

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION
Official Records *

UN LIBRARY
OCT 29 1979

UN/SA COLLECTION

FIRST COMMITTEE
11th meeting
held on
Monday, 22 October 1979
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 11th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 30 TO 45, 120 AND 121 (continued)

- General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Troyanovsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Baron von Wechmar (Federal Republic of Germany)
Mr. Barua (India)
Mr. Barnett (Jamaica)
Mr. Ramphul (Mauritius)
Mr. Al-Ali (Iraq)

* 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.1/34/PV.11
24 October 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 30 TO 45, 120 AND 121 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation, in its statement of 18 October, presented here in the Committee the attitude of principle of the Soviet Union towards the problem of the limitation of the arms race and disarmament, a characteristic feature of which was the desire on the part of our country to produce a break in the negotiations on this problem and to proceed from discussions to the elaboration and implementation of concrete agreements concerning genuine measures on disarmament. We likewise stated that we considered most timely and worthy of the greatest and most serious consideration and support the proposal of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic concerning the adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of a declaration on international co-operation for disarmament.

Today, the Soviet delegation would like to speak in greater detail on this proposal. We fully share and, indeed, support the desire of the Czechoslovak Government to activate in every possible way the comprehensive realization of the decisions and recommendations that were adopted unanimously by all of us at the tenth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament. It should be pointed out in this connexion that a characteristic of the document of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic resides in the organic combination of the basic ideas that have been built into both the Declaration and the Programme of Action of the Final Act adopted at the special session. It may be stated that the declaration proposed by Czechoslovakia would be a sort of link between those two documents since it would give substance to and develop the propositions contained therein and translate them into practical reality.

Another characteristic feature of the arms race forced upon the world that has been very properly emphasized in the document of the Czechoslovak delegation is the fact that the pace of stockpiling armaments and, in the first instance, of the most sophisticated forms of weapons of mass destruction is outstripping

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

that of the achievement of agreements at the various negotiations on disarmament. If such a trend is not halted and if the finest efforts are not made to reverse it, then the fate of the world will constantly be subjected to new trials and the forthcoming Decade may well turn out to be the decade of missed opportunities. The Soviet delegation, which has made its ultimate goal the achievement of general and complete disarmament, has constantly manifested and will continue to manifest perseverance and single-mindedness in the fulfilment of this task. We are ready to co-operate in this field with all other States.

The experience accumulated by States in the elaboration and conclusion of various international agreements on questions of the limitation of the arms race and of disarmament have demonstrated convincingly that concrete results in this field can be achieved only through a clearly expressed political will and resolve on the part of those taking part in the negotiations. An example of this is the achievement of Soviet and United States agreement on the conclusion of a Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, namely, SALT II. A characteristic of the most recent years is to be found in the fact that in the process of the negotiations on disarmament an increasing number of States are being included, the result of a natural process that reflects the inevitable awareness of numerous States of the unquestionable truth that a secure peace on earth can be guaranteed, not by means of an unbridled stockpiling of military potential and the pursuance of a policy that proceeds from a position of strength and nuclear threat, but by means of the elaboration and conclusion of international agreements that would lead to a general decrease and elimination of armaments in strict compliance with the principle of not doing damage to any of the parties concerned.

The extensive participation of States in this complex and difficult process calls for a qualitatively new and higher level of co-operation on their part, as well as for the further development and deepening of mutual contacts and the establishment of a favourable atmosphere of trust in relations between States independently of their social structure, level of economic development and membership or non-membership of military alliances.

The proposal of Czechoslovakia reflects the proposition that the process of disarmament negotiation should be a continuous one and should proceed, as far as

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

possible, at a rapid pace, encompassing all aspects of the problem that may lend themselves to discussion. Scarcely anybody would doubt the necessity and importance of precisely this kind of approach to the activities of the international machinery for discussion and solution of questions involving the lessening of a military threat.

At the same time, it is inadmissible that, in the course of negotiations and also by way of condition for the achievement of specific agreements, there should be arguments advanced which have nothing in common with the subject of the negotiations. Clearly not helpful to the success of talks on disarmament or to the elaboration of already existing ideas and proposals in this field are the many fabrications concerning an alleged threat to the security of some of the parties to the talks posed by other States.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

The cause of peace is being further harmed by various kinds of war propaganda. In our country, such propaganda is constitutionally prohibited, and it is for that reason that we have so readily responded to the appeal contained in the Declaration to all States to embody in their constitutions, in so far as possible, or in some other fashion, their political will and resolve to contribute by all means to the cause of peace, to international security and to the achievement of progress in the sphere of disarmament.

The draft declaration also contains an urgent appeal to make every effort to reduce further the threat of the outbreak of military conflict and to strengthen mutual trust, with a view to expanding the basis for significant progress in the solution of disarmament questions and the laying of groundwork for the disbanding of military alliances. The Soviet Union's position in this respect is well known. It has consistently been in favour of the disbanding of military blocs, and it is for that reason that we fully support this appeal. An important provision in the draft document submitted by the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is the proposal that States should not strive to achieve unilateral advantages and military superiority, and that they should refrain from any other steps that might have an adverse effect upon efforts aimed at achieving progress in the sphere of disarmament.

As for the Soviet Union, Leonid I. Brezhnev in his statement on 6 October of this year in Berlin stated:

"We do not strive towards any military superiority. Our intentions have never included and do not include any threats to any State or group of States."

There is no doubt that were all other States to build their policies on such a peace-loving basis, the process of détente - including military détente - would have been greatly facilitated, that there would be a strengthening of stability and, in the final analysis, there would be a substantial improvement propitious to the cause of peace.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

In the view of the Soviet delegation, the draft declaration on international co-operation for disarmament submitted by the delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is a highly relevant document that demands close attention. The adoption of such a declaration and its implementation by all States would serve to establish conditions in international relations in which it would be far easier to conduct negotiations on all aspects of disarmament and to accelerate the achievement of concrete results from such negotiations.

The adoption of the declaration would likewise be a further step towards the realization of the Final Document of the tenth special session devoted to disarmament and would serve to translate its decision into concrete agreements in this sphere.

Baron von WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany): Arms control and disarmament are central elements of the policy of the Federal Republic of Germany aimed at détente and at the safeguarding of peace. Because of its special geographical position, the Federal Republic has a vital interest in the preservation of peace. Arms control and disarmament are therefore a fundamental concern of our practical, day-to-day foreign and security policy, which is pursued with the aim of contributing, together with our partners in the Western Defence Alliance, to a more stable balance of forces in Europe and in the world at the lowest possible level of armaments. Our policy continues to be governed by the concept of a comprehensive world-wide partnership for security, as put forward by Federal Chancellor Helmut Schmidt at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. This concept is based on the assumption that the new reality of world-wide interdependence calls for a policy of peace and security that is global in nature.

The Federal Republic of Germany therefore welcomes the fact that the United Nations has intensified its world-wide disarmament efforts following the

(Baron von Wechmar, Federal
Republic of Germany)

resolutions adopted at the tenth special session. The Federal Government supported from the outset the endeavours to strengthen the United Nations role in the field of disarmament, and it is prepared to make a constructive contribution to the success of the United Nations disarmament efforts.

The Final Document adopted by the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, created a framework and a yardstick for our subsequent discussions. Our task is now to use the consensus arrived at in the Final Document for concrete and realistic measures in the field of arms control and disarmament. We consider it wrong to question the consensus achieved or to evade the concretization of the Final Document by proposing new general declarations of principles of a non-operative nature.

The international developments that have occurred since the tenth special session do not warrant euphoria. However, they substantiate the realistic prospect of being able to realize, step by step, the recommendations of the tenth special session and to move nearer towards the goal of a more peaceful world order in which the threat or use of force as a political means would be eliminated.

The outstanding international event in the field of arms control was without doubt the signing in Vienna of the SALT II Treaty by President Carter of the United States and President Brezhnev of the Soviet Union. The Government of the Federal Republic welcomes the fact that these two countries succeeded in concluding this extensive treaty that is of vital importance to world-wide arms control endeavours.

We consider SALT II as representing an important step along the road to a more even balance of nuclear forces between East and West. The Government of the Federal Republic hopes that, following the ratification of the treaty, the SALT process will be continued as soon as possible, in accordance with the joint statement of principles, with a view to agreeing on further reductions and qualitative

(Baron von Wechmar, Federal
Republic of Germany)

limitations and, in particular, to reducing the existing disparities in the field of nuclear medium-range missiles.

We therefore welcome the readiness expressed by General Secretary Brezhnev to include the Soviet medium-range systems in SALT III. As Federal Chancellor Schmidt stated before the special session of the General Assembly, these weapons "cannot be ignored in a balanced system of military equilibrium". (A/S-10/PV.5, page 77)

It is an undeniable fact that in the field of modern, land-based medium-range nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union enjoys marked superiority over the Western Alliance. This disparity is a reason for great concern to the Alliance, and as such it is an element of instability. In view of the range and technological capacity of the Soviet SS-20 missiles, the offer to withdraw Soviet medium-range weapons only from the western part of the Soviet Union appears hardly attractive.

(Baron von Wechmar, Federal Republic of
Germany)

Under these circumstances, the Western Alliance has to prepare decisions in accordance with its resolve to continue its endeavours to stabilize the balance of forces and bring about a more stable military relationship. These endeavours are clearly reflected in the planned combination of concrete, realistic arms control proposals and defence policy measures - measures which respond exclusively to defence needs. We hope that it will be possible in the framework of SALT III to reach agreement on specific limitations of nuclear weapons, including long-range theatre nuclear forces. Such limitations would have to be in accordance with the generally accepted arms control principles of equality and parity.

Now that agreement has been reached at SALT on parity for intercontinental strategic nuclear arms, it should also be possible at the Vienna negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions to realize within the geographically limited region of Central Europe the arms control principle of parity for conventional forces. Over the last six years these negotiations have developed into an East-West dialogue on security policy issues which in itself has a stabilizing effect. In the course of this process, both sides have achieved a considerable amount of conceptual convergence. This convergence of principles must now be translated into concrete results. In the first instance this requires agreement to be reached on the existing manpower levels on both sides. The Federal Government is determined to continue its efforts in close co-operation with its allies for a successful outcome of the negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions.

Negotiations on security and arms control can be conducted successfully only in an atmosphere of mutual trust. In Europe, a start has been made in the form of the confidence-building measures of the Helsinki Final Act. This process should be continued. We consider the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe as the most appropriate framework for dealing with this subject.

The follow-up Conference to be held in Madrid in 1980 is intended to contribute to this end. Furthermore, with its initiative for a Conference on Disarmament in Europe, France has provided an impetus for agreements designed to increase trust. These endeavours have our support.

(Baron von Wechmar, Federal Republic of
Germany)

Another positive development this year has been the commencement of work by the restructured Geneva Committee on Disarmament. We welcome the fact that the Committee on Disarmament has, by elaborating its rules of procedure and its programme of activities, been able to establish the procedural and substantive basis for solving the task assigned to it. The "elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament" adopted by consensus by the newly-established United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) have also served to widen the basis for further productive negotiations within the Geneva Committee on Disarmament.

In view of these fields in which progress has been made, the Federal Government is confident that the steadfast continuation of the world-wide efforts for disarmament and arms control based on the consensus achieved thus far will permit the objectives of the Final Document to be attained step by step. This applies to both the nuclear and the conventional fields.

Although the Committee on Disarmament has not yet been able to find a suitable and realistic basis for negotiations on nuclear disarmament measures, the successful conclusion of SALT II indicates the direction in which promising solutions may be found.

The detailed discussion of negative security guarantees within the Committee on Disarmament has led to greater clarity of the different interests existing and the resulting proposed solutions.

The Federal Government considers it justified that the non-aligned non-nuclear-weapon States want effective guarantees from nuclear-weapon States to the effect that they will not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against them. However, it is concerned that an international convention will not be able to do justice to the differing security conditions of the various regions. Under these circumstances, how the effectiveness of the security pledges already made by the nuclear-weapon States can be enhanced should be examined.

Although the three parties negotiating the comprehensive test ban complex have not yet been able to conclude their deliberations, the Federal Government nevertheless hopes that they will soon be able to do so and that the Committee on Disarmament will then be able to deal with the elements for a treaty to be submitted to it. This would no doubt have a positive effect on the Review Conference of

(Baron von Wechmar, Federal Republic of
Germany)

the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. In this context we welcomed the second report of the Ad Hoc Group of Seismological Experts and also advocated that the Group be given a new mandate.

The Federal Government continues to be willing to participate in a seismological verification system with its Graefenberg Central Observatory, which possesses the most up-to-date equipment.

The satisfactory outcome of the two meetings of the Preparatory Committee for the second Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty augurs well for the forthcoming Conference. The Federal Government regards the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as an essential contribution to safeguarding peace. It holds the view that the Non-Proliferation Treaty continues to be the most effective instrument for a convincing policy of non-proliferation. Therefore, every attempt should be made to convince those countries that are still hesitating about signing the Treaty or are opposed to it. Only universal application can ensure that the Treaty is wholly effective. My Government hopes that the forthcoming Review Conference will bring us nearer to this goal.

The preliminary work for conventions on other types of weapons of mass destruction has also made progress, albeit to differing extents. We welcome the "Agreed joint USSR-United States proposal on major elements of a treaty prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons", which has been submitted to the Committee on Disarmament. We hope that it will be possible next year to draw up a treaty ready for signing.

One of the most urgent disarmament measures is a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons. The Federal Government has stressed its great interest in such a ban by means of theoretical and practical contributions. As early as 1954 the Federal Republic of Germany renounced the manufacture of chemical weapons and accepted international verification measures to control the observance of this undertaking. In March this year we held a workshop which was attended by representatives from 26 countries. We then submitted to the Committee on Disarmament a working paper (CD/37) on the problem of verification with regard to the non-manufacture of chemical weapons. In the paper we set out our own experience of verification and the findings of the workshop. In summing up

(Baron von Wechmar, Federal Republic of
Germany)

the experience and findings, it can be said that effective on-site controls of civilian chemical plants are possible without prejudicing industrial interests.

We hope that next year the Committee on Disarmament will find an organizational arrangement for continuing the discussion of chemical weapons among all the interested States on the basis of both the national contributions made hitherto and the joint report of the United States and the Soviet Union regarding the state of their bilateral negotiations. This cannot replace parallel bilateral negotiations between these two States, but it can supplement them in a useful way.

In view of the fact that by far the greater portion of world arms expenditure is used for conventional weapons and that the growth rate of this expenditure is alarmingly high, the Federal Republic of Germany gives high priority to conventional arms limitation and disarmament.

As is well known, it has for many years now pursued a highly restrictive arms export policy and subjected the export of armaments to stringent controls. The restrictive nature of its arms export policy is reflected in the low percentage of export permits for war materials in relation to its over-all exports, this figure having been only 0.22 per cent in 1978.

(Baron von Wechmar, Federal Republic of Germany)

The Federal Government supports all international efforts for limiting arms exports. It is convinced that the success of such endeavours is dependent on the participation of the receiving countries as well as all the important supplier countries in both East and West. In this context, the Federal Government is following with interest and sympathy the initiative taken by several Latin American countries for regional agreements on the limitation of arms acquisition.

The United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects was unfortunately unable to produce agreements ready for signing.

However, apart from a ban on fragmentation weapons, whose fragments cannot be discovered by X-rays, almost general agreement existed on a draft protocol regarding "land mines and other devices". A convergence of views was also achieved in the discussion on incendiary weapons. We are therefore confident that a continuation of the negotiations on the basis of the results of the first session of the Conference will lead to a positive over-all result at the second session, scheduled for next autumn.

In his speech a few weeks ago, the Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Hans-Dietrich Genscher, made the following appeal to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly:

"The community of nations is called upon to make every effort to stop the armament spiral. The arms build-up is a threat to peace, it hampers development and it impairs the ability to provide development aid." (A/34/PV.11, p.34-35)

He thus gave expression to the Federal Government's conviction that the paramount goal of our policy of security and peace - the creation of a stable balance - would be impossible to attain if we ignored the economic and social aspects, because economic and social problems can engender instabilities which threaten peace.

(Baron von Wechmar, Federal Republic of Germany)

Therefore, the Federal Government welcomes the progress achieved hitherto in preparing a comprehensive study on disarmament and development. By financing six major national studies, it is contributing to the work of the group of experts, and hopes that the results of their study will provide a starting-point for concrete measures.

A stable and comprehensive security partnership both between North and South and between East and West can only evolve in an atmosphere of mutual trust. The Federal Government therefore attaches particular importance to the confidence-building measures as a significant preliminary step towards verifiable arms limitation and disarmament and as a condition for the continuation of the process of détente. It noted with satisfaction the almost unanimous adoption of its resolution, submitted together with 19 co-sponsors, at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly recommending that all countries agree on confidence-building measures on a regional basis, taking into consideration the particular conditions of the respective region. Like many other countries, we transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, pursuant to resolution 33/91 B of the General Assembly, our views on and experiences of confidence-building measures, which can be summed up as follows.

At the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe held in 1975, agreement was reached on concrete and verifiable confidence-building measures. The experience gained with the implementation of the measures agreed in the Final Act of Helsinki is encouraging. Quite a few countries, including the Federal Republic of Germany, have striven from the outset to implement the agreement in a broad-minded manner and have not only given prior notification of manoeuvres, but have also invited numerous observers so that they may gain an over-all view of the manoeuvres.

Apart from these measures, designed primarily to provide reciprocal information, there are numerous other measures that could also enhance trust between States. Permit me to name but a few of them: the setting-up of so-called hot-lines, which permit swift contact between Governments

(Baron von Wechmar, Federal Republic of Germany)

in the event of disturbing developments; the establishment of observance posts at geographically important points in order, among other things, to reduce the fear of surprise attacks; the exchange of military delegations, which is conducive to greater mutual understanding and to improved personal contacts; and the disclosures of defence budgets as a prerequisite for verifiable reductions in expenditure.

We are aware that the confidence-building measures developed in and for Europe cannot be transferred in unchanged form to other regions. However, we are convinced that the concept of confidence-building measures is sufficiently flexible to permit its adaptation to the particular geographical, political and military conditions of individual regions. In our view, the essential element in this context is that concrete measures should be developed and agreed upon which lead to more openness and transparency among the countries concerned and thus help to prevent misjudgements and to give assurance that particular military activities of a neighbour do not represent a threat to one's own security. Only the embodiment of concrete confidence-building measures in agreements can ensure their orderly implementation and the "practice of joint action".

The first step towards the introduction of such concrete measures should, in our opinion, be a study assessing the possible methods and means of achieving increased trust, taking into due consideration the differing security conditions of the various regions.

While multilateral conventions on confidence-building measures are not sufficient per se to preserve international peace and security, they can nevertheless make an important contribution towards greater stability in international relations.

Mr. BARUA (India): The search for a secure and safe international order was undoubtedly the single most important objective behind the founding of the United Nations 35 years ago. The words of the Charter -

(Mr. Barua, India)

"to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" -- familiar to all of us, give expression to a deep-rooted yearning of mankind, namely, to live in peace and to devote itself to the pursuit of happiness. It is therefore entirely appropriate that the United Nations should give the highest priority to the question of international peace and security, for a feeling of insecurity would hamper and jeopardize human activity in all fields.

No nation can avoid the responsibility of providing an appropriate and adequate level of defence for its security. In the imperfect world in which we all live, security has to be the primary concern of a nation. The problem of security has almost always been thought of in military terms. This is natural and understandable. However, it is now generally accepted that force alone does not guarantee security and that a nation can reach a point at which the acquisition of additional military might would not necessarily provide additional security. In fact, beyond a certain point, more could well turn out to be much worse; excessive expenditure on armaments could reduce security rather than strengthen it. I submit that the world has at present reached such an excessive, irrational and highly dangerous level of armed preparedness.

(Mr. Barua, India)

This is particularly true in respect of the arsenals of nuclear weapons which threaten the very survival of mankind. Consequently, the urgent attention of the international community has to be focused on the avoidance of nuclear war and on nuclear disarmament. In 1945, two nuclear bombs of 30 kilotonnes of high explosive destroyed the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, killing nearly 300,000 people. Since that time, the world's nuclear stockpiles have grown to the equivalent of more than 1 million Hiroshima bombs. A fraction of these weapons, if used for war, would destroy civilization as we know it today. The continuous qualitative and quantitative expansion in nuclear weaponry has long since lost its meaning, at least from the military and strategic points of view. Doctrines of strategic deterrence are exploited by interested groups continually to feed the mad momentum of the arms race. We must take action effectively to halt and reverse this nuclear arms race before either an accident or a misplaced confidence in first strike capability or sheer madness makes it too late for all of us.

The special session of the United Nations devoted to disarmament held in 1978 adopted, by consensus, a Programme of Action. While my delegation did not regard the results of the special session as entirely satisfactory, we believe that the Programme of Action in the nuclear field, if implemented in good faith by the nuclear-weapon States within a reasonable time-frame, would lead to meaningful measures of nuclear disarmament. It is acknowledged by nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States alike that the 30 years of disarmament negotiations have not yielded even one small concrete agreement in the field of nuclear disarmament. It is more than high time for the nuclear-weapon States to take bold, statesmen-like decisions so as to assure the international community that their declared commitment to undertake genuine disarmament measures is more than mere words.

In this connexion, my delegation takes note of the Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement signed in Vienna last June by the Presidents of the United States and the Soviet Union. SALT II, as we all know, will not result in any reduction of nuclear arsenals. Nevertheless, we welcome it as evidence of the willingness of the super-Powers to continue the process of negotiations and as only a first step in the direction of nuclear disarmament, which has rightly been accorded the highest priority in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Barua, India)

A treaty to ban all nuclear-weapon tests in all environments was first proposed by India in 1954 with a view to checking effectively the growing menace of the nuclear arms race. My delegation is not sure whether we are any nearer to the attainment of that objective today than we were 25 years ago. The partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963 in no way affected the appetite of the nuclear-weapon States for more and more sophisticated nuclear weapons. The negotiations which have been going on among the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom for the past three years do not even seem to have reduced the number of nuclear tests. In 1978 alone, as many as 48 nuclear explosions were carried out, 27 by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 10 by the United States of America, 6 by France, 3 by China and 2 by the United Kingdom. One nuclear-weapon State continues to explode nuclear devices in the atmosphere. My delegation shares the disappointment of many others that, despite the repeated appeals of the General Assembly, the negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty have not yet been concluded. We should all certainly welcome the early conclusion of these negotiations, and we hope that a treaty acceptable not only to the negotiating States but to all other States will emerge. We are conscious, of course, that as far as the nuclear-weapon States are concerned, a comprehensive test-ban treaty would at best place qualitative restrictions on their nuclear-weapon programmes. We should also not lose sight of the imperative need, which India has persistently emphasized, of all the nuclear-weapon States becoming parties to a test-ban treaty for it to be truly universal and effective. It is equally essential that the treaty should be comprehensive in its scope - that is, it should not contain any loop-holes whereby certain kinds of tests of whatever magnitude would be permitted. The attitude of my Government to a future comprehensive test-ban treaty would be decided in the light of these considerations.

At its thirty-third session, the General Assembly adopted a resolution by an overwhelming majority calling upon the nuclear-weapon States to observe a moratorium on nuclear-weapon tests pending the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. One of the two most important nuclear-weapon States voted in favour of that resolution. My delegation regrets that the exhortation of the General Assembly has failed to evoke the slightest responsive chord among the nuclear-weapon States.

(Mr. Barua, India)

Over the years the General Assembly has taken the consistent view that the only effective and lasting guarantee against the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons is nuclear disarmament. The Charter of the United Nations was drafted at a time when the destructive potential of the atom bomb was not common knowledge among the international community. Had the danger posed by atomic weapons been known at that time, appropriate provisions to deal with the genie before it escaped from the bottle would no doubt have been included in the Charter. In the absence of specific articles dealing with the nuclear menace, the Organization took the only step it could - namely, it adopted a resolution on this subject at the first available opportunity at its very first session. The complete lack of response of nuclear-weapon States to repeated calls for halting and reversing the nuclear arms race has given rise to a feeling of frustration among the non-nuclear-weapon States.

It is out of this despair that proposals began to be put forward during the past few years seeking what has come to be known as "negative security guarantees". I should not like to go into the merits of the various proposals that have been put forward on this item. My delegation will do so at the appropriate time and in the appropriate forum. However, I would like to caution my fellow representatives from non-nuclear-weapon States against attaching too much significance or meaning to the various concepts of negative security guarantees, all of which discriminate with regard to one category of non-nuclear-weapon States. I am aware that the problem of nuclear disarmament is a complicated one to which answers have to be found piecemeal and in stages. We, the non-nuclear-weapon States, bear no part of the responsibility for the complexity of the situation. In disarmament negotiations we have allowed our attention to be diverted from the real issues of nuclear disarmament to other, definitely less important, measures of non-armament or confidence-building, such as a non-proliferation treaty, nuclear-weapon-free zones and so on.

(Mr. Barua, India)

Similarly, on the subject of security assurances, we have, unfortunately, been made to focus our attention on the content, form, language and other unimportant issues involved in the so-called negative assurances which would only create an illusion of security. The real answer to the search for security by all States, nuclear and non-nuclear alike, lies in nuclear disarmament and, pending nuclear disarmament, in an international convention outlawing the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

As early as in 1961, the General Assembly adopted resolution 1653 (XVI) declaring that the use of nuclear weapons is contrary to the aims of the United Nations, a direct violation of the Charter and contrary to the rules of international law and laws of humanity. That resolution was approved by a large majority, including the affirmative vote of one nuclear-weapon State.

(Mr. Datta India)

Last year, on the initiative of many non-aligned delegations, the General Assembly adopted resolution 33/71 B reiterating that the threat or use of nuclear weapons would be a violation of the United Nations Charter and a crime against humanity. The resolution further called upon Member States to submit proposals for the avoidance of a nuclear war for consideration by the General Assembly at its current session. We trust that this matter will be pursued further, both here as well as in the Committee on Disarmament next year.

The special session devoted to disarmament aroused world public opinion against the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race. It is time for the United Nations to take advantage of this development by concentrating on the dissemination of public knowledge and the creation of enhanced feeling against the use of nuclear weapons. Efforts to build world public opinion would assist the Governments concerned to turn away from the path of nuclear competition in the direction of practical measures for avoiding nuclear war. The United Nations has achieved significant successes in the past in helping to arouse the conscience of mankind on a number of humanitarian issues, through a variety of special observances. Would it not be appropriate that this vital question, on which depends the future and fate of man himself, should receive similar attention? Coinciding with the commencement of the second Disarmament Decade next year, we feel that the United Nations Centre for Disarmament should make greater efforts to mobilize world opinion against the use of nuclear weapons and the danger of nuclear war. The Centre could usefully involve the non-governmental organizations in this noble endeavour.

It would be unrealistic and even dangerous to endeavour to build a secure world upon foundations of human misery. Forty per cent of the total populations of over one hundred countries are living in a state of absolute poverty. The problems of economic development and of establishing a New International Economic Order are being considered in another forum. Development, like disarmament, should be pursued for its own sake. Nevertheless, there is an essential link between the two.

(Mr. Barua, India)

The world today is spending more than \$400 billion on armaments. In real terms, this amount represents a four-fold increase during the 30 years since 1948. Two countries account for 50 per cent of this expenditure. Research and development of weapon systems consume nearly \$30 billion a year and mobilize the talents of half a million scientists and engineers throughout the world. That is a greater research effort than is devoted to any other activity on earth, and which absorbs more public research money than is spent on the problems of energy, health, education and food combined. This criminal waste of the limited resources of our planet must be stopped. Even if only a portion of these resources were diverted to the developmental needs of the poorer two-thirds of the world, it would go a long way towards helping the speedier economic development of the developing countries which, in its turn, would benefit the developed countries themselves in various ways. At the same time, a reduction of armaments would not diminish the security of the rich countries; on the other hand, it might actually enhance their security. I trust that the expert group which is examining the relationship between development and disarmament will come up with a concrete plan of action which would at the same time allay the apprehensions in some developed countries about the adverse economic and social consequences of disarmament.

Before concluding, I would like to pledge the full co-operation of my delegation to you, Mr. Chairman, and to all other delegations in the taking of such decisions as would help further the cause of disarmament in however small a way.

Mr. BARNETT (Jamaica): Countries such as mine perceive the matters with which this Committee is charged from a distinct perspective. We are no less liable than any other to death caused by nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, but we are certainly not likely to be the users. Our perspective, therefore, is that of a prospective, non-participatory, victim.

In reviewing the developments in disarmament and security since the last session of the General Assembly, my delegation confesses to some disquiet. There have been positive moves: the signing of the SALT II agreements by the Soviet Union and the United States springs readily to mind. The Jamaican delegation welcomes this development and urges its early ratification. We also note that in article XIV the parties undertook to begin, promptly after the entry into force of the treaty, active negotiations to achieve agreement on further measures for the limitation and reduction of strategic arms. Within the United Nations the two disarmament bodies established by the tenth special session had their first substantive sessions. The United Nations Disarmament Commission was able to adopt by consensus the 'Elements of a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament', while the Committee on Disarmament concluded its first year's work, if not with brilliant success, certainly with features which distinguish it from its predecessors; here I refer to its rules of procedure, its agenda and its secretary.

Nevertheless, there appears to be a spreading malaise in the international system. Indeed, we leave the decade of the 1970's - the Disarmament Decade - with both a qualitative and quantitative improvement in armaments, growing militarization in most regions of the world, and a threat of horizontal nuclear-weapons proliferation.

What can we look forward to in the years to come? Already our formal agenda on disarmament issues is long and likely to continue to grow. The second Review Conference of Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Madrid meeting of States Signatory of the Helsinki Final Act and the second special session devoted to disarmament and negotiations leading to the conclusion of a SALT III agreement are some of the important events on this agenda.

(Mr. Barnett, Jamaica)

The sophistication of weapon systems is such that improvements in accuracy have made large numbers of weapons no longer necessary. We are alarmed not only by the growing sophistication of nuclear and conventional weapons, but also by the extension of the arms race into outer space as the two major nuclear States turn increasingly to the military uses of satellites. These satellites can be and have been used to monitor the activities in any country of the world in any area of the world.

With the developed countries' continued superiority, the gap between the haves and the have-nots continues to widen, and the developing countries stand by helplessly as the traditional doctrines of sovereignty become meaningless. My delegation therefore awaits with interest the report of the Secretary-General on the consideration of establishing an international satellite monitoring agency.

Turning to the report of the Committee on Disarmament, it is my delegation's view that as regards procedures the Committee has fulfilled the requirements of paragraph 120 of the Final Document. We welcome the adoption of its rules of procedure and consider that its agenda could form the basis of work in the Committee on Disarmament for several sessions, embodying as it does the so-called decalogue which reflects the priority areas in disarmament as decided by the General Assembly. We should also like to express our congratulations to Ambassador Jaipal on his appointment in the dual capacity of Secretary of the Committee on Disarmament and personal representative of the Secretary-General.

My delegation also welcomes the fact that under the item "Cessation of the Nuclear Arms Race and Nuclear Disarmament" a proposal was made which brought back the consideration of nuclear disarmament into the multilateral negotiating forum. According to the report on the Committee on Disarmament there was an exchange of views

"... on a number of specific questions in an effort to identify the prerequisites and elements for multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament and to delineate the course of action for the achievement of this objective." (A/34/27 para. 43)

(Mr. Barnett, Jamaica)

The report continued that:

While the exchanges of views on this item were most useful, they would need to be continued and intensified during the next session of the

Committee in order than an agreed basis for progress might be found¹. (ibid.)

In this regard my delegation wishes to add its support to the position of the Group of 21 of the Committee on Disarmament that a working group be established to continue and intensify the consideration of this item.

(Mr. Barnett, Jamaica)

On the question of assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States against the threat of use of nuclear weapons, my delegation notes that the Ad Hoc Working Group established to consider this question was able

'...to begin meaningful consideration of, and negotiate on, some of the elements which fell within its mandate". (CD/47, para. 12)

In this regard, we share the view that the mandate of this Ad Hoc Working Group should be renewed so that it may continue the consideration of this important and complex matter. Nevertheless, it must be noted that the offers so far made to the non-nuclear-weapon States on the non-use of nuclear weapons are at best ambiguous and conditional.

My delegation hopes that any success which might be achieved in the control of the nuclear arms race will not be eroded by a concomitant increase in the conventional arms race on which serious attention has to be focused.

The Committee on Disarmament had one area of success in that it received from the delegations of the USSR and the United States the text of an "Agreed joint USSR-USA proposal on major elements of a treaty prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons" (CD/31). While my delegation welcomes this development, it also serves to highlight the other areas in which the parties to bilateral and trilateral negotiations have not been as forthcoming as they were in that of radiological weapons. It is not our intention to belittle this joint initiative, but while, as far as we are aware, radiological weapons do not yet form a significant part of the arsenals of States, nuclear weapons and chemical weapons do.

We had hoped that with the new disarmament machinery in place, and especially with the revitalized Committee on Disarmament, multilateral negotiations on those areas of major concern to the international community - the drafting of a comprehensive test ban and the banning of chemical weapons - would begin. Instead of this, the members of the negotiating Committee have had to remain on the sidelines, their only role being limited to that of urging the parties to the negotiations to conclude successfully their negotiations or at least to inform the Committee of the stage that those negotiations had reached.

(Mr. Barnett, Jamaica)

In 1980 the second review conference of parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty will be held. It is widely agreed that if a comprehensive test ban is not drafted by that date or if work has not at least begun on the draft of such a treaty, then a successful outcome of that conference cannot be predicted.

We have recently heard disturbing reports regarding the possibility of horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. We believe that unless a comprehensive test ban is drafted and gains the widest possible adherence, it is unrealistic to expect non-nuclear-weapon States to continue to forgo the nuclear option. My delegation shares the disappointment of the Group of 21 of the Committee on Disarmament on this issue and urges that negotiations on this question be given the greatest priority in the Committee on Disarmament. Surely it is recognized that the longer such a treaty is postponed, the less likely it is that it will be more than a symbolic gesture.

Jamaica is a party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco. We therefore wish all States within the zone defined by the Treaty to be parties to and participate fully in its provisions. We are particularly conscious of our location and are anxious that our region be freed from rivalry and turmoil. In our view, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace can contribute to building confidence among States.

The issue of the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons, and their destruction, remains of vital interest because of the great possibility of proliferation of these weapons. As more and more States become industrialized and develop their chemical capacity, the chances of the production of chemical weapons increase.

My delegation wishes to stress once again the urgency of concluding an agreement banning chemical weapons, and notes in this regard the declared intention of the USSR and the United States to "present a joint initiative" on this question "to the Committee...as soon as possible".

(CD/48, p. 5)

We hope that at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly we will have occasion to welcome such an initiative.

(Mr. Barnett, Jamaica)

My delegation supported the establishment of the Disarmament Fellowship Programme by the thirty-third session of the General Assembly and my country is among those whose candidates were awarded such a fellowship. We wish to express our appreciation to the Centre for Disarmament for its work in this area and we support the continuance of this programme on an annual basis.

Before I conclude, allow me to extend the welcome of my delegation to the new Assistant Secretary-General, Mr. Martenson, and to wish him success in his new post.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): In its foreign policy Mauritius has always advocated peace and security, co-operation and harmony among the peoples of the world. In our view, halting the arms race and passing to effective measures on disarmament, and first of all in the field of nuclear disarmament, has become vitally important for ensuring international peace and security for improving inter-State relations so that the peoples of the world may devote their entire efforts to development and progress. The arms race represents a heavy burden for all States, for all peoples of the world. No doubt the countries that are most seriously affected by the arms race are the developing ones which are encountering great problems of economic under-development as the result of the imperialist colonialist and neo-colonialist policies that divided the world into rich and poor.

The present situation is tragic and it should not be allowed to continue. In a century of scientific and technological breakthroughs two-thirds of the world's population live in a wretched plight and countless people suffer from starvation, malnutrition, disease and illiteracy, and the gap between the rich and the poor countries, far from narrowing, is growing wider and wider. If two decades ago the average economic gaps stood 10 to 1 for the developed countries, now this relation is 14 to 1 and, in the absence of adequate measures, the rate will be 20 to 1 by the end of the century. The consequences are most painfully felt by the least developed countries, but they also touch the developed ones, the whole of present-day economic, social and political life.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

Certainly it is necessary to mobilize significant material and financial resources in order to take effective steps to liquidate underdevelopment. Naturally, the decisive factors to that end still remain the actual efforts of the people involved. However, such an effort, already limited by the reduced opportunities of the lagging countries, is being considerably obstructed by the arms race. Since imperialist policy is pushing the developing countries even further into the world arms race they have to buy more and more weapons, which hinders their making economic progress. The struggle for redividing the world into spheres of influence and domination, which has now gained in intensity, is feeding old conflicts and engendering new ones from which follow even more weapons, which are more up to date and terribly costly. Hence, arming exerts serious pressure upon the budgets of the developing countries.

It is absolutely obvious, and this should be frequently stressed, that it is not the developing countries that cause the main world problems involving the waste of large financial and material resources on armaments. According to United Nations statistics in the poorest Central African countries of the third world, for instance - per capita military spending runs to \$5 a year, which is as little as 1 to 2 per cent of the arms burden borne by the citizens of the developed countries. Nor do the developing countries as a group have greater weight in world military expenditures: about 16 or 17 per cent these days. Yet if these sums, a small percentage of the world scale, are related to the modest resources of the States lagging behind and above all to their urgent economic and social needs, it is easy to understand how great an effort they are forced to make. The third-world military expenditure in 1977 of \$60 billion represents 40 per cent of the economic investment of those countries, which is as much as they spent to advance agriculture, their major economic sector. And what is worse, the military spending of the developing countries is rising at the alarming rate of 14.7 per cent a year, which outdistances by far the 5 per cent rate of increase of their gross national product.

At the same time, the spiral of the global arms race entails less assistance by the developed countries to the developing ones. Official

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

assistance for development given by the industrial market-economy countries dropped from 0.48 to 0.31 per cent of the donors' gross national product between 1970 and 1977. Moreover, the transfer of technology to the developing countries has been obstructed for strategic military considerations and that impedes the developing countries from benefiting from the great achievements of contemporary science and technology.

In view of these facts, Mauritius considers that immediate and firm action is needed in order to bring about the reduction of military expenditures all over the world and, in particular, the military expenditures of the most armed countries of the world. It will support any initiative in this Assembly that will aim at reduction of military budgets.

The tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, represented a big step forward to a new approach to the whole problem of disarmament. The spirit of the special session and the letter of its Final Document should be translated into action. It is the firm belief of my country that now, more than at any time in the past, it is necessary that all the revolutionary, democratic, progressive forces, all the people of the world, step up their struggle for immediate cessation of the arms race, for passage of effective disarmament measures - nuclear disarmament measures in the first place - for building a world of peace, free from weapons and from war.

The highly responsible mission in the field of disarmament, which the United Nations General Assembly entrusted to the Disarmament Commission, was the identification of viable, efficient solutions to curbing the arms race and achieving disarmament through concerted efforts, perseverance and tenacity. The enlarged membership of the Committee and the more democratic framework for action are now favourable premises to that end. We regret that after reading the report of the Committee on Disarmament we could not notice any meaningful progress on any of the subjects which were before it, to say nothing of the fact that the most important question relating to the very survival of mankind - the issue of nuclear disarmament - was not even included among the topics under discussion by the Committee on Disarmament. A reading of the report indicates that a huge effort was made by the non-aligned countries in particular. Nevertheless, progress is not

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

noticeable in spite of some statements to the contrary heard even in the General Assembly. I believe it is high time to evaluate the performance of the body, not by the efforts made by some of its members, but by the results achieved in fulfilment of the tasks entrusted to it. As for the statement that the work contributed to the creation of a climate more favourable to bringing about agreement on certain disarmament measures in the future, we have heard that for the last several years when examining the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which was replaced at the tenth special session of the General Assembly by the Committee on Disarmament.

The Disarmament Commission has submitted its first report to the General Assembly. It is a good beginning but it is not sufficient. The report should have given more attention to the very interesting proposals made by many Governments at the tenth special session of the General Assembly, some of which are mentioned in paragraph 125 of the Final Document.

A number of studies in the field of disarmament are currently under way in pursuance of previous decisions of the General Assembly. My delegation attaches particular importance to the work of the study group headed by General Carlos Romulo, the Foreign Minister of the Philippines, on the relationship between disarmament and international security, and to that of the group headed by Mrs. Inga Thorsson, Under-Secretary of State of Sweden, on the relationship between disarmament and development. We look forward to the completion of their work and to their submissions to the General Assembly at its next session.

The item proposed by Czechoslovakia deserves careful consideration. The opportunity should be used in order to reaffirm the obligation of States to co-operate in bringing about meaningful disarmament measures in areas of central significance. In particular, the responsibility of the nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant countries should be spelled out and, at the same time, the nuclear-weapon States should be urged to start implementing their obligations under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which calls for actual nuclear disarmament and not for negotiations about nuclear disarmament. Life proves

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

that good intentions and declarations, no matter how fine they may sound, are not enough to bring about true disarmament. It is not by mere declarations of good intent that disarmament can be achieved or that the peace and security of peoples can be ensured. Most firm action is needed - practical steps and measures toward disarmament and, above all, toward nuclear disarmament.

The Prime Minister of my country, the Right Honourable Sir Seewoosagur Ramgoolam, stated in the general debate in a plenary meeting at this session the firm commitment of my country to implementing the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. Mauritius will continue to work to bring about peace, security and true freedom in the Indian Ocean and it looks forward with hope to the forthcoming Conference on the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

I will conclude by calling the attention of representatives present here to the true dimension of the problem we are discussing. The very survival of mankind is at stake. And even if a nuclear nolo-caust is avoided, the consequences of the arms race should not be overlooked. Only 1 per cent of the world's military budget would suffice for 10 years to give the developing countries the necessary help in overcoming the critical situation of their food production. Less than half a billion dollars, which means half of the daily military spending in the world, or one third of the cost of the Trident nuclear submarine, is the sum needed by the World Health Organization (WHO) to eradicate paludism in the world. Let us realize the full dimension of the problem and its consequences.

All countries of the world can bring a contribution of their own to the cause of disarmament. Your election, Sir, as Chairman of the Political and Security Committee of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the election of the Ambassador of the Bahamas, a small but peace-loving country of the Caribbean zone, reflects the growing role and responsibility of the small and medium-sized countries in today's world affairs.

Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The call to convene the tenth special session devoted to disarmament came upon the initiative of the non-aligned countries, and Iraq, during that session, stressed the need to link the world armaments situation with the economic, social and political problems facing the world. We hope that we will be able to translate the session's recommendations into a genuine strengthening of the disarmament machinery, whether it be negotiating or deliberative. Here we must give priority to the question of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, as well as chemical weapons. As the preambular part of the Final Document of the tenth special session stated:

"Priorities in disarmament negotiations shall be: nuclear weapons; other weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons; conventional weapons, including any which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects; and reduction of armed forces".

(Resolution S-10/2, para. 45)

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

Iraq considers that the basic and fundamental element for the taking of real disarmament measures is the political will of States, in particular of those that possess the largest nuclear arsenals. As the document to which I have just referred states:

"In the task of achieving the goals of nuclear disarmament, all the nuclear-weapon States, in particular those among them which possess the most important nuclear arsenals, bear a special responsibility".

(ibid., para. 48)

That is why the non-aligned countries referred during their last Summit Conference, which was held at Havana, to the importance of the talks between the two major super-Powers and of the results of the second round of Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. We also find it stated in the final document of that Conference that:

"The treaty resulting from SALT II is a major step in the negotiations between the two major nuclear Powers and could lead to comprehensive talks on general and complete disarmament and to the elimination of tension throughout the world".

We hope that this Treaty will result in the achievement of a real peace, removed from the political hegemony of the major Powers, so that the peoples may realize their aspirations and national hopes.

General and complete disarmament represents a basic goal for all peoples throughout the world who cherish peace and freedom and aspire to a world free of the shadow of war and total destruction and all forms of threats and aggression. However, in spite of the efforts exerted by the United Nations, particularly at its tenth special session devoted to disarmament, we find that the nuclear arms race has continued to escalate day by day at a feverish rate until it has reached the point of constituting a real danger to international peace and security. The present development in military technology, and especially in its nuclear aspect, has led to the emergence and proliferation of weapons of enormous destructive capacity. The weapons arsenals are increasing and developing in the major countries at a rate sufficient to kill the hopes of peoples for general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

The hope expressed by Mr. Kurt Waldheim, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, that general and complete disarmament might be achieved by the end of the 1970s has not yet been fulfilled in spite of the fact that the Disarmament Decade is about to conclude. This means that one of the basic objectives of disarmament, namely, utilization of the resources saved as a result of it to promote the scientific, technological and economic progress of the developing countries, also has not been achieved. We know that world expenditure on armaments has reached the sum of \$450 billion annually, and that a small part of that sum could bring enormous positive changes in the lives of millions of people, and particularly those in the developing countries that are obliged to devote a large part of their resources to the purchase of arms at a time when they are in dire need of directing all those resources towards development and the overcoming and eliminating of backwardness once and for all.

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

The reason for this painful reality resides in the continued policies of aggression and hegemony, in the oppression and exploitation of peoples and the rule of might, all of which threaten the freedom, interests and national security of peoples. People are being pressured by a show of force or by threats to employ that force.

With regard to agenda item 36 on the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, we would remind representatives that all the countries in the area, including Iraq, have accepted that proposal, with the exception of the Zionist entity, which has adopted nuclear blackmail as a new threat to the area in line with its policy of expansion and aggression in the Middle East, supported by the United States of America. The Zionist entity's stubborn adherence to its previous attitude of not agreeing to the establishment of the Middle East as a nuclear-weapon-free zone and its refusal to join in the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty and place all its nuclear activities under the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency, along with the fact that the Zionist entity has been the only exception to a world consensus during the past five sessions of the General Assembly, lead us to draw the conclusion that some of the countries of the region will be forced to seek effective and real means of protecting their national and regional sovereignty. This will turn the Middle East into an area threatened by a destructive war that could jeopardize not only the future of the peoples of that area, but also of all the peoples of the world, and threaten them with destruction. We would draw the attention of all concerned to this grave problem, stressing the urgent need for them to devote to it the sufficient and appropriate attention required to arrive at a world decision that would serve us as a guarantee and preserve this sensitive area from the threat of nuclear arms.

At their summit conference held at Lusaka in 1970, the non-aligned countries declared that the Indian Ocean should be a zone of peace. They reaffirmed their deep interest in this matter in the statement issued by the Ministerial Meeting

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

of the Co-ordination Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Havana in May 1978, which was consolidated by the statement of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of these countries at the Belgrade conference held in July 1978, as well as at the recent summit conference at Havana. The United Nations General Assembly also adopted resolution 2832 (XXVI) dated 16 December 1971, declaring that the Indian Ocean is a zone of peace. In 1972, the General Assembly in resolution 2992 (XXVII) established an Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. Following that, the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth, thirtieth, thirty-first, thirty-second and thirty-third sessions, and at its tenth special session, adopted further resolutions in this connexion. Despite all that, there has been no noticeable or practical progress towards the implementation of these resolutions, owing to the fact that certain major Powers have not held serious negotiations among themselves and with the littoral and hinterland States concerned to achieve the objectives of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, as well as to the fact that they did not respond to the invitation of the Ad Hoc Committee to hold a conference on the Indian Ocean.

Iraq also feels profound anxiety at the continued presence of military bases and aircraft carriers, at the escalation of the American military presence, as well as at repeated American statements and declarations threatening to use military force in the Indian Ocean and its natural extensions, particularly the Arab Gulf. Among such declarations were the recent statement by President Carter of the intention to increase the American forces and troops in the Indian Ocean area, and the threats by responsible American authorities to occupy Arab oil sources.

Such American declarations and statements constitute a major obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and increase the presence of military force in the area, with a resultant escalation of the threat to the countries of the region and to international peace and security. The American threats contravene the intentions and objectives of the United Nations Charter and are in contradiction to its principles, particularly

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

with regard to sovereignty and cessation of the use or threat of force against the territorial integrity of other States. Such political exploitation also affects the rights of peoples freely to decide their political and economic systems and to enjoy their recognized rights to total sovereignty over their national wealth and resources.

My delegation wishes to reiterate its deep concern that freedom of navigation in the Arab Gulf be provided for, now and in the future. The security of this vital region must be the responsibility of the countries of that region alone, without any external interference or regional measures that may be linked to foreign States.

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

Iraq, which has actively and effectively participated in the meetings of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, wishes to stress the importance of the final document that emerged from these meetings and reaffirm the recommendations concerning the date and the venue for convening the Conference on the Indian Ocean, which, we hope, will be convened in 1981. Iraq also wishes to stress the importance of the participation in that Conference of the permanent members of the Security Council and the principal users of the Indian Ocean, they should also join the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, having in mind the possibility of taking regional measures and steps in various specific areas of the Indian Ocean region, in order to implement the principles and achieve the objectives of making that ocean a zone of peace, taking into consideration the special factors of the region, the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law.

With regard to agenda item 121, "Israeli nuclear armament", the delegation of the Republic of Iraq will soon have the opportunity to speak in detail concerning this dangerous and serious matter.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last speaker for this afternoon's meeting. The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on him.

Mr. EILAN (Israel). Last week the representative of Iraq made a statement on the item on hegemony. He misused the procedural opportunity to heap the usual calumny upon Israel. Today he spoke on disarmament, and the Committee was treated to a repeat performance of the same litany of hate and the same juxtaposition of falsehoods and inexactitudes.

There exists a prescription for slander which is simple and safe: Accuse your opponent of every imaginable crime, however improbable, and then watch him deny your charges, hoping that in accordance with the old French proverb, qui s'excuse s'accuse, some of your accusations will, as the saying goes, stick. The delegation of Israel has no intention of thus obliging the delegation of Iraq.

(Mr. Milan, Israel)

I shall however have to reiterate what I said in exercise of the right of reply to the representative of Iraq the other day. The spectacle of the representative of a country which is the largest arms importer in the third world coming to this Committee to preach disarmament is an exercise of the kind of monumental hypocrisy that has caused the United Nations to lose whatever prestige it still had.

The representative of Iraq in his reply challenged me to prove my allegations. Well, I am not discussing bizarre rumours but cold, cold facts. The fact that Iraq is the largest importer of arms in the third world is mentioned in the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) yearly report of 1979, on page 182. I have a photocopy of it, and anyone who wishes to verify it can do so by consulting the United Nations Library.

There are some other points which I should like to raise, and I reserve my delegation's right to do so in the course of our deliberations.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Iraq, in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq): We have not come here to enter into a competition in rhetoric in order to mislead our audience in an attempt to deceive, as the representative of the Zionist entity alleged. We are here before the representatives of States that are expected to be conscious and aware of exactly what is happening in this world.

When we speak of Israeli nuclear armaments, we are speaking of facts well known to all, and when the time comes we shall present the complete data and information proving that this entity has embarked on the path of using that weapon in the area in order to achieve its imperialist, racist and aggressive intentions.

Since he spoke of Iraq's armaments, the rate at which it is arming and the size of its arsenal, I should like to recall that the Zionist entity - which has very few weapons and which lacks destructive weapons - was nevertheless able, with these modest weapons, to occupy the territories of three Arab States, in addition

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

to the whole territory of Palestine, and also challenge all the resolutions of the United Nations concerning these acts of aggression. Every day we hear of the use of Israeli destructive weapons in the south of Lebanon destroying cities and villages and killing innocent victims among the Lebanese people.

If we wished to speak at length, we could have recourse to literary references. But there are facts. The Zionist entity now has nuclear weapons, and it is trying to achieve its imperialist and colonialist objectives in the region. We are not trying to mislead anyone but to reveal these facts before the representatives of the world.

Mr. Ould ABBEIH (Mauritania) (interpretation from French): I did not wish to join in this diatribe, but wanted simply to remind representatives that Israel not only is a powder keg in the Middle East region but, what is worse, has maintained and still maintains close co-operation in the matter of the production of nuclear weapons with one of the world's most cruel régimes, which still exists on the African continent - and here, of course, I am referring to South Africa. I defy the representative of Israel to deny this.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.