



UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.2077  
5 November 1975

ENGLISH

---

Thirtieth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND AND SEVENTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 5 November 1975, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon)  
Rapporteur: Mr. ARTEAGA ACOSTA (Venezuela)

- Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security /31/ (continued)
- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3254 (XXIX): report of the Secretary-General /34/ (continued)
- Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use: reports of the Secretary-General /35/ (continued)
- Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /36/ (continued)
- Urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /37/ (continued)

/...

---

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be distributed as soon as possible.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent in quadruplicate within three working days to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, Room LX-2332, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 6 NOVEMBER 1975, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 11 NOVEMBER 1975.

The co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3258 (XXIX) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) /38/ (continued)
- Implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean /39/ (continued)
- World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference /40/ (continued)
- General and complete disarmament /41/ (continued):
  - (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament
  - (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency
- Mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade: report of the Secretary-General /42/ (continued)
- Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa /43/ (continued)
- Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /44/ (continued)
- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3262 (XXIX) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General /45/ (continued)
- Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General /46/ (continued)
- Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other hostile purposes, which are incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /47/ (continued)
- Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia: report of the Secretary-General /48/ (continued)
- Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific /120/ (continued)
- Conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests /122/ (continued)
- Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons /126/ (continued)
- Organization of work

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 120, 122 and 126 (continued)

Baron von WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany): The First Committee is once again required to take stock of endeavours in the field of disarmament and arms control and to put forward constructive proposals for achieving further progress. Obviously we shall not achieve that aim by eloquent speeches, largely oriented towards propaganda goals. On the contrary, what is needed is a sober analysis of the situation, and the ability to perceive what is possible in the existing political circumstances and to pursue it resolutely.

We cannot be satisfied with the progress achieved so far.

True, it has been possible to conclude a number of important multilateral and bilateral agreements and to give effect to them. For instance, certain regions have been spared from the arms race. The ban on the use of bacteriological and chemical weapons established by the Geneva Protocol of 1925 has been considerably reinforced by the prohibition of the manufacture of bacteriological weapons. The horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons has been rendered more difficult and the radio-active contamination of the atmosphere substantially restricted. Communication between the United States and the Soviet Union has been further developed in order to prevent nuclear wars. All those measures have helped to safeguard international peace.

On the other hand, there is no denying that the arms race and the development of weapons technology are continuing on many levels and in almost every region.

Baron von Wechmar, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

In the introduction to his annual report, the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, said, and I quote:

"In a world increasingly preoccupied with the problems of social justice, hunger, poverty, development and an equitable sharing of resources, global expenditures on armaments are approaching \$300,000 million a year. Never before in peacetime has the world witnessed such a flow of weapons of war. Some \$20,000 million worth of arms are now sold annually in the international arms trade.

"To the perils inherent in the massive nuclear and conventional armouries of the greatest Powers are now added growing and competitive military establishments in some of the most sensitive areas of the world ..." (A/10001/Add.1, p. 8)

Alarming as these facts are, we must not see in them a cause for resignation. We must rather show endurance and imagination in the search for new ways of reducing political tensions, of checking the arms race and substantially reducing armaments. It really goes without saying, but I cannot help mentioning it all the same: the task is to concentrate the scarce resources of the nations on meeting mankind's urgent humanitarian and social requirements.

However, there is one point that must not be forgotten. Disarmament must serve to safeguard peace. Disarmament policies can have dangerous consequences if they are not aimed at a global and regional balance of forces, of maximum stability. Furthermore, eliminating the causes of political tension must go hand in hand with the elimination of military confrontation. Mutual confidence in the observance of agreements in these fields should be strengthened by adequate verification.

Through its consistent policy of renunciation of force, the Federal Government has promoted détente in Europe and thus laid the foundations for fruitful co-operation. The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe has created a good basis for the continuation of a policy of peace in Europe. Its results must now be translated into action. The nations of Europe and North America, aware of their common responsibility, have tried to span the gulf by mutual co-operation. My country has strongly supported



(Baron von Wechmar, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

these efforts from the very beginning. No nation in Europe senses more than the German nation the dangers ensuing from the division of our continent.

There is still a great deal of mistrust and fear to get rid of. That is why the Federal Government has immediately set about implementing the confidence-building measures adopted in Helsinki. It has notified military manoeuvres to all the States who participated in the Conference and has invited them to send observers. The willingness of all parties to give effect to these concrete agreements in the field of military security will have a bearing on efforts to achieve more far-reaching agreements with the aim of reducing the dangers of military confrontation in Europe.

Uppermost in our minds in this connexion are the Vienna negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions. We hope that perseverance and patience will assert at regional level the principle of parity that governs the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). The establishment of a stable balance of power in Central Europe would constitute a substantial contribution to the elimination of tensions in Europe and to the consolidation of world peace.

The nuclear Powers, but especially the two world Powers, carry a high responsibility for checking the nuclear arms race and maintaining peace and security. The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks are of major significance for world-wide stability. We have welcomed the results produced so far. Between the United States and the Soviet Union there should be no insurmountable obstacles on the way to the successful conclusion of the Vladivostok agreements.

The fixing of common ceilings for the central offensive strategic systems would then at least have secured a quantitative stop and created a basis for the reduction of such weapons. We understand the impatience of world opinion, and especially of the non-aligned countries, over the sluggish progress and therefore we appeal to the world Powers not to relax their negotiating efforts and thus meet their obligations under the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Even more difficult than quantitative restrictions and quantitative reductions of nuclear arsenals appears to be the task of calling a halt in qualitative terms. Up to now the problem of ensuring that the inevitable advancement of technology is not aimed at the achievement of military

(Baron von Wechmar, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

perfection appears to be hardly soluble. Non-verifiable prohibitions with vague definitions of what is actually banned would at any rate not suffice.

As regards the nuclear arms race, however, the conclusion of a sufficiently verifiable comprehensive test-ban treaty and the cessation of all nuclear weapon tests would represent a decisive advancement and are therefore strongly recommended. We realize that in the final analysis this calls for political decisions at the highest level. All the same, we do not think that this makes a further study of the complex technical and scientific problems superfluous.

After all, scientists are still not in agreement as to how far it is possible to distinguish, without the necessity of on-site inspections, between low-yield nuclear tests and earthquakes by means of the present methods of teleseismic detection, even if these were to be further developed. In particular we shall have to continue our search for ways and means of ensuring that substantial knowledge derived from peaceful nuclear explosions (PNEs) is not diverted to the development of nuclear weaponry.

Debates in the Geneva Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) have confirmed that a nuclear explosive device intended for peaceful purposes can also be used as a weapon. That is why separate PNE development by non-nuclear-weapon States is at least a potential contributor to horizontal proliferation. But PNEs can also be used by nuclear-weapon States for testing new weapons technologies and hence promote vertical proliferation. In order to make sure that the resulting complex verification problems do not delay the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, it has been proposed that a moratorium on PNEs be agreed at the same time. We think such a proposal is worth considering if it will remove a major obstacle to a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

In any event tests for PNEs or their practical application should only be carried out under a non-discriminatory international régime of the IAEA. The Agency's work in this connexion, including the elaboration of a model agreement, is in the interest of a consistent non-proliferation policy and therefore deserves our full support.

(Baron von Wechmar, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

The Federal Republic of Germany ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty last spring, together with four other Euratom countries. It considers that Treaty, to which so far 96 States have acceded, to be an indispensable instrument of the policy of non-proliferation, and it repeats its appeal to those countries which have not yet done so to accede to the Treaty, or at least observe its principles. As the Geneva Review Conference has shown, however, the Treaty will only become more attractive if the nuclear-weapon States, too, meet their obligations to the full and if they voluntarily subject their civilian nuclear installations to international control. The Review Conference also underlined the role of the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a basis for intensive international co-operation in the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The shortage of conventional energy sources and rising energy requirements are leading to a rapid expansion of peaceful nuclear technologies, and hence to a growing production of plutonium and other fissionable material. In the plenary of the General Assembly, Foreign Minister Genscher and other speakers pointed out that it was one of the most pressing tasks of our time to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy while preventing its misuse for weapons purposes.

We understand the developing countries' desire to possess modern technologies and are ready to co-operate with them without discrimination while observing the Non-Proliferation Treaty in letter and spirit. The Final Declaration of the Review Conference contains valuable recommendations for ensuring the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. It would serve the goal of non-proliferation and facilitate nuclear exports if all non-nuclear-weapon States were to subject their entire fuel cycle to international safeguards. For economic and security considerations the proposals to examine the question of establishing regional and multinational nuclear fuel cycle centres also deserve our full support. Surely it would be easier to put them into practice if the countries participating in such installations were given a guarantee that they will be supplied with nuclear fuel. The Federal Government also endorses the request made by the Review Conference that uniform standards, covering physical protection as well, be evolved for the export of fissionable material and nuclear equipment. Both supplier and recipient countries should understand that this is necessary in the interest of a consistent non-proliferation policy.

(Baron von Wechmar, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

Ideas and suggestions to set up nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the globe met with a considerable response at the last session of the General Assembly. Following the Finnish proposal which we supported, a comprehensive study was elaborated by Government experts under the auspices of the CCD, which we feel is a useful compendium. We think that the following aspects should be given particular attention. Nuclear-weapon-free zones must serve to supplement the world-wide system of a consistent non-proliferation policy, which means that they must not conflict with the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and should make allowance for the fact that a nuclear explosive device designed for peaceful purposes can also be put to military use. Furthermore, plans for nuclear-weapon-free zones should be considered in the light of the specific characteristics of any one region and examined as to whether they are capable of strengthening international security and stability and are consistent with the accepted rules of international law. If these requirements are met, we welcome the initiatives put forward by some groups of countries to set up nuclear-weapon-free zones.

International efforts designed to ensure disarmament and arms control must concentrate on weapons of mass destruction in particular. Whereas, in the field of A and B weapons it has been possible to give effect to the relevant conventions, there are still no comparable arrangements covering chemical weapons. Although this year's discussions in the CCD have not produced any visible progress towards a prohibition agreement, we do not think that they have been altogether futile. Five countries have submitted concrete proposals regarding the still unresolved definition and verification problems. The Federal Republic of Germany, which as early as 1954 undertook to manufacture ABC weapons, also presented a working paper in the CCD regarding the definition and classification of chemical warfare agents. The paper attempts to develop a practicable method of distinction between warfare agents and other toxic substances on the basis of objective criteria. There is a growing realization among CCD member States that a comprehensive convention can only be achieved step by step. But only after the United States and the Soviet Union have realized the intention they stated in 1974, "... to consider a joint initiative in CCD with respect to the conclusion, as a first step, of an international convention dealing with the most dangerous, lethal means of chemical warfare"

(Baron von Wechmar, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

only then will an international prohibitive agreement be within reach. Like other CCD members, we are waiting somewhat impatiently for a concrete proposal to be made. In the meantime, Government experts should continue to seek practicable solutions and wider agreement regarding the complex problems of definition and verification.

The outstanding result of the last CCD session is the presentation of identical drafts by the United States and the Soviet Union for a treaty on the prohibition of environmental warfare. The draft is a step forward as compared with previous proposals, and its basic concept seems acceptable to us. But before the text of the treaty can be finally formulated it will have to be thoroughly examined at the national level and negotiated in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. As in previous cases, the draft provides for verification by a complaints procedure to be set in motion in the Security Council. This is certainly not an ideal solution. At any rate, it should be ensured that decisions cannot be blocked by a veto. In its comments on the proposal for a ban on environmental warfare last year, the Federal Government emphasized that efforts to ensure disarmament and arms control should not only cover present instruments of combat but should be forward-looking and designed to prevent disastrous future developments of military technologies.

It is with this positive basic attitude that we shall also examine the new Soviet proposal for a ban on the development of new mass destruction weapons. However, the present draft treaty is much more vague in substance than is the draft on environmental warfare, though the latter also gives rise to questions. It is clear already that verification of a ban on future developments will be most problematic. Perhaps, to begin with, an international panel of scientists should look into the problems and evolve methods whereby the trend of new scientific findings and their possible application for future weapons technologies can be calculated. Before this question is clarified it would hardly seem possible to formulate concrete definitions of what is to be prohibited.

In conclusion I would briefly touch upon the institutional aspect of disarmament. The CCD, which not only commands vast expertise but also embodies a representative cross-section of all groupings of States, should continue to be the main forum for negotiating world-wide arms control arrangements.

(Baron von Wechmar, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

I hope that the deliberations of the First Committee will lead to constructive draft resolutions. But to achieve this, it will be necessary for all concerned to show a readiness for compromise and to realize that it is not the number of resolutions that ensures concrete progress in the field of disarmament and arms control but rather the will for international co-operation and the conviction that no arrangement can strengthen peace unless it enhances the security of all countries, or at least maintains it undiminished. If we bear this in mind, we have good reason to hope that our resolutions will, even to a greater extent than last year, be adopted by consensus or with a convincing majority and will thus lead to genuine progress.

Mr. ENE (Romania) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, before starting my statement, I should like to say how happy I am to have an opportunity to represent my country in this debate under your Chairmanship. Your career as a diplomat, well-known not only in New York but in Geneva and elsewhere as well, is a guarantee for proper procedure in our work and, we hope, for the successful conclusion thereof. May your wisdom inspire us to work for a cause which is so close to our hearts.

My feelings of esteem are also extended to the other officers of the Committee.

The agenda at the present session of the General Assembly sheds particular light on the efforts of the international community to find the required solutions for the urgent questions before it.

Coming as it does after the seventh special session of the General Assembly, which was devoted to development and economic co-operation as one of the most urgent world problems, this session obviously turns the spotlight on the acute need for disarmament. The unprecedented number of disarmament items on our agenda, together with the diversity of the subjects involved, reflects the ever more active participation and the growing concern of all States, and, because of the importance of what is involved, goes beyond any mere evaluation of the activities of any particular body or of any specific field. It brings to light the general awareness that the present situation can no longer be tolerated. Weapons, the squandering of immense resources they entail, the stockpiling in the world of enormous quantities of destructive materials, which can always be used as instruments in a policy of force and diktat, are already having their effect on aspects of the structure of international relations and even on the very evolution of human society.

This debate is taking place under the aegis of our confidence in the United Nations and in its ability to make a decisive contribution to the furtherance of disarmament and the establishment of a lasting peace.

During the 30 years that have elapsed since the United Nations came into being, important changes and transformations have occurred in the world. The United Nations at present has 142 Members, compared with 51 Members in 1945.



(Mr. Ene, Romania)

Likewise, there has been a more intensive participation by all States, regardless of size or potential, in the debates and the solution of the problems arising in international life.

Thus today the United Nations can be relied upon as an expression of the true will of the international community, which aims to do away with the power politics of yore and to create new relationships among States.

The Secretary-General, in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization, wondered whether Member States could agree on the means to enable the United Nations to become an effective instrument for the maintenance of peace. If what is involved is disarmament, our reply is beyond any doubt an affirmative one. But all Governments, in the light of the duty they owe to their own peoples, must frankly admit the dangers of a continued arms race, and must not create any illusions. Likewise, Governments must act with a feeling of responsibility and with perseverance before it is too late, so as to take resolute measures for disarmament, above all, for nuclear disarmament.

In considering these questions, Romania starts from the premise of the particular seriousness of the arms race, and primarily the nuclear arms race, and its harmful effects on the security and development of all nations and on peace and stability throughout the world.

We consider that it is incumbent upon the United Nations, in keeping with its responsibility under the terms of the Charter, resolutely to discharge its functions and to place the disarmament problem among its primary and most urgent tasks, and to bring the negotiations on disarmament out of the deadlock in which they are at present stalled.

Disarmament is a question of general interest. It affects in the highest degree every State and every people, and it cannot be conceived of as being within the competence of a limited number of States. For this reason, there must be a drastic change in the way it is dealt with:

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

there must be an approach to the substantive, genuine questions of disarmament, rather than a mere examination based on the immediate situation, which at times is influenced by tactical considerations; bureaucratic negotiations must be replaced by an open approach, with the participation of all those concerned and with account taken of their interests and points of view.

With these considerations in mind, the Romanian Government has decided to submit to this session of the General Assembly its position on disarmament questions, and has done so in an official document which has been distributed today to all Member States.

Romania considers that it is most necessary to redouble efforts aimed at bringing the negotiations out of their deadlock and adopting urgent measures that will lead to general disarmament, and above all to nuclear disarmament.

The proposals contained in the document we have submitted are intended to bring about, first of all, the freezing and reduction of military budgets; the prohibition, gradual reduction and eventual destruction of nuclear weapons; the establishment of zones of peace and co-operation free from nuclear armaments; measures for disarmament and military disengagement, partial or on a regional scale; resumption of the negotiations on the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament; the strengthening of the role of the United Nations and the General Assembly in the field of disarmament; the prohibition of war propaganda; and the mobilization of all social forces in the implementation of disarmament measures.

The documents before us -- that is, the reports of various bodies, of groups of experts, and of the Secretariat, together with the statements thus far made -- prove that the above-mentioned areas of action must be accepted as essential subjects for genuine negotiation.

Our immediate aim should be that of halting the arms race and of adopting effective measures to end competition in the production, improvement and acquisition of armaments, and the expansion of military facilities.

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

It must be mentioned that the only criterion for assessing the scope of any measure on this subject is its effect on the arms race. But the treaties and conventions that have so far been concluded, although they have had a certain influence in improving the political climate, have not been able to slow down the arms race, much less to affect the very basis thereof, particularly in respect of nuclear armaments. A first step in reaching that goal is the freezing and reduction of military budgets, starting from the present level. This requires the undertaking of negotiations in goodwill so that agreements and arrangements can be appropriately concluded to end all increase in military budgets and establish an effective programme for their gradual reduction, beginning with the budgets of the great and powerfully armed countries.

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

A fundamental principle which must be followed is to ensure the highest priority for nuclear disarmament measures. Nuclear disarmament is the Gordian knot, and on its unravelling depends the beginning of an effective process of general disarmament. No other approach would be significant in attaining this end.

For this purpose, priority must be given to banning the installation of new nuclear weapons and withdrawing weapons previously installed on the territory of other States, to halting the improvement and production of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, and to the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons.

The course and conclusions of the recent Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference have made these priorities clear. The nuclear arms race has continued unchecked. Now, the danger of nuclear proliferation can only be removed by halting nuclear weapons production and eventually destroying all stockpiles. So long as nuclear armament continues other countries will also undertake the production of nuclear weapons, and no one will be able to stop them.

In addition to action to outlaw and destroy nuclear weapons, we consider it to be useful and necessary to take similar measures to prohibit new types of weapons of mass destruction and new delivery systems of such weapons.

Finally, it is an elementary requirement which becomes increasingly obvious that nuclear-weapon States should solemnly undertake the commitment that they will never, in any circumstances, use nuclear weapons, or threaten to use them against States which do not possess them. At the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, Romania, together with other States, proposed that the nuclear Powers which are parties to the Treaty should undertake such a commitment by way of an additional protocol to the Treaty. That proposal is still fully relevant, and we are convinced that its acceptance could substantially contribute to strengthening the purposes of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Such a commitment derives from the balance of obligations which must exist under the Treaty; the non-nuclear weapon States, which under the Treaty have undertaken not to produce or acquire such weapons, have the right to have their security guaranteed.

Further progress in disarmament also involves the adoption of partial measures of disarmament and military disengagement, within a comprehensive programme. Such an approach, within a programme which gives absolute priority

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

to nuclear measures, would make it possible to make progress on various aspects reciprocally conditional, and that would have beneficial effects on the whole problem.

Among those measures, priority should go to the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world, subject to adequate security guarantees. Since this is an area in which non-nuclear States are free to act, steps to create nuclear-free zones can lead, as the efforts of Latin America clearly show, to placing whole areas beyond the threat of nuclear warfare, thus providing a model for the world of tomorrow, free from nuclear weapons.

The study on this question, which is one of the basic documents of the present session, is a praiseworthy effort by the United Nations. As we have already said, this study should now be used for constructive purposes, so as to encourage the efforts of States in various regions of the world. There is no doubt that the General Assembly, on whose initiative the study was undertaken, is competent, as has been suggested, to clarify the points which were not elucidated by the experts. Romania, for its part, reiterates its proposal to transform the Balkans into a zone of peace and co-operation, free, in the future, from all nuclear weapons.

Other partial measures intended to strengthen confidence among States and measures of military disengagement, can help to reduce sources of tension and reinforce progress toward détente. To this end there is an important role for regional action in regard to co-operation and security in various parts of the world. In our opinion, such action is particularly necessary in Europe where there is now an unprecedented concentration of military forces and arms, including nuclear weapons. Undoubtedly, the adoption of decisive measures of military disengagement and disarmament on the European continent will have a favourable influence on the international atmosphere as a whole.

It is, therefore, up to the States which participated in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe to act without delay to implement the military measures that were adopted at that Conference, as the first step in the efforts to build security on the continent.

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

In view of the general opposition towards any manifestation of the cold war, there is also a strengthening of the demands to put an end to military blocs and the policy of blocs, which are incompatible with the new progress towards détente and co-operation. Hence it is increasingly relevant to make every effort to do away with military blocs, and to put an end simultaneously to NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, as the condition for building confidence and security on the continent.

Likewise, since the final aim of all efforts is still general and complete disarmament, we must resume negotiations and review our efforts to draft the treaty on general and complete disarmament, which was abandoned more than a decade ago. It is understood that negotiations should give all States the opportunity of explaining their point of view on the contents and fundamental principles of the treaty, and of participating on conditions of full equality in all phases of the negotiations.

We must also recognize that the structure of the disarmament negotiations does not reflect the requirements of the democratization of international life, and the participation as equals of all States in the solution of international problems; the disarmament negotiations have remained unaffected by the changes that have taken place in international relations.

First of all, the role of the United Nations in disarmament must be resolutely reaffirmed. It should exercise direct authority regarding the negotiation and control of the implementation of disarmament measures. The General Assembly must fully exercise its powers by organizing in-depth debates on the subject of the situation in regard to armaments and the principles which should govern disarmament, and by making recommendations which could serve as a basis for negotiation.

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

It is in this spirit that my country supports the convening of a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on disarmament, as was decided at the recent Conference of the non-aligned countries at Lima to which Romania had the honour to be invited. Of course, such a session should be carefully prepared so that the results might lead to a decisive turning point in disarmament. It could be held, let us say, in 1977.

An open approach to disarmament questions, a recognition of the inalienable right of each State to make its contribution to the negotiations in conditions of complete equality, are sine qua non conditions for determined action in this field. In the same context there should also be the systematic informing of all States on the conduct of the negotiations so as to acquaint them with, and enable them to evaluate, the status of negotiations, as well as the implications thereof for international peace and security.

Our President, Nicolae Ceausescu, stated:

"Disarmament is a problem of peoples themselves and they have the right to know and must know what is being done to this end in order to enable them to have their say in regard to the measures to be taken. These problems are of great importance and are topical. They are of equal concern to all peoples, whether large or small, as well as the popular masses, and that is why they cannot be solved behind closed doors."

In this respect, particular attention should be given to the activities of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva which require drastic improvement measures. At present the Committee is marked by conservatism and routine. It does not deal with real questions created by the arms race. Whatever the importance that could be attached to the measures towards which the Committee is directing its activities, it has not succeeded in making a substantial contribution towards promoting disarmament and, primarily, nuclear disarmament.



Romania has repeatedly put forward suggestions and proposals to improve the activities of that body. We shall continue to work consistently towards that end.

One of the first steps in this direction would be to establish a close relationship between the Committee and the United Nations General Assembly so that the Committee may become a viable and effective negotiating body, able to discharge the tasks entrusted to it by United Nations decisions.

In summarizing the considerations I have stated, I should like to conclude by saying that the reassessment of disarmament must include at least four basic factors, namely: the principles governing negotiations; the content of negotiations; the structure of negotiations; and the link with public opinion. Each of these factors requires a careful review, free of preconceptions, in the light of the realities of international political life.

The Government of Romania is convinced that achievement of the above-mentioned objectives is a fundamental condition for ensuring lasting peace in the world, and is all the more necessary today when peoples are fully engaged in their economic and social development.

The document which I have the honour to submit on behalf of the Government of Romania expresses Romania's conviction that the primary task of today's generations is to spare absolutely no effort, to rouse every conscience, to channel all energies toward a single purpose -- namely, to impose determined measures for disarmament, and primarily for nuclear disarmament, to completely exclude force and the threat of its use in international life, and to free mankind from the nightmare of atomic warfare.

It is in this spirit that I wish to reaffirm the decision of my country to work in the future as well, together with all other States, to attain our common objective -- disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Romania for his kind words and for his introduction of the declaration of the Government of Romania contained in document A/C.1/1066, and I am most grateful for his expressions of courtesy to myself and the officers of the Committee.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): Every year, when discussing the disarmament items of our agenda, we had to admit that in spite of the efforts frequently invoked in the debates, the arms race continued its spiralling movement. This year is no exception. World military expenditures are reaching \$300,000 million a year, a figure much larger than the estimated product of developing countries in South Asia, the Far East, and Africa combined, a figure which is heavily dominated by the expenditure of the major military Powers. If we bear in mind that approximately 400,000 engineers and scientists are currently occupied in military research and development, we seem to be receiving an unwanted guarantee that, in the absence of adequate measures, the arms race will continue. The qualitative changes in armaments, which is the main feature of the nuclear arms race, are going to accelerate, since 40 per cent of all the funds allocated for research and development, both from public and private resources, are being used for military projects.

The economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security are known to all of us. They have been convincingly described by the Secretary-General's report of 1971, circulated as document A/8460/Rev.1, which the General Assembly welcomed with satisfaction in its resolution 2831 (XXVI). I would like to state that the conclusions and recommendations of that report are fully valid today. Two more recent reports of the Secretary-General have also touched upon this question describing, inter alia, the positive impact of disarmament and Reduction of the Military Budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries: the former was produced in 1972 and the latter in 1973.

The continuation of the arms race contradicts the spirit of the new democratic trend in international relations; it goes against the efforts aimed at establishing a new world economic order. I fully agree with those of my colleagues who have already been repeating for some time that détente cannot be considered a lasting, irreversible process as long as the arms race continues.

This being so -- and everybody seems to agree -- may I be permitted to ask what is wrong in this world, what are the real obstacles in the way of disarmament? The other day, the representative of Sweden called for a return to some basic and fundamental questions which would make the absurdity of the present situation even clearer. My delegation feels that indeed it would be proper for this Organization to address the basic questions mentioned by Sweden in an effort to start the too-long-awaited process of disarmament, nuclear disarmament first of all.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

It is with a feeling of deep regret and profound dissatisfaction that I must say that this Committee is recording the passing of another year without any progress in the field of disarmament negotiations. And what is even worse, in spite of the optimism voiced by some and the consolation expressed by others, the negotiations under way have not so far opened up any prospects for the future. In fact, the only multilateral negotiating body reporting to the General Assembly -- I have in mind the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament -- has for many years been dealing with peripheral questions without even touching upon the central ones, not to mention that the question of general and complete disarmament, on which some countries tried to gain political capital more than a decade ago, is now invoked strictly in rhetorical exercises by the same countries. This situation is no longer tolerable. We should give proper directives to the CCD so that this body can concentrate on the real problems facing mankind and approach them under a programme that could give us at least some guarantee that the end result would be disarmament and not another cover-up for the further acceleration of the arms race.

Nuclear disarmament should receive top priority. The threat of ultimate disaster which nuclear arms have generated is by far the gravest single peril the world faces today. With due respect to the nuclear-weapon States, we have to tell them that we cannot -- just cannot -- rely on the assumption that they would not use these weapons. That is why we firmly reject the concept that the so-called balance of terror does actually prevent war, just as we reject all theories of nuclear strategy and deterrence which, by implication, are trying to justify the possession of nuclear weapons and the nuclear arms race and to lull the public -- the peoples of the United Nations -- into a false sense of security.

The Geneva Conference for the Review of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in which I participated as the sole representative of my Government, proved that the nuclear-weapon States were far from recognizing the importance of nuclear disarmament. On the contrary, they tried hard to demonstrate that the Non-Proliferation Treaty had in fact only three articles -- those aimed at preventing horizontal proliferation -- as if the commitment contained in article VI relating to nuclear disarmament -- I repeat, disarmament and not non-proliferation -- did not concern them.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

Strangely enough, in spite of what happened in Geneva, no serious proposal for nuclear disarmament was made. Instead, new ideas are now being put forward to control all peaceful nuclear activities in the non-nuclear-weapon States. More interest is being shown by some in the modest nuclear progress of developing countries, for instance, than in the huge and still increasing arsenals of sophisticated nuclear weapons of the so-called super-Powers.

Many States, concerned with their security and that of their respective areas, have been militating for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. As a member of the Organization of African Unity, Mauritius, together with the other African States, is committed to the complete banning of any type of nuclear weapons from the African continent. We consider that States entering into such zonal arrangements, because of their renunciation of nuclear weapons, are entitled to negative security assurances from the nuclear-weapon States, which should solemnly undertake never under any circumstances to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against States in the nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Mauritius firmly supports the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. We welcome the consultations under way for summoning, as a first step, a conference of littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean with a view to implementing that Declaration through concerted efforts directed towards the elimination of great-Power and foreign and imperialist military rivalry and bases from the Indian Ocean as well as the littoral and hinterland States. We invite the great Powers and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean to refrain from all actions incompatible with the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. We also invite them to avoid further escalation of their military presence in the area. In this connexion I may wish to address myself more specifically to the situation in the Indian Ocean at an appropriate time.

In the meantime, the Committee may be interested to learn that at the recent meeting of President Ford of the United States and my Prime Minister the Right Honourable Sir Seewoosagur Ramgoolam in Washington an assurance was given to us that there will be no nuclear weapons on Diego Garcia.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

The Secretary-General of the United Nations this year quite rightly placed a particular emphasis on disarmament in the introduction to his annual report. He said:

"United Nations action should be based on accurate and adequate information, which must be made available in suitable form to Member States and to the public." (A/10001/Add.1, p. 8)

My delegation fully supports this statement.

I shall not here refer to the secrecy of some negotiations, like the SALT talks, for instance -- I prefer to talk about sugar. The stringent need to correct the situation is evident, even if we look at this year's report of the CCD to the General Assembly. This report is a masterpiece of non-reporting. It records the fact that in this negotiating body some countries, which are enumerated, made statements concerning, for instance, the prohibition of chemical weapons, and the number of the meeting in which this reference was made is given in parentheses. But the verbatim records of the CCD meetings are not made public, and the meetings themselves are held in secret. What, for example, was the position of Yugoslavia on the question of nuclear disarmament at the regional and tactical levels, with particular reference to the situation in Europe, mentioned in paragraph 24? Document CCD/PV.677, to which we are referred, was not distributed to all the Members of the United Nations.

There is a tendency to produce the impression of exclusiveness, to develop complexes and a general alienation of world public opinion from the field of disarmament, which, it is asserted, is very complicated and highly professionalized.

This session of the General Assembly should adopt a decision aimed at improving the existing facilities of the United Nations for collection, compilation and dissemination of information on disarmament issues, in order to keep all Governments, as well as world public opinion, properly informed on progress achieved in disarmament.

In view of the general competence of the General Assembly in the field of disarmament, we propose to invite States and relevant intergovernmental bodies and conferences to report periodically to the Assembly about measures and progress towards disarmament.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

The world should be made aware of the danger the present situation in the field of armaments represents and it should be mobilized to press actively for disarmament. Unfortunately, the public has been frequently and seriously misled into believing that steady progress is being made in disarmament. A United Nations pamphlet which I happened to see describes the United Nations achievements in disarmament in emphatic terms, without mentioning the complete disappointment voiced here on the lack of actual progress towards disarmament.



(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

This Organization, created for peace and security, must play an adequate role in disarmament. The Secretary-General has put before us a proposal which many in this room do support:

"I believe" -- he said -- "that it is vitally necessary, in the interest of the welfare of humanity, and indeed of its survival, that in this thirtieth anniversary year the General Assembly itself should consider a basic review of the role of the United Nations in disarmament." (A/10001/Add.1, p. 8)

He further said that:

"Any basic review of disarmament will have to include the problem of how disarmament can best be discussed so that the discussion can be comprehensive." (Ibid.)

Several delegations have already referred to this proposal. My delegation supports it and is ready to co-operate in the adoption of adequate measures aimed at strengthening the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

Mauritius favours the convening of a world disarmament conference with the participation of all States on an equal basis, during which universal disarmament guidelines would be approved -- in particular, with respect to nuclear disarmament and the utilization of resources thus freed for international economic co-operation. If it becomes evident that it will not be possible to convene a world disarmament conference, then a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament issues should be convened. Maybe it would be necessary to consider also the convening of the Disarmament Commission, the only United Nations body specialized in disarmament.

It does not matter which conclusion we reach on organizational set-up: what is important is to ensure conditions for the participation of all States in the discussion and adoption of decisions regarding all disarmament questions, as this field touches, in the most direct way, the interest of all States.

In my statement today, I have deliberately not dealt with individual items on our agenda. It is my delegation's belief that, because of the deadlock in the disarmament negotiations and the refusal of some countries

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

actually to engage in serious negotiations on the real problems of disarmament, such a discussion is not required here. Exhaustive studies on nuclear tests, on chemical weapons and on many other questions have been made and are available. Unavailable is the political will of the most armed States in a position to break the deadlock. That is why I preferred to address those questions which, in our view, depict the causes of the arms race and the deadlock in the negotiations, as well as some ways and means which could eventually better serve, under present circumstances, the cause of disarmament. With your permission, I would summarize them:

First, to address the basic and fundamental questions related to the arms race;

Secondly, to approach disarmament in a comprehensive manner, giving priority to nuclear disarmament;

Thirdly, to improve the United Nations capacity for collection, compilation and dissemination of information on disarmament issues;

Fourthly, to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament; and

Fifthly, to ensure conditions for the participation of all States in the solution of disarmament problems.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to announce that Mongolia has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolutions in documents A/AC.1/L.707 and A/AC.1/L.711.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: I regret again to state that, as we have no speakers for this afternoon, I am compelled to cancel that meeting.

I also regret to inform you that, so far, we have no speakers for tomorrow afternoon's meeting. Unless any delegation volunteers to speak at that time, I shall be compelled to cancel tomorrow afternoon's meeting also.

(The Chairman)

Members may realize that in this way we have lost four meetings this week. I know that delegations are very hard at work in consultations and in preparing draft resolutions. This is very welcome information that I have received, and I should like to encourage more intensive consultations and preparation of draft resolutions. May I invite delegations to introduce these draft resolutions as soon as possible, as some delegations have already done.

At yesterday's meeting I mentioned that it was my intention to close the list of speakers on 7 November and the general debate on 14 November. However, I have since held consultations with various delegations, and I have listened to the views expressed by many, especially by the Group of 15 of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Taking into consideration all the views expressed and the prevailing situation in the Committee, and with the hope that we shall proceed more decisively on our agenda items, I would now propose to the Committee the closure of the speaker's list on Tuesday, 11 November, at 12 noon, and the closure of the general debate of the conclusion of business on Wednesday, 19 November. I hope that this will meet with the approval of the Committee.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): I think your proposal would be quite helpful, Mr. Chairman, but I should like to suggest that we accept the first part of it, that the list of speakers should be closed on 11 November, and request you to extend the time for the general debate to 21 November. That would be more convenient to some of us who are working hard to prepare speeches and in the interval we could attend consultations with a view to preparing draft resolutions, which you have kindly and generously agreed to accept. My suggestion is that the list of speakers should be closed on 11 November but that the general debate should continue until 21 November. I am making not a formal proposal but a suggestion for consideration.

Mr. MISHRA (India): I should like to join the representative of Nigeria in his suggestion that the debate might go on until 21 November rather than 19 November.

The CHAIRMAN: We could take a decision today to close the list of speakers on Tuesday, 11 November, at noon if that is the wish of the Committee; and there does not seem to be any objection.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: As for the general debate, that can continue as long as members of the Committee wish. We could even have meetings on Saturday and in the evenings, if there were speakers on our list.

I should like to make an indication -- an indication only -- of 19 November for the ending of the general debate but, naturally, that would be open to prolongation to meet the wishes that have been expressed. We shall review the situation on Monday next, 10 November, after we have seen how many names we have on the list of speakers.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I would venture to make a suggestion, Mr. Chairman, which might perhaps reconcile diverging points of view and also, of course, take into account your own very understandable concern that we should make the best use of our time. My

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

suggestion is that we should set Friday, 21 November, as suggested by the representative of Nigeria, supported by the representative of India, as the closing date for the general debate, with the express indication by you, Sir, that you would extend the same flexibility as you have in the past -- as, for example, two days ago in the case of the representative of the Soviet Union -- so that any representative would be authorized in the course of the general debate to introduce draft resolutions, specifically. And I would add that I see no objection not only to the introduction of draft resolutions but also to comments on draft resolutions which are already before the First Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I quite understand the wishes expressed; that is why I did not want to take a firm decision today on the closure of the general debate. We have only taken one decision, regarding the closure of the list of speakers. I want to be flexible as far as the general debate is concerned, but I appeal to those delegations which wish to speak to inscribe their names as soon as possible. I shall take into consideration the views expressed here.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.