



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 11TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

CONTENTS

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

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

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

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

/...

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

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

AGENDA ITEM 46: PROHIBITION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND MANUFACTURE OF NEW TYPES OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND NEW SYSTEMS OF SUCH WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 47: REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 48: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A ZONE OF PEACE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 49: CONCLUSION OF A TREATY ON THE COMPLETE AND GENERAL PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR-WEAPON TESTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 51: GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (continued):

- (a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY;
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 52: SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT: REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 53: WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

The CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the members of the First Committee and on my own behalf, I should like to express our deep sorrow to the Permanent Mission of the United Arab Emirates on the brutal assassination of the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of that country. I request the Permanent Mission to convey our condolences to the Government and people of the United Arab Emirates and to the bereaved family.

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

Mr. CANALES (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): There is no doubt that cessation of the nuclear arms race, subsequent reduction of such arms and their final elimination are the most important steps to be taken if we are to progress towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control, which was the hope expressed by most heads of delegations of States Members during the recent debate in the General Assembly.

From the very moment when, at the end of the Second World War, the first two atomic bombs were dropped, with devastating effect, mankind realized that it was faced with the supreme danger of mass destruction unless it proved possible to avoid the future proliferation of such weapons. More than 30 years have passed since that first use of nuclear energy for military purposes, and now we observe with horror that in fact the destructive power accumulated by the nuclear Powers is far greater than we could have imagined. Today there is a nuclear capacity in the arsenals of the nuclear Powers that is a million times greater than that used at Hiroshima and Nagasaki; that is to say, mankind is on the verge of a catastrophe of unprecedented proportions. The delegation of Chile therefore completely agrees with the opinion of the majority of the members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) that nuclear disarmament has first priority in any disarmament activity.

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

World peace is now dependent on an unhappy situation in which an equal potential in such weapons is maintained by the nuclear Powers; that is, the balance of terror and an arms control which legitimizes a controlled form of the arms race constitute the means of preventing a confrontation. This is a highly dangerous and damaging situation, because, firstly, a momentary break in the balance of nuclear weapons and a strategic opportunity that is fully used could lead us into a conflict with unforeseeable consequences, but which would in any case be devastating for all mankind. Secondly, it imposes an arms race which can only be maintained with large military budgets to the detriment of the economic and social development of the peoples of the world.

Powers with nuclear capacity have the responsibility of preventing the continued proliferation of nuclear weapons, vertical or horizontal. All States Members of the United Nations are aware of this and are prepared to find appropriate formulas for proposing legal instruments that will contribute to nuclear disarmament, but we need the prior willingness of the nuclear Powers to participate in and to sign these agreements. Unless success is achieved in time on this aspect of disarmament, within a few years many developed countries will become members of the club of atomic terror, by using the nuclear capacity that they acquired for peaceful purposes to join the arms race in this type of weapon of mass destruction, as an imperative of their own national security, thus giving rise to an uncontrolled horizontal proliferation and making the aims of nuclear disarmament into something unattainable.

The statement of the Chilean delegation at this phase of the debate on disarmament will concentrate on matters related to nuclear materials, to show the importance that our country attaches to nuclear disarmament as an essential stage in the attainment of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, which is the supreme hope of States that sincerely desire international peace and security.

Chile aspires to the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes in order to make use of the great benefits that it would provide in the future, since, fortunately, we belong to a continent which was the first to conclude a treaty which prohibits the use of nuclear weapons in Latin America and which accepts the safeguards régime of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

We recognize that considerable progress has been made in establishing legal instruments of a bilateral and multilateral nature to restrict the race for the acquisition of nuclear weapons and all types of weapons of mass destruction. But those treaties, conventions or agreements have proved incapable of fully achieving their objectives because of the suspicion and natural distrust aroused by the absence of an adequate controls system.

The Geneva Protocol of 1925, the Antarctic Treaty, the partial nuclear test ban Treaty of 1963, the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and other Celestial Bodies; the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof are considered as key elements in the legal system to prevent a further arms race. But they represent only the first steps towards attaining broader disarmament objectives before it is too late and we are powerless to prevent a world-wide confrontation.

We do not agree with those States which maintain that substantial progress has been made towards halting the arms race, or that the consolidation of détente guarantees permanent peace, because peace is only partial and temporary as long as real sources of friction exist that could engulf us in a generalized conflict, or regional tensions that could turn into a broader conflict.

The military might of the great Powers, which is growing from day to day, an unjust international economic order offering no viable solutions to the major problems of the poor countries, and the expansionist ambitions of some powerful States are facts of life that can upset the balance and produce a conflagration of major proportions.

The two greatest nuclear Powers could themselves reach bilateral agreements that would effectively achieve nuclear disarmament. It is they who hold the key to whether nuclear proliferation, whether vertical or horizontal, gains momentum and spreads to a greater number of countries, or whether nuclear weapons shall be permanently prohibited so that nuclear energy may be used solely for peaceful purposes for the good of the international community, thus contributing to mankind's progress and well-being.

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

Since 1970 several bilateral agreements have been entered into by the main nuclear Powers, which will help to control the arms race in various quantitative aspects; but they do not halt the arms race, and only seek to achieve a certain balance that will make more effective the political détente agreed to at the Conference on Peace and Security in Europe.

At any rate, the goodwill of the main political leaders of those Powers has made possible the signature of eight treaties or agreements on the limitation of nuclear weapons, the restriction of nuclear testing and the prevention of nuclear accidents. We are pleased to congratulate them on those activities, which demonstrate good faith in the negotiations and dispel the atmosphere of suspicion which might otherwise surround them. We sincerely hope that the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks will continue to make progress towards a cessation of the arms race.

We unreservedly applaud the intentions made public by President Carter in his speech at the current session of the General Assembly. They represent a milestone in the achievement of a graduated formula for solving the problem which concerns us. It is also our hope that the other side will evince a similar will to find a solution, for indeed that would be recognized by present and future generations as the most decisive and effective step towards the strengthening of international peace and security.

The proposal for a 50 per cent reduction in nuclear weapons is a source of hope, for it would be a major means of encouraging other initiatives for genuine disarmament. To dash these hopes would be to give the negotiations a set-back that would lower the morale of genuinely peace-loving countries.

We regret that the major endeavours made from year to year in the field of military science and technology have made possible further qualitative vertical nuclear proliferation. This makes the danger of nuclear war a more catastrophic prospect, since the progressive sophistication of this type of weapons gives them an even greater destructive power and tips the nuclear balance, even if only temporarily, in favour of the Power that achieves the greatest technological advancement.

The neutron bomb is a case in point. Today, efforts are being made to protect human rights throughout the world, while at the same time weapons are being manufactured whose power of devastation threatens the basic human

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

right to life and security, not only for this but for future generations, which will not be able to escape the consequences of an atomic war: for those weapons would contaminate the entire planet with permanent environmental pollution that would cause serious injury to all human beings.

Our delegation believes that most of our disarmament proposals should be designed to prevent vertical and horizontal proliferation of this type of weapon of mass destruction. The most effective way to achieve this is to halt the nuclear arms race, reduce such arms and eliminate the arsenals of the major nuclear Powers. The adoption of agreements on a total nuclear test ban and the conclusion of a greater number of treaties for the establishment of denuclearized zones in those parts of the world where there is still time to do so would contribute to the attainment of these objectives.

Present test-ban treaties have been only partial and have not succeeded in halting those tests. The Antarctic Treaty, the Treaty on the peaceful uses of outer space, the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof, and the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963 have limited but not put an end to such testing. Between 1945 and 1976 more than 1,000 nuclear explosions were detected. In 1976 more than 40 nuclear weapons tests were announced, of which probably only one was carried out for peaceful purposes. This balance-sheet, in itself, is alarming and in conflict with the aim of nuclear disarmament. For as long as nuclear testing continues, we shall be threatened with the further improvement of those weapons, which means that they will acquire an ever-greater destructive power.

Since the adoption of the partial nuclear test-ban Treaty of 1963, more than 500 nuclear explosions for military purposes have been carried out, which is obvious proof that we require more rigorous legislation on this subject in order to achieve a complete test ban. This is a matter to which we must accord top priority.

The Government of Chile attaches fundamental importance to this subject and is particularly pleased to note that the majority of members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) interpret the agreement now under consideration in this sense. Whatever differences exist, there are no reasonable arguments for delaying the conclusion of an agreement on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear testing.

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

It is our hope that that legal instrument will be approved before the opening of the special session of the General Assembly in 1978 devoted exclusively to disarmament matters.

One major obstacle has been the establishment of adequate and reliable verification procedures. We believe that if all act in good faith, they must accept inspections to guarantee a speedy, mandatory and thorough on-the-spot investigation to permit the timely submission of the respective reports. Any agreement reached must establish clear procedures for the conduct of peaceful nuclear explosions. In no case should explosions of this sort be hampered, since they should be carried out under duly accepted international inspection in the context of article V of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and the various applications of such peaceful explosions, especially as a source of energy, will benefit mankind.

My delegation considers that until the treaty is approved the nuclear super-Powers should undertake to cease their nuclear tests. Otherwise, good intentions about preventing nuclear proliferation are worthless, and merely maintain uncertainty and suspicion among countries.

We have maintained that a very effective indirect measure to prevent the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons is the establishment of denuclearized zones in various regions of the world where groups of States, of their own free will, wish to adhere to the requirements and prohibitions imposed by a régime of this kind. If the parties interested in a treaty make an immediate and solemn announcement of their intention of refraining, on a reciprocal basis, from producing, testing, obtaining, acquiring or possessing any kind of nuclear weapons, we would then have the basic conditions for the creation of a denuclearized zone.

Moreover, the nuclear Powers must undertake, in additional protocols, not to supply this type of weapon to States of their regions, to emplace such weapons on their territories, or to allow such weapons to enter those countries under any pretext, even in temporary transit.



(Mr. Canales, Chile)

Latin America set the first precedent, through the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which permanently removes the danger of a nuclear arms race on that continent. It is our sincere hope that this example will lead to the establishment of additional denuclearized zones, as contemplated for years in Africa, the Middle East and southern Asia, through removal of the obstacles and divergencies that have prevented the conclusion of the treaties concerned.

We would conclude our statement at this stage of the debate by summing up our position as follows:

First, we consider it the obligation and responsibility of nuclear-weapons States to adopt concrete and effective measures for nuclear disarmament;

Secondly, it is the inalienable right of countries that do not possess this type of energy to develop it for peaceful purposes, provided that they agree to comply with the requirements of accepting the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Thirdly, nuclear disarmament is only the first essential in a policy of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control; it must be followed by the elimination of the military arsenals of all kinds of conventional weapons, particularly weapons of mass destruction.

In order not to prolong this statement, my delegation will deal subsequently with other items coming under the general heading of disarmament.

Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria): May I at the outset express our condolences to the delegation of the United Arab Emirates and, through it, to the Government of that country on the loss inflicted on its Government and people by the tragic death of its Minister of State.

The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria notes with satisfaction that at the current session, as at others, the questions of disarmament are in the limelight here in our Organization. This has been evidenced both by the statements of heads of delegations in the general debate and by the discussion in our Committee, which this year has accorded a higher priority to the questions of disarmament. It cannot be otherwise, as those are the questions that are closely followed by the Governments and peoples of all States, irrespective of their size, their level of development or the character of their social system.

We submit that that is due first of all to the need to supplement political détente with measures to bring the arms race to a real and effective stop and to reduce armaments and armed forces. Governments and nations have become ever more conscious of the fact that the security of countries cannot be strengthened and guaranteed by increasing armaments - for the arms race undermines confidence between States, creates suspicion and aggravates tension in international relations; it creates an international atmosphere of insecurity, instead of bringing about a greater degree of national security.

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

As the Secretary-General said in his report on the work of the Organization:

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

Disarmament on the other hand will strengthen confidence among States, will be greatly conducive to solving international issues exclusively through peaceful means, and will release resources for the aims of the economic and social development of nations. However, we should not lose sight of the absence in the course of the last year of substantial progress in the field of disarmament, and of the relative stirring up of militarist forces and the military industrial complex.

These circumstances have aroused among nations justified fears that mankind may be dragged into another round of the spiralling arms race. This anxiety has been amply demonstrated by the resolute condemnation of and opposition to the attempts by some Governments to introduce new kinds of nuclear weapons and to impose on their allies additional military expenditures. World public opinion rightly saw through and realized the danger that those weapons concealed, although they were presented to the public as the "most humane weapons", endowed with the capability of destroying solely the enemy's troops without affecting material objects or the civilian population outside the theatre of war. In this respect it should be noted with satisfaction that the last few months have clearly demonstrated the great importance of maintaining the vigilance of world public opinion in efforts to prevent any sinister attempts by militarist forces.

A lot of intensive talks on the questions of disarmament have been conducted during the period between the two sessions of the General Assembly, within as well as outside the framework of the United Nations. Peoples all over the world have been hopeful that during this year new progress would be attained

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

in halting the arms race and reducing armaments and armed forces. Although no substantial results are at hand, it can be definitely stated that those negotiations were fruitful. They have been greatly conducive to the reciprocal ascertainment of the positions of the participating States, and to a clearer delineation of the areas where agreements could be reached in the near future.

The disarmament talks have been distinguished for their concrete character and purposefulness. They have unambiguously proved that in this field there is no place for moves or conceptions based on considerations of expediency, nor is it possible to make any headway if the declared readiness to work for the achievement of real results is not supported in fact by all participants in the negotiations through a constructive attitude and viable proposals. Any disregard, in our view, of the interests of the genuine security of the parties involved in the negotiations or any attempt to obtain one-sided advantages engenders serious perturbations in the process of negotiations and holds back and delays the attainment of agreements. The fact that all nuclear States were not present at those talks was another serious impediment for the realization of decisive progress.

We wish in this connexion to point out with some concern that, in complete dissonance with the overwhelming preoccupation expressed during the debate in this Committee about the dangers and negative impact of the arms race and with the genuine intention of meeting the challenge of the arms race and of proceeding with meaningful negotiations to reach agreements on partial measures with the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament, there were some voices raised with the aim of concealing not only a negative approach, a nihilistic approach, to disarmament but also of trying unsuccessfully to justify the arms race and furthermore to place the blame on those who have been involved in a genuine search for positive solutions.

However, events during the last few months have provided grounds for a certain optimism. My Government has noted with satisfaction the positive development of the bilateral talks between the USSR and the United States on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons and is convinced that their speedy conclusion will impart a strong impetus to multilateral endeavours in the field of disarmament. We have followed with great

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

interest and satisfaction statements made by the representatives of countries involved in active negotiations: they have conveyed a feeling of justified optimism, substantiated by constructive efforts, and we would like to express our support of their genuine efforts.

Favourable prospects are at hand to mark progress in such important matters as the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, the prohibition of chemical weapons, and the ban on developing new kinds of weapons of mass destruction. Those prospects have been clearly and objectively outlined in the comprehensive and lucid statement by the representative of the USSR, Ambassador Issraelyan. My delegation fully endorses the appraisals contained in his statement.

There is widespread conviction that in order to stop the arms race it is of decisive importance to adopt effective measures to halt the nuclear arms race, both horizontally and vertically, that is, to discontinue the qualitative and quantitative proliferation of those most dreadful weapons. It is not accidental that the attention of our Organization, as well as that of other bodies dealing with the question of disarmament, has for many years been focused on different aspects of that problem.

The successes scored in the last years in curbing the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons are raising hopes, but there is much more to be desired. The fact that two nuclear States and some others which are on their way to entering that category have still not ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons cannot but raise justifiable concern. The use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes by an ever larger number of States creates a real danger of widening the circle of States possessing nuclear weapons.

The news about South Africa's drive to acquire atomic weapons - and preparation for that acquisition is already in an advanced stage - is a confirmation of that apprehension. The possession of nuclear weapons by the racist régime in Pretoria is an immediate danger for the peoples of Africa and for international peace and security. I should like to emphasize here that it is to the credit of the Government of the Soviet Union that it has informed and alerted Governments and world public opinion about the intentions of the racist régime in South Africa. We are convinced that

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

concerted efforts by Governments and peoples will be able to foil those plans of Pretoria. Furthermore, there have recently been some most disturbing reports to the effect that in yet another area of conflict attempts had been made to acquire nuclear weapons which are dangerous as an instrument of political blackmail and also pose an immediate danger of nuclear confrontation.

Led by the desire to contribute to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria supports all measures aimed at strengthening the International Atomic Energy Association (IAEA) system of guarantees established under the terms of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Furthermore, my Government considers that it is of essential importance for all nuclear-weapon States, including those which are not parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to place under IAEA control their entire activity in connexion with the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The measures co-ordinated within the framework of the so-called London Club for control over the exportation of nuclear material and equipment are also called to play an essential role in this respect. My country's modest experience shows that the IAEA system of guarantees under the terms of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons does not create any impediments to the peaceful use of atomic energy.

The need to stop the ongoing sophistication of nuclear weapons is of substantial importance to the efforts to halt the nuclear arms race. It is generally recognized that the main way of doing this will be to establish a general and complete ban on nuclear-weapon tests. The partial treaties and agreements, both bilateral and multilateral, which have been signed so far have greatly contributed to limiting the spheres in which tests may be conducted. However, it is possible by those measures to bar the way to the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, among others, because those treaties have not been ratified by two nuclear-weapon States.

In the conditions of the development of science and technology nowadays, it becomes absolutely imperative speedily to place a general and complete ban on all nuclear-weapon tests. This is why we regard favourably and hopefully the trilateral negotiations to reach agreement on this issue that have been initiated between the USSR, the United States of America and the

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

United Kingdom in Geneva. My Government maintains its view to the effect that all nuclear States ought to discontinue the tests in all environments, because otherwise it is not possible to achieve lasting results. We hope that the remaining two nuclear States will in the very near future join in the efforts of the others and become parties to the existing treaties.

It is our submission that serious damage would be inflicted upon scientific and technological progress if tests with nuclear devices for peaceful purposes were to be halted. Such a decision would deprive humanity of the positive results ensuing from the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We are confident that that issue will be rightly resolved by a future treaty banning all tests with nuclear weapons.

In our view, the problem regarding the supervision of the implementation of such a treaty does not any longer present a serious impediment for its speedy conclusion. In this respect, a common opinion is gaining in substance, namely, that control can be effectively exercised through national technical means, supplemented by an international exchange of seismological data. Bearing in mind what we have said so far, my delegation considers the draft submitted by the Soviet Union to represent a good basis for the elaboration of a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

(Mr. Vankov, Bulgaria)

As to the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new kinds of weapons for mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, I should like to mention at the present stage of our discussion that this year many outstanding questions have been clarified as a result of the negotiations held within the framework of the Committee on Disarmament with the participation of experts. Now there is a much greater understanding of the need to conclude a comprehensive treaty, and a draft has been submitted by the USSR. We do hope that on this question the General Assembly will adopt a resolution insisting that work on this treaty be accelerated.

Considerable work was done during the year on the question of concluding a treaty banning all chemical weapons. We continue to believe that the radical measure here will consist in completely banning and destroying chemical weapons. We are therefore hopeful that the negotiations currently conducted between the USSR and the United States will lead shortly to the preparation of a joint draft which will be presented to the Committee on Disarmament for consideration. My delegation intends to dwell in more detail on these two questions at a later stage of our discussion, if appropriate.

For obvious reasons, one of the main questions in our discussion is the preparation and holding of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The special session has been the focus of wide attention and definite hopes, in the expectation that it will achieve the very much needed break-through in the search for a global approach to the complex questions of disarmament and in setting the priority areas to which the efforts of Governments should be directed. The idea of holding a special session on disarmament came up logically as an intermediate solution in connexion with the impossibility, for well-known reasons, of convening a world disarmament conference. This special session must become a landmark on the road to the practical preparation of that conference. Without any underestimation of the indisputable importance of the special session, scheduled to take place next year, it is more than obvious that only a large and authoritative forum, invested with broad and full powers - that is, only the world disarmament conference - can be in a position to co-ordinate, elaborate and adopt



(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

effective measures in the field of disarmament. That is why, although attention is now concentrated on the forthcoming stage, the General Assembly should not lose sight even for a moment of the right perspective. It is only natural that the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference should be given a mandate to carry further the discussion of this question, that is consonant also with the concrete recommendation of the Preparatory Committee on the Special Session.

We assess as successful and useful the work carried out so far by the Preparatory Committee under the competent guidance of its Chairman, Ambassador Rozas. Almost all the procedural and organizational questions have been resolved. At its next session the Committee will face its most important task, that of preparing the final documents for the special session. These documents should be the result of collective efforts and should reflect the common agreement of all participants.

At this stage of the work I should like to express briefly some basic considerations of the Bulgarian delegation on the character and contents of the documents. My delegation shares the understanding that the final document or documents should comprise the following four essential parts.

First, an introduction, containing in a concise and clear form appraisals of a general character made on the basis of an objective analysis of the current state of negotiations in the field of disarmament; this introduction should offer a well-balanced account of what has been achieved and what remains to be achieved, and should show the consistency and continuity of the current and future efforts in this field.

Secondly, a declaration on disarmament, incorporating in a logical sequence the fundamental principles to be implemented through negotiations and the conclusion of agreements to halt the arms race and achieve disarmament; among these fundamentals my delegation would like to see reaffirmed such important concepts as the link between political and military détente; the obligation not to use force in international relations or to impair the security of any of the participants in the talks, and renunciation of the seeking of unilateral advantages and of use of the achievements of science

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

and technology for the qualitative perfecting of weapons, etc. Of overriding importance is the formulation of provisions reflecting the correct approach to the problems of disarmament, which assumes progression through a number of partial measures to limit and reduce existing armaments and a ban on the development and manufacture of new kinds of weapons and certain others, thus leading to general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

Thirdly, a programme of action on disarmament, which would determine the priority tasks, beginning with measures to halt the nuclear arms race and proceeding to all important and pressing disarmament problems. The programme should take into account the whole range of the proposals made so far, and should be based on the principles of non-impairment of the security of any State and the inadmissibility of unilateral advantages at the expense of other States.

Fourthly, a mechanism for the conduct of negotiations, which would reflect the need to make effective usage of all channels for conducting negotiations. We are deeply convinced that the existing machinery of the United Nations, and the body associated with the United Nations, have proved their capabilities in practice. The status of the Committee on Disarmament, which already has behind it a 15 years' span of constructive and fruitful activity in its capacity as the most appropriate and representative multilateral organ for the conduct of negotiations in the field of disarmament, should be reaffirmed and consolidated in that document. In our opinion, no comprehensive and viable mechanism for disarmament negotiations can be conceived other than a world disarmament conference, and it is of exceptional importance, therefore, to include a clear-cut decision on the convening in the near future of the world disarmament conference.

The considerations summarized here are elaborated in documents A/AC.187/81 and 82 of 7 September, 1977, which the People's Republic of Bulgaria, together with the USSR and other socialist States, submitted for consideration by the Preparatory Committee. These documents are a new proof of the consistent and constructive line of policy of the socialist countries in the field of

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

disarmament. I have no doubt that they will contribute to the successful progress of the preparatory work of the session.

Mr. Chairman, at the current stage of active preparation for the Special Session on questions devoted to disarmament, we deem it sound and timely to resolve the question of the just representation of the Eastern European countries in the Preparatory Committee. I submit that its present composition does not adequately reflect the political realities in the world, nor, for that matter, does it take due account of the role and the contribution of the socialist countries in the solution of the problems of disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, as a peace-loving socialist country, pursues a steadfast policy of further deepening and strengthening détente in international relations. This policy was recently reiterated by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and President of the State Council of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, in his address to the 64th Inter-Parliamentary Conference held last September in Sofia, Bulgaria, in which he stated:

"Today, the best way to serve one's own people and mankind as well is to move along the road of peace and disarmament, to respect the legitimate interests of all countries and peoples, and to work to turn international détente into an all-embracing and irreversible process."

Guided by this understanding my delegation will join its efforts to those of other delegations in the promotion of détente, disarmament and international co-operation.

I thank you.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): Mr. Chairman, I should like, first of all, to refer to the fact that my colleague Ambassador Harriman has conveyed to you and to the other officers of the Committee the Nigerian delegation's felicitations on your election. However, since I have known you personally for a long time, I thought I should be remiss in my duty if I did not also convey to you my personal congratulations.

The general debate on the disarmament items on our agenda is taking place at a time of great anticipation and of great expectation. The momentous decision taken at the thirty-first session to convene a special session of the General Assembly in 1978 is on the point of bearing fruit, judging from the optimistic report of the Preparatory Committee, which was introduced the other day by its Chairman. Indeed, we can confidently say the special session is only a few short months away and, as has been expected, we hope it will provide a forum for the entire membership of this Organization to generate fresh enthusiasm for and to give new directives to the efforts at achieving general and complete disarmament. This is an opportunity and a prospect which has been generally welcomed even by those who had initial doubts. I can now recall with considerable satisfaction that my own Foreign Minister was one of the first to raise publicly, during his statement in the general debate at the thirtieth plenary session of the General Assembly, the prospect of a special session on disarmament. He said at that time:

"There is need for all States to confront the issue of disarmament in a more constructive and meaningful manner in a forum of sovereign equality. The proposed world disarmament conference can provide such a forum. If the attempt to convene such a conference continues to be frustrated, my delegation will not hesitate to join other third-world States in demanding that the General Assembly should focus attention on disarmament in a special session." (A/PV.2378, page 68)

When therefore, in response to an initiative of the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Colombo last year, this First Committee felt able to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of resolution 31/189-B, on convening the special session, a sense of anticipation was generated which grows more intense the nearer the event.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

The decision to convene the session arose out of a worrisome awareness of the pressing and ever growing danger implicit in the arms race, on the one hand, and the lack of progress in disarmament negotiations, on the other hand. The General Assembly, which convened in a sixth and a seventh special session to elaborate proposals for a new international economic order, has logically decided to convene the eighth special session on a most intimately related issue. The Nigerian delegation hopes that all Members will exert their best endeavours to ensure that the eighth special session succeeds in laying a solid basis for what I would call "NIPSO", or the new international peace and security order.

The painstaking preliminary work already done and still envisaged by the Preparatory Committee is an indication of the seriousness with which the special session is being taken, especially by the non-aligned States Members. Disarmament, like détente, has to be given a broader base, and a greater opportunity has to be provided for meaningful contribution by all States.

Coupled with the anticipation of the special session has been a sense of expectation arising from recent events and from statements by those who have to give most in the taking of any meaningful steps towards general and complete disarmament. In their contribution to the general debate in plenary Assembly, President Carter and Foreign Minister Gromyko gave firm commitments of their Governments' intention to undertake meaningful reductions in their arsenals of deadly weapons. On the one hand, President Carter indicated a willingness on the part of the United States to reduce its nuclear-weapon arsenal by 10 per cent, 20 per cent or even 50 per cent. On the other hand, Foreign Minister Gromyko expressed the readiness of the Soviet Union to discuss in concrete and practical terms the problem of nuclear disarmament in all its aspects. Then, at the beginning of this debate in the First Committee a week ago, Ambassador Issraelyan of the Soviet Union and Ambassador Fisher of the United States dealt extensively with the intensive negotiations going on in Geneva. Those negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on chemical weapons are said to be proceeding well. There was also reference to the negotiations on a comprehensive test ban treaty going on between the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Naturally my delegation earnestly hopes that the great expectations raised by those negotiations will not again be dashed.

In the meantime, the Nigerian delegation believes that neither the anticipation of the special session nor of the expectation aroused by encouraging statements and by bilateral and trilateral negotiations is enough to make us feel secure or even very optimistic. The stakes, we believe, are too high for such complacency. Weapons of destruction which, like the sword of Damocles, hang over the heads of us all, have reached a stage of sophistication and thorough destructiveness far beyond any rational explanation. The perfection of existing weapons and the development of new ones proceed at full speed, year in, year out, as if there were not the slightest intention of avoiding a war that would mean the end of it all. In the past few months attention has been focused on a new type of weapon whose destructive capacity will spare concrete and glass but not you and me, Mr. Chairman, nor any living organism. If we are to believe in the efficacy of all the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), then we see a certain inconsistency in continuing to develop even more sophisticated weapons as we speak of reducing those already in deployment. My delegation believes that an indispensable step in limiting strategic arms would be taken if all countries, and especially the super-Powers, refrained from the development of new weapons of mass destruction.

An item on this subject was introduced by the Soviet Union two years ago and was remitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) for discussion. While many useful meetings, with the participation of experts, were held, there has yet been no agreement on the issue of definition. The 1948 United Nations definition of weapons of mass destruction may still have validity; however, we believe that the advance of military scientific research makes necessary a reformulation. Other problems that have arisen out of the discussions of this item seem to us not incapable of solution. While the General Assembly should therefore encourage the CCD to continue its consideration of this subject, it should, pending agreement on a convention or conventions, firmly discourage the development of such weapons.

Even without taking into account the expense of the development of new weapons of mass destruction, my delegation is concerned that already more than enough of the resources of the world are being wasted on armaments. According to the latest

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

figures, almost \$350 billion are spent annually on arms. This is a staggering amount which the world can ill afford to tie down in weapons of destruction that everyone hopes will not be used, when in fact there are more pressing needs touching on the daily lives of billions of people all over the world, on which we could have spent a mere fraction of this sum.

Three years ago, the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the New International Economic Order, whose main theme is the assurance of a decent standard of living for peoples everywhere. Three years ago, a comprehensive Programme of Action was adopted for the new international economic order. Today, very little has happened in implementation of that Programme. All that would have been required to improve the conditions in the developing countries, to implement the integrated programme for commodities, to create the common fund on commodities, to relieve the debt burdens of developing countries, to improve the infrastructure of developing countries and to increase food production would, even at today's inflated prices, constitute only a fraction of the annual expenditure on arms. A commitment to lay aside a mere 5 per cent of military budgets for development purposes would certainly make a tremendous impact on the development process. We are firm in our belief that, until resources are shifted from armaments to development, no programme for development can run its full course. There is therefore this organic link between disarmament and development which we all ought to accept.

In his annual report, the Secretary-General underscored this link, with an example which is of the greatest relevance to my own region. Making a comparison between expenditure on arms and the requirements of the World Health Organization for the eradication of one of the most deadly diseases in the world, the Secretary-General wrote:

"That Organization's programme for eradicating malaria at an estimated cost of \$450 million - half of what is spent daily for military purposes - is dragging for lack of funds. In a world where scientific and technological capability is one of the keys to the future, 25 per cent of the world's scientific manpower and 40 per cent of all research and development spending is engaged for military purposes." (A/32/1, p. 13)

Then the Secretary-General drew the logical conclusion when he wrote:

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

"These are but a few examples of the burden on the economic development of all States constituted by our failure to achieve substantial progress on disarmament. Disarmament must therefore be a vital part not only of our efforts to establish a better system of international peace and security, but also of our attempts to restructure the economic and social order of the world." (Ibid.)

It is well known that in Africa today malaria is the greatest killer; it constitutes one of the greatest setbacks to productivity and to development, since farmhands as well as city workers are always incapacitated by it. Yet malaria continues to rage unchecked because the World Health Organization cannot raise the equivalent of half a day's expenditure on armaments. Similarly, hunger and abject poverty continue to be the lot of the overwhelming majority of the world's population, mostly in the developing countries, because we have failed to implement in a meaningful way the Disarmament Decade proclaimed in resolution 2602 E (XXIV), which would have released increased resources for purposes of development.



(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Last year, on this Committee's recommendation, the General Assembly adopted resolution 31/68, on effective measures to implement the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade. In that resolution the Assembly called on Member States and the Secretary-General to intensify their efforts in support of the link between disarmament and development envisaged in General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV) so as to promote disarmament negotiations and to ensure that the human and material resources freed by disarmament were used to promote economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries. The Assembly also urged the CCD during its 1977 session to adopt a comprehensive programme dealing with all aspects of the cessation of the arms race and general and complete disarmament.

My delegation notes with interest the proposal submitted by Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden for a United Nations study on the theme of disarmament and development. Such an in-depth study as is envisaged may, we believe, provide a useful follow-up to the earlier studies conducted on such subjects as the social and economic consequences of the arms race. Naturally, we would expect this study to focus attention mainly on the central issue in disarmament.

On the question of a comprehensive negotiating programme, we are also gratified that the CCD decided in the last days of its 1977 session to set up at the beginning of its 1978 session an ad hoc working group to elaborate a comprehensive programme for disarmament. My delegation believes that the General Assembly, in noting that decision, should request the CCD to submit such a comprehensive programme to the special session on disarmament.

I shall now comment briefly on the ongoing disarmament discussions reflected in the report of the CCD. As a member of the CCD, Nigeria is of course aware of the complexities of the issues involved in movement towards the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. Notwithstanding, we are greatly perturbed at the fact that the CCD has very little to report - and this has become the rule rather than the exception - except a catalogue of discussions and more discussions.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Take the perennial subject of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty, for example. It is recognized that a comprehensive test-ban treaty is an indispensable step on the road to positive nuclear disarmament. The General Assembly has over the past years annually condemned the continuation of nuclear-weapon tests and expressed its belief that whatever might be the differences on the question of verification, there was no valid reason for the delay in the conclusion of such a test-ban treaty. My delegation has always shared that belief. Of the three obstacles to the conclusion of such a treaty - that is, the questions of verification, participation by all nuclear-weapon States, and peaceful nuclear explosions, we note with interest that the second has virtually been resolved. The United States has indicated a willingness voluntarily to suspend tests for a period; the Soviet Union has agreed to an initial implementation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty by three nuclear Powers.

While we note this positive development, my delegation believes firmly that a fourth nuclear Power has no excuse whatsoever for not joining its two allies and the Soviet Union in the initial signing of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. In this, as in other issues, that fourth nuclear Power should make a gesture of positive reaction to the concern of the international community and should forgo any further nuclear testing.

The vexed question of verification, in the view of my delegation, has become a political, not a technical, problem. The advance of science has, in our understanding, made the method of seismological identification sufficient for distinguishing between earthquakes and nuclear explosions. Thus it is a matter of political, rather than scientific, distrust that has prompted insistence on on-site inspection. I hardly need say that, equally, it is political distrust that has prompted rejection of on-site inspection. Political distrust can only be removed by political action.

Perhaps the issue of peaceful nuclear explosions is slightly more intractable. While we appreciate the preoccupation of those who are in favour of banning all nuclear-weapon tests - peaceful or otherwise - as a Party to the non-proliferation Treaty we also recall that provision is made therein for explosion for peaceful

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

purposes. The legal framework for peaceful nuclear explosions can be established, we believe, under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The trilateral negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty can, in our view, be speedily concluded and their result should be submitted to the CCD for finalization before the eighth special session of the General Assembly.

Two related questions are of special interest to my delegation. The first is the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones. I should like in this connexion to congratulate the United States for its adherence to Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Africa has been declared a nuclear-weapon-free zone by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity. That Declaration has been endorsed by the General Assembly in successive resolutions, the latest of which is resolution 31/69. In spite of that resolution, however, we note with concern that the apartheid régime of South Africa has actively continued to pursue a nuclear programme whose end is the acquisition of nuclear-weapon capability. In fact, but for the timely intervention of the Soviet Union and the United States, the South African régime would have conducted its first nuclear test on the continent of Africa. My delegation would like at this stage to express its gratitude to the Soviet Union and the United States for their vigilance and for their joint action. We hardly need stress the threat to the peace and security of an already explosive region which the introduction of nuclear weapons poses. It is clear that the Vorster régime, which has made itself the leper of the world, now believes it can find safety in nuclear blackmail. In view of the callousness of that régime, it is obvious that it will not hesitate to use nuclear weapons to maintain its universally condemned policy of apartheid.

My delegation will propose, therefore, that the initiative taken by the United States and the Soviet Union should be formalized by the General Assembly, which should call on the Security Council to exercise surveillance with regard to the nuclear ambitions of South Africa and to take effective measures to prevent South Africa from acquiring nuclear-weapon capability. In addition, the General Assembly should urge all States to suspend forthwith any co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field until it submits its entire nuclear programme to the safeguards prescribed by the International Atomic Energy Agency and until it becomes a party to the non-proliferation Treaty.

My delegation continues to believe in the need for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. As one of the earliest signatories of the Treaty, we note with satisfaction that about 100 countries are now parties, and we hope others will soon find themselves able to accede to it. However, we should like to reiterate that the Treaty imposes rights as well as obligations on nuclear-weapon as well as non-nuclear-weapon States. It is becoming increasingly disturbing that once non-nuclear weapon States assume their

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

obligations, they are then denied their rights. The benefits of co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear technology constitute one of the main promises of the non-proliferation Treaty. That promise, unfortunately, is not being fulfilled, least of all to the developing countries parties to the Treaty. The activities of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which has a vital role to play in disseminating the benefits of the peaceful uses of nuclear technology, are replete with evidence of the yawning gap between the expenditure on safeguards and the expenditure on the promotion of technical co-operation. The nuclear-weapon States will have to understand that, unless a happy balance is struck in the provisions for the International Atomic Energy Agency to carry out its two-part mandate arising in part from its statute and in part from the non-proliferation Treaty, then a certain tension will continue to mark the relationship between the two groups - the developed and the developing countries - in the Agency. Any resolution which is to be adopted this year, therefore, will have to take account of the need for increased resources to strengthen not only the safeguards activities of the International Atomic Energy Agency but also its promotional activities. My delegation will have more to say on this when the draft resolution already in circulation is being discussed.

Draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.13 which was adopted by this Committee last year and subsequently became General Assembly resolution 31/65 requested the CCD to continue negotiations as a matter of high priority, with a view to reaching early agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and for their destruction.

Though the CCD, in keeping with that resolution, did have its say, as its report shows, real negotiations seem to have been proceeding bilaterally between the Soviet Union and the United States. From the materials available to the CCD it is clear that strong political will is required to overcome some of the technical problems which, we do appreciate, have to be resolved before agreement between the two negotiators can be reached. My delegation believes that the conclusion of a chemical weapons treaty before the eighth special session is not an unrealistic expectation. We would therefore appeal to the two negotiating States, the Soviet Union and the United States, to make that possible. A joint initiative by the two super-Powers in the CCD would certainly facilitate

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

the conclusion of the Treaty, and we hope that that will be made possible during the spring session of the CCD.

Those are the remarks I wished to make at this stage of our work. My delegation will have more to say when specific items are being discussed. I cannot however end without paying tribute to the Secretary-General and his colleagues on the action taken to implement General Assembly resolution 31/90 on the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. We have read with interest the Secretary-General's report in document A/32/276 and have found the first issue of the Disarmament Yearbook informative and helpful. We also note that the United Nations Centre for Disarmament has been established and that efforts were made to recruit its staff on a wide geographical basis. However, we note further that geographical spread has been neither numerically nor qualitatively equitable, at least as far as Africa is concerned. We look forward to the redress of that glaring imbalance in the new unit.

Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, permit me to congratulate you, on behalf of the Byelorussian SSR, on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. We should also like to congratulate the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur, and we wish all the officers of the Committee success and harmony in their work in the interests of achieving fruitful results on the extremely important items which are under consideration in the First Committee. Our delegation will do everything in its power to promote such an outcome of our work.

In this statement I should like to refer just to one of the 17 items relating to the problem of disarmament on the agenda of the thirty-second session of the General Assembly: namely, the question of the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament. On the other items of disarmament our delegation will speak at a later stage, both in the course of the general debate and when we come to consider the relevant draft resolutions.

The Byelorussian SSR delegation has studied with attention the report of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament, and the documents of that Committee. After consideration of the documentation presented and the statements of the representatives on the Committee and of a number of delegations, we note with satisfaction that, in spite of all the variety of approaches on the part of States to the problem of disarmament, in the Preparatory Committee an atmosphere of constructive co-operation prevailed.

As a result, an agreed draft agenda for the special session was approved and many organizational and procedural matters were successfully resolved. Something which is of positive significance is the recommendation of the Preparatory Committee with regard to the need to do everything possible to see to it that the decisions of the special session on questions of substance are adopted, in so far as may be, on the basis of consensus. By adopting that approach, all States will be protected against attempts to gain one-sided advantages for anyone. In other words, there will be general observance of the principle of not harming the security of any party. At the same time, we should like to express the hope that the rule of consensus will not be used to impede progress towards a solution of the problems of disarmament.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

As the Committee will recall, the composition of the Preparatory Committee did not entirely reflect the actual role played by States in tackling the problems of disarmament. It is our belief that this deficiency in the work of the Preparatory Committee will be corrected by the adoption of an appropriate decision at this session of the General Assembly. This is something which is particularly necessary because the Preparatory Committee, in its forthcoming meetings, will be turning its attention from organizational matters towards broad discussion and the preparation of documents on approaches of principle to the solution of the problems of disarmament and on the main subjects to which States should give priority in their efforts.

The positions of principle of the Byelorussian SSR on matters connected with the special session of the General Assembly have been repeatedly set forth and are familiar to the Committee. They were set forth, inter alia, in document A/AC.187/4 in our answer to the questionnaire of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Byelorussian SSR delegation considers that it would be advisable at this stage to tell this Committee some of our views with regard to the content of the final documents of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

We believe that the special session should promote the attainment of the principal goal of all efforts of States in the field of disarmament: namely, general and complete disarmament. For this purpose, we should exploit every possibility, we should pay due attention to partial measures to limit and halt the arms race and to achieve disarmament and we should encourage bilateral, regional and multilateral measures.

There is no doubt that at the special session it would be a good idea to take stock of everything positive which has been achieved in resolving the problems of disarmament. And quite a good deal has been achieved. Since we are all familiar with this, I do not think there is any need for me to enumerate the treaties, conventions and agreements which are in force, but I should like to stress the need for all Member States of the United Nations to become parties to those documents. I think that we should also give fresh powerful momentum to the business of concluding work on the proposals which have already been submitted in the United Nations, that is, proposals aimed at preventing and limiting the arms race and reversing that disastrous course and at achieving realistic measures of



(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

practical disarmament. In other words, we should exploit to the full existing political and material conditions, so that, on the basis of the fundamental provisions and principles of the conduct of disarmament talks and taking full account of the actual circumstances of the time, we may indicate ways and means of making decisive progress towards the cessation of the arms race in all its forms and the attainment of binding and effective international understandings in the field of disarmament.

We should like to express the hope that all States, those which possess nuclear weapons and those which do not, those with powerful armed forces and those without them, States great and small, developed and developing, regardless of the social system to which they belong, will evince the utmost goodwill and sense of political responsibility for the fate of the world, for security and co-operation in the world, and will make their contribution to solving the problems of disarmament. The States of the socialist community will strive, as they always have done, to help the special session of the General Assembly, to open up prospects for the attainment of concrete international understandings on each and every aspect of the problems of disarmament.

In outlining the future programme of action on disarmament, the special session of the General Assembly should consider measures both for nuclear disarmament and for the reduction of conventional armed forces and armaments. We see an opportunity for halting the nuclear arms race and bringing about nuclear disarmament in the taking of measures to prevent the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war; in strengthening the régime governing the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons; in a complete and general ban on nuclear weapons testing; in the establishment of foolproof nuclear-free zones; in a cessation of the production of nuclear weapons; in the prohibition of the development and production of new models and types of nuclear weapons; and in making a start in reducing stockpiles of nuclear weapons and, subsequently, bringing about their total elimination.

Practical measures to limit and reduce armed forces and conventional armaments would be the reduction of air forces, artillery, tanks and other modern forms of conventional weapons, as well as of the armed forces equipped with such weapons; the elimination of foreign military bases on the territory of other

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

countries; the creation of peace zones; a reduction of military budgets and the devotion of resources freed thereby to purposes of economic and social progress, and the expansion of assistance to the developing countries. Of great importance would be an understanding on the prohibition of the creation of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; the elimination of chemical weapons; the total demilitarization of the sea-bed and ocean floor; and the withdrawal from specific areas of the world's ocean of vessels carrying nuclear weapons.

Referring now to the question of machinery for disarmament talks, I should like to stress that the decisions of the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament questions should facilitate the successful functioning of existing organs and channels for disarmament talks which have proved their worth and have already yielded considerable positive results.

We also note with considerable satisfaction the recommendation of the Preparatory Committee which attaches particular importance to convening a world disarmament conference, as well as to international machinery for disarmament negotiations.

If we were to take these measures, if we were to achieve the conclusion of treaties creating binding obligations not to use force in international relations, if we were to take measures to deepen and consolidate international détente and to supplement it with military détente, it would make it possible for all States to demonstrate to the peoples of the world that they are discharging their Charter obligations to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and to unite their forces for the maintenance of international peace and security. On practically all the questions I have touched on and all the problems I have mentioned in the field of disarmament, we have concrete proposals submitted by the Soviet Union and other States of the socialist community, and we shall toil unremittingly to translate those drafts and those proposals into fact and make of them effective international agreements and understandings.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

Speaking on the very eve of the sixtieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, we would like to stress, with particular vigour, our determination to continue unswervingly to pursue Lenin's policy of peace, of the strengthening of security and of broad international co-operation and to achieve the goals and principles of that policy, which have now been enshrined in the new Constitution of the USSR, that sets as one of its goals the attainment of complete and general disarmament.

In conclusion, I should like to express the hope that our comments will be taken into account duly in the course of the forthcoming work of the Preparatory Committee for the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament.

Mr. ROMULO (Philippines): Another year has gone by without any disarmament. No bombs have been destroyed, no missiles have been dismantled, no planes have been junked, and no warships have been decommissioned, as a result of any agreements to move toward a disarmed world.

Has this year marked a step towards disarmament or a step towards disaster? The verdict is not in. The bleak atmosphere is lightened somewhat by the efforts to put ceilings on future strategic weapons development, and by the prospects for the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. But whether the special session can be a definitive turning point from an arms race to a race for peace and security may not be known for some years.

It is only a short time ago that the last major escalation of the nuclear arms race was initiated, when the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics decided, in their desire to appear invincible, to place not one but many nuclear warheads on each intercontinental missile. Each now has many warheads targeted for each single missile of the assumed adversary. Thus, a move toward a "counterforce" strategy has become inevitable, and with it the pressure for striking first in time of crisis. Far from providing additional security, multiple warheaded missiles, through both their numbers and the heightened likelihood of a nuclear exchange, have drastically increased the peril of our life on earth.

How is it, then, that the cries of alarm, from every hand, have met with so little concrete action to alleviate the danger? We know a great deal about the statistics of the arms race. We can easily do as I have done, and call attention to its most threatening new aspects. But we know, in fact, very little about the dynamics and motors of the arms race. If the present circumstances in the world spawn an arms race, what circumstances would spawn its opposite? Simply to repeat the litany, "We must disarm or we are doomed", demonstrably does not accomplish disarmament.

There are some characteristics of the present world which we can point to with certainty as contributing to what former Secretary-General U Thant called "the mad momentum of the arms race". For one thing, the world does not have a reliable and adequate system for the maintenance of international peace and security which will give assurance to States that their legitimate security needs will be met in a disarmed or disarming world. As I have stated previously, nations cannot be expected to, and will not, disarm into a vacuum devoid of effective security guarantees.

(Mr. Romulo, Philippines)

We may ask ourselves why we live at peace, generally speaking, in our own societies, but not in the world society? We can see at once that a community of interest and sense of local identity have given rise to circumstances which do not yet obtain in the world as a whole - in particular, a generally shared outlook based on values and norms which have been embodied in effective community-wide instruments and institutions. Individual citizens, or groups of citizens, could not and did not relinquish reliance on individual arms until a system of law, order and justice became effective and accepted throughout the region, and effective remedies for disputes and redress of grievances were available.

How then can we dream of a world disarmed when the prerequisites of a peaceful society are not met, or are hardly even contemplated? A degree of arms limitation may be accomplished in the absence of the acceptance of the notion and the instrumentalities of community, but not disarmament. World disarmament presupposes the instrumentation of acknowledged world community, and most particularly the evolution of effective peacekeeping and peacemaking through our world Organization, with decision-making which is not subject to challenge or evasion by the Members. There is absolutely no other assurance of lasting peace or international security, and no other assurance can be offered or demonstrated.

In the shorter term, we have other considerations which tend to militate against effective arms limitation agreements. We have misapprehensions about the goals and objectives of others; we have misapprehensions about the degrees of threat which others' efforts at defence represent; we have difficulties in encompassing the cultural and psychological uniquenesses in the human family. We have serious questions about where existing philosophical and ideological variations among us will lead. We are subject to the "worst possible case" evaluations made by military experts of the motives and actions of others; and we seek short-term increases in security by developing more overwhelming weapons systems, while in fact reducing long term security to nil.

(Mr. Romulo, Philippines)

The world is also subject simply to the momentum of that which it has set in motion - namely the momentum of vast resources of science, invention, industry, politics, and the military and work forces which are now invested in the "zero sum game" of temporary security through guaranteed mutual destruction. This momentum now has reached such a pace that qualified observers are justified in asking whether it can be halted or slowed at all. The first requirement, certainly, is that decision-making with regard to slowing the momentum, involving such matters as development, production or deployment of additional weapons systems, must be successfully freed from the influence of the momentum-producing elements which have an economic, political or career stake in its continuation.

I have dealt at some length with these rather unaccustomed areas precisely because it is unlikely that they will be treated in any substantial way in the foreseeable future, including during the meetings of the special session devoted to disarmament. Yet, this complex of essentially societal and psychological factors constitutes the hard core of unresolved questions fuelling the arms race.

Turning more specifically to the special session, we are gratified at the progress thus far made by its Preparatory Committee under the guidance of its excellent Chairman, H.E. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas, and can fully support the framework developed for the session, and the outline of the products which we may expect from it. We look forward with the greatest interest to the forthcoming further and more substantive meetings of the Preparatory Committee. We hope that space will be found within the agenda of the special session itself for consideration of some of the ancillary but critical areas to which I have just alluded. The great advantage, it seems to me, of scheduling a special session is the opportunity it provides to focus at some length on issues which cannot be expected to find their place within the framework of our annual brief review in this First Committee of the Assembly.

The special session represents opportunity - the kind of opportunity which might otherwise have been provided by annual or biennial meetings of the Disarmament Commission, or by an occasional world conference. It

(Mr. Romulo, Philippines)

represents an opportunity greatly to increase our international efforts, focused on the United Nations, to reduce and reverse the arms race. These efforts should give form to both short-term and long-term goals, and should lead to determination of the venues which are required both for continuing negotiations and for surveillance of those negotiations on a regular basis.

The special session also provides an opportunity to focus and to inform world public opinion which is, in a sense, the final arbiter, by default or by action, of human destiny.

We are gratified by the series of background papers produced thus far for the special session by the Secretary-General. Indeed, we welcome generally the increased role the Members have accorded the United Nations in disarmament matters. We believe that these are but a beginning to the emphasis and intensity with which the world Organization should approach the question which, we cannot too often remind ourselves, is a life and death matter for humanity. We welcome in particular the updating of the report entitled "Economic and social consequences of the arms race and of military expenditures" (A/32/88 and Add.1). I need not recount here the figures delineating the self-inflicted damage we, the world community, have suffered by entering into an open-ended nuclear and conventional arms race.

We are also gratified that the United Nations has published the first volume of its Disarmament Yearbook. This accomplishment is in line with our view that the role of the United Nations as a centre for information and support work for disarmament negotiations should increasingly be enhanced and developed.

There are still seven months until the convening of the special session. In seven months a great deal can be done to assure the maximum results from the session. Certain steps could be taken now by concerned Governments to lessen the intensity of the arms race and to create an auspicious atmosphere for the special session. Among such steps which immediately commend themselves are: first, achievement of the long-sought comprehensive test ban among Governments willing to participate; second, an ancillary moratorium on the testing or

(Mr. Romulo, Philippines)

use of non-weapon nuclear devices pending completion of a comprehensive study on their usefulness and their impact on the nuclear arms race; third, an agreement among major weapons supplying nations progressively and in a balanced manner to reduce conventional arms sales.

A number of similar steps could be taken immediately at the initiative of the concerned Governments without advance agreement, and dependent upon an eventual favourable response in kind.

Among such steps might be: first an undertaking not to produce or deploy new weapons systems, especially those such as the Cruise missile, the deployment of which would add a whole new escalative dimension to the nuclear arms race, as has been the case, for instance, with multiple warheaded missiles; second, an announcement that the most lethal chemical weapons, the dreaded nerve gases, would be removed from stockpiles, destroyed, and no longer produced; third, a moratorium on the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes, and a reduction in stockpiles; fourth, a percentage or quantitative reduction in military budgets, nuclear weapons stockpiles and delivery systems; and fifth, an undertaking to suspend sales and delivery of nuclear reprocessing plants which have capability for concentration of weapons-grade material, and to forego such arrangements in future.

Many of these steps, although taken initially at individual initiative, would lay the basis for reciprocation and early formal agreements. Clearly any of them, or any combination, would set the stage for very serious and productive work at the special session devoted to disarmament. The "balance of risks" in any such measures as have been mentioned is clearly in favour of peace, accord and agreement, and away from the risk of war. The primary threat to security in the world today comes, not from military unpreparedness, but quite the contrary, from the deluge of engines of war from which we seem unable to stand aside. Such steps or initiatives coming before the convening of the special session would bring real hope and an atmosphere conducive to progress not now present.

I appeal most earnestly to the concerned Governments to consider what actual steps they might take at an early time, and in any case during the seven-month grace period before the special session begins its work.



(Mr. Romulo, Philippines)

I do not know whether the world has five years, or 10, or 20; but what we all know is that the world is in dire peril and cannot endlessly exist poised on the brink of Armageddon. What divides us is mirrored in the most alarming and threatening arms build-up the world has ever known. The arms race can only be arrested by what unites us. And what unites us is insufficiently mirrored in the institutions, the practices and the understanding of nations and peoples, and most particularly, of this world Organization. We cannot command the arms race to end, any more than we can turn back the tides of the sea with a word. What we can seek to do is to give form and substance to specific steps of harmonization, accommodation and agreement, confident that such a process, once set in motion, is even more compelling than the onward rush of the machines of war. They can be emptied of their importance and fascination, and rendered mute, silent and motionless upon the plains of the time in which we live if we are willing to initiate a process of steps, real steps, toward disarmament. We must not always wait for others to act first. We must be prepared to break the vicious circle ourselves when it is in our power to do so, confident that the atmosphere of trust engendered will facilitate co-operative agreements. Most importantly, we must engage ourselves with enthusiasm in defining the nature of the world community and its appropriate institutions, which alone can bring the assurance of a secure and fruitful future for the world.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.