



NOV 6 1984

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 18th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil)

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE
(continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Manda-Loundhet (Congo)
Mr. Zainal Abidin (Malaysia)
Mr. Choudhury (Bangladesh)
Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar)
Mr. Tshering (Bhutan)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

(Mr. Manda-Loundhet, Congo)

wide support among the States Members of the United Nations. But we deplore, on the other hand, the divergences that continue to persist on convening it and the conditions under which it should be held.

The time is more than ever ripe for the international community courageously to face up to the whole issue of disarmament.

The members of this Committee will recall that over 20 years ago, in Belgrade, the first summit conference of the non-aligned countries proclaimed that it was necessary for the nations of the world to adopt in their relations the principles of peaceful coexistence and even then made an appeal for general and complete disarmament in order to lay the foundations for a lasting and fruitful peace for present and future generations.

We are convinced that peace is intimately linked with disarmament. There can be no peace without disarmament. For that reason, every effort intended to improve the international situation and preserve peace and concord among men will always enjoy the support of the People's Republic of the Congo. Both bilaterally and multilaterally, the Congolese Labour Party and the Government of that country have never ceased working in that direction.

The Congolese delegation welcomed the holding in Geneva, from 1 to 11 October 1984, of the second session of the Preparatory Committee for the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, envisaged by the Second Review Conference, in 1980, and General Assembly resolution 38/74, which was adopted by consensus.

We voice the hope that this third session of the Committee will in fact meet as planned from 22 April to 3 May 1985 and that finally disagreements on the cessation of the arms race and nuclear disarmament can be settled.

But non-proliferation, as was stressed by a representative of my country two years ago, should not serve as a pretext to prevent those with the capacity and desire to do so from acquiring appropriate structures in order that they, too, can make a positive contribution to the progress of science and history.

It is in this context that we construe the concept of denuclearization. The idea of creating denuclearized zones in Africa, Latin America, the Middle East or South-East Asia is one which enjoys our full approval and should, as we see it, be interpreted in the sense that it would by no means permit parties and Powers outside those zones to come and deploy their arms there or to carry out tests that would be dangerous for the environment.

(Mr. Manda-Loundhet, Congo)

To judge by the statements we have heard in this room, the debates on disarmament are extremely emotional. One sometimes wonders whether we really want disarmament. We say a lot but we do not do much.

Those who possess nuclear weapons, those who have a considerable conventional weapons capability, led by the super-Powers, could set an excellent example of a community spirit for the rest of the world. They could, for instance, allocate the thousands of billions of dollars now spent in the pursuit of scandalous and criminal research for work on healthier, nobler and more humanitarian discoveries. They could more effectively help to deal with the most serious ills that beset mankind at the present time. They could help their own people who are perhaps suffering from intimidation by misinformation. They could also give some valuable assistance for development to the third world.

And it is here that my delegation, aware as we are of the relationship between disarmament and development, supports the idea of establishing a disarmament development fund and justly values the work already done along these lines by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 37/84 of 9 December 1982.

Unfortunately, we cannot fail to note that the situation is really quite different. What we expect is a long way off. We give with one hand and take back with the other. We assist in order to have more and, finally, we carry on with the escalating arms race. Armaments and always armaments, and that is the slogan.

(Mr. Manda-Loundhet, Congo)

This has caused great desolation among the peoples of the world. While words of peace and disarmament are bandied about, ultra-modern laboratories, constructed at the cost of billions of dollars, are working to discover even more powerful, more terrifying and more criminal weapons.

The sense of desolation is even greater since the danger which hangs over us is to be feared not only from the earth but also from the seas and from outer space. The engines of death, ultra-sophisticated as they are, extremely accurate, extremely fast, are plying the oceans and are even now to be found in outer space. One of the military leaders of a great country affirmed - not as a joke, by the way - a few months ago that the idea of waging war in outer space was much preferable to waging war on earth, because it would not cost so many human lives. But did he give any thought to the future consequences of such an idea? This illustrates very clearly the Machiavellian designs which are cherished by certain Powers. And what is even more unpleasant, those Powers adopt a particularly flippant view of the rest of the planet. Aware of their own power, they seek at all costs to impose on others their conception of the world, a world in their pockets, as it were, not knowing what to say, or what to do, incapable of thinking for itself. That is what is sought by those who own the sword of death.

They are mistaken. We would paraphrase a great American politician for their benefit: "You may deceive all the people part of the time, and part of the people all of the time, but not all the people all the time".

As I said earlier, disarmament and related problems must, as we see it, be regarded as the crux of world peace. Congo, which is a peace- and freedom-loving country, will never fail to make its contribution to helping to restore, preserve and strengthen it. For this reason, the Congolese delegation appeals to the two great Powers to resume the Geneva negotiations which were broken off last year and would equally appeal to the international community to do everything possible to complete successfully the process of general and complete disarmament in the context of the United Nations.

Mr. ZAINAL ABIDIN (Malaysia): May I at the outset, Sir, congratulate you on your election to the chairmanship of this Committee. Your long experience and active involvement in the field of disarmament are great assets which augur well for the progress of our work. My delegation would also like to take this opportunity to express its felicitations to the other officers of the Committee on their election.

(Mr. Zainal Abidin, Malaysia)

I should like to begin by stating that by virtue of our membership in the United Nations we seek two main objectives: first, to ensure that our peoples have the right to live in peace, security and freedom and to enjoy a better quality of life; secondly, by creating this institution and participating in it we are in fact aiming to make this Organization strong enough for all States to feel secure, confident and committed to the attainment of its desired goals, thereby enhancing international peace and security.

While our world has never been totally free from tensions, competition and fears, the current situation has been aggravated by the massive build-up of armaments, nuclear and conventional, which could destroy the human race. This situation creates a two-tiered level of both competition and a heightened sense of fear, leading to further increases in the number and capacity of nuclear weapons.

At one level there is the competition among the nuclear-weapon States, more specifically between the super-Powers. The tension in East-West relations has made it difficult to negotiate - let alone reach - nuclear-arms-reduction agreements or to ensure that previous agreements and treaties, such as SALT I and II, are being respected in fact and not only in form. The super-Powers are still operating on the basis of mutual armed deterrence.

At the second level the tension-increasing competition between the nuclear-weapon States and the non-nuclear-weapon States increases the dangers of horizontal nuclear proliferation, as well as the accumulation of conventional weapons, which could create conditions of instability. This could easily pit nuclear-weapon States against non-nuclear States, escalating the vicious circle and compelling many to increase spending on defence resources which could be better used for socio-economic development.

The current situation thus calls for a fresh or renewed commitment on our part towards general and complete disarmament. All States need to work together to bring an end to the arms race. However, no significant or substantive progress can be achieved if the super-Powers do not resume their negotiations on nuclear arms control and disarmament. It is crucial, therefore, that the super-Powers enter into constructive negotiations soon. We hope that the two sides will find a way to resume their talks.

Three years ago, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on the subject of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. An arms race in outer space carries serious implications for international peace and security. Deliberations in the

(Mr. Zainal Abidin, Malaysia)

Conference on Disarmament on this matter have not made much progress. It is hoped that the Conference will continue to deliberate on the matter.

We hope that the United States and the Soviet Union will be able to discuss all aspects of arms control in outer space.

An issue of growing concern to the international community is the use of chemical weapons in warfare. Malaysia is of the view that any disarmament measure must include a ban not only on the use of weapons but also on the production of new types of chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles. We view with concern the alleged use of these weapons in the continuing armed conflicts in various parts of the world. The results of the discussion on this issue at the Conference on Disarmament are encouraging, and we urge all parties involved to continue their negotiations on a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons as a matter of priority. My delegation will continue to give its support to the Assembly in its efforts to prohibit the use of chemical weapons.

Proposals to create nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world, including South-East Asia, strengthen efforts and steps to prevent the spread of nuclear arms. Such zones of peace would create conditions conducive to peace and stability and eliminate super-Power rivalries for spheres of influence, thus preventing potential regional conflict. Furthermore, such moves would certainly pave the way for regional co-operation and complement the goal of disarmament. Mindful of this fact, Malaysia and its partners in the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) will continue to pursue the establishment of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia, which would provide a basic framework for ensuring peace and stability in South-East Asia. As a positive step towards the realization of this goal, the ASEAN member countries have endorsed the concept of a nuclear weapon-free zone in South-East Asia.

(Mr. Zainal Abidin, Malaysia)

The goal of establishing a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean also offers countries in the region concerned prospects of increased stability and security. My delegation fully supports all efforts to bring about an early realization of this proposal. In this connection, my delegation regrets that the Conference on the Indian Ocean has yet to be held. Although there is still a divergence of views on the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, we believe this divergence can be narrowed down through a spirit of compromise. While we are striving to achieve this objective, the littoral and hinterland States themselves must exercise the necessary restraint and responsibility and must not act in a manner inconsistent with the spirit of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. We hope that the rescheduled Conference on the Indian Ocean in 1985 will produce positive and concrete results.

The immense destructive power of nuclear weapons, their great numbers and the accuracy with which they can be targeted guarantee that nuclear war, if it comes, will produce destruction on an unprecedented scale. In the eventuality of such an occurrence, no nations, big or small, will escape its consequences. There are today well in excess of 40,000 nuclear warheads. Unfortunately, despite the realization of their destructive power, the production of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction has taken on a new momentum never before seen. Mindful of the catastrophic consequences of such a conflict, and consistent with the objectives of disarmament, my delegation would like to call on all nations, particularly the nuclear-weapon States, to halt this dangerous development.

Some argue that the bonds formed between States as a result of bilateral and multilateral co-operation in economic, social and political affairs are, or may soon become, sufficiently strong to overcome those tendencies for confrontation, which are a consequence of unrestrained military technology. But, given the speed by which military technology advances, the frailty and uneven progress of East-West relations, it is reasonable to doubt this. Let us, therefore, exploit the limited time and opportunity we have at our disposal to reduce the arms race and to secure international peace and security in order that our future and that of succeeding generations are ensured.

Mr. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh): It is with particular pleasure that I greet you, Sir, and offer you my warmest congratulations on your unanimous election as the Chairman of the First Committee. Yours is an onerous responsibility as you guide our work during this difficult period, when major disarmament negotiations

(Mr. Choudhury, Bangladesh)

are either suspended or interrupted. Your association with the United Nations and your well-recognized contribution in the field of disarmament, however, reinforce our conviction that under your able leadership the Committee will achieve constructive results during the current session. I want to begin by assuring you and the able officers of the Committee of the fullest co-operation of my delegation in the discharge of your task.

I should also take this opportunity to record our deep gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Tom Vraalsen, for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the deliberations of the Committee during the last session.

During the course of the general debate in the Committee, preceding speakers have correctly highlighted the perils we face today with the new round of the arms race, both nuclear and conventional. There is no gain saying the fact that this unprecedented build-up of the most sophisticated and lethal weapons in the arsenals of the super-Powers and other militarily significant States poses the greatest threat to the very survival of mankind.

The global nuclear arsenal has reached such gigantic proportions that the use of a fraction of it could destroy our civilization many times over. Any outbreak of nuclear war, however limited in scale, would inevitably escalate and the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, even when they are not remotely involved, would be equally threatened. This grim situation, therefore, leaves us with only one option - dialogue and meaningful negotiations.

During the course of the year we have viewed with deep concern the break-off of bilateral negotiations between the two super-Powers. We take note with satisfaction of the recent high-level contacts between the two super-Powers and hope that they will resume serious and meaningful negotiations in respect of theatre nuclear forces (TNF) and the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) at the earliest possible opportunity.

Bangladesh is irrevocably committed to general and complete disarmament and we have consistently supported a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Inspired by its firm conviction that there can be no durable peace except through the elimination and destruction of nuclear weapons and its stockpiles, Bangladesh acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in 1979. We are, however, disappointed to note that, although over 100 States have acceded to the Treaty, nuclear proliferation, both vertical and horizontal, continues at a fast pace. We are firmly convinced that the limitation of nuclear armaments and other weapons of mass

(Mr. Choudhury, Bangladesh)

destruction is an essential first step in creating an atmosphere of trust and confidence and the relaxation of global tensions. The non-nuclear-weapon States are legitimately concerned about the threats to their security and nuclear-weapon States must provide them with the negative security guarantee. Pending conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty effective measures should be taken to ensure that all States refrain from testing nuclear weapons. Similarly, there should be a freeze on the production, deployment, research and development of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. It is a matter of particular concern to us that nuclear Powers and some of the military significant States have not complied with their obligations under the Non-Proliferation Treaty and have continued to develop new types of weapons of mass destruction. On the other hand, the non-nuclear-weapon States which are parties to the Treaty have fulfilled their undertakings and have not acquired nuclear weapons or even nuclear explosive devices.

The Third Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty is going to take place in less than a year. My delegation attaches particular importance to that Conference as its outcome is bound to have a far-reaching impact on the current non-proliferation efforts. In the view of my delegation, the Review Conference will have a major task in further strengthening the Non-Proliferation-Treaty régime. Under the existing régime, the nuclear-weapon States have undertaken to pursue negotiations on measures relating to cessation of the nuclear-arms race and to nuclear disarmament. The forthcoming Review Conference will afford us an opportunity to work towards a comprehensive test-ban treaty. A treaty prohibiting all nuclear explosions would be a significant non-proliferation measure and would no doubt promote the purposes of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Choudhury, Bangladesh)

We are equally alarmed to observe that the arms race now threatens to reach outer space as well. The development of anti-satellite systems, a new area for the arms competition, would undoubtedly upset what the nuclear Powers themselves consider as the security balance of power. Therefore, any attempt to use outer space for military purposes should be halted, and it should be declared as the common heritage of mankind to be used for humanity at large. We must act now before it is too late.

My delegation had emphasized in the past that effective measures should be taken to prohibit the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons. We therefore feel encouraged by the progress made in the negotiations in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. Important and constructive contributions have already been made in the negotiations, and we are hopeful that it will be possible to achieve a major breakthrough in this particular field. Similarly, we hope that the Conference on Disarmament will be able to overcome its current impasse and resume serious negotiations on the prohibition of radiological weapons and the release or dissemination of radioactive materials for hostile purposes.

We should also pay equal attention to the issue of conventional disarmament. In the past, we failed to adopt effective measures to curb the phenomenal growth in the conventional arms race. It is in this context that we had emphasized that indiscriminate arms sale should be stopped. We are particularly concerned at the development of high-technology conventional weapons which in terms of their harmful effects can hardly be distinguished from nuclear weapons. We should take firm action to stop production of such weapons without any further delay. In this context, my delegation commends the report on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces brought out by the United Nations.

The colossal military expenditure, estimated to reach the trillion-dollar mark soon, stands out in sharp contrast to the current critical international economic situation. In his statement to the General Assembly Mr. Humayun Rasheed Choudhury, Adviser for Foreign Affairs of the Government of Bangladesh and leader of the Bangladesh delegation, stated:

"This unrestricted use of scarce resources for military purposes has, on the one hand, created a sense of fear and uncertainty among nations and, on the other, has added to universal social opportunity cost. The close relationship

(Mr. Choudhury, Bangladesh)

between disarmament and development does not need any elaboration. It is now universally recognized that a redirection of resources from armaments to development will be in the interest of developed and developing countries alike." (A/39/PV.15, p. 47)

Bangladesh, a least developed country, has consistently emphasized that the colossal financial and other resources which are being consumed by the armaments race should be directed to eliminate poverty in the world. The interaction between disarmament and development, the glaring discrepancy in the amount spent on armaments as against development do not bear recounting. At the last meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the esteemed Swedish delegation illustrated how scarce resources were wasted on an ever-escalating arms race. Permit me to quote some of the relevant figures. Every minute 30 children die because of lack of food or vaccine; every minute \$US 1.3 million is spent for military purposes; the cost of one modern nuclear submarine corresponds to the educational budget of 23 developing countries with 160 million school-age children. This glaring discrepancy should inspire us to adopt concrete measures to divert resources from armament to development.

Various studies on the subject, both inside and outside the United Nations, have demonstrated beyond any shadow of doubt that disarmament and redirection of these resources from the production of armaments will help both developed and developing countries alike by providing much-needed stimulus to production, investment and international trade. Bangladesh has always closely associated itself with all the initiatives that have been taken in the past on this issue. It is in this context that at the last meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission we welcomed, the French proposal to convene a United Nations conference on the question of the relationship between disarmament and development. My delegation pledges its full co-operation to all initiatives to that end.

In the preceding sessions, my delegation also expressed our conviction that regional and international peace and security would be promoted through the creation of zones of peace and nuclear-weapons-free zones in various regions of the world. As a littoral State, we have attached particular importance to the creation of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace and have consistently maintained that the successful implementation of United Nations General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) will be in the interest of peace and security. To that end, Bangladesh has actively participated in the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian

(Mr. Choudhury, Bangladesh)

Ocean and has lent its full support to the convening of an international conference in Colombo.

Bangladesh has also been making consistent efforts to promote peace and stability in the South Asian region. Our joint initiative, along with six other countries of the region, has borne fruit. When Bangladesh made the proposal in 1980, its primary objective was to harmonize and strengthen the efforts of these regional developing countries to forge collective self-reliance for the common benefit of their peoples. The first ever meeting of the seven South Asian Foreign Ministers, held in New Delhi in August 1983, launched the Integrated Programme of Action under the framework of South Asian Regional Co-operation (SARC). This was followed up at the Second Ministerial Meeting, held in Male, Maldives, in July 1984. A number of meetings of senior officials had preceded these ministerial meetings to work out this programme. It is a matter of satisfaction that as many as nine specific areas of co-operation have been identified and working groups have been set up for their evaluation and implementation. It is indeed an honour for us that Bangladesh has been selected as the venue for the first SARC summit, to be held in the last quarter of 1985. We thank other members of the region for the trust and confidence they have reposed in us.

Bangladesh firmly believes that regional and international peace can be secured through strict adherence to the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on the Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation amongst States. We shall observe the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations next year. The present state of the deteriorating international situation has only added to the importance of the occasion. These are challenging times for the world Organization. Let us renew our pledge to uphold faithfully the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter which are as valid today as they were four decades ago.

The prevailing global tension and conflicts have demonstrated once again that the complex and interrelated issues connected with the question of disarmament can be addressed only in a multilateral context. The United Nations, therefore, has a central role to play in the field of disarmament, and we have consistently supported the strengthening of the United Nations machinery for helping the Secretary-General in his disarmament efforts as well as his peace-keeping role. We fully subscribe to the view expressed by the Secretary-General when he stated:

(Mr. Choudhury, Bangladesh)

"It is especially valuable in times of tension that a multilateral structure is available within which nations, despite their differences, can come together for dialogue and serious negotiations, whether in the General Assembly, the Security Council or the Geneva Conference on Disarmament."

(A/39/1, p. 3)

Bangladesh attaches particular importance to the Conference on Disarmament - the single multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament - and we have supported the proposal for the expansion of membership of the Conference. In keeping with its firm and enduring commitment to work for general and complete disarmament, Bangladesh applied for membership of the Conference on Disarmament and remains ready to make its humble contributions to all future disarmament negotiations to be undertaken by that important body.

We are meeting at a crucial juncture of the history of mankind. The very survival of mankind is at stake. Our common awareness of the grave dangers we face and our desire to take appropriate measures to halt the arms race must be translated into reality to bring in an era of global peace and security. During the current session we have listened to many substantive and concrete proposals made in this regard. These proposals should be examined carefully in the coming days. The least we can do is to take effective measures partially to redress the situation. It is our common responsibility, and we urge all States, particularly the most powerful ones, to display moderation and vision and enter into serious and meaningful negotiations on disarmament. Let us utilize the vast powers at our command for the enrichment of mankind, not for its annihilation.

Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): Sir, I am pleased to express my congratulations to you on your election as Chairman of this important Committee, and I wish to express my confidence that your long experience in the field of disarmament will contribute to the success of our proceedings.

I should like at the outset of my statement in this debate to express a thought that occurred to me during my review of the record on disarmament activities within the framework of the United Nations. Last year alone the First Committee submitted some 60 draft resolutions on disarmament to the General Assembly which, in turn, adopted them. By making a simple comparison of the topics of those resolutions and of the items under consideration in the First Committee at this session, we can clearly see that, with the exception of the item entitled "Use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind", they

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

are virtually the same. In making that remark I do not wish simply to record my surprise at its significance. Actually it is not confined to disarmament alone; it holds true for most, if not all, of the important economic and political issues before the United Nations - issues which affect the destiny of all peoples and which have been the subject of resolutions of this Organization for more than 30 years without the slightest hope of their settlement. A cursory glance at the General Assembly agenda of the last session and of the present session is sufficient to illustrate that fact. We believe that it represents in essence the resolve of the international community to maintain international peace and to protect the rights of mankind in the face of the unfavourable reality that does not easily come to terms with the inevitability of change for progress.

Proceeding from that premise, I do not wish to ponder this fact for long; otherwise what would be the consequences if the United Nations turned its back completely as soon as a certain issue had been exhaustively considered and the resolutions concerning it adopted, whatever the consequences those resolutions might have, whether implemented or not. Last year alone, for example, the General Assembly reiterated its profound concern over the continuation of nuclear testing against the wishes of the majority of Member States. It also reiterated its conviction, in resolution 38/62, that the banning of all nuclear tests by all States was a matter of the highest priority. Such requests had been repeated in many other resolutions of the previous session. The General Assembly, in resolution 38/72, urged "all States to exert every effort for the speediest elaboration of a multilateral treaty on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests by all States". Once again the General Assembly, in resolution 38/63, entitled "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", requested the Conference on Disarmament "to resume its examination of issues relating to a comprehensive test ban, with a view to the negotiation of a treaty on the subject".

The perseverance of the General Assembly in attempting to achieve a nuclear-weapon-test ban is in itself a salutary phenomenon, because it proves beyond any doubt that the United Nations will always measure up to the historical responsibility entrusted to it, regardless of the hardships it may confront in this respect.

I share the views expressed by those who have already spoken in this Committee concerning the lack of political will on the part of the major Powers that have the primary responsibility in the field of disarmament. The enormous amount of weapons,

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

whether nuclear or conventional, that exist in the world today is a result of the lack of confidence in international relations in general. Therefore, my delegation associates itself with other delegations in calling for confidence-building measures and for verification of the stages of disarmament through international control and urges the super-Powers to resume negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF), as well as limiting strategic nuclear weapons.

Moreover, my delegation feels, in view of the strained international situation, that our collective duty calls for strengthening the role of the United Nations as representative of all the countries of the world, with their varying viewpoints and as the organ capable of resolving differences in order to curb the threat posed by nuclear weapons. Hence we attach the highest importance to the Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, to be held in 1985. The international community should also emphasize the critical importance of having all the countries of the world accede to that Treaty as evidence of their good faith to curb the nuclear-arms race. The cessation of the arms race, whether nuclear or conventional, is a matter of concern for all the countries of the world, whether large or small, and it is not confined to the two super-Powers, for it poses a threat to the fate of the whole world.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

The effect of the arms race on economic development is no less dangerous than its effect on international peace. Rather, in the view of my delegation and all the developing countries, this is one of the major obstacles to their social, as well as economic, development to catch up with the march of progress and to achieve a better life for man.

The arms race directly affects development efforts in a twofold manner:

First, the industrial countries use a major part of their resources for the purpose of armaments, and this is unproductive. If these resources were directed in the industrial countries to productive purposes, a state of prosperity would come into being that would transcend their borders to reach the developing countries in the interdependent and interlinked economic situation in the world. On the other hand, the use of a great part of the resources in industrial countries for the arms race acts as a barrier to those major countries' fulfilling their obligations to the developing countries in the field of development assistance in all its forms. It is not surprising that the industrial countries have not been able so far to allocate even the scanty percentage of their gross national product that was agreed upon as being the minimum requirement to advance economic development in the developing countries. Thus international interdependence in the field of economic development has remained a Utopian vision that has virtually eluded the world.

Secondly, the developing countries themselves have not been spared the evils of the arms race. In a world where they are threatened on every side, they have found themselves impelled to spend increasingly on armaments. So in a parallel way to the arms race among the major countries, we see another arms race among the smaller countries that depletes a considerable part of their resources to the detriment of their peoples' prosperity, thereby sacrificing the objectives of economic and social development that should have been accorded highest priority.

We can thus see the negative implications of the arms race are not confined to the threatening of international peace and security and increasing the potential for grave military conflicts. These negative implications extend to the economic field, which is closely linked to human requirements in the developing countries and thereby constitutes an obstacle to man's prosperity as well as to the fulfilment of his material and spiritual capabilities that would enable him to reach his fullest potential once his daily needs were fulfilled in order that he might advance to a wider and nobler horizon.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

Therefore my delegation, owing to its belief in the close link between development and curbing the arms race, considers that, until this arms race ceases completely, all efforts should be geared to practical steps to curb the arms race immediately pending its complete cessation, when this desired object may be achieved practically.

Undoubtedly the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the final analysis contributes to the achievement of the goal of complete disarmament, to which all mankind aspires. The widening of the circle demanding the creation of these zones reflects among other things the concern of many countries of the world, especially those not parties to what is known as the East-West conflict, so that they are not dragged into a nuclear war in which they have no stake. My delegation, as a supporter of the idea of creating nuclear-weapon-free zones, cannot fail to express its concern vis-à-vis the obstacles so far placed in the way of the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, adopted by the General Assembly in 1971. At the same time, we call on the Ad Hoc Committee to accelerate the preparatory work concerning the Conference on the Indian Ocean, so that it may be held at the beginning of 1985. This should be preceded by comprehensive preparations so that the Conference may be successful. Such preparatory work will include the effective convergence of the points of view among the States that will participate in the Conference in order to secure a positive conclusion that would contribute to peace and security throughout the world and not just in the Indian Ocean.

In his report concerning the implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/64, the Secretary-General stated that:

"since the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East would contribute to the improvement of the situation in the area, further efforts to that end should be made". (A/39/472, p. 2)

In this respect it behoves us to pose the following question: Is there any other area in the world that has witnessed in the last decade what the Middle East has witnessed, that is, regional wars and conflicts, military invasions and wanton massacres?

Israel's nuclear capability is one of the items before this Committee and Israel's possession of this lethal weapon constitutes a constant source of concern for the inhabitants of this region as well as the international community, especially since it is Israel alone that monopolizes the nuclear weapon or the

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

capability of dealing a nuclear blow, as military analysts assert in publications dealing with the issue in detail, beginning with the uranium theft up to its enrichment and turning it into a tool of terrorism to be unleashed against the countries of the region. Is it not enough that Israel's practices in the region, which embody the doctrine of racist supremacy, religious intolerance and the use of military force to usurp the lands of others - is this not enough to necessitate declaring the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone? The implementation of this requires, on the other hand, compelling Israel to abide by the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), including subjecting its atomic installations to international control. Unless these two conditions are met, the Middle East region will remain hostage to Israeli nuclear terrorism. We cannot fail to point to another aspect of Israel's disregard of international law and its irresponsible behaviour in the field of the peaceful use of nuclear energy, that is, its unwillingness so far to implement Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which was adopted in the wake of its wanton aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor in June 1981. Israel has not ceased its periodic threats to renew its aggression against the peaceful nuclear reactors of any Arab country. The relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions have remained unimplemented. Iraq was neither compensated for the damage inflicted upon it as a result of that act of injustice and aggression nor did Israel cease its continual threats, nor did the countries concerned abstain from providing Israel with the weapons enabling it to carry out its military acts of aggression against others - unless an end is put to all that, it will not be possible to achieve our goal of declaring the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

In this respect, the nuclear collaboration between Israel and the racist régime in South Africa is no longer a secret. The gravity of the nuclear capabilities available to South Africa is not confined to the consequences of such collaboration with Israel for the Middle East. Rather this situation - in the context of the conflict of destiny between the white minority that possesses these nuclear capabilities and the defenceless indigenous majority - threatens the peace and security of southern Africa as well as of the world in its entirety with the most ominous repercussions, before which the international community should not stand passive.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

For many years now man has known the real danger posed to his future and civilization; during this time all arguments and principles advocating nuclear balance and nuclear deterrents have collapsed. Yet the world nuclear arsenal today has reached dimensions that defy the imagination, as the result of the strategic doctrines adopted by the major Powers in the wake of the Second World War and the ensuing actions and reactions from both sides as they engaged in a feverish race.

Although science has not so far been able to predict the plight of the world after a nuclear conflagration, the numerous atmospheric and biological side effects will surely be more devastating than even the direct and frightening effects of nuclear explosions. We hope that the concerted efforts of this Committee and the Conference on Disarmament, as well as the work to be done in the 1985 Third Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, will lead to the achievement of this lofty goal: the protection of man and his material and spiritual civilization from destruction.

Mr. TSHERING (Bhutan): Since this is the first time I address this Committee, allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of this important Committee. I also wish to congratulate the other officers of the Committee and offer my delegation's co-operation in all the tasks ahead.

During the recent general debate at the plenary session all heads of delegation focused attention on the most urgent issue facing the international community today: nuclear disarmament and the survival of mankind. This Committee has year after year also been grappling with the issues of disarmament, and this year's session is no exception. With each passing year the number of items on the agenda has increased, and with it the number of resolutions, but the burgeoning arms race goes on unhindered and the world situation has deteriorated. The results of the deliberations of the Conference on Disarmament during 1984 and the previous years, as reflected in the relevant reports, are disappointing.

Many obstacles which existed in the past are still with us, but with genuine will and a common purpose they are not insurmountable. The two special sessions of the United Nations devoted to disarmament testify to our belief not only in the desirability of disarmament but, most important, in its realization. It is not too late. There is an opportunity before us now to move forward constructively and without delay towards a concrete and workable programme for general and complete disarmament, particularly with respect to nuclear weapons which pose a constant threat to the very existence of mankind.

(Mr. Tshering, Bhutan)

I have paid close attention to the many speakers who have preceded me in this Committee and carefully studied the reports of the Conference on Disarmament (A/39/27), the Disarmament Commission (A/39/42) and the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. The inference is clear that no efforts in the field of disarmament can be successful without the commitment of the nuclear-weapon States. Year after year resolutions have been debated and agreed upon but action to implement them has been distinctly lacking. We sometimes feel that the energy has gone out of the negotiations and that the activities of the negotiating body are considered by some as a smokescreen for non-decision and political rivalries. Unfortunately, a commitment by all nuclear-weapon States to renounce first use of these weapons, to veto their testing and production, and to work actively for the elimination of the overkill power of those that already exist, has not been forthcoming.

There has been much comment on the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in this Committee and elsewhere. It is now crystal clear that the NPT has failed to stop vertical proliferation. Indeed, non-proliferation should not and cannot be a goal in itself but must be closely allied with a commitment from the nuclear-weapon States to reduce, and eventually eliminate, their own stockpiles.

A clear contradiction exists in that the major Powers, in particular the super-Powers, are conducting a vigorous anti-proliferation campaign on the global level, while they themselves continue to engage in a spiralling nuclear-arms race. Such a policy militates against a climate of trust and can only impede progress towards disarmament.

The international community is now faced with a new concern. Indeed, there is cause for alarm that even outer space may be militarized, making the arms race unmanageable. Anti-satellite weapons and space-based anti-ballistic missiles (ABM) systems create a "star wars" scenario. These weapons are no longer the subject of science fiction alone but represent real and present dangers. We must prevent outer space from being militarized; outer space should be used only for peaceful purposes.

The guiding principle in politics must be world peace. It has been the constant endeavour of the United Nations to bring about a climate in which world peace is possible. For this to come about, Member States must weigh national policies against global needs. We must re-evaluate the policies and postures of the past in the context of a radically changing world. It is clear that, at a time

(Mr. Tshering, Bhutan)

when the resources of this planet are being increasingly strained to provide its population with the basic necessities of life, it is no longer defensible for a vast proportion of these resources to go to military purposes. Arms competition is not only an irresponsible and costly waste of the world's resources; it is also a major impediment to all attempts to bridge the gap between the developed and the developing countries, both in the political and economic spheres.

For this reason, arms control, and especially nuclear disarmament efforts, cannot be considered in isolation; rather they must form part of a holistic approach to a new international order of trust and co-operation among nations. Any arms control negotiations which may have the effect of perpetuating of inequalities among nations will therefore continue to be unacceptable to the developing countries.

Despite some achievements in arms control in the past and some progress on the prohibition of chemical weapons now, the overall record remains one of limited, often peripheral progress, greatly overshadowed by a virtually worldwide and continuing build-up of military forces. The major military Powers have a special responsibility to show by their action a real commitment to reversing this situation. If they do not, the results will be growth and not reduction in the world's stockpile of nuclear weapons and an increase in the global resources devoted to military research and development - the very opposite of what we are trying to achieve. International tension will not be lessened but increased, and the horrifying prospect of a catastrophic global holocaust brought closer.

(Mr. Tshering, Bhutan)

In view of this, my country's Foreign Minister stated in the plenary session:

"Achievement of superiority by either side is a pathetic illusion, and the headlong rush to try to attain such dominance produces ever greater insecurity and instability. Each megaton of potential destructive force brings us closer to the probability of an accident or a breakdown in restraint. Let us apply the same ingenuity wasted on these gigantic follies to find constructive solutions to the problem of collective security, and thereby end the perceived need for instruments of mass annihilation."

(A/39/PV.20, p. 72)

This threat of apocalyptic destruction is what we have been brought to by the irrational arms policies of the last three decades. Forty years ago no nuclear weapon existed; today there are tens of thousands. According to some current estimates, the world's nuclear stockpiles now represent 15 tons of TNT per person on the globe, about 60 tons per person in the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries. It is hardly necessary to say that that far exceeds any legitimate defence needs. The number of countries with a nuclear capability has continued to grow, particularly in the last decade. The rise in military spending has outpaced the rise in the world gross national product by about two to one in recent years. What some studies refer to as "an arms race no one can afford" features a stockpile of over 50,000 nuclear weapons, a 10 per cent increase in the world military budget from 1982 to 1983, with the super-Powers now allocating between 6.5 and 12 per cent of their gross national product for military outlays - this while 2 billion people live on incomes below \$500 a year, and every minute 30 children die for lack of food and inexpensive vaccines.

Those statistics allow no room for complacency. I do not think there is a single nation which does not share the horror of what they portend. The results of the special sessions and the resolutions adopted by this Committee represent small but important steps towards reversing this scenario and thereby paving the way for a new order of world peace based, not on precarious military balances and the perpetuation of economic and social inequalities, but on mutual respect, understanding and progress among nations.

One of the most encouraging developments to have emerged from the past two special sessions was the restructuring of the disarmament negotiating body with the participation of all the nuclear-weapon States and a number of other States on an equal basis and the creation of the Disarmament Commission. Those arrangements

(Mr. Tshering, Bhutan)

represent an important advance - the recognition that disarmament vitally affects us all, that it can no longer be treated as the exclusive concern of only a few nations, or of only certain sections of the world's population. In an increasingly interdependent world, what happens in one area - politically, economically, socially or militarily - inevitably has repercussions which go far beyond that area. Nowhere is this more strikingly evident than in the field of armaments, both nuclear and conventional. Time and time again we have seen countries, many of them poor and economically disadvantaged, forced to divert much-needed resources to defence purposes because of conflicts in effect imposed from outside.

The United Nations, owing to its unique role in this interdependent world, has a critical part to play in the disarmament process. It is our hope that all nations, from the largest to the smallest, will take the opportunity to play an active part in developing and implementing a strategy for comprehensive disarmament in the directions outlined by the special sessions.

We continue to recognize the important part that bilateral, regional and subregional negotiations have played and will continue to play both in reducing areas of tension and in bringing about a reduction in the arms race and the arms trade. At the same time, we believe that the efficacy of such efforts can be greatly enhanced by co-ordination with the appropriate bodies dedicated to disarmament. Without such co-ordination, efforts may be duplicated or wasted or hopelessly mired in misunderstanding. In any case, bilateral negotiations, because of their limited scope and the number of parties involved, could never replace the genuinely multilateral search for nuclear disarmament measures.

The task before us is clearly stupendous. Some 2,500 years ago, the Lord Buddha said: "Where there is a will, there is a way." Year after year the representatives of so many nations have eloquently expressed their concern. I am sure that reason has power; so has compassion. People do wish to survive. We appeal to the humanitarian aims, the universal desire for peace and the noblest aspirations which inspired the founding of this Organization.

The delegation of the Kingdom of Bhutan by participating in this debate is joining the other delegations in a call for a spirit of co-operation to eliminate nuclear weapons. This is the true revolution. This is the prayer of mankind. This is the path to a new age of enlightenment.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives who have asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. MAZARI (Pakistan): We have no desire to turn the general debate on disarmament issues in this Committee into a debate on the situation in Afghanistan, which will be considered by the plenary General Assembly starting on 13 November. It is therefore with some hesitation that my delegation has asked to be allowed to speak this afternoon to exercise its right of reply to a tendentious statement made by the representative of the Kabul régime in this Committee on the afternoon of 26 October.

The representative of the Kabul régime made baseless allegations against my country in a vain attempt to divert attention from the indigenous national resistance of the Afghan people, now in its fifth year, against that régime. He accused Pakistan of interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs. He also tried to justify the presence in Afghanistan of more than 100,000 foreign troops which sustain the Kabul régime against the unrelenting resistance of the freedom-loving people of Afghanistan.

While categorically rejecting the baseless allegations levelled by the representative of the Kabul régime against my country, I would like to point out that the régime in Kabul, which was installed in power by foreign troops and whose precarious authority does not extend beyond the confines of Kabul and a few other towns, has been rejected by the overwhelming majority of the population of Afghanistan more than one third of which has sought refuge from its oppressive presence outside the country.

(Mr. Mazari, Pakistan)

Three million Afghans have left their hearths and homes to seek temporary refuge in Pakistan alone. These three million Afghan refugees, whom we have accepted on purely humanitarian grounds as part of our Islamic and international duty, are a standing rebuke to the policies of a régime which has turned the country into a vast prison and is daily engaged in indiscriminate and cruel reprisals against its own people.

The resistance of the Afghan people against foreign military occupation is purely indigenous in character. This should be evident from the fact that it is taking place throughout the length and breadth of the country, including its northern provinces. It is therefore a travesty of the facts to attribute the resistance of the valiant Afghan people against foreign occupation and domestic oppression to alleged foreign interference.

These are facts which have been recognized by the international community in several resolutions passed by the United Nations General Assembly and the Islamic Conference, as in the position taken by the Non-Aligned Movement on the subject. The international community has demanded in unequivocal terms the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan and called for the preservation of the sovereignty and non-aligned character of Afghanistan, the restoration of the right of the Afghan people to determine their destiny free from foreign intervention and the creation of conditions enabling the Afghan refugees to return to their homeland in safety and honour. These are essential conditions for a peaceful settlement of the Afghanistan issue.

Pakistan has consistently worked for a political settlement of the Afghan issue on the basis of these essential conditions. For this purpose it is engaged in indirect talks through the intermediary of the personal representative of the United Nations Secretary-General, the latest round of which was held in Geneva in August this year. Despite the serious obstacles in resolving this issue and in the face of provocations by the Kabul régime in the form of ground and air violations of Pakistan's territory, we are determined to persevere in our search for a negotiated settlement of this issue.

The statement of the representative of the Kabul régime also contains a baseless allegation that Pakistan is preparing for a war with India. Nothing could be further from the truth. The only purpose of such a palpable falsehood could be the desire to embitter relations between India and Pakistan. This attempt will not succeed. Pakistan has consistently pursued and will continue to pursue a policy for the establishment of tension-free and good-neighbourly relations with India.

(Mr. Mazari, Pakistan)

No amount of distortion on the part of the representative of the Kabul régime can either alter the fact of the foreign military intervention in and occupation of Afghanistan or the international community's verdict on the situation in that country.

Mr. MASTAMAND (Afghanistan): The previous speaker has no right to talk about Afghanistan as representative of the Afghan people. Afghanistan and the Afghan people have their own representatives in the United Nations. They have no need for extra representatives - representatives who do not represent their country and people. I do not want to waste the time of the Committee but I should like to mention some examples of the "peaceful coexistence" of the military régime of Islamabad.

There was the killing of more than seven people who were visiting the tomb of the former Prime Minister, Mr. Bhutto; the imprisonment of thousands of members of the Movement for the Restoration of Democracy; the banning of all activities of a political party and the abandonment of the initial promises regarding elections; and the changing of the 1973 Constitution. All those are examples of so-called American-type democracy.

Or we can cite the real Islamic democracy, of which the people of Pakistan have suffered more than three times in the short history of their existence. The purchase of more than \$US 3 billion worth of armaments from the United States imperialists and the preparations for nuclear explosions are also examples of the real "peace-loving" character of the military régime. The confiscation of all democratic rights from the people and depriving them of any freedom, including the freedom of religion, is an excellent example of the military régime's so-called Islamization of society. The intervention against India, the sending of terrorist bands to the Punjab and the violation of India's border on 19 October are also signs of good relations with neighbours which try to live in peace.

One of the most important examples of the real character of the military régime and its respect for the Charter of the United Nations is its recognition of the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, which has been firmly renounced and rejected by the international community, including United States imperialism.

All the examples I have mentioned show the real structure and character of the military régime and they will be enough for the international community to understand and know the character of the military régime.

Mr. MAZARI (Pakistan): It is regrettable that the representative of the Kabul régime has taken the floor once again to repeat baseless allegations against my country and to distort the facts of the situation in Afghanistan. The correct position about the conditions in Afghanistan has already been stated by us during the exercise of our first right of reply, which we would like to reiterate. I would also like to take this opportunity to reject categorically the totally unfounded allegations made by the representative of the Kabul régime against my country.

It is generally recognized that the real situation in Afghanistan is different from what the representative of the Kabul régime would like the members of this Committee to believe. The international community has passed judgement on the situation in Afghanistan in several resolutions of the General Assembly, the last of which was resolution 38/29. As members of the Committee are aware, this resolution, inter alia, calls for the immediate withdrawal of the foreign troops from Afghanistan. The reality, therefore, is that Afghanistan is under the military occupation of a foreign Power which has installed a régime in Kabul to serve its designs rather than the people of Afghanistan. Accordingly, it is hardly any surprise that the people of Afghanistan, who have rejected this oppressive régime, are engaged in armed resistance to regain their freedom. The Kabul régime is trying to suppress this resistance with the brutal and indiscriminate use of force. As a result of the atrocities committed by the present rulers in Kabul, about one third of the population of Afghanistan has been forced to take refuge in neighbouring countries.

What is required of the régime in Kabul is to ponder over the grave situation in Afghanistan which has been created by its reckless reliance on foreign bayonets and to heed the call of the international community to redress that situation instead of hurling abuse on its neighbour, Pakistan, and making unwarranted comments on matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of my country.

I should like to conclude by once again rejecting categorically the false and unfounded allegations levelled by the representative of the Kabul régime against my country, which is a victim of the bloody confrontation between the people of Afghanistan and the régime in Kabul and which desires nothing more than to live in peace and good-neighbourliness with a stable and fully sovereign Afghanistan.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.