



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.2090
18 November 1975

ENGLISH

Thirtieth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND AND NINETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 18 November 1975, at 10.30 a.m.

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. GHORRA	(Lebanon)
<u>later:</u>	Mr. MIKANAGU (Vice-Chairman)	(Burundi)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	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 19 NOVEMBER 1975, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 24 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 of 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)

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 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)

Mr. BERASATEGUI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): In a statement at the 2073rd meeting of the Committee the Permanent Representative of Argentina referred to the present state of disarmament negotiations and discussed a certain number of priority items on our agenda. My delegation now wishes to pursue those points, together with some others, and in so doing we shall try to concentrate on those proposals which have appeared in the form of draft texts and accordingly need careful examination so that their authors may be able to take into account the views expressed in the First Committee.

I should like to begin by referring to the two identical draft conventions on the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other hostile purposes, presented by the Soviet Union and the United States in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD). Naturally, my country is second to none in its desire to protect the environment, through suitable international action. That is why last year we sponsored in the Assembly resolution 3264 (XXIX), which requested the CCD to proceed as soon as possible to draft an agreement on the question and at the same time transmitted to the CCD the draft convention which had been, in our opinion, so opportunely presented by the Soviet Union.

Subsequently, at the 686th plenary meeting at the CCD, we had occasion to make a certain number of preliminary comments on the draft conventions submitted to the CCD and consequently to make a number of points and ask some questions of the authors on the precise scope of the documents. Since both documents are before the General Assembly for the first time I think it appropriate to remind representatives of our questions and to explain our reasons for asking them. We trust that at the forthcoming session of the CCD the authors of the drafts will be able to reply to our observations.

In our opinion, the third and fourth preambular paragraphs of the drafts seriously limit the scope of the prohibition of climate-changing techniques for military and other hostile purposes. Nor does the preamble make any reference to the aim of any collateral measure, which is the promotion of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

(Mr. Berasategui, Argentina)

In Geneva we pointed out that article I of the drafts referred simply to the prohibition of:

"... environmental modification techniques having widespread, long-lasting or severe effects as the means of destruction, damage or injury to another State party." (CCD/471 and CCD/472).

Such a qualification appears highly restrictive, since it qualifies what is to be prohibited in such a way as to make it possible, even legitimate, to use environmental modification techniques for military or other hostile purposes so long as they do not produce the effects to which I have referred. We believe that situation needs to be corrected, because if we go by the text of the drafts we see that the purpose pursued by their authors is the prohibition and not merely the limitation of the use of such technology.

We note also the omission of a provision similar to that of article X, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction, relating to the exchange of equipment, material and information for peaceful purposes. Such a provision is essential, particularly for the developing countries, on account of the importance which environmental modification techniques may acquire if they are used at any time with productive purposes in mind.

The draft also failed to take account, perhaps through an involuntary omission, of the periodic convening of a review conference to consider the implementation of the purposes and provisions of the proposed convention. An arrangement of that kind is provided for in other disarmament agreements and I suggest that there is no valid reason for departing from that practice in the present case.

We have noted with satisfaction that the authors of the drafts are prepared to consider, in a spirit of negotiation, the changes which would be necessary in order to arrive at a more complete and more precise text than those submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. We can assure them that we, for our part, will work constructively towards the preparation of such texts so that the General Assembly may have before it a document capable of gaining wide acceptance.

(Mr. Berasategui, Argentina)

I should like now to refer to the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.707 and L.711, presented originally by the Soviet Union. I should like to express our thanks to the Soviet delegation for this new contribution to the work of the United Nations in the disarmament field.

The draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707 should be considered together with its annex, which is a draft treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. We believe it has become increasingly evident with the passage of time that the five nuclear-weapons States must co-operate in order to bring about a cessation of weapon testing in all environments. From that point of view the approach in the document is correct, but we would draw attention to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which does not seem to us to indicate the most appropriate procedure, for two reasons.

(Mr. Berasategui, Argentina)

First, because the negotiations proposed therein should not be limited to those five Powers, although their participation is essential for the treaty to be concluded. Non-nuclear-weapon States have a legitimate interest in this question and it should be recognized that they have the status of parties to any effort connected with the cessation of nuclear-weapon testing and the establishment of an international régime for peaceful nuclear explosions on a non-discriminatory basis.

Secondly, the proposed date, 31 March 1976, coincides with the date agreed on for the entry into force of the Threshold Treaty concluded between the United States and the Soviet Union. The link thus established is not likely to facilitate acceptance by those States which are being invited to negotiate.

The choice of a suitable forum is in this case, as in others, a matter of great importance. The present choices have not offered viable alternatives to the authors, simply because we do not have available a negotiating forum with full representation of nuclear-weapon States. In this respect, we should recall yet again that organizational problems are very often more important than they might seem at first sight.

With respect to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.711, we followed with particular interest the explanations that were given by the Soviet delegation when it presented that draft to the Committee. Those explanations dispelled certain doubts and provided useful information for determining the precise scope of that initiative. We shall not here embark on a detailed examination of the text of the annexed draft agreement because we understand it to be a legal model, as it were, which, before it becomes definitive is subject to whatever contributions may result from the consideration and comparison by experts of the levels attained by science and technology in the generation of new systems of weapons of mass destruction. In other words, we have a model now available to us which will serve as a point of departure in a technological undertaking, which in turn will make it possible to determine whether or not the model satisfies the purposes and scope of an eventual prohibition.

(Mr. Berasategui, Argentina)

For example, environmental modification techniques for military or other hostile purposes may produce the same sort of effects as weapons of mass destruction. However, these techniques have their own special features which require special regulations, as was clearly understood by the authors of the draft conventions presented to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD). As we see it, the Soviet initiative does not, therefore, exclude special solutions for individual cases.

If our interpretation of the intentions of the co-authors is correct, it might be possible to amend the operative part of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.711 in certain minor ways which would, in our opinion, allow for a very considerable increase in the number of sponsors. My delegation is prepared to co-operate in any efforts made to achieve that aim.

Before I conclude these remarks, I wish to refer to another question which, if it has not the same characteristics as the one I have just been considering, is nevertheless of special importance for my delegation. A number of speakers in this debate have stated that it is necessary to strengthen the régime of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons by the extension or application of safeguards to all peaceful activities of States not parties to the Treaty. As this raises some rather delicate political and legal problems, we wish to state our position on it.

First of all, no treaty and no provisions of a treaty can be imposed on third States which have decided, in exercise of their sovereignty, not to sign the treaty. This applies also to the safeguards system under the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Secondly, somewhat surprisingly, no mention has been made here of the fact that the International Atomic Energy Agency already has a safeguards system, in accordance with its statute, which has never been regarded as inappropriate and which covers a wide range of activities. According to the recent report of the Agency (A/10168 and Corr.1 and Add.1) there are 30 nuclear power stations, 60 reactors of other types, 20 fuel plants and 109 areas of accounting subject to such safeguards.

(Mr. Berasategui, Argentina)

Thirdly, it has not been pointed out that these safeguards, applicable to certain specific nuclear materials, are broader than those provided for in the Non-Proliferation Treaty with respect to the scope of prohibition; in other words, what is to be understood by military purposes.

Fourthly, no mention has been made of the fact that various States not parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty have freely accepted these safeguards, so that in fact practically all their installations are subject to the safeguards.

(Mr. Berasategui, Argentina)

Fifthly, if what is being suggested is that the developed countries should use their technological and financial capacity in order to insist on a specific safeguard régime which other importing States do not accept, it should be recalled that operations involving the importing of nuclear materials and equipment are, in certain cases, a matter of appropriateness at a given time, and need not reflect the impossibility of mobilizing national resources and technology. In other words, if one is not obliged to sell, then one cannot be obliged to buy under unacceptable conditions when it is possible, perhaps at a slightly higher cost, to build with one's own resources, without having to accept such conditions.

Mr. MIKANAGU (Burundi) (interpretation from French): Each one of you might wonder why a small country and one as weak as Burundi is should have any interest in disarmament, whereas the responsibility for genuine disarmament lies with the major nuclear Powers. In my opinion, it is precisely the weaker countries which should be concerned with the disarmament question, since they are the real victims of the arms race. For it is no mere chance that all bloody conflicts and hotbeds of tension are confined, not within the polygons of the super-Powers or the industrial countries, but always within the developing countries.

Furthermore, the struggle of the major Powers to achieve world hegemony and to share out the zones of political and economic influence creates a feeling of insecurity among the third-world countries, and leads them to accept substantial military expenditures to the detriment of development expenditure, so that they will be able to resist any possible aggression. There is no shortage of arms for supplying them, since the major Powers, one of whose most prosperous industries is the industry of death, are manufacturing the most sophisticated and diabolical weapons, and wish to get rid of the military stockpiles they regard as obsolete.

Thirty years ago the United Nations proclaimed that it wished to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war which twice in a lifetime had brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours. Some speakers who

(Mr. Mikanagu, Burundi)

preceded me pointed out that nuclear weapons have not been used since the Second World War and that the danger of a nuclear war has retreated considerably in recent years. I completely agree with them on that specific point. But the other weapons, including napalm, have been constantly used in horrible ways since 1945, and that only in the developing countries where hotbeds of tension have been deliberately created by the super-Powers so that they can share out political, economic, or strategic zones of influence.

Certainly, there has been no progress in the field of disarmament, because of the imperialism of some major Powers which dispute among themselves the hegemony of the world and of the oceans. In their race for world domination and hegemony, some major nuclear Powers, whose political theory is power and might, have not only manufactured enormous quantities of conventional and nuclear arms, but have also deployed, beyond their natural frontiers troops and war fleets, as well as having military bases on the territories of other States.

It is that aggression and expansion which ravages the third world today. Let us consider all these local wars, whether permanent or periodic, which are being waged; consider these regional tensions and conflicts, which could have catastrophic consequences for world peace. The list is too long: Korea, the Middle East, Indo-China, southern Africa, the Indian Ocean, Cyprus, Angola, and so on.

Profiting from or causing boundary disputes between neighbouring States or ideological conflicts among fellow nationals, the conquerors of world hegemony sell or supply weapons to one side, which must, of course, accept aggressive imperialist blocs on its territory. Thus the countries of the third world are manipulated by the rivalry of the major Powers that are exploiting situations in order to divide among themselves spheres of influence, strategic zones, and mining or oil resources.

The war which today ravages the very wealthy territory of Angola, so richly endowed by nature, is an illustration of this thesis and sheds a harsh light on the cause of the other hotbeds of tension in the third world countries.

(Mr. Mikanaçu, Burundi)

By the use of their most diabolic weapons the major Powers, like wolves, are tearing to pieces the young Republic of Angola, which is the very heart of Africa. This tragic situation of Angola reminds us of the sad and sinister period of congolization, when I myself became a victim of the puppet Tschombe. I thought then that I was fighting for a certain ideology. When I think of it today, I find that I was really very naive. Where is the ideology in the tragedy which is destroying Angola today?

Now that our Organization has just entered into a new phase of maturity, we must get rid of everything childish or adolescent by trying to put an end to the regional hotbeds of tension and conflicts which are a dangerous encouragement to the arms race. We also note that the small amount of development aid agreed to by the two super-Powers and their satellites is directed towards countries which constitute zones of tension and political influence, while they neglect other countries which, alas, are the poorest and therefore the ones most in need.

Let those who might be tempted to preach disarmament for propaganda purposes, with the intention of maintaining their monopoly of the most diabolical conventional weapons and the most sophisticated nuclear arms, harbour no illusions, because you cannot fool all the people of the world all of the time.

It is not a balance of arms that we need. This military balance of terror can never guarantee peace. My delegation is in favour of genuine general and complete disarmament.

It is absolutely deplorable that \$300,000 million are swallowed up every year in the furnace of military expenditure, whereas these enormous material and human resources could have been used for economic and social purposes for the greater wellbeing of mankind.

We must also deplore the fact that the countries of the third world are not politically independent because of the traffic in arms by the two super-Powers. The third world countries, as poor as they are, are compelled to buy quantities of arms from the two super-Powers for their security, or even for their aggression.

(Mr. Mikanagu, Burundi)

These weapons are sold to them, of course, but always tied to political conditions. Ultimately, therefore, only the two super-Powers are politically independent. Thus, my delegation considers that the only weapon to guarantee our political independence must be the unity and solidarity of the countries of the third world against the super-Powers. Burundi is, naturally, in favour of genuine general and complete disarmament. We must not only prevent the manufacture of new weapons, but also destroy the existing ones.

As regards the world disarmament conference, Burundi considers that the purpose of the conference should be the total destruction of the stocks of all weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, and the prohibition of the manufacture or the development of other weapons of that kind. However, we must not go too fast by convening a world disarmament conference only to fail in achieving our ultimate goal of real disarmament. It is essential that the conference should, from the outset, have a good chance of achieving tangible results. That is why it is indispensable that all nuclear Powers agree to participate in that conference.

It is obvious that the world disarmament conference can only succeed in an atmosphere of confidence among peoples, without suspicions or distrust. The major Powers must also promise to cease the foreign interventions in the political, economic and military affairs of other States.

In any case, the delegation of Burundi has a strong feeling that the question of convening a world disarmament conference has now reached a deadlock, because most countries consider that the participation of all the nuclear Powers in the conference is a sine qua non. Now, one of the nuclear Powers is holding out for prior conditions for the convening of the conference, in particular that the nuclear countries should first undertake an unequivocal commitment that they will never be the first to use nuclear weapons, at any time or in whatever circumstances, and will not use them against non-nuclear States and nuclear-weapon-free zones, and that they will withdraw all their armed forces, including nuclear missiles, from other countries, and dismantle all their military bases, including nuclear bases, on the territories of other States.

(Mr. Mikanaga, Burundi)

We must also point out that certain countries do not wish to be lulled or deceived by the convening of a world disarmament conference to serve only as a propaganda forum intended to camouflage the arms race or maintain the arms balance of certain major nuclear Powers.

Thus the choice is clear: either the world disarmament conference is held without the participation of all the nuclear Powers, or there is no conference at all. In any case, my delegation is still convinced that the participation of all the nuclear Powers is essential.

The implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace is of concern to Burundi. The escalating rivalry between the major Powers in the Indian Ocean is a grave threat for the coastal States and the hinterland countries of the Indian Ocean. The General Assembly, in resolution 2832 (XXVI) of 16 December 1971, inter alia called on the great Powers to enter into consultations immediately with the coastal States of the Indian Ocean with a view to:

"(a) Halting the further escalation and expansion of their military presence in the Indian Ocean;

"(b) Eliminating from the Indian Ocean all bases, military installations and logistical supply facilities, the disposition of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction and any manifestation of great Power military presence in the Indian Ocean conceived in the context of great Power rivalry;".

More recently, on 24 December 1974, the General Assembly adopted resolution 3259 (XXIX) entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". But we must know that the great Powers which are battling for hegemony over the world are not prepared to dismantle their military installations in the Indian Ocean.

My delegation deplores the internal quarrels we have heard at the meetings held by the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, to organize a conference on the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Mikanagu, Burundi)

To conclude, I would just venture to quote from what the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Burundi said on 2 October last in the general debate in the General Assembly.

"The end of the third United Nations decade coincides with the end of the era of blind power, of domination, colonialism and the most outrageous imperialism, a time when the exploitation and plundering of the world by the strongest Powers was organized on a grand scale in the name of either liberty or socialism or simply democracy. The era that is coming to an end has seen the slow maturing and arduous birth of the third world, which has come to occupy its place among the former. It enjoys this right by virtue of the fact that it includes two thirds of mankind and vast resources over which it intends henceforth to exercise full sovereignty."

(A/PV.2372, pp. 3 and 4)

In conclusion, my delegation firmly believes that if all peoples were to unite, as one man, to resist the blackmail and aggression of the major nuclear Powers which seek world hegemony, then weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, would be eliminated, through the unity and solidarity of the peoples of the world.

Mr. VINCI (Italy): The high level of the statements made on the many items inscribed in our agenda under the general subject of disarmament shows the seriousness with which the members of the international community consider these items. How could it be otherwise, since these are complex problems which, affecting in several ways the present and future life of our peoples, can by the same token change for better or for worse the destiny of mankind. For my part, I will try to keep up with this high standard, and although my remarks must necessarily be focused on some of the more actual items, this should not be construed as lack of interest in the other topics. The increasing number of these items, already noted by previous speakers, is an important fact in itself, since it is there to recall to us how slow is our pace in questions related to disarmament compared to the wider and wider expectations and to the speed of science and technology.*

* Mr. Mikanagu (Burundi), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

That is why, among other reasons, the Italian delegation, along with other delegations, cannot consider itself entirely satisfied with the progress achieved during the year in the field of disarmament and arms control.

As the Secretary-General has so aptly pointed out in his introduction to the year's report on the work of the Organization,

"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." (A/10001/Add.1, p. 8)

My country has indeed long been deeply aware of the necessity of halting the arms race, and it is the more so at present. We need its cessation more and more in order to divert the resources saved from armaments to more productive uses for the benefit of all mankind and to build up what is not less indispensable: mutual confidence among nations. That is why we keenly share the intense and general expectations of more positive progress in the crucial field of arms reduction and disarmament.

We are, however, forced at the same time to take note of some hard facts of life which give no signs of real final change. So at this stage we cannot but recognize that in order to be effective arms control and disarmament measures must take full account of the mutual security interests of the parties concerned, of the related political conditions and of the complexity of advancing military technology. For these reasons we believe that, within the framework of a well structured programme of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, a gradual and progressive approach is perhaps the best way of attaining our common and vital objectives in this field.

We also feel that the current process of international détente should afford new impetus to the efforts directed at achieving more substantial measures of arms control and, by interaction, draw from them greater strength and a growing momentum of its own. Indeed, it is in this direction that the very touchstone of détente and the real test of its validity lie.

We consider the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference to be of great importance. Once correctly and fully implemented, its impact could certainly be felt

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

beyond the regional level. In such a case, which we sincerely advocate, it could effectively contribute to a qualitative change of far-reaching consequences in the over-all relations between our countries and peoples, to a point where it would finally become possible to remove the real obstacles that still block the way towards the achievement of significant measures of arms control.

In that endeavour, which will require the active determination of each one of us, it would still be up to the nuclear Powers, and in particular to the two super-Powers, to play the decisive role. In this respect what is needed is that both sides, setting aside all dogmatic approaches, show their political willingness to meet some concrete unavoidable requirements without which one can hardly conceive how to solve the underlying issues inherent in any serious and effective system of reduction of armaments and disarmament.

What we have in mind are some essential components or factors which have to do with credibility, with serious guarantees for implementation, with respect for the national security of the contracting parties and for a general balance of forces. Last, but not least, what is required is compliance with certain priorities which clearly imply that the primary effort should be devoted to curbing the nuclear arms race and dispelling the threat of a nuclear holocaust.

Consequently we are anxious to see the spirit of Helsinki, as we understand it, become truly operative in depth, replacing outmoded concepts of power politics and being transferred to all the forums in which the main disarmament issues are debated -- namely, in the bilateral Soviet-American negotiations in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, in the transactions in Vienna on the balanced reduction of forces in central Europe, and, finally, in the forthcoming negotiations in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Furthermore, we still expect the super-Powers to carry out the joint initiatives they officially announced at their last summits on some vital items long pending in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

Having made these preliminary remarks, we should like to stress our appreciation of the valuable work carried out in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament during the current year, bearing particularly in mind the presentation of a draft treaty on the prohibition of environmental warfare and the studies accomplished by the groups of governmental experts on denuclearized zones and on peaceful nuclear explosions.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

The Italian delegation feels, however, that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, to the vital functions of which we attach great importance, should work with a greater sense of urgency and receive the greater impulse thereby entailed which would enable it to achieve more satisfactory results. To that end we would encourage all constructive efforts aimed at strengthening the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and revising, as appropriate, its ways of working so that it may more adequately discharge its fundamental task.

One of the most significant events during this past year in the field of disarmament was undoubtedly the Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty held in Geneva last spring. The Italian Government, which, with four other European countries, ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty just before the beginning of the Conference, has already had the opportunity of expressing its appreciation, on the whole, over the outcome of the Review Conference. The consensus reached on its final declaration, mostly a product of the efforts of the President of the Conference, Madame Inga Thorsson of Sweden, to whose statesmanship I wish to pay a tribute, reflects adequately -- although, naturally, as a result of a difficult compromise -- the not always convergent views and proposals which emerged in the course of the Conference.

The Italian delegation took into account particularly the importance assumed in the Conference by both the problem of containing the risks of nuclear proliferation and that of ensuring a just distribution of the benefits deriving from the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. On the basis of these two main points, it acted fundamentally on the principle of ensuring a precise balance between the rights and the duties provided for by the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

In this context we may well recall the precise duty, established in Article 6 of the Treaty, for the nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty to undertake concrete efforts towards genuine disarmament measures in the field of nuclear armaments. The importance in this field of a constructive dialogue between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has been evident since the entry into force of the Treaty itself.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

Truly enough, if the destructive power accumulated by both the nuclear Powers is in fact beyond imagination, it is on the other hand within the reach of our minds or perceptions to realize that somehow, paradoxically, this same overdestructive and overkilling potential maintains the so-called terror balance, in other words, the strategic balance in the world which ensures the present precarious situation of peace. And, realistically speaking, as long as this balance of power exists there is a check on the use of nuclear weapons.

For these same reasons my country, which has on many occasions welcomed the agreement on the principles for a limitation of strategic armaments reached last year at Vladivostok by the United States of America and the Soviet Union, attaches the greatest importance to an early translation of those principles into a concrete and final agreement. However, measures of limitation of those armaments will have to be followed by appropriate measures of real reduction of the nuclear arsenals. In our view, there is no other way to ensure respect of the necessary balance between the engagements of both the nuclear-weapon States and the non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the treaty, as well as a correct application of article VI of the same treaty.

We are conscious, on the other side, of the problem constituted by the growing risks of nuclear proliferation. In this respect we are convinced of the essential role that can be played by the Non-Proliferation Treaty. That is why the Italian delegation firmly hopes that other States will be induced to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, since its universal acceptance is in our view a fundamental condition of its success.

Among the problems discussed at the Review Conference, special attention must be given here, in our view, to that of nuclear-weapon-free zones. I wish to take this opportunity to express our deep appreciation of the work carried out by the Ad Hoc Group of Qualified Governmental Experts who, meeting under the auspices of the CCD, examined in great detail all aspects of this problem. The final report of the Group of Experts adequately reflects all the viewpoints expressed during the course of their work. I should like to recall what are, in the opinion of the Italian Delegation, the essential preconditions of the establishment of denuclearized zones.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

We believe, first of all, that every initiative in this field should, where the appropriate conditions exist, be taken primarily by the States of the area concerned, on the basis of consultations which are to be left to the free will of each party. We also consider essential the participation of the principal military Powers of the area. No less fundamental importance, in our view, should be attributed to the following two points: (a) the precise definition of the limits of the territory to be covered by the denuclearization agreement; and (b) full respect of international law, particularly in relation to the freedom of navigation in the high seas and to the right of innocent passage in the territorial seas, as well as to the uses of international space. Equally important, in our view, is the principle that a denuclearization agreement should not prejudice the security arrangements existing in any given region. We feel, in fact, that each State is entitled to exercise its free and sovereign choice as to how to preserve its own security: this applies particularly to those regions in which collective security arrangements are in force. The problem of the guarantees of security which should be afforded to the non-nuclear States of the nuclear-weapon-free zones and of the means of control and verification of such agreements also deserves particular attention. The Italian Government will evaluate the individual concrete proposals in the light of these criteria.

As regards peaceful nuclear explosions, we are pleased to note with interest and appreciation the important work undertaken by the group of experts which met last summer within the framework of the CCD, in accordance with the mandate conferred upon it by General Assembly resolution 3261 D (XXIX). The crucial aspect of the question of peaceful nuclear explosions is centred on the difficulties inherent in the problem of ensuring an adequate balance between two opposing interests. On the one hand, there is the fundamental and inalienable right of all States to enjoy the actual and potential benefits of nuclear technology and to develop nuclear energy research, production and use for peaceful purposes, as well as the right to enjoy full access to nuclear technology and to the nuclear fuel market, in equal and stable conditions. These rights constitute, in fact, one of the corner-stones of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and are of particular value and importance in relation especially to the huge and impending problems produced by the energy crisis. On the other hand, there is the urgent need to prevent the

acquisition of technology relating to the construction, development and use of nuclear explosive devices which can be diverted to military purposes, thus disrupting the barrier erected against the further dissemination of nuclear weapons.

The Italian delegation also takes note that the informal meetings with the experts held in the CCD on the subject of peaceful nuclear explosions have confirmed that in the present state of technology there is no real distinction between the devices used in nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes and those applied to military purposes. As a consequence, it has been confirmed that in present conditions peaceful nuclear explosions represent a serious risk for the régime of non-proliferation.

Three possible solutions have been envisaged for the settlement of this complex question, in which the Italian Government is greatly interested. First of all, a proposal has been made for general application by all States of the régime of article V of the Treaty. It has also been suggested that a moratorium on peaceful nuclear explosions should be agreed upon in order not to delay an early conclusion of at least an ad interim arrangement for the cessation of all nuclear experiments. A special régime outside the context of the Non-Proliferation Treaty could also be considered. We could ask ourselves -- and the CCD could be the appropriate body in which to do so -- whether and in what way these positions could be reconciled.

Furthermore, we find it necessary to devote serious attention to a more precise clarification of the possible peaceful uses of nuclear explosions, both at the present time and in the future. In fact, we must precisely determine the possible uses of the technology of nuclear explosions for civil purposes at present and what are the future short-term and long-term prospects for those uses. We believe that the essential thing is an urgent need for clear-sightedness concerning all aspects of peaceful nuclear explosions if the system of non-proliferation is truly to be safeguarded.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

We hope that the super-Powers will accept the proposal advanced many years ago by the Italian delegation -- I refer to document ENDC/234 of 23 August 1968 -- and recently taken up again on various occasions in the CCD, that experts from non-nuclear countries should be present at peaceful nuclear experiments.

At the same time, we wish to encourage the International Atomic Energy Agency in the role it is playing in this field and hope that the consultative group created by a recent decision of the Board of Governors of the Agency will soon be able to carry out a study of the juridical implications of the problem and possibly elaborate a model agreement for the delivery of peaceful nuclear explosion services.

The Italian delegation considers the total prohibition of nuclear tests to be a question of the utmost importance in the framework of general and complete disarmament under effective international control and as a first specific step towards more effective implementation of article 6 of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

In this context the Italian delegation has considered with interest the draft treaty on the prohibition of all nuclear tests recently introduced in the General Assembly by the Soviet delegation. While noting that this draft does not provide for an adequate and effective mechanism of control and verification, we consider that it could contribute to accelerating the pace of the long-protracted negotiations for the achievement of agreement on this important and delicate issue. We should prefer, therefore, to see these negotiations developed, on the basis both of the Soviet proposal and of others, and to have them transferred to a technical body as highly competent as the CCD, which in our view remains the best and most qualified body for the further consideration of this important matter. This procedure would associate the non-nuclear States in the related negotiations and offer them a real opportunity of contributing effectively and positively to them. But in this area, as in many others, the fundamental question of verification, I repeat, needs to be satisfactorily solved. On this specific point we believe that the studies analysing the technical merits of the effective range of the various systems of controls, both national and international, should be

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

increased and broadened. We are therefore looking forward with great interest to the meeting of experts, so opportunely proposed by Sweden, which will be held during the CCD session next spring.

Coming to the important relationship between a comprehensive test ban and peaceful nuclear explosions, we should like to reaffirm, as other delegations have done, that it would be most advisable to find a solution first to the problem of peaceful nuclear explosions. In our view, a satisfactory settlement of that delicate question might on the one hand constitute a real step towards better understanding and on the other become effective common ground on which to reach agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty.

We also wish to recall that Italy has since 1968 supported an approach according to which a separation of the two problems would be methodologically correct. Leaving military explosions aside provisionally, and endeavouring to reach an agreement on an acceptable form of control as regards nuclear explosions of a peaceful nature, would simplify the problem, thus facilitating a temporary solution concerning peaceful nuclear explosions.

Our position is equally positive as we turn to consideration of the new Soviet proposal for the prohibition of the development of new weapons of mass destruction. We cannot, however, like many other delegations, refrain from raising a certain number of questions as we look at the proposed draft treaty, as it is now conceived. The absence of a clear indication of the object of the ban itself makes it difficult to evaluate all the implications of such an initiative. While the Italian delegation is greatly interested in any such measure which would contribute to the strengthening of mutual confidence between States, we should like to see the contents of this proposed agreement better clarified before passing a final judgement on it.

Although no substantial progress was attained last year, the problem of reaching an agreement on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons remains, in the opinion of the Italian delegation, an issue of fundamental importance. While thanking those delegations which provided us with valuable proposals and working papers in order to achieve a better understanding and a clearer definition of the difficult issues implicit

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

in this important matter, we believe that the greatest efforts should for the moment be concentrated on the prospects which seem to be offered by a gradual and progressive approach to the solution of the problem. In this context, we continue to support the Japanese proposal, which appears to us to be in present conditions the most useful base and by far the best starting-point for positive developments in this field.

We are waiting hopefully, as we have already stated in Geneva, for the two super-Powers to fulfil their promise of a joint proposal in this field. The Italian delegation, however, is willing to consider with favour agreements which may, at the initial stage, be centred on the prohibition of only the most lethal chemical agents. Essential conditions of the acceptability of such an agreement remain, in our view, acceptance of the necessity of ensuring the destruction of existing stocks of such weapons and the adoption of an effective system of controls.

The Italian delegation, which showed interest in the proposals advanced last year in the General Assembly by the Soviet Union concerning the prohibition of environmental warfare, welcomed with appreciation the draft agreement introduced in the CCD by the delegations of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics last August. During the meetings of the experts held in Geneva during the summer session of the CCD, as well as on other occasions, a thorough analysis, including a technical study of the various techniques which can or could be utilized for the modification of the environment by any party for hostile purposes, was made available for the benefit of all concerned.

It is our sincere hope that the negotiations will proceed fruitfully in the CCD during the next year so that a satisfactory agreement can be reached on the text of a treaty based on the broadest consensus. With this purpose in mind, the Italian delegation favours a precise definition of the sphere of application of the prohibition, with clear exceptions made for peaceful uses which can be derived from these techniques. It is important too, in our view, that an adequate mechanism be devised for solving controversies emerging from the application of the treaty and that a clause be included in order to protect third States from damage they might possibly incur from the experimentation or use of such techniques.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

The Italian Government has from the outset considered with interest the proposal of convening a world disarmament conference, with a view to contributing to the pursuit of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. This remains the main, final goal we should aim at in all our efforts.

The holding of a world conference raises a number of questions relating to both the complexity and the delicacy of the issues which will be dealt with in that forum. And in order to give the right replies to those questions we should take them up by degrees and with caution as we evaluate the conditions and the timing of this very initiative. My delegation confirms its interest in the idea of convening a world disarmament conference, an interest that has been demonstrated by its active participation in the Special Committee, and in the ad hoc group created by the Special Committee, which has worked under the resourceful and able guidance of Ambassador Hoveyda of Iran. At the same time we wish to recall that the very complexity of the topics which could be discussed at the conference requires, in the first instance, adequate and attentive preparation -- the more so because the conference must do its utmost to live up to the great expectations it will engender in world public opinion. We believe, therefore, that we should start by laying down a solid basis for fruitful negotiations. To that effect, we believe, for the same reasons I have mentioned before, that the participation, even at the preparatory stages of the conference, of all the countries chiefly concerned, and in particular of all the nuclear-weapon States, is an essential condition.

Finally, the presence on the agenda of the item relative to napalm and other incendiary weapons leads us to confirm the fact that the question of the prohibition or restriction of certain uses of those weapons and also of other so-called non-conventional weapons, is being thoroughly studied by the Italian Government. We have already expressed our clear preference for the questions being handled in such a highly qualified negotiating organ as the CCD. We nevertheless look forward with interest to the outcome of the study to be undertaken of the technical aspects by the experts meeting under the auspices of the International Committee of the Red Cross, in the early part of next year. Following that study, possible measures of prohibition or limitation of the use of such weapons, should be discussed in the framework of the CCD.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

I would like to conclude my statement as I opened it, by expressing our sincere hope that the important and altogether constructive debate which is taking place in this Committee will promote, on the political plane, a greater sense of urgency and a new momentum in arms control and ultimately in disarmament. The future of our planet, the future of mankind depends, to a great extent, on the results of our common efforts.

Mr. ROMULO (Philippines): The First Committee is once again considering the most important item on its agenda -- the problem of disarmament. Its importance is underlined not only by the fact that the item has been under consideration since the first session of the General Assembly, but also by the fact that among all the items under consideration, it has always been allotted the greatest number of meetings in each session.

Throughout the years a conglomeration of proposals, working papers and observations has been presented with the view of ultimately achieving the principal goal of general and complete disarmament. Thus, the problem has become more complex and technical with the passage of time. At the same time, in the maze of attendant fears and indecision, many golden opportunities have been lost or missed in our attempt to achieve real progress in the solution of this problem. The fact that those missed opportunities are gone forever should not be a cause for disappointment or an excuse for inaction, but should serve as a spur to redoubled efforts to attain a goal affecting the survival of mankind. *

My delegation, bearing in mind its serious responsibilities in the United Nations, has since its inception followed closely the problem of disarmament. Having done so, it is with much regret that we count ourselves on the side of those who are disheartened, frustrated and disillusioned with our work. My delegation considers that the only genuine measure of disarmament so far achieved is the prohibition of bacteriological (biological) weapons. All the other treaties or conventions negotiated and agreed upon in the course of time are non-armament measures. In other words, we agree with those who say that we

* The Chairman returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Romulo, Philippines)

are just beginning to grapple with the real problems of disarmament. Why this is so, after 30 years of existence of the United Nations, is very plain to see. The one and only answer to this enigma is the prevailing distrust among nations in international relations. So much distrust for one another is generated by fears for national security narrowly defined. The big Powers are obsessed with apprehension that other big Powers might excel or surpass them in armaments thus posing a threat to their security. This is the true and underlying cause for the relentless build-up of armaments, both nuclear and conventional. Aggravating the situation, the smaller Powers also exert efforts to acquire armaments and spend vast sums of money in the belief that in so doing, they would be strengthening their own security.

We established the United Nations and provided it with a system of collective security envisaged in the Charter, but no one seems to have faith in that system. Unless we exert dedicated and concerted efforts to make the system a living reality, we are afraid that all these talks about disarmament will just become another exercise in futility. Pessimistic as this may sound, all these debates and meetings and negotiations are likely to be doomed to failure unless we begin to take seriously the collective security system envisaged in the United Nations Charter.

As matters now stand, hope is indeed the only thing that sustains us and keeps us persevering in our efforts for disarmament. Somewhat desperately we hope that somehow a breakthrough will be achieved and the necessary political will on the part of the major military Powers will emerge to expedite the solution of the many problems of disarmament. We also hope that that day will come soon, enabling us to fulfil our commitment to the central purpose of our Organization, which is "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

(Mr. Romulo, Philippines)

In viewing the entire complex of disarmament questions, my delegation does not lose sight for a moment of the principal goal of general and complete disarmament. To achieve this goal, however, as everybody will agree, we must accord top priority to nuclear disarmament, and all efforts must now be concentrated on that aspect of the problem. As we have said earlier, we are gratified by the ban imposed on the use of bacteriological or biological weapons, but we have yet to deal with chemical weapons. Next to nuclear disarmament, the prohibition of these weapons should also be treated on a priority basis.

In connexion with nuclear disarmament, we believe that the following steps should be followed: first, the total prohibition of nuclear weapon tests in all environments -- in other words, the achievement of a comprehensive test ban, as envisaged in the Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963; secondly, the drastic reduction or limitation of existing nuclear weapons and their means of delivery; and, thirdly, the final destruction of all nuclear weapons, under inspection and control, as a part of the programme for general and complete disarmament.

We are firmly convinced that the elimination of all nuclear weapons is the only guarantee against a nuclear war, and the only certain means of avoiding the holocaust consequential to such a war. At the same time, every effort must be made to facilitate progress along any promising route towards the goal of general and complete disarmament, which is urgent for human survival. In this connexion, I reiterate our belief that the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, forwarded to the CCD several years ago and which has still to be considered by it, represents the best and most balanced basis upon which to proceed. It may, in some respects, require up-dating, but it has the advantage of proposing stages of a process leading towards disarmament in a balanced and logical manner.

My delegation is convinced that in order to achieve tangible results we have to reconsider the methods and procedures of the United Nations in disarmament negotiations. The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should continue with its work because we feel that it is still a useful negotiating forum, although perhaps its organization and working methods require

(Mr. Romulo, Philippines)

some changes. To give impetus, however, to the work of the CCD, we believe that a world disarmament conference or, alternatively, a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should be held. Let us not forget that the 1970s have been declared a Disarmament Decade. We would not be true to our pledge to achieve progress during this Disarmament Decade if we were unable even to convene a world disarmament conference or a special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. It should be understood, however, that the convening of a world disarmament conference or of a special General Assembly session on disarmament is not an end in itself. In other words, we need to make careful preparations for the conference or the special session so that we can be assured of achieving tangible results. A successful world disarmament conference or a special Assembly session can, it may be hoped, provide new perspectives on disarmament questions, a new orientation or over-all view of the problem from which the United Nations can undoubtedly benefit and a new political climate for decisive action.

We listened with interest on 3 November when the representative of Sweden, Mrs. Thorsson, announced her proposal for the creation of an intergovernmental committee on disarmament. My delegation wishes to extend its full support for that proposal. As a matter of fact, the Philippine delegation made a similar proposal in 1970 for the establishment of a committee of the General Assembly for the Disarmament Decade with the idea that the creation of such a committee would strengthen the role of the United Nations in disarmament matters and bring this all-important subject closer to the peoples of the world. I made this proposal myself, and I am proud to have made it.

The following is a quotation from the statement of the Philippine delegation at the 1749th meeting of the First Committee on 2 November 1970:

(Mr. Romulo, Philippines)

"With this in mind, the Chairman of our delegation, ..." -- this refers to my own position -- "strongly holds the view that the General Assembly might well consider the institution of machinery to assist the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which would have the task generally of exploring and developing the opportunities presented by the Disarmament Decade. In the context of the proposals regarding procedure, such machinery might take the form of a committee of the General Assembly for the Disarmament Decade, which should add substantially to the efforts being made in the disarmament negotiations. For instance, the committee might be assigned the following functions: first, to plan activities appropriate to the Disarmament Decade directed towards increasing public understanding of the need for disarmament and supporting of the important negotiations now being held on disarmament and arms limitation; secondly, to initiate in co-operation with the Secretariat, a periodic newsletter on the Disarmament Decade, detailing activities by Member States, by the United Nations and its agencies, and by non-governmental organizations in support of the Disarmament Decade, and to develop other appropriate publications; thirdly, to give consideration to the holding of a special session of the General Assembly, a meeting or meetings of the Disarmament Commission, or to the planning of a world conference on disarmament to be held as early as possible in the Disarmament Decade; fourthly, to consider the holding of regional seminars on regional arms control problems; fifthly, to keep under review the programme of the negotiations on disarmament; and sixthly, to review the interrelationship of progress on disarmament with the requirements for progress in further development of other primary functions of the United Nations, including the capacity of the United Nations for effective peace keeping and peaceful settlement of disputes". (1749th meeting, para. 52)

As we look back to that meeting of the First Committee, it is a matter of regret and keen disappointment to us that that Philippine proposal was not taken up and dealt with at that time. Now that we have reached the midpoint of the Disarmament Decade, a parallel proposal is being made and it would be sheer folly on our part to overlook a similar opportunity once again. As I

(Mr. Romulo, Philippines)

have stated, we will support the Swedish proposal and we earnestly hope our Committee will approve the creation of an intergovernmental committee of the kind proposed and provide it with the means to achieve the desired results during the remaining years of the Disarmament Decade.

My delegation would like to turn briefly now to a few specific items on disarmament before our Committee. My delegation expresses its appreciation to the Ad Hoc Group of Qualified Experts for the study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones. That Group has submitted to us, through its Chairman, Professor Reijo Korhonen of Finland, a very instructive report on the subject. This is a timely document, especially because of the growing interest in the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones all over the world. My delegation realizes that nuclear-weapon-free zones cannot be created everywhere, in view of circumstances related to military blocs or alliances, unless greater headway is made with respect to nuclear disarmament. Despite that handicap, we support the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones wherever possible as a means of supplementing the Non-Proliferation Treaty by prohibiting the spread of nuclear weapons. The delegation of Mexico, however, has raised very valid points with respect to the establishment of those zones. We support the suggestion that the General Assembly should take the initiative in providing a definition of the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone and a definition of the principal obligations of nuclear-weapon States in respect of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Those definitions should provide basic criteria in the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

(Mr. Romulo, Philippines)

The Philippines is a State party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and its representatives participated in the Review Conference of that Treaty held in Geneva last May. Thanks to the efforts of the President of the Review Conference, Mrs. Thorsson of Sweden, the Final Declaration of the Conference was adopted by consensus. There are delegations which feel that the Review Conference resulted in strengthening the Non-Proliferation Treaty. That may be true in so far as the concept or objective of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is concerned. With all due respect to such views, my delegation is of the opinion that the Review Conference resulted in the diminution of the faith of some States parties in the continuing validity or viability of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. That was brought about by the frustration and inability of some delegations to prod nuclear-weapon States towards a comprehensive test ban and towards nuclear disarmament despite all efforts towards that end. We are referring to additional protocols 1 and 2 proposed to be annexed to the Treaty. We believe that these two proposed protocols, if agreed upon, could bring about the desired balance of mutual responsibilities under the Non-Proliferation Treaty between the nuclear-weapon States and the non-nuclear-weapon States. We look forward to the developments in the next five years before the second review conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1980, with the hope that the nuclear-weapon States will by that time see their way clear to an acceptance of these two additional protocols.

Lastly, we should like to refer to the item on the prohibition of the use of the environment for military or hostile purposes. Two drafts of a convention on this subject were submitted by the co-Chairmen of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), the United States and the Soviet Union. My delegation attaches very great importance to the proposed draft convention. The subject matter being highly technical, there is need for the constant advice of experts on the scientific and technological progress achieved, especially where it could influence the environment. The proposed draft convention will be up for consideration by the CCD next year and it is therefore opportune for the First Committee to consider the views of delegations on this important subject.

(Mr. Romulo, Philippines)

From the technical papers submitted by Canada and Sweden and in the light of expert opinion expressed in informal meetings at the last session of the CCD, my delegation is convinced that there is indeed a need to prohibit the use of the environment for hostile or military purposes. Let me repeat that: From the technical papers submitted by Canada and Sweden and in the light of expert opinion expressed in informal meetings at the last session of the CCD, my delegation is convinced that there is indeed a need to prohibit the use of the environment for hostile or military purposes. My delegation, on the other hand, is pleased to note that in the proposed drafts there is a provision regarding the peaceful uses of science and technology relating to the environment. Such peaceful uses could mitigate the havoc wrought by storms, tidal waves and earthquakes -- of which my country is one of the constant victims -- thereby contributing to the well-being of hundreds of millions of victims of natural disasters. We should therefore encourage the peaceful march of science and technology in this field.

I would conclude by reiterating the main concern of my delegation, which I hope is sincerely shared by this Committee. I refer to the lack of real progress towards general and complete disarmament.

Let us remember, and bear constantly in mind, that our planet earth and all of mankind are and will remain under what amounts to a suspended sentence of death until this overriding goal is achieved.

Granted their good intention, proposals to halt or limit the escalation of the armaments race in sophisticated nuclear weapons, and to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear arms, are at best partial remedies -- only partial remedies. The stark fact remains that the nuclear Powers already possess overkill capacity or the means to annihilate the human race several times over.

(Mr. Romulo, Philippines)

My appeal to this Committee, and to the leaders of the States represented here -- and I have come back from my country to make this appeal -- is to place the human interest, the interest of all mankind, above selfish and narrow concepts of the national interest, and to make a fresh effort, in concert, to remove this intolerable burden which daily presses more heavily upon the conscience of humanity.

Mr. MALIKYAR (Afghanistan): In today's world, the potential for organized violence has assumed enormous dimensions. As a result of the arms race nuclear weapons have brought mankind to the brink of oblivion many times in past decades. Yet efforts to control the momentum of the nuclear armaments race have produced no significant results. On the contrary, military technology is advancing as far as human ingenuity and skills allow.

Attempts have been made towards disarmament, but they have not yet been successful, though there seems to be no doubt that a disarmed world is a universal desire. That is particularly true of the developing countries.

Each year the world spends an enormous amount on armaments: more than the entire income of half of the world's developing countries and more than 20 times the total amount of aid given to the developing countries. Expenditure on military research and nuclear development is steadily increasing. The arms trade is also escalating astronomically and is consequently resulting in the worldwide spread of the most modern and sophisticated weapons. This global distribution of nuclear arms is seriously endangering world peace and security. Therefore, my delegation feels that it is urgently necessary to control the ever-increasing arms trade, among other important measures which need to be taken in this field.

(Mr. Malikyar, Afghanistan)

The development of different systems for the delivery of nuclear weapons continues unabated. Huge tactical and strategic nuclear weapons, with tremendous powers of destruction, have been deployed by the major Powers; the nuclear arms race continues; and nuclear tests are still being undertaken. Efforts to control armaments and the development of military technology have unfortunately not produced significant results so far. Apart from the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, which came into force this year and which calls for the destruction of stockpiles -- to which Convention my Government has acceded -- no real multilateral disarmament measure has thus far been undertaken by the international community.

Since the last session of the United Nations General Assembly, efforts have been made, through bilateral and multilateral negotiations, towards the process of disarmament and arms control. The number of items reflecting that fact on the agenda of the First Committee has reached a record. Bilateral and multilateral considerations of disarmament reflect the determination and concern of the international community both to solve the various important problems in the field of disarmament and arms control and to end the unwarranted utilization of resources for arms production.

My delegation, while appreciating some of the recent relevant and encouraging developments in the international arena, including the atmosphere of détente between the super-Powers, cannot remain silent regarding urgent problems such as those at present under consideration by this Committee, towards the solution of which no tangible progress has thus far been made by the international community.

In the view of my Government, among the items at present under consideration nuclear disarmament merits prime consideration, for it is vital that that problem be finally solved in order that general and complete disarmament may be achieved.

Afghanistan has acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The Review Conference on that Treaty took place in the early part of 1975. My delegation still maintains the belief that the Non-Proliferation Treaty, even with its now evident short-comings, is continuing to play a major part in the eventual avoidance of the awesome danger of nuclear war and the achievement of nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Malikyar, Afghanistan)

The main aim of the Review Conference was to give weight to the Treaty and to increase its effectiveness and recognition. As a result, it can be stated that a new impetus is required to give credibility and viability to the concept of non-proliferation. Such a result can be achieved only if both political and technical measures are truly put into effect. It is not my intention to go into the details of such political and technical measures. I wish simply to state that unless the nuclear Powers take effective measures to stop the vertical as well as the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons the international community will inevitably be faced with the consequences of that nuclear proliferation.

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), in addition to considering the usual items, in the course of its deliberations in the past year studied, on the basis of the recommendation of the General Assembly, the issue of the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military purposes. In that regard a useful discussion took place in the CCD. My delegation hopes that, on the basis of the identical draft conventions presented by the United States and the Soviet Union, the CCD will be in a position to adopt a unanimous draft in the course of its future sessions.

As a means of preventing the dissemination of nuclear weapons, the creation of nuclear-free zones throughout the world has gained increasing momentum and support.

As we are all well aware, the General Assembly adopted at its twenty-ninth session, on the initiative of the Finnish delegation, a resolution requesting the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to submit a study on nuclear-free zones during the present session of the General Assembly. The special report of the CCD on this important subject is now available and at our disposal. The report is another successful achievement of the CCD during its session in the course of the current year. The study reflects various aspects of the agreements and disagreements which must be confronted in order that nuclear-free zones may be created and established around the world. In the view of my delegation, the report is of great importance in the creation of nuclear-free zones and gives valuable guidance to countries interested in the establishment and maintenance of such zones in their regions.

(Mr. Malikyar, Afghanistan)

The Government of Afghanistan, as a matter of principle, has always supported and will continue to support the establishment of such zones in different parts of the world, especially in the area to which my country belongs.

As it stated on this issue in the course of the general debate at the last session of the General Assembly, Afghanistan believes that it forms a part of the nuclear-free zone that should be established in the region of the Middle East on the basis of the proposal of Iran and Egypt.

Afghanistan is of the view that the creation of such zones is closely linked to the non-proliferation system which is reflected in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and thus should not be considered in isolation from that Treaty, to which it should in fact be complementary.

My delegation has always supported the banning of nuclear tests in all environments. It is unfortunate that to date there is no prospect of such a prohibition under strict and effective international control. The banning of atmospheric nuclear tests has failed to obtain universal acceptance. In our view it is essential that all nuclear Powers should accede to the partial test ban Treaty.

With regard to the banning of underground nuclear tests, we welcome the initiative concluded at the summit talks held between the Soviet Union and the United States in July 1975 and look forward both to the coming into force of that Treaty and to its expansion into a broader multilateral agreement.

(Mr. Malikyar, Afghanistan)

To that end, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has submitted to the First Committee a draft proposal on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, which in principle meets with our approval. We earnestly hope that that draft resolution will be adopted by the Committee.

With respect to the activities of the CCD, it should be stated that during the course of the past years of its deliberations there has been no specific and concrete achievement on the prohibition of chemical weapons, which in the view of my delegation is of crucial importance. My delegation wishes to clarify its position with regard to the necessity of reaching an agreement on the effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all kinds of chemical weapons and on their elimination from the arsenals of all States.

My delegation has always supported any constructive proposals which would serve the important cause of general and complete disarmament. In this respect, on behalf of my delegation, I wish to state that we fully endorse the new proposal which has been presented by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the consideration of the First Committee regarding the item entitled, "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and of new systems of such weapons". My delegation welcomes that proposal, the final aim of which is the halting of the arms race, thus providing a basis for the attainment of general and complete disarmament. It is for this reason that my delegation has become a sponsor of this new proposal of the Soviet Union and we earnestly hope that the Committee will be able to adopt it unanimously, and that the CCD, after thorough consideration of the draft agreement annexed to the draft resolution, will be able to draft a final agreement which will meet with the approval of the international community as a whole.

With respect to the Indian Ocean item, we welcome the efforts of the Ad Hoc Committee for the Indian Ocean, as well as the efforts of the States Members of the United Nations in the region to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. My delegation is satisfied with the consultations undertaken for the convening of a conference of littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean with a view to complementing the Declaration on the Indian Ocean already adopted by the General Assembly.

The Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference has ably pursued the study of the question of such a conference within the framework of the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly. My delegation is of the view that that Committee has once again been able to highlight the general trend in favour of convening the conference, after adequate preparation has been made both in the preparatory stages and with regard to the final convening of the conference with the co-operation and participation of all nuclear-weapon States. I wish to reiterate the position of my delegation that we fully support the convening of such a conference and are confident of its successful outcome for disarmament, on the basis of the decision adopted by the non-aligned countries.

Those are some of the general views of my delegation on the items at present under consideration by this Committee. Among the various items before us we are considering the mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade. Unfortunately, it should be stated that the results so far are regrettably not encouraging. Nevertheless, we hope that the remaining second half of the Decade will be more promising and successful in achieving general and complete disarmament. We earnestly believe that with the full support of the international community, there is much more room for progress towards the attainment of the noble aims in the field of disarmament and arms control. My delegation will lend its full support to any measure or action during the present session which will facilitate the achievement of these noble ends.

In conclusion, I wish to state that my delegation has always been of the view that the role of the United Nations should be further developed and strengthened in all matters related to disarmament. On this assumption, we would also support any progressive measures recommending necessary guidelines to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, its work procedure and the priority of the items under its consideration, in order to make the CCD and the United Nations more adequately responsive to the urgent needs of the international community on matters of disarmament.

Mrs. BORODOWSKY (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Beyond doubt disarmament is one of the questions which most concern mankind. The very creation of the supreme world Organization, the United Nations, had as its basic aim the pursuit of peace, which is not an abstract term since it entails the attainment of such essential objectives as preserving future generations from the scourge of war, reaffirming faith in the fundamental rights of man, creating conditions in which justice can be upheld, and promoting social and economic progress, as well as many more objectives which are all contained in the Charter.

Nevertheless, 30 years have elapsed and it is alarming to learn how much science and the latest technological advances serve the development of the war industry; and to see the enormous investment of material and financial resources, which means that more than \$300 billion are spent yearly, while the larger part of the world lives in subhuman conditions of poverty and disease.

In analysing this never-ending rise in expenditure on the arms race we must approach this question from various angles. What prompts Governments to incur this military expenditure? The motives are not the same -- there are profound differences. The developing countries have been compelled to invest enormous resources to increase their defence capability. An example of this was our own country which, when the revolution triumphed, had to divert its attention from economic development to military preparedness so as to defend and consolidate the revolution.

(Mrs. Borodowsky, Cuba)

With regard to the nuclear Powers, my delegation considers that we must study in depth the policy of each one; we must not forget that it was the Soviet Union which first introduced the concept of general and complete disarmament in this international forum. Nor should we forget either that the Soviet Union -- which is a nuclear Power -- has never used its military might to destroy defenceless peoples.

In this connexion, my delegation considers it to be appropriate and timely to recall the words of our Prime Minister, Commander Fidel Castro, at the Fourth Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries which was held in Algiers two years ago:

"Some, with obvious injustice and traditional ingratitude, and forgetful of the real events and the profound and insuperable gap between the imperialist and socialist régimes, would ignore the glorious, heroic and extraordinary services rendered to mankind by the Soviet people, as though the crumbling of the colossal system of colonial domination which was deeply rooted throughout the world until the Second World War and the conditions which made possible the liberation of scores upon scores of peoples formerly held under direct subjugation by the colonial Powers, the disappearance of capitalism in vast regions of the world and the emergence of forces which keep at bay the insatiable voracity and the aggressive spirit of imperialism, had nothing at all to do with the glorious October Revolution. Without the October Revolution and without the immortal prowess of the Soviet people -- which resisted first intervention and an imperialist blockade and later defeated fascist aggression and crushed it at the cost of 20 million lives, and which has developed its technology and economy at the cost of invincible effort and heroism without exploiting the labour of a single worker on earth -- the end of colonialism would not have been possible at all nor the combination of world forces which prompted the heroic struggle of so many peoples for their liberation."

It is true that the first socialist State which emerged on the international scene has become a military and economic Power, but it is precisely because of that development that the Soviet Union has been able to provide generous and selfless aid to those that are struggling to achieve and maintain their complete

(Mrs. Borodowsky, Cuba)

political, economic and social independence; Cuba has been a recipient of that aid and it was also internationalist aid and to a large extent that of the Soviet Union which contributed to making the heroic and exemplary people of Viet-Nam victorious. Many peoples have been the recipients of that selfless aid.

At a stage when the collective dynamism of progressive forces is clearing the way for a new economic, political and social order, this Committee has to consider a large number of items on disarmament. Some have been considered for several years within the Organization, as well as in other competent forums. Other items have been on the agenda for a short time; and others are being dealt with for the first time at the present session of the General Assembly.

Among the last-mentioned, some, which have been included in our agenda on the initiative of the Soviet Union, are outstanding. Such are, first, the conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests; and secondly, prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. My delegation considers that the Soviet proposals, as well as the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.707 and A/C.1/L.711 constitute an important contribution to halting the arms race which is fundamental for the strengthening of international peace and security. My delegation supports both draft resolutions.

The question of chemical and bacteriological weapons has been the subject of lengthy and difficult debates and negotiations; fortunately a convention has been arrived at prohibiting the use of bacteriological weapons, and my country is a signatory to that convention.

Nevertheless, on the question of chemical weapons no concrete solutions have been reached; an agreement of this type would strengthen the Geneva Protocol of 1925, and would represent a step forward towards the primary objective, which is general and complete disarmament. The world community awaits the achievement of so rational and humanitarian an agreement and recognizes those that are striving towards this end as opposed to those that attempt to put a brake on positive achievements towards the achievement of an agreement that would prohibit the use of those weapons which cause so much harm to the present

(Mrs. Borodowsky, Cuba)

generation. It is vital that future generations should not be threatened with the use of these horrible weapons; and that international responsibility should provide the same brake it applies today on the use of nuclear weapons.

Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use can be analysed again, not only in this Committee but also at the forthcoming meeting of experts to be held in Lugano, Switzerland at the beginning of next year. Thus it will be possible before the Diplomatic Conference to arrive at constructive approaches leading to the prohibition of or restriction on the use of such weapons.

The idea of convening a world disarmament conference is gaining more and more active and broad support from almost all countries of the world. Cuba supports the convening of that conference with the participation of all the States of the world, whether or not they are Members of the United Nations, countries large and small, nuclear and non-nuclear countries, in conditions of equality and with the same rights. That will be a new and appropriate universal forum in which disarmament items can be effectively aired and thus will give significance and substance to the Disarmament Decade.

My delegation trusts that the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference will continue to fulfil its mandate and work with broad powers so as to be able to adopt the necessary measures for the prompt convening of that conference. A most important task of the conference would be to consider all means to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control, and also to define the deadly economic and social consequences of the arms race for mankind and to analyse thoroughly the relationship between disarmament and the socio-economic development which particularly affects the developing countries.

In this respect we must bear in mind General Assembly resolution 3093 (XXVIII) which deals with the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and the utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries. This could be one of the many ways gradually to lessen the enormous economic gap which exists between a small group of developed countries and the vast majority of developing countries.

(Mrs. Borodowsky, Cuba)

Another interesting item on disarmament was the Soviet proposal, made at the last session of the General Assembly, on the 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. Everything seems to indicate that this question will be successfully concluded and that a concrete agreement will be reached in the near future.

In the second half of the Development Decade, my delegations entertains the hope that at the end of the Decade, when we meet to consider what has been achieved, we shall have a positive balance as regards effective measures for general and complete disarmament. To that end, it is essential that peace-loving countries unite their forces against those who intend to continue the arms race so as to maintain their political, economic and military domination in the world. The familiar slogan "divide and conquer" must have no place in the present era, an era in which the forces of socialism, anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism and anti-neo-colonialism are being consolidated.

Whether the positive results of détente and the principles of sovereign equality, respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty, non-recourse to the threat or use of force, territorial integrity of States, peaceful settlement of disputes, non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States, respect for human rights, equality of rights and self-determination of peoples and co-operation among States are to be extended to all regions of the world will depend largely on the efforts and unity of those countries.

To conclude, I should like to quote a phrase used in the General Assembly by our Prime Minister, Comrade Fidel Castro: "When this philosophy of despoilment disappears, the philosophy of war will have disappeared" (A/PV.872, para. 188).

The CHAIRMAN: At yesterday's meeting I made the point that it would be advisable to fix a deadline for the submission of draft resolutions, and I suggested Friday, 21 November, but a little extra time for the submission of draft resolutions was requested. After further consultations with some delegations, and taking into consideration the interest of the whole Committee, I have come to the conclusion that perhaps it would be advisable for us to set the evening of Monday 24 November as the deadline in principle. If certain draft resolutions, for one reason or another, are not ready by then for submission, we will reconsider the situation at that particular time.

My main concern is with regard to those delegations which will not be participating in the consultations in connexion with the preparation of the draft resolutions. They certainly will need the time to study them, to report back to their Governments and to await instructions, and as we shall be pressed for time from the beginning of next week I think it only fair that all delegations be given an equal opportunity to consider matters on which they are going to vote or to participate in a consensus.

Therefore, although we shall be as flexible as possible in the Committee in dealing with matters, I hope that we can progress a little faster. My concern is not merely to finish our work in the allotted time, but also to give all delegations the equal opportunity to which they are entitled. I hope that this approach meets with the approval of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.