for their initiative in this field.

In the second place, the conventional arms race tends to increase the risk of armed conflicts, particularly in regions where there is a large measure of antagonism between States. My delegation feels that to advance the reduction of the conventional arms build-up in such regions it is essential to create the necessary conditions that would be conducive to promoting the relaxation of tension and to instil mutual trust and confidence among States in the region.

It is in this context that my delegation has consistently lent its support to efforts to accelerate the creation of zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world. In my own region, South-East Asia, Malaysia has proposed the creation of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality that would be free from big-Power rivalry and any form or manner of external interference.

In the Indian Ocean, we should like to see the early convergence of views of all concerned in the realization that the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace are an imperative necessity.

It has always been the belief of my delegation that the establishment of both the zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones constitute constructive and explicit efforts towards reducing the areas of potential conflicts, removing big-Power rivalry, lessening tension among nations, promoting the concept of regionalism for the economic and social development of countries in the region and facilitating the attainment of general and complete disarmament.

(Tan Sri Zaiton, Malaysia)

The denuclearization of a zone, however, must be examined in the light of existing circumstances in the geographical area in which the zone is located. The denuclearization of a zone must necessarily emanate from the countries in the region for they, more than others, should be in a position to determine its desirability and feasibility. It must be strictly observed by all countries of the region as well as by those immediately outside it, and it must be honoured by all the nuclear Powers.

While 1976 has been notable for its lack of progress in disarmament negotiations, there have been encouraging developments in 1977 that promise to give us a glimmer of hope that real progress could be achieved in the coming years. We have in the first place noted the agreement of the USSR and the United States to renew negotiations on the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). Preparations for the special session on disarmament are proceeding smoothly. We note in this regard that through the consultations which the non-aligned countries carried out with the other members of the Preparatory Committee on the special session on disarmament there has been substantial progress in identifying the various common areas of concern where urgent action is needed. Indeed, the special session provides a significant opportunity for the international community to consider the whole gamut of disarmament questions in its entirety. My delegation trusts that full participation by all Members of this Organization will ensure a concerted and co-operative approach towards achieving an effective and comprehensive programme of action for general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

Effective measures must be taken to deal with the problems of the arms race, both nuclear and conventional, to cease all nuclear-weapons tests, to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and to prohibit the production of weapons of mass destruction.

In the area of achieving a convention on the complete prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction, the General Assembly of the United Nations has for the past several years requested the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD)

(Tan Sri Zaiton, Malaysia)

to continue negotiations on this item as a matter of high priority. My delegation notes that the United States and the Soviet Union have agreed to work out the basic elements of a chemical weapons treaty. That is an encouraging development. We hope the two super-Powers will work together with other CCD members to achieve substantial progress in reaching agreement on an appropriate draft convention on chemical and biological weapons before the convening of the special session on disarmament next year.

(Tan Sri Zaiton, Malaysia)

In regard to the negotiations for a comprehensive nuclear test ban, it is also encouraging that this year, the United States, the USSR and the United Kingdom have started talks to achieve an agreement in this field. We have indeed waited long enough for such a treaty. It is particularly important that agreement on a definitive cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests should be started immediately without awaiting the participation of the other nuclear-weapon States, although we naturally hope that they will find it possible to associate themselves with such an endeavour with the least possible delay. At a later stage, the talks should necessarily be extended to include the participation of members of the CCD so that a comprehensive draft treaty could quickly emerge that would take care of the essential points. Of particular importance to my delegation is the assurance that such a treaty would be all-encompassing and would take care of the problem of peaceful nuclear explosions in order to prevent the horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons, without however prejudicing access by developing countries to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for their economic and social development.

I have in my intervention highlighted some of the areas of concern to my delegation and pinpointed those other areas where we feel progress could be achieved. It is vitally important to my delegation that we should quickly seize on the momentum created by these encouraging developments to urge the super-Powers concerned to reach agreements on some of the pressing issues that affect our security and peace. We hope that by the time the special session is convened, a new era will emerge that will allow us the comfort of living in a more disarmed world.

Mr. TSHERING (Bhutan): Mr. Chairman, at the outset allow me to say how happy my delegation has been, not only to have you presiding over this important Committee but also in the manner that you are guiding our deliberations. With all your experience, and the tact and skill which you have already demonstrated, we feel confident that the complex task ahead of us will be guided to a successful conclusion. I am sure, in this onerous task, the two able Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur will ably assist you. On behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, I assure you of our fullest co-operation.

(Mr. Tshering, Phutan)

In the world today there already exist enough deadly weapons to destroy the world many times over. As the years have passed and the negotiations on disarmament have become ever more protracted, we have come to realize with growing horror that what was fiction yesterday has become reality today, that today's fears may become tomorrow's nightmare. In the name of the balance of power, the arms race continues unabated. Peace remains precarious and tensions existing in different parts of the world remain unresolved. In the interest of the survival of mankind it is imperative that the question of disarmament be reviewed today, with greater concern than ever.

The Secretary-General in his introduction to the Report on the Work of the Organization for the year 1976 stated:

"Disarmament in all its aspects involves the most sensitive questions of national security and international confidence. Therefore a more comprehensive and urgent approach is desperately needed if real progress is to be made. I hope that the United Nations will take its natural place in this effort." (A/31/1/Add.1, p.5).

Indeed the United Nations has a special responsibility under the Charter and in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly in matters pertaining to disarmament. Many resolutions have been adopted since 1946. Important joint statements and the agreed principles of the two super-Powers have been received. The United Nations proclaimed the Disarmament Decade in General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV).

Year after year this Committee and the General Assembly have recited the agreed principles and the joint statements and appealed to the great Powers to move forward to complete disarmament. Indeed, the General Assembly has adopted volumes of resolutions, including many convincing reports of the Secretary-General and the Group of Experts. The number of disarmament items on the agenda has also increased. Besides these encouraging events, several collateral measures have also been taken, including the conclusion of treaties and conventions. These agreements should have given special impetus to the disarmament negotiations. Unfortunately they do not appear to have done so.

(Mr. Tshering, Bhutan)

Despite all these measures and the continued efforts of Member States and the General Assembly of the United Nations, there has been no appreciable movement towards the ultimate goal. Complete nuclear disarmament continues to elude us as debates on collateral measures constantly sidetrack us.

The need for complete disarmament both in nuclear and non-nuclear weapons is not in dispute and the dialogue over these issues at the international level is still intense, but the tendency has been to prolong debate over peripheral issues rather than to come to terms with what is clearly fundamental. We believe that the time has come for all nations to understand the basic nature and magnitude of the problem and the actions required to eliminate it.

Fifteen years after the establishment of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) and 32 years after the birth of the United Nations, the arms trade and the arms race are still accelerating with as great a momentum as technological developments allow. Sometimes one gets the impression that the arms trade and indeed the arms race is to remain with us until the concerned great Powers are prepared to move, and the arms race will continue to be a global phenomenon. It is clear, therefore, that progress being made towards disarmament is far from satisfactory. At the same time the steady increase in the innovative capabilities of nuclear technology has resulted in the production of new and ever more lethal weapons. I need not go into the details of all these as many distinguished speakers before me have already amply highlighted the problems now confronting the international community.

It is indeed regrettable that there has been no substantial progress achieved in any of the forums of disarmament negotiations. We remain convinced that such negotiations are imperative for maintaining international peace and security. The CCD has, we believe, acquired vast experience and exclusive knowledge in the years since it was established. In its further deliberations, we urge the CCD to adopt measures for the complete prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and to work towards achieving an early convention on weapons of mass destruction.

(Mr. Tshering, Bhutan)

According to recent statistics, about \$350 billion or more annually are being devoted to military expenditure in a world where millions of people are suffering from chronic hunger, malnutrition, lack of shelter and other such deprivation. In view of this there is a growing need to view closely the relation between development and disarmament. It is clear from these staggering data that all States should make conscious efforts to direct their resources from destructive to constructive purposes. Only then can we come close to bringing about the new international economic order that is an essential prerequisite to world peace. It is in this spirit that my delegation continues to support the reduction of the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council and other major military Powers. When two thirds of the world population lacks the basic necessities of life, the increase in military expenditure in the name of security runs counter to all civilized norms. For this reason we believe international security will be more greatly enhanced and strengthened by disarmament than by the continuation of the armament race.

It was in the light of this that, in 1971, my delegation supported resolution 2832 (XXVI) of the General Assembly declaring the Indian Ocean a Zone of Peace. Being a hinterland State of the Indian Ocean, Bhutan is particularly concerned with this question. We regret that even after six years the great Powers have not respected this resolution. My Government hopes that the negotiations between the two super-Powers will lead to a positive solution whereby great-Power rivalry in the area, including foreign military bases, will be eliminated. We continue to support the convening of a conference of all littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, with the co-operation and participation of all major Powers and major maritime users.

In the same spirit, we oppose the proliferation of nuclear weapons and support all moves towards the proper and effective control of nuclear-weapon technology. At the same time, we attach importance to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy directed solely towards development and attainment of economic self-reliance. We do so because of our conviction that such technology, if used peacefully, will help accelerate the pace of development in the developing countries.

(Mr. Tshering, Bhutan)

In a recent handbook published by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) on "Armament and Disarmament in the Nuclear Age", it is stated:

"Despite a considerable and highly significant shift in world military expenditure, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO) contributions to arms remain predominant. NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization totally dominate the world military scene; four countries - the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France - provide the bulk of the world's capacity to design and produce weapons and, relatedly, virtually, monopolise the international trade in arms, particularly with the third world. The joint military expenditures of the two alliances account for 80 per cent of the world total".

Such statistics leave no doubt as to who should initiate arms reduction and nuclear disarmament. Surely, it is not too much to expect the nuclear-weapon States to take the first step.

It is in this light that my delegation believes the two super-Powers must reach an agreement as soon as possible on measures to reduce both nuclear and non-nuclear weapons. We are encouraged by the statements made by both super-Powers indicating their readiness to negotiate and urge them to bring the second agreement relating to strategic arms limitation talks to an early and fruitful conclusion.

While the initiative on disarmament must be taken by the major Powers, the issue concerns all countries and the entire human race. We believe the co-operation and understanding of all countries, big or small, rich or poor, should be solicited in our efforts to move towards comprehensive disarmament. My Foreign Minister recently stated in the General Assembly:

"We completely endorse the Secretary-General's statement ... that 'the developing countries ... must be involved, and actively so, in a problem which vitally affects them all' (A/32/1, p. 13)."
(A/32/PV.25, pp. 83-85)

(Mr. Tshering, Bhutan)

We welcome, therefore, the coming special session of the General Assembly devoted completely to disarmament, as recommended by the non-aligned movement in its Colombo Declaration and decided by the last 31st session of the General Assembly. We endorse unreservedly the guidelines for the agenda of the special session as outlined in this non-aligned Declaration. The task before us is arduous and complex, but we are confident that, with mutual trust and co-operation among States, the road to general and complete disarmament will be greatly shortened and our goal eventually realized. In this respect, my delegation will also support the various moves towards adoption of measures to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. At this stage, we wish to place on record our appreciation to the Secretary-General and the disarmament division of the United Nations for their dedicated work, and particularly for the publication of the United Nations Disarmament Yearbook.

In conclusion, I wish to quote the statement made by the King of Bhutan, His Majesty Jigme Singye Wangchuck, at the Fifth Non-Aligned Summit Conference held in Colombo last year. His Majesty stated:

"The Non-Aligned Movement, from Belgrade in 1961 to Algiers in 1973 and Lima in 1975, has continued to accord high priority to the question of disarmament, not only as a means for relaxing tensions in the world and promoting international peace and security, but also for the purpose of releasing much needed resources for development purposes. In our view, the development of technology and the ever-increasing expenditure on weapons of mass destruction is a vicious cycle, which is leading mankind ever closer to disaster. In order to halt the arms race and initiate a genuine process of disarmament, we are in favour of convening a world disarmament conference or a special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted exclusively to the problem of disarmament."

It is our hope that the special session of the General Assembly will be able to rekindle the hope of mankind in their efforts towards achieving the comprehensive disarmament that is so desperately needed and so long overdue.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Today the First Committee is concluding the general debate on questions of disarmament. Without claiming to sum up this general debate, I should like, however, to draw one conclusion. By reflecting the common aspirations of peoples to see a speedy end put to the arms race and to achieve disarmament this debate has shown once again that the key problem in this matter is nuclear disarmament. It is precisely on this problem as a whole or on some of its aspects that attention is concentrated by practically all delegations which took part in the debate. We fully share this position to strive towards the speedy implementation of measures in the field of nuclear disarmament to resolve this problem as a whole.

In this year of its sixtieth anniversary the Soviet State launches to the Governments and peoples an appeal that the energy of the atom should be used only for peaceful purposes. This appeal was sounded recently in the statement of the Secretary-General of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Leonid Brezhnev.

In striving to implement this appeal, not by words but by deeds, the Soviet Union has proposed a radical step, namely that all States agree on a simultaneous cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons. This should encompass all forms of such weaponry: atomic weapons, hydrogen or neutron bombs or missiles. At the same time the nuclear Powers could undertake to begin a gradual reduction of the stockpiles already accumulated, moving forward until they achieve a 100 per cent complete elimination of such weapons.

The implementation of the new Soviet proposal, which was put forward in the statement of Leonid Brezhnev, will be an important step towards solving the most important problem of the present time - the elimination of the threat of nuclear war. The task of diminishing the threat of nuclear war is directly related to the question of a complete and general ban on all nuclear-weapon tests.

It is important to give effect to a ban on tests of nuclear weapons in order to put an end to such tests not only in the atmosphere, outer space and under water, but underground as well. For several years the solution of this question was blocked because of the problem of controls. A year ago we took steps to clear this obstacle

(... Masraelyan, USSR)

by declaring our readiness to achieve a compromise on the question of controls over the fulfilment of the agreed commitments on the basis of voluntary checks on the spot.

New obstacles, however, arose. We then took another important step by giving our consent, on the basis of an agreement with the United States and the United Kingdom, not to carry out during a given period of time any underground tests of nuclear weapons, even before accession of other nuclear Powers to the agreement is achieved. But now, in an effort to move forward in the negotiations on this matter and to bring these negotiations to a successful conclusion, the Soviet Union takes yet another new important constructive step by expressing its readiness to agree that, together with the ban for a specific period of all nuclear-weapon tests, a moratorium be called on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. This proposal was made by President Brezhnev in his statement on 2 November.

The history of many years of negotiations on the complete and general ban on the testing of nuclear weapons clearly testifies to the readiness of the Soviet Union to achieve an effective solution of this problem. The Soviet Union not only had initiated the various proposals in this matter, both within the framework of the United Nations and in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, but it has always shown flexibility, a readiness to seek a mutually acceptable solution. The Soviet side has always considered with great attention the views and proposals of other States, including the non-nuclear States, and it took these views into account in determining its own position.

We hope that the persistent efforts of the Soviet Union to achieve an agreement on a nuclear-test ban and that the important step of the USSR on the question of calling a moratorium on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes will be duly appreciated by all, and in particular by our partners in the negotiations in this matter, which will be resumed very soon. We are awaiting a response to our proposals from our partners in these negotiations. It is necessary to ensure a speedy conclusion of this important agreement which is being expected throughout the world and has been expected for such a long time.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

May I be allowed to express my thanks to the delegations of the United Kingdom, Ireland, Australia, Indonesia, Sudan, Liberia, Ethiopia, Nepal and several other countries which expressed great appreciation of the new step of the Soviet Union in the question of the nuclear-test ban. In the struggle against the threat of a nuclear war, one of the crucial tasks is the prevention of the dissemination of nuclear weaponry. It is not coincidental that at the current session of the General Assembly much attention was given to this question. The importance of this matter was pointed out in the statement which was made by the President of the United States, Jimmy Carter, during the general debate and it was also pointed out by the delegations of several other countries.

In recent years we have been witnessing an accelerated development of nuclear energy in many countries. This is quite natural because the nucleus of the atom is a new and very promising source of energy. The increasing economic advantages of this type of energy, the improvement of its safety for man and the environment explain the interest which was shown by many countries in the use of nuclear energy for constructive purposes.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

While we support the optimum development of peaceful uses of nuclear energy, we have always stressed and we continue to stress that such development should in no way lead to an increase in the risk of nuclear-weapon development, of dissemination of such weapons and, therefore, of an increase of the threat of nuclear war. The development and expansion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy leads to an increase in the number of States possessing an ever-growing reserve of fissionable material and special equipment technology. Objectively speaking, this fact increases their potential capability to develop nuclear weapons. Therefore it is important to make provisions for conditions of co-operation which would rule out the threat of any materialization of such capabilities.

At the same time, along with the measures aimed at strengthening the non-proliferation régime, the enhancement of the universality and effectiveness of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) remains a very important task. The States parties to that Treaty do not include such countries as South Africa, Israel and others whose technological development and production capability are such that they are in a position to acquire nuclear weapons on their own.

Particularly acute is the question of not allowing nuclear weapons to come into the hands of the racist régime in Pretoria. We believe that the United Nations must take appropriate measures in order to prevent such a dangerous development. The acquisition of nuclear weapons by the South African authorities would create a very direct threat to the security of the African States, lead to a steep escalation of instability and tension in southern Africa, undermine the efforts of the African States to create a nuclear-free zone on that continent and increase the nuclear threat for all mankind.

The aim of strengthening the non-proliferation régime is being pursued by steps being taken by the main nuclear-exporting States, and we believe that the work towards increasing control measures over nuclear exports should be continued. An important step to strengthen the non-proliferation régime could be the expansion of controls over all the nuclear activities of the importing countries having no nuclear weapons of their own. The view has been

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

expressed that the non-proliferation régime and its strengthening would allegedly be an obstacle to the broad development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

On 2 November the representative of Finland, Ambassador Pastinen, in his reply to the representative of Pakistan very convincingly showed that such fears have no foundation and that, indeed, what is involved here is not the limitation of the peaceful uses of energy and not discrimination against non-nuclear countries but the prevention of the danger of the use of growing nuclear capabilities to manufacture nuclear weapons.

I should like to say a few words on a question which seemingly has no direct relation to the cause of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons but which at the same time is related to that question because it involves the creation of the means of delivery of such weapons. We share the concern which was expressed by some countries with regard to the creation in Africa of a nuclear-test range. Such activities would contradict the efforts of States aimed at reducing and limiting the arms race.

In conclusion, I should like to stress again that we want to diminish considerably and then eliminate altogether the threat of nuclear war, which is the most awesome threat to mankind. The measures aimed at achieving this purpose must doubtless be an important part of the over-all range of efforts to strengthen and develop détente in international relations. What is needed to implement such measures is the joint efforts of many States, and we hope that the current session of the General Assembly will provide new impetus for these efforts.

Mr. WONG (Singapore): Mr. Chairman, my delegation is pleased to see you in the Chair. We have the highest regard for you, Sir, and we are confident that your fine leadership will enable this Committee to complete its work successfully and in a most efficient manner. We should like also to express our satisfaction at the election of the other officers of the Committee and extend our warmest congratulations to them.

Much has already been said about the astronomical figures of global defence expenditures. However, it serves a purpose to underline once again the immense magnitude of that military spending, if only for us to become more acutely aware of how the world's limited resources are going into the

(Mr. Wong, Singapore)

manufacture of deadly weapons. Reliable estimates put the world's arms expenditures for 1976 at about \$330 billion. This sum is said to correspond to the entire gross national product of a typical highly industrialized country with a population of about 50 million and is about 25 times the total amount of foreign aid to the developing countries. Of this \$330 billion, about four-fifths went into the production and sale of conventional weapons.

Whilst my delegation recognizes the grave dangers that arise from the remaining one-fifth of the world's military expenditures on the nuclear arms race, both in the so-called horizontal proliferation or spread of nuclear weapons and in the vertical competition to make existing nuclear arsenals and delivery systems more destructive and more deadly, we feel that insufficient world attention and concern have been focused on the equally unmanageable and equally serious problem of the international race in conventional weapons.

Before going into the possible reasons behind this relentless race among nations towards the brink of Armageddon, and before making an attempt to explore the opportunities for checking this mad competition, let me first of all venture to suggest what might be the prospects of the race in conventional weapons in the foreseeable future. This is as much to put ourselves in the right perspective on what might perhaps be realistically expected as it is to remind ourselves of the bleak consequences for humankind if we were to continue this staggering arms build-up. A recent study on this question stated somewhat discouragingly that the only certainty concerning the international arms trade in the years ahead is that the trade will continue. One common prediction is that the number of suppliers will increase as producer nations begin to see their own reluctance to sell weapons abroad as resulting only in increased sales and benefits to their competitors. Moral considerations would lose their persuasion as potential economic loss is seen to have no real effect on the total arms trade. Another forecast is that the arms trade of the future will see increased sophistication in the range of weapons available and a blurring of the distinctions between offensive and defensive weapons - strategic and tactical, nuclear and conventional. Deliveries of armaments to both developing and industrialized countries are likely to increase. Therefore, more of the world's limited resources will go into arms production and consumption, as both developed and developing countries devote increasingly larger proportions of their gross national products to arms expenditures.

(Mr. Wong, Singapore)

Having painted the bleak scenario that we might expect to face for the next few years, I shall next attempt to address myself to the difficult questions of why nations perceive the need to arm themselves, what is the basis for their sense of insecurity and, given that sense of insecurity and the possession of means of aggression, why nations go to war.

Members of the Committee will immediately recognize the familiarity of those questions as I admit we are not the first, nor will we be the last, to pose them. Many answers have been given by others who have the benefit of also being wise, and it would be presumptuous of me to pretend that I could provide better formulas that would serve more constructive purposes. Nevertheless, it remains clear to us all that, at the same time that the world community is exerting its efforts to halt the arms race and whilst it remains committed to a search for peace, we as members of this community must also undertake more concerted action to reach a better understanding of these fundamental problems of human nature, problems of relations between nations, the perception of threats to national security and of other vital national interests, and the dynamics whereby that perception is brought to the conduct of nations and the decision-making process of the people that govern nations in times of peace and of war.

In his learned book on "The Insecurity of Nations", Charles Yost, a former United States permanent representative to this Organization, suggested several what he called "underlying causes of national insecurity". One possible cause was what I would describe as the intrinsic nature of man which governs relations between people, which in turn determines relations between nations. Then there are also urges, such as that for aggression, which according to Yost were bred in man from his very beginnings to serve basic requirements such as nutrition, reproduction, sleep and social relations. His thesis was that the dark Freudian traits that explain the vileness in human nature and our inherited emotional drives have not yet adapted themselves to the new environment which man has himself created in modern society. Going on to an examination of the beliefs and institutions that govern the actions of modern man and the compatibility of those beliefs and institutions with his security and his survival, Yost offered further thoughts. In the earliest years of human civilization, man was moved by religion. Wars were waged

(Mr. Wong, Singapore)

and lives sacrificed in the name of a Being greater than ourselves. At the same time, Christianity, Buddhism, Islam and Hinduism, also had their civilizing effects. The nature of man was tempered by compassion, spirituality and other virtuous teachings of the great religions.

However, in more modern times, the forces of nationalism and ideology seem to have taken a greater hold over man and his actions. Whilst man would probably no longer die for his religious beliefs, he would have little hesitation in dying for the freedom of his land, his people and for his ideological beliefs and political doctrines. Similarly, he would not hesitate to fight and kill for those same causes. The advent of modern science and technology also has relevance to the present state of the human condition. The aggressive urge has now been extended far beyond the power of the fist to the mind-boggling possibilities of the total extinction of the human race in a nuclear holocaust. On the other hand, the possibilities for understanding and accommodation have also been expanded by the advances in communication between peoples and nations. Science and technology have however brought with them other problems. The differences in the speed of development of nations have been accentuated. We speak today of the growing economic gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots". Communications have increased our perception of that disparity, and it has resulted in our different views about the injustice and inequity of the existing world situation and our often conflicting approaches to the problem.

To some other thoughtful writers who have considered the difficult question of why man feels insecure and wages war such "conventional wisdom", quoting the words of John Stoessinger, may not be particularly satisfying. In his examination of six cases in his study on "Why Nations Go to War", ranging from the outbreak of hostilities in the First World War to what he called "The Thirty Years' War" in the Middle East, Stoessinger gave his own conception of the forces at work, the personalities that invoked such forces and the failings of man-made institutions that contain the machinery for waging war and that only leads to its own ultimate destruction and the destruction of the nation. He concluded that war is a sickness, an acquired sick behaviour that can be unlearned. He further suggested that there can be no winner in a war of our own time. As for the causes

(Mr. Wong, Singapore)

of war, he put the blame on errors in the views of national leaders on their adversaries' intentions, character, capabilities and power. Stoessinger also put the blame on self-delusions by the leadership about both itself and its nation. The constructive message that Stoessinger had to offer was that mankind's only chance for survival lies in its ability to perceive itself, not as separate units, but as an indivisible whole.

Going back to the question of what can be done immediately to control the spread of conventional arms and what are the opportunities that present themselves to the world community for working towards the objective of a safer and saner world, there seem to be a number of practical issues that require examination. Among those issues are the following questions: should the suppliers of arms, or the recipients, or both, exercise restraints themselves? Should constraints be forced on them? Should their efforts at arms control be taken unilaterally, bilaterally, regionally or globally? What should be the type, quality and quantity of conventional arms at which level control ought to be exercised? What are the methods for reaching agreements aimed at such arms control? If my delegation seems to raise more questions than those for which it can provide answers, it is because we ourselves are not altogether sure what these answers are. On the first issue of restraints and constraints on the part of either suppliers or recipients, or both, we readily admit that numerous obstacles are involved.

(Mr. Wong, Singapore)

The relevant factors are: (1) the demand for weapons as a result of the internal political situation of nations and of their relations with other countries in the region; (2) the unequal levels of armament in producer countries and in non-producer countries; (3) the problems connected with military alliances or defence agreements; (4) the threat of military intervention by outside Powers; (5) the supply of weapons as an instrument of policy and for exerting influence; (6) the economic pressures from the arms industry in industrialized countries with its own vested interests, and finally, the larger problem of continued nuclear weapons proliferation. Given these immense problems, it is not surprising that progress in arms control has been slow and is likely to remain so.

Having accepted the practical difficulties, it might be worth while to see what measures remain possible and which can be taken by suppliers and recipients at the international level, at the regional level and at the national level. First, I think we all are aware of the history of proposals made at the international level. Briefly, to recount the attempts that have been made within the United Nations to discuss this question, we should recall that the first attempt was made in 1965 by the delegation of Malta. The proposal was defeated by a single vote. The next attempt was made in 1967 by the delegation of Denmark. Faced with widespread opposition, it was finally withdrawn. The third attempt occurred in 1970. Sweden and the United Kingdom were opposed in their attempt to refer the subject of the arms trade to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. The fourth and most recent attempt to focus attention on this problem came last year at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly. At that session of the General Assembly, the Foreign Ministers of six countries, Japan, Belgium, Ireland, Netherlands, Philippines and Singapore, devoted a major part of their addresses to the question of the conventional arms race. Those six delegations, joined by Ecuador, Bolivia, Paraguay, El Salvador, Venezuela and Colombia co-sponsored a draft resolution asking the Secretary-General to undertake a study of the problem and to solicit the views of Member States. That proposal, like those before it, was defeated.

(Mr. Wong, Singapore)

Bearing in mind the obstacles previously cited to any attempt to curb the conventional arms race, the difficulties and failures met with in past proposals at the international level are perhaps not hard to understand. The tentative conclusion of my delegation is that there are probably no present prospects for progress at the international level. Any proposal which focuses attention on the arms trade or on the transfer of arms would be objected to on the ground that it discriminates against non-producing countries. Any registration proposal must therefore cover production as well as trade. No such proposal is, however, likely to find acceptance at the international level now or in the near future.

At present, it would seem to my delegation that the most hopeful approach is through regional or subregional recipient-country agreements which would cover production as well as trade. The possibility for such agreements is greatest in those regions or subregions of the world, such as Latin America, where intraregional rivalries have not been inflamed by the East-West rivalry. In December 1974 eight Latin American countries subscribed to the Declaration of Ayacucho, expressing their desire to create "conditions which will make possible the effective limitation of armaments and put an end to their acquisition for purposes of war". More recently, however, tensions seemed to have arisen between some of those countries, and those tensions appear to have undermined the spirit of the Declaration of Ayacucho and resulted in a renewed competition for sophisticated weaponry by those countries. The prospects in other regions of the world are even more bleak.

Let me now turn to the problem on the suppliers' side. What measures can the arms suppliers take, either singly or collectively, at the national, regional and international levels, to reduce the arms race?

The first thing they can do is to subordinate the economic motivations to their foreign policy, national security, and arms control objectives. That is, however, easier said than done, especially in the case of certain countries whose economies and defence industries could be adversely affected by any curtailment of their arms trade. Secondly, the suppliers should try to work out a co-ordinated arms sales policy. The United States should, for example,

attempt to obtain the agreement of the Soviet Union in exercising restraint. Perhaps the major suppliers of conventional weapons could form a club so that certain understandings could be reached among them. Thirdly, the arms suppliers should give their support to regional initiatives to control the arms trade. Finally, the arms suppliers can take certain unilateral measures to reduce the arms race. Those measures could be of either a qualitative or a quantitative nature. An arms supplier could, for example, refuse to sell certain types of weapons, such as weapons exclusively or primarily designed to deliver nuclear warheads. It could also refuse to sell certain high-technology weapon systems which are not commensurate with the legitimate defence requirements of the requesting State and the transfer of which would upset the strategic balance in an area.

I have now come to the end of what I have to say. We have tried to look at the problem of the conventional arms race from its many aspects. The first aspect was the magnitude and dangers of this arms race. The second concerned the prospects of what was likely to happen in the next few years. Then, we attempted to examine what might be described as the fundamental human causes of this arms race. We also discussed the problems and obstacles that deter efforts at curbing the conventional arms race. We explored the opportunities for continued efforts at this difficult task, bearing in mind the difficulties and the historical experience of many failures in the past.

When I was recounting the long history of past proposals, with its larger degree of failure than of what can be said to be success, not only was I reminded of the tremendous difficulties arising from the undying distrust of man for his kindred, but also I sought consolation and perhaps even a little inspiration from the undaunted spirit in which this same creature, man, has ceaselessly tried to rise above his anxieties, suspicions and fears of his fellow beings. Let me conclude with a quotation from a great statesman who, before his untimely death in 1961, was Secretary-General of our Organization, Dag Hammarskjöld. He once said, "Fear motivates much of human action. It is our worst enemy and, somehow, seems to taint at least some corner of the heart of every man."

Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time my delegation has spoken in this Committee I should like sincerely to congratulate you on your election to the chairmanship of this important Committee. I should also like to express our sincere congratulations to the other officers of the Committee and to wish them every success under your leadership.

Mankind as a whole has suffered the scourges of the first and second world wars, which have left their abominable effects in various parts of the world. They have left their mark on human history with the killing and mutilating of millions of people. Furthermore, those wars caused inestimable material losses. That is why disarmament has been a cherished hope of all the peoples of the world, who wish to co-operate in the creation of a world in which security and stability are paramount. But that hope has evaporated despite the arduous efforts that have been exerted in order to achieve that goal because international tension and nuclear terror dominate various parts of the world as a result of colonial interests and aspirations and attempts at further domination and influence.

The arms race has gathered momentum and has spread, and now includes new parts of the world. It has begun to consume a considerable proportion of vital resources, particularly since, according to recent reports, military expenditures amount to \$350 million a year.

It is a source of concern that nuclear tests are still being conducted despite the serious efforts to save mankind from destruction and annihilation. In the past year alone there have been 1,800 nuclear explosions, which can only lead to further tension and conflicts. This can but make the consolidation of international détente difficult to achieve. In this context I should like to state that unless crucial results are attained within the framework of the United Nations, no progress can be achieved without consolidation of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and without embarking upon negotiations in the various fields related to disarmament and without the participation of all the countries concerned.

Today the world spends considerable sums on the acquisition of arms to attain stability and security. But what is actually achieved is only more tension and a lack of the trust that is a basic prerequisite of security.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

Millions of dollars are being squandered to achieve a so-called military balance among nations despite the fact that humanity is in urgent need of programmes and development processes for countries in various parts of the world which are still in poverty, ignorance and disease.

Disarmament has occupied a prominent place in the work of the General Assembly for three decades as a result of the continued demand of the peoples of the world for disarmament, which is inevitable, and the ending of the arms race has become an international concern. In this respect I should like to quote the Secretary-General's report on the work of the Organization (A/32/1), in which he says:

"... 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, 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." (A/32/1, p.12)

The world has long reached the stage at which it cannot achieve real security save through general and complete disarmament and increased international co-operation in the field of disarmament on the basis of mutual benefit and the establishment of relationships that will pave the way for the elimination of tension and conflict.

The use of force cannot be sanctioned in international relations, for continuation, expansion and intensification of the arms race will inevitably lead to increased military dangers and threats and will impede the development processes essential to the majority of the countries of the world.

Now that two thirds of the Disarmament Decade have passed and we are in a position to evaluate what has been achieved, we can arrive at a not very satisfactory conclusion concerning the stockpiling of nuclear weapons and the development of such weapons, as well as the enlarging of arsenals and the introduction of new and more destructive weapons.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

The cost of the arms race is increasing at an abominable rate while the problems of development in developing countries are becoming more complicated. The threat of a nuclear war, the danger of annihilation and the considerable material and human cost make disarmament an inevitable necessity.

My country believes that any efforts at disarmament should be concentrated on the total banning and prohibition of all nuclear tests. In this respect the General Assembly has each year adopted several resolutions urging Member States to conclude agreements prohibiting nuclear tests, since such agreements would constitute an encouraging factor on the road to general and complete disarmament.

On this occasion my delegation wishes to express its satisfaction concerning the draft treaty prepared by the Swedish delegation to lay down sound foundations for a complete nuclear test-ban treaty. The declarations and statements issued by the Soviet Union and the United States of America concerning new efforts to reach and conclude new agreements to put an end to the arms race are, we believe, a new positive step towards reducing the current stockpiles of nuclear weapons in accordance with the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Though the efforts that have been made give us hope in further attempts to achieve what all aspire to, certain countries which turn to the acquisition of nuclear weapons and do not ratify the Non-Proliferation Treaty pose a real threat to international peace and security. In this respect I should like to emphasize the close-co-operation existing between the racist régimes in Tel Aviv and Pretoria in the field of the development and acquisition of nuclear weapons. The introduction of nuclear weapons into such explosive areas as the Middle East and the continent of Africa constitutes an immediate danger to the Arab and African peoples and consequently endangers the peace and security of the world. Given their policies of apartheid and religious discrimination, which have been condemned by the international community, these two régimes will not hesitate to resort to nuclear weapons as a means of nuclear intimidation and blackmail and to oppress peoples and occupy territories by force. The stockpiling of complicated and sophisticated weapons and the development of nuclear weapons by these two racist régimes are grave developments requiring immediate

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

attention by the international community and necessitating effective measures by various countries, particularly the Western countries, to put an end to any co-operation with and any military and economic assistance for these two régimes unless they become parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

The fact that these two régimes have not signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty or accepted the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East and the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa is but a reassertion and reaffirmation of the aggressive intentions of these two racist régimes and their violation of United Nations resolutions and international law.

The necessity of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world in the light of the United Nations Charter helps to consolidate and strengthen relationships among the countries of the world, on the one hand, and to consolidate and safeguard international peace and security on the other.

I should like to affirm here that unless considerable progress is made towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and towards forcing the Zionist entity which threatens the area with nuclear danger to sign that treaty we shall have failed to achieve the objective sought by these declarations and statements we have made and by the resolutions we have adopted, namely, the establishment of peace and security in the world.

My country considers the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa and the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia to be no less important than similar action on the Middle East if we wish to proceed towards general and complete disarmament. We are greatly concerned with the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) and other resolutions which followed, for we have repeated on several occasions previously that we fully support that Declaration and the desire to keep the area free of competition and rivalry by major Powers and to remove the various military bases from territories overlooking the Indian Ocean. Declaring the Indian Ocean area a zone of peace will certainly contribute to the consolidation of international peace and security and will help to put an end to the arms race and the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other, conventional, lethal weapons in the area.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

Among the most important problems facing our world today is the problem of increasing, innovating and producing chemical, biological and incendiary weapons as well as napalm. Many countries of the world have not ratified the Geneva Protocol concerning the prohibition of the use of these weapons, which came into effect over 50 years ago. Research concerning the development of such weapons as well as of toxic gases, and the stockpiling of these weapons, are a clear indication of disregard of the human values for which the international community strives. That is why the delegation of my country wishes to express its gratitude and appreciation for the valuable efforts exerted by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in order to reach agreement on the prohibition of the development and production of toxic chemical weapons and other conventional weapons and the destruction of stockpiles of such weapons, and urges the intensification of such efforts because that constitutes a positive step towards actual disarmament.

The question of the reduction of the military budgets of the major countries and the allocation of part of that military expenditure towards the economic development of developing countries is an important item which cannot possibly be separated from the problem of disarmament. By its resolution 31/87 the General Assembly has reaffirmed its conviction of the urgent necessity that the States permanent members of the Security Council, as well as any other State with comparable military expenditures, carry out reductions in their military budgets. In this respect the fifth summit Conference of non-aligned States declared that the arms race runs counter to efforts seeking the establishment of a new international economic order, for there is an essential and urgent need to transfer the allocations used for military expenditure to social and economic development, particularly in developing countries.

The forthcoming special session of the General Assembly devoted to the consideration of disarmament and the consolidation of the role of the United Nations in paving the way to general and complete disarmament will have a positive effect in particular on putting an end to the nuclear arms race and encouraging nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament alike. My country looks forward to the special session of the General Assembly, cherishing the hope that that session will adopt a declaration of principles and a programme of action concerning disarmament, and will consider the role

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

of the United Nations in the field of disarmament within the framework of its Charter and consider calling for a world conference on disarmament in the near future in accordance with General Assembly resolutions and the resolutions adopted by the fifth non-aligned summit Conference.

International peace and security cannot be established except on the basis of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Priority in this respect should be given to nuclear disarmament, including the prohibition of all nuclear tests and the destruction of all lethal and destructive weapons. My country supports resolutions and measures which contribute to positive steps leading towards general and complete disarmament and towards building a world of peace, security, prosperity and fraternity.

Mr. NEAGU (Romania): The initiative taken seven years ago by the Romanian Government concerning the inclusion of an item entitled "Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security" on the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly stemmed from its concern over the alarming proportions reached by military expenditures and the harmful effect of this state of affairs.

It is of course legitimate to ask ourselves about the impact of a study - particularly a study worked out with the participation of Governments - concerning the consequences of the armaments race on disarmament negotiations. This question is justified, taking into account the fact that this phenomenon was studied by scientists and specialized institutes in different countries, and that the basic data relating to the arms race and its consequences are common knowledge.

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

In our opinion, the preparation by the Secretary-General of the United Nations of a report on this matter and the acceptance, on the basis of consensus, by the representatives of Member States of its assessments, conclusions and recommendations, especially those concerning priorities in the field of disarmament, already represents a way of assuming responsibilities as to the present situation.

Once these responsibilities are assumed, the obligation arises to remedy that situation.

Then, being firmly convinced that disarmament can be achieved only through the common, conscious action of all peoples, we feel that in order to act they must be informed about the real impact of the arms race on their lives.

It is only by taking concerted action and by mobilizing their inexhaustible energies that peoples will decisively determine the adoption of effective disarmament measures thus overcoming the influence of some circles narrowly interested in promoting the old policy of oppression, diktat and pressure, and in producing and selling deadly weapons.

It may be concluded that although not automatically leading to disarmament measures, the aforementioned study represents a warning, issued with the authority of the United Nations, over the consequences of the arms race, an explicit expression of the fact that we do not contemplate placidly this harmful phenomenon. At the same time, the study provides for an agreed basis for future actions to be taken towards general and complete disarmament and, above all, nuclear disarmament.

The report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, assisted by a group of consultant experts, and entitled, "Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures," (A/8469/Rev.1) was submitted to the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly. The report has been welcomed and has enjoyed wide international recognition as providing in-depth information on the manifold aspects of the complex phenomenon of the arms race, as well as on the great dangers it engenders in the political, economic and social fields.

My country fully shares the widespread feeling that urgent measures are necessary at this stage to stop the arms race. We are also aware that the arms race has witnessed important changes which make it incompatible with the efforts made by the international community to establish a new international economic order. These are the reasons which prompted Romania, in agreement with

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

other States, to suggest that the 1971 report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the consequences of the arms race be updated.

As a result of the decision adopted in this spirit in General Assembly resolution 3462 (XXX) of 11 December 1975, the Secretary-General has submitted to the present session his new report entitled, "Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures." (A/32/88/Add.1)

This report fully demonstrates the soundness of the General Assembly's decision to keep under constant attention the problem of the arms race and its consequences.

We should like to emphasize that a thorough examination of this document clearly reveals that practically all of the conclusions of the 1971 report have retained their full validity. The threat of ultimate self-destruction as a result of nuclear war represents the greatest peril facing the world. Effective security cannot be achieved today by further armament, and the world has long since reached the point where security can only be sought in disarmament, in the expansion of international co-operation among all countries in all fields, the establishment on the basis of mutual benefit of ties which will permit the elimination of present sources of tension and conflict, and the suppression of the relevance of force in international relations. The costs of the arms race are enormous and can no longer be supported. The most ominous danger hanging over the world is posed by the military forces of the largest Powers and the immense destructiveness of the weapons with which they are equipped.

The risk of final obliteration as well as the immense human and material resources engulfed in the arms race have rendered disarmament more imperative than ever.

At the same time, the new report of the Secretary-General lays stress on the significant changes undergone by the arms race phenomenon and the aggravation of its consequences in the political, economic and social fields. Underlining the increasing technological character of the contemporary arms race, the new report demonstrates that this character substantially complicates the equation of disarmament, rendering its solution more and more complicated and seriously amplifying the harmful political, economic and social consequences of the arms race at both the national and international levels. The urgent need for vigorous

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

action to be taken in the field of disarmament is stressed by the report, and in this we see the principal merit of the updated report submitted by the Secretary-General.

I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to express to the Secretary-General and to the group of consultant experts all our gratitude for this important study. The deep analysis and the clear-sightedness of the conclusions and the pertinence of the suggestions make it a valuable document which deserves to be carefully examined by the General Assembly at its special session devoted to disarmament and could provide useful guidelines for future disarmament negotiations.

Being convinced that the efforts aimed at stopping the arms race and achieving disarmament require the thorough knowledge and comprehension of the arms race phenomenon and of its consequences, we deem it suitable that the Secretary-General, the Governments and the international, national and non-governmental organizations give this report the widest publicity by every means at their disposal.

It is our firm belief that all these measures will enable the updated report to become a remarkable contribution of the United Nations in informing the international community about the particularly serious consequences of the arms race for the peace and security of the world and for the economic and social welfare of all peoples. We believe that this contribution will clearly emphasize the need to adopt effective disarmament measures, primarily nuclear, and will direct the negotiations towards the vital fields on which depends the fulfilment of this supreme aspiration of mankind.

The presentation of this study confirms the soundness of the call by the General Assembly calling for increased efforts on behalf of the United Nations in order to ensure a better-informed world public opinion on the arms race and its consequences as well as on the disarmament negotiations now under way and on the position of States with respect to the measures to be adopted.

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

In this connexion, the decision of the General Assembly to establish a United Nations Centre for Disarmament holds a prominent place. It is gratifying for my delegation, which co-sponsored the draft resolution providing for the creation of the Centre, to see that after one year of activity the results obtained are noteworthy. The Centre has to be credited during this period with the publication of the first United Nations Disarmament Yearbook, with the preparation of basic documentary material for the special session devoted to disarmament and with a substantial contribution to the updating of the report on the consequences of the arms race.

While expressing our belief that the Centre will find new ways of strengthening the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, we wish the staff of the Centre every success in fulfilling the lofty tasks entrusted to it by the Member States.

The CHAIRMAN : I should like to announce that Burundi and Algeria have become co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.10.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.