

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records*



FIRST COMMITTEE
30th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 7 November 1984
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

NOV 13 1984

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 30th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

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

Statements were made by:

Mr. Korhonen (Finland)
Mr. Tari (Israel)
Mr. Ali (Bangladesh)
Mr. Mastamand (Afghanistan)
Mr. Arsov (UNESCO)
Mr. O'Connor (Ireland)

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/39/PV.30
10 November 1984

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 65 AND 142 (continued)

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

Mr. KORHONEN (Finland): I have taken the floor in order to introduce two draft resolutions. The first one that I would like to take up is the draft resolution relating to a study of nuclear-weapon-free zones in document A/C.1/39/L.13. As a matter of fact, it ought to be a relatively simple task for the Group of Governmental Experts appointed to review and supplement the study on the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects. After all, the previous study, made in 1975, only provides a model and a starting point for the work. However, after working at four sessions during a total of six weeks, assisted by two consultants and a secretariat, the Group, unfortunately, was not able to reach a consensus even on the fifth draft, which was discussed at the last session in June of this year. In fact, the Group did not have time even to begin an examination of the analytical part of the draft study, because it was held up by slow progress on those chapters which are intended to summarize facts and describe historical developments.

(Mr. Korhonen, Finland)

I have to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the members of the study group have worked hard and we all know how difficult it can be to reach consensus on controversial matters in a group of this size and type. Nevertheless the members of the group have felt that it would be possible to complete the study if the mandate is extended to the next session of the General Assembly. In these circumstances my delegation thinks that the study group deserves to be given the chance to submit its report in 1985. This is the purpose of the draft resolution submitted for the attention of the Committee in document A/C.1/39/L.13.

May I also take this opportunity to emphasize that, whatever difficulties have emerged in the study group, nobody has intended to detract from the agreed principles and other conclusions reached in the previous study. It is clear that the comprehensive study of 1975 will retain its value in any case. My delegation believes, however, that it is possible to move forward from that study and to formulate a new and updated version which could serve the needs of the Governments in those parts of the world where the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is feasible. We look forward to an opportunity for a more extensive discussion on this subject in the General Assembly once the new study has been completed.

If there are any relevant observations on that subject in the General Assembly already this year, they should, of course, be brought to the attention of the study group in conformity with a similar decision made at the session last year. That is the purpose of the final paragraph in the draft resolution.

I should like to turn to another resolution which I also have the pleasure of introducing today. It is draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.11 concerning the First Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques. The Review Conference was held in Geneva from 10 to 20 September this year. As I had the honour to preside over the Conference, I should like in this statement to comment briefly on the Conference and the Final Declaration unanimously adopted by it.

As members of the Committee will recall, the main provision of the Convention concerns the prohibition on using environmental modification techniques for warlike purposes.

The Review Conference, after detailed consideration of relevant provisions of the Convention, was able to confirm that the obligations assumed under the Convention have been faithfully observed by the States parties. The strong common

(Mr. Korhonen, Finland)

interests of the States parties in preventing the use of environmental modification techniques for military or any other hostile purpose was also reaffirmed, as was the continuing importance of the Convention and its objectives. The Conference also recognized the need to keep under continuing review and examination the provisions concerning the scope of prohibition incorporated in the Convention. Here I should mention that at present 46 States are parties to the Convention, while it has been signed, but not yet ratified, by 19 States.

I wish to emphasize that the First Review Conference was held in a spirit of co-operation, and as such showed a useful example to other disarmament and arms control forums.

The draft resolution which I have the honour to introduce is sponsored by six States representing all groups - Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Norway, the United Kingdom and Finland.

The draft resolution contains many of the basic conclusions of the Final Declaration to which I have already referred. In the operative part of the draft resolution it is suggested that the General Assembly take note of the positive assessment by the Conference of the effectiveness of the Convention. The draft also includes a call to all States to refrain from military use of environmental modification techniques and reiterates its expressed hope for the widest possible adherence to the Convention.

May I conclude with the hope that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.11 will be adopted by consensus by the General Assembly.

Mr. TARI (Israel) (interpretation from French): May I begin this first statement by expressing on behalf of my delegation our deep satisfaction at seeing Ambassador Souza e Silva chairing the First Committee this year. His diplomatic experience and his knowledge of the topics before us ensure the success of our work. My congratulations extend to all other officers of the Committee. Let me also take this opportunity to reiterate my delegation's thanks to Ambassador Vraalsen for the distinction and the effectiveness with which he presided over the First Committee last year.

The First Committee has been meeting for three weeks. It is endeavouring once again to cover a broad range of subjects as carefully as possible, each of which is important for the future of our countries. In many of the statements so far made,

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

we hear two topics recurring. We hear the deep concern about the effects of the arms race in all our societies and over the entire planet; the need is also expressed promptly to halt this devastating process, to bring it to an end and finally to reverse it. But at the same time we hear expressed in all the statements, especially by the more modest nations, a feeling of frustration and of discouragement, given the powerlessness shown by the international community even to slow down the general arms race. In reality from year to year the political and diplomatic multilateral efforts devoted to disarmament face increasingly gloomy prospects.

Conflicts around the world are multiplying. The aspiration to disarmament, more than a philosophy of life, has now become a categorical imperative upon which the very survival of mankind depends.

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

How often has it been said that were it applied to third world development, to education, to sustaining starving peoples, a fraction of the sums devoted to armament could change the face of the earth. The various multilateral forums devoted to disarmament are of course indispensable, primarily because they make contact and dialogue possible with regard to these vital subjects. Society, however, expects more. And an additional risk is beginning to emerge, namely, that of the ritualization of certain debates, of the endless repetition of resolutions and proclamations which can, at the very best, assuage consciences, while the dangers of the arms race become ever more visible and, perhaps, even closer. In the aftermath of the Second World War in 1946, at a time when burning questions were being raised about the human condition and man's fate, Albert Einstein, that great scientist and philosopher, wrote the following out of an anxiety that has become increasingly obvious over the years:

"Science has made the danger more imminent, but the real problem lies in the minds and hearts of men. We always have the option to choose between hope and destruction. But let us not wait until choice is taken out of our hands forever."

These few thoughts, which do not pretend to originality, are those of a representative of a country with a keen desire for peace. The vision of the ancient prophets of Israel is one of peace - of eternal peace and total disarmament. It is a vision that is 3,000 years old, one that we have never abandoned, even in the most difficult historical circumstances.

In the course of our Committee's debates, the State of Israel has on several occasions been referred to by representatives of various countries, usually from the Middle East. In some cases those references have amounted to a few quick sentences without any relevance to the subject before the Committee - sentences that were clearly a kind of lip service to what has become for some almost a ritual, namely, the practice of historical mis-statement against Israel. Moreover, it has happened - and particularly during the statement of the representative of Syria - that such remarks have been more detailed. In this latter case, the amassing of falsehoods and diffamatory assertions have probably made even clearer the hypocrisy of an exercise indulged in by the representative of a State that is itself dedicated to aggression, to military dictatorship and to the denial of human

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

rights. I shall not make specific mention of all the speakers who have employed this form of discourse against Israel. I am hopeful that thereby I can - perhaps - avoid another series of inflammatory statements, which I do not feel this Committee particularly wants to hear.

My delegation wishes, if possible, to avoid contributing to the transformation of this Committee into another arena in which debates would continue on questions to which the United Nations is already devoting an excessive amount of time. For that reason my present statement will attempt to disregard remarks such as those I have just described. Of course, my delegation does reserve the right to address itself to them at some future date.

On the other hand, I should like at this stage to examine some of the subjects within the purview of the First Committee from a Middle East perspective. The Middle East continues to be the arena for a series of serious conflicts. In one of them, new chemical weapons have been employed. Of course, I am referring to the deadly war Iran and Iraq have been waging for more than four years now. That conflict is one that appears to have inspired a singularly restrained reaction on the international level but one that has already given rise to hundreds of thousands of victims. One of its singular aspects is that new weapons - chemical weapons - have been utilized. Deadly gases have been employed in that war in contempt of all international conventions, giving it a new and particularly atrocious and revolting dimension. We cannot but feel a very deep anxiety at this further escalation of the atrocity. Of course, there is the risk that once a certain form of weapon - in this instance chemical weapons - has been used, its use may spread and become general. Furthermore, it is characteristic of a certain international practice whereby the very ones who use such terrible weapons are the same ones who continue publicly to moralize and to preach disarmament without being unduly brought to account.

Generally speaking, the Middle East today is marked by a frenetic arms race, both quantitative and qualitative. The surge in the price of oil and the ensuing rapid enrichment of certain countries of the region have resulted in billions of dollars' being devoted, throughout the Middle East, to the building up of arsenals. The spiral effect has become inevitable here. As soon as one country acquires weapons, its possible future adversary, the country that feels itself threatened

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

and that sometimes actually is, in turn feels itself obliged to acquire additional and costly matériel. At the same time, through the very build-up of such arsenals the risk of explosion is increased. As soon as the level of collective security in a region deteriorates, the dangers of a greater shock increase. Contrary wise, but according to an identical rule, confrontations at the global level result in an exacerbation of regional tensions. The statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Singapore on 24 September 1979 has become almost classic. He said:

"If the global crisis is left unresolved, the indications are that in the 1980s civil wars, small-nation wars and proxy wars will spread further in the third world. Already across southern Asia, South-East Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Central America, border and territorial disputes, recollections of injustices from times past and social upheavals are igniting countless conflicts". (A/34/PV.6, p. 41)

All of this leads me to say that Israel attaches particular importance to the question of regional disarmament. In the past, Israel has on several occasions put forward proposals designed to make progress in this area. Israel feels that initiatives relating to regional disarmament should emanate from the regions themselves. It is also important that they lead to direct negotiations. That is a question of substance more than of form. Without prejudicing their outcome, such direct negotiations would in all cases constitute an important initial step towards the establishment of the confidence so sorely needed by the States of the Middle East. Israel feels that we are not serving the interests of any cause or project if we allow such negotiations to be carried out by proxies or through intermediaries taking the place of direct and reciprocal commitments between the nations concerned. On 3 June 1981 the representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General a letter proposing the establishment along such lines of regional disarmament commissions made up of all members of the various regions. Their task would be to examine ideas and proposals in order to arrive at intergovernmental regional agreements on arms control and reduction. Israel has since repeated that proposal.

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

In conclusion, I should like to mention a few of the elements of the Israeli position with regard to non-proliferation. In his statement to the General Assembly on 3 October 1984 Mr. Yitzhak Shamir, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel, recalled that the State of Israel had constantly felt concern about the question of nuclear weapons and that it had consistently held the aim of non-proliferation of such weapons. Mr. Shamir added that Israel felt that the most credible barrier to the proliferation of nuclear weapons in a region as troubled as the Middle East would be the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, following upon negotiations freely undertaken by the countries of the region, on the model of the Treaty of Tlatelolco in Latin America. The progress noted recently with regard to the transformation of the South Pacific into a nuclear-weapon-free zone is particularly encouraging in that connection.

On this question, which is of considerable importance for Israel, my delegation reserves the right to speak in greater detail when it is debated in the First Committee.

Mr. ALI (Bangladesh): My delegation has already had the privilege of congratulating the Chairman and the other officers of the Committee on their unanimous election. During the past few weeks we have seen ample evidence of their diplomatic skill, which reinforces our firm belief that the Committee will achieve tangible results under their able and proven stewardship.

In our general statement last week we indicated the position of the Bangladesh delegation on various disarmament issues currently before the Committee. While doing so we reiterated our firm conviction that we must put an end to the continuing escalation of the arms race, both nuclear and conventional, in order to ensure peace and security so as to preserve our planet. We also emphasized that, in our common endeavour towards general and complete disarmament, nuclear disarmament should be our immediate and central objective. At the same time, we felt that sustained efforts should be undertaken to halt the arms race in outer space and to prohibit the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical and radiological weapons. Similarly, equal attention should be paid to the issue of conventional disarmament, with a view to curbing the phenomenal growth in the arms race. My delegation also expressed our firm belief that world peace and security could not be ensured through the accumulation of arms. It should be a

(Mr. Ali, Bangladesh)

self-evident truth by now that the Member countries which have been vigorously taking part in the arms race, under the plea of safeguarding their national security, have actually bought greater insecurity at higher cost. The social opportunity losses resulting from the diversion of scarce global resources to military purposes have afflicted developed and developing countries alike. In our statement today we should like to deliberate specifically on the item concerning the relationship between disarmament and development.

The preceding speakers, in deliberating on this item, have underlined that the global military expenditures have already reached a staggering magnitude and that such expenditures continue to increase at a faster pace every year in clear contrast to the current critical international economic situation. While the expenditures on armaments have steadily increased and are now estimated to have reached the trillion-dollar mark, official development assistance has been on the decline and currently amounts to less than 5 per cent of the total spent on armaments. It is self-evident that such developments have serious implications for the economic prospects of the world, particularly those of the developing countries.

It may be recalled that the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly and first special session devoted to disarmament has established that in a world of limited resources there is a close relationship between expenditure on armaments and economic and social development. The actual gravity of the situation will be fully appreciated if we take into account that not only scarce material but also technical and human resources have been continuously diverted to the arms race which were more urgently needed for development in all countries, irrespective of their levels of development. The same document has further stressed that progress in disarmament would contribute positively to development and the narrowing of the gap between the developed and the developing countries.

As one of the least developed countries, Bangladesh has acutely felt that the huge material, technical and human resources which are being channelled towards the arms race should be directed to the elimination of global poverty. The close interaction between disarmament and development and the glaring discrepancy between the amounts spent on armaments and those spent on development do not need recounting. A number of delegations, including that of Bangladesh, have already quoted undisputed figures to prove that point. It has also been pointed out that

(Mr. Ali, Bangladesh)

the various studies on the subject which have been undertaken, both within and outside the United Nations, have established conclusively that disarmament and redirection of scarce global resources from the production of armaments would help both the developed and the developing countries alike by providing a much-needed stimulus to production, investment and international trade. The current critical international economic situation should inspire us to adopt concrete measures towards that end.

Bangladesh has had the privilege of being closely associated with all the initiatives that have been taken in the past on this issue. In its capacity as Chairman of the Co-ordinating Group on this subject at the second special session on disarmament, it made a sincere effort to harmonize the views of different groups. Subsequently, as Chairman of the Group of 77, it consistently advocated the de-escalation of the arms race and the optimum utilization of the available resources for the social and economic development of the developing countries. At preceding sessions of the United Nations General Assembly Bangladesh also fully supported the Nordic move on the subject. The French delegation at the last session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission took an important initiative in the matter. Bangladesh actively participated in the deliberations on this item, and we fully subscribed to the view expressed by several delegations that, in consideration of the importance and urgency of the matter, there should be a comprehensive discussion of it at a high political level. In this context, we extended our support to the French proposal for the convening of an international conference on the subject, to be preceded by meetings of the Preparatory Committee, both under the auspices of the United Nations. The purpose of convening such a conference has been clearly spelt out in the report of the Commission (A/39/42), and my delegation fully endorses that. In the United Nations Disarmament Commission there was no disagreement concerning the importance or urgency of this item; however, there were divergent perceptions of our future course of action. Consequently the Disarmament Commission could not come up with a consensus course of action. My delegation, however, takes this opportunity to compliment Ambassador Bhatt of Nepal on the exemplary manner in which he conducted the

(Mr. Ali, Bangladesh)

deliberations of the Working Group on the item as its Chairman at the last session of the Disarmament Commission.

In view of the urgency of the situation, my delegation would like to make an appeal to all concerned to demonstrate the necessary political will with a view to evolving a consensus course of action. In this difficult period in the international economic situation, the developing countries, particularly the least developed countries, are passing through a critical phase. Their development efforts have suffered a major set-back due to a number of economic factors beyond their control. To worsen the situation further, some of them, including my own country, have been adversely affected by natural calamities. Consequently every major sector in their economy has suffered decline. The actual economic performance of the developing countries since 1980 has been in stark contrast to the growth path traced in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade. In such a critical economic situation we cannot defer consideration of this item and keep on squandering our precious resources for destructive purposes when more than a billion people in the developing countries still live in abject poverty. Of these, more than 500 million suffer from chronic hunger and malnutrition. The situation clearly calls for the demonstration of the necessary political will to enter into a comprehensive discussion on the item at a high political level. In this spirit we fully support the early convening of an international conference on the relationship between disarmament and development, to be preceded by meetings of the Preparatory Committee, both under the auspices of the United Nations. My delegation once again pledges its full co-operation in all initiatives to that end. Scientific innovations and technological breakthroughs have placed vast powers and potentials at our disposal. Therefore it should be our sacred responsibility to use them judiciously for the betterment of the human race instead of wasting them on the arms race.

Mr. MASTAMAND (Afghanistan): At the outset, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate sincerely the delegation of the Soviet Union on the celebration of the sixty-seventh anniversary of the great October Revolution which, for the first time in the history of mankind, established the worker-State and a reliable support for a world liberation movement.

The question of chemical weapons is an important issue for which a proper and reasonable solution is yet to be found. All efforts, both bilateral and multilateral, towards concluding an international convention to ban chemical weapons have so far failed to produce tangible results. The responsibility for that failure is due to the intransigence of United States imperialism with its abhorrent behaviour. Indeed, the United States is the only country in the world which for over half a century has stubbornly refused to ratify the 1925 Geneva Protocol. During that time United States imperialism has sprayed more than 72 million litres of toxic chemicals and more than 100 million litres of agent orange, containing at least 130 kilograms of dioxin over Indo-China, particularly the territory of Viet Nam, killing thousands of innocent men, women and children and virtually destroying 130,000 hectares of arable land. As a result of those barbaric acts, more than 300 kilograms of food perished while millions in the third world suffered from hunger and malnutrition.

Dioxin has been shown - at least in laboratory animals - to be carcinogenic and tetragenic, and tests show that it is potentially mutagenic. What can be more miserable and horrible for a mother when, at the end of her difficult labour, she gives birth to a monster - because she was exposed to dioxin sprayed by aggressive imperialist forces. The use of chemical weapons in Viet Nam by the United States military has also had tragic effects on United States Army personnel, about which the New York Times, in its 11 May 1984 issue, stated that the contention between the Viet Nam veterans about agent orange, on one side, and seven chemical manufacturers, on the other, is still unresolved. Of 2.8 million Americans who served in Viet Nam, tens of thousands have claimed injury to themselves or genetic damage to their children from dioxin.

In March 1984, the Reagan Administration called on the United States Congress to authorize a race in chemical arms. In this connection, Peace Courier magazine

(Mr. Mastamand, Afghanistan)

stated that Mr. Reagan had said that, if the Congressmen were responsible people, they would approve the funds he had requested for the production of chemical weapons in 1985. He also emphasized that the allocation of funds for chemical weapons would compel "the other side" to agree to an accord with the United States.

The United States already has the largest chemical weapons arsenal in the world - more than 150,000 tons - plus 55,000 tons of new high-toxic stocks of nerve agents, a large part of which is deployed in Europe.

The Americans have put into service VX - the most powerful organosphosphorous toxic agent. This is an extremely toxic substance, whether taken through respiratory organs or applied to the skin. One kilogram of that agent can kill almost 4 million persons.

The United States Government has requested of the Congress an amount of \$10 billion for chemical weapons build-up. The amount to be spent on binary nerve gas weapons is included in that.

In addition, the whole world has been shocked once again by the disclosure of new facts concerning the genocide committed by United States imperialism by testing a new chemical weapon in Brazil. Those facts were revealed last week at Nairobi at a conference of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) by Sonia Regina, President of the Brazilian Ecological Organization, which calls itself "the movement for survival". She stated that the two hydro-power projects - or, rather, the two chemical-weapon-test companies, namely, the United States DOW Corporation and the Japanese company AGROMAX - had committed atrocious crimes in Amazonia, located in the north-east of Brazil, had killed more than 7,000 men, women and children and completely wiped out two Indian tribes. According to the report, United States imperialism tried to hide that crime. It flooded all the contaminated area on 6 September and prohibited the entry of journalists and specialists to the area that had been exposed to a massive test of poisonous chemicals. She also stated that the symptoms of poisoning were identical with those recorded in Viet Nam.

Moreover, excerpts from a secret letter of Paulo Neto, Secretary of the Special Environmental Protection Committee of Brazil, were read at the conference. They stated that the deleterious and irreversible effects of the test of chemical

(Mr. Mastamand, Afghanistan)

substance were similar to the effects of bombs, and that the contaminated area resembled the zone of a nuclear explosion.

The aforementioned facts show the real inhuman and aggressive nature of United States imperialism and its allies against mankind. All peace-loving countries must strongly condemn those atrocities and demand an immediate investigation into those criminal acts. For further information about the aforementioned recent barbaric actions, delegations may refer to the 600-page book written by Sonia Regina and given to UNEP.

In this regard, we strongly support the proposal of the Warsaw Treaty organization concerning the question of freeing Europe from chemical weapons. The elimination of chemical weapons from Europe would make it possible to reduce the risk of chemical war on the continent and, consequently, in the world. The overwhelming majority of States resolutely demand that the production of chemical weapons be halted, existing stockpiles of them destroyed, and the development of a new type of chemical weapons must be banned to save mankind from the danger of chemical war.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan attaches great importance to a complete ban on the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons. These dangerous weapons of mass annihilation must be completely wiped out of the arsenals of States.

Concerning the reduction of military budgets, I should like to mention that that is one of the measures recommended in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2). A number of resolutions have been adopted since the first proposal was made by the Soviet Union to the effect that the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council should be reduced by 10 per cent and the resources thus released should be devoted to the economic and social development of States.

(Mr. Mastamand, Afghanistan)

There has been a constant increase in the military budgets of States, in particular that of the United States. The Pentagon's budget amounts to \$292.9 billion, and an increase of 13.9 per cent was finally approved by the Congress.

It is necessary to take preventive measures as a matter of urgency. Such measures must be pointed in the right direction and must apply in the first place to the permanent members of the Security Council.

Regarding the relationship between disarmament and development, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan fully shares the profound concern of the majority of countries of the world that the arms race squanders enormous material and intellectual resources for non-productive purposes every year, while a great number of countries are suffering from malnutrition and disease and are deprived of elementary education and medical attention.

The intensification of the arms race would destroy and destabilize international economic relations and lessen the possibility of restructuring the new international economic order. For example, the cost of a single new nuclear submarine is equal to the annual education budget of 23 developing countries with a total of 160 million children. The absence of safe water and sanitation causes the death of 15 million children below the age of five. This costs \$40 billion a year, which is less than 28 days' world spending on arms at current rates.

It is also estimated that 5 million children die each year and another 5 million are left crippled. This could be prevented by immunization at a cost of \$2.5 billion - about what the world spends on the arms race every 32 hours. Finally, the arms race involves a terrible cost, amounting to more than \$1 million a minute, in a world where 40,000 children in developing countries are dying not every year or month or week, but every day.

The magazine of the International Foundation for Development states that the United States devotes over \$200 billion a year to military defence against the foreign enemy, but 45 per cent of Americans are afraid to go out alone at night within a mile of their homes.

The consumption of natural resources by the arms race is the main cause of joblessness, malnutrition and illiteracy in today's world; 600 million people have no jobs, 450 million people suffer from hunger and 120 million children are without schools.

(Mr. Mastamand, Afghanistan)

Finally, it is very necessary to stop the terrible arms race and save mankind from the dangerous situation in which we live.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Mr. ARSOV (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)) (interpretation from French): First I should like to reiterate the condolences which Mr. Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow, Director-General of UNESCO has already conveyed to the Indian Government in connection with the tragic death of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India and Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement. The late Mrs. Gandhi played a historic part not only in promoting the economic and social progress of her own people but also in developing cultural and scientific co-operation on an international scale, as Prime Minister of her country, and as a member of the Executive Council of UNESCO from 1960 to 1964.

In resolution 38/188 J of 20 December 1983, the General Assembly invited the specialized agencies and other organizations and programmes of the United Nations to broaden further their contribution, within their areas of competence, to the cause of arms limitation and disarmament.

That decision of the General Assembly reaffirmed UNESCO's competence in the field of disarmament, which is based primarily on its Constitution, which states that it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed.

The purpose of my statement today is to give as briefly as possible an account of UNESCO's activities since the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly in the fields of disarmament, the maintenance of peace and international understanding - activities which form part of its 1984-1985 programme - and thus to supplement the information circulated in documents A/39/544 and A/39/492.

At its twenty-second session, held in 1983, the General Conference of UNESCO adopted resolution 20, entitled "Role of UNESCO in fostering public opinion in favour of the cessation of the arms race and transition to disarmament". In that resolution the General Conference recalled the relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth and thirty-seventh sessions calling upon the specialized agencies of the United Nations system to intensify activities within their specific fields of competence to help disseminate information on the consequences of the arms race. Finally, the General Conference invited the Director-General, inter alia, "to adopt the measures necessary to follow up the

(Mr. Arsov, UNESCO)

relevant resolutions of the General Assembly on the subject of disarmament which are within the spheres of competence of UNESCO".

The Executive Board itself adopted a decision in which it reaffirmed its conviction that UNESCO has an important part to play in the United Nations system with regard to promoting disarmament, through research, education, the dissemination of information, communications and culture. The Executive Board further invited the Director-General to pursue the activities which UNESCO is undertaking in the field of education for disarmament and, in co-operation with the Department of Disarmament Affairs, to make a specific contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign.

Pursuant to the provisions I have just referred to, UNESCO has initiated a number of activities which relate to research, publications and training.

In the areas of research and publications, UNESCO has issued a publication on the obstacles to disarmament and ways of overcoming them which, inter alia, deals with the technical revolution and its impact on disarmament prospects. That study emphasizes the relationship between socio-economic development and the solution of problems connected with efforts to halt and reverse the arms race, and to promote the transition to disarmament.

As a result of an international symposium on science and international problems organized jointly with the Pugwash Conference in February 1982, UNESCO published an anthology of articles entitled "Scientists, the Arms Race and Disarmament" which covered such subjects as the role of science and technology in the arms race, the role of scientists in the arms race, the social responsibility of scientists, and so on. A translation of this publication into French and Spanish is under way.

Among other research and publications projects, we would mention the final report and recommendations of the inter-governmental conference on education for international understanding, co-operation and peace and education on human rights and fundamental freedoms, in order to develop a state of mind conducive to the strengthening of security and to disarmament. This conference took place in Paris in April 1983 and the report has been widely disseminated among those responsible for national education in member States, education specialists, teachers and everyone involved in the education process throughout the world.

(Mr. Arsov, UNESCO)

The drafting committee working on a methodological guide for the promotion of disarmament for the use of teachers met last May in Turin, Italy, in order to consider the first draft of that guide. The final version of that publication is to appear in 1985.

Another drafting committee, working on a manual on education on current world problems on the theme of education for peace, disarmament and human rights, which is designed for teachers, met in Morges, Switzerland, last July. The final editing of that manual is under way and it too will be published in 1985.

(Mr. Arsov, UNESCO)

An international study on co-operation among educational institutions and social institutions, particularly in information media in education for peace and disarmament, has been completed. A group of experts will shortly meet to prepare a report on the study. This report is also to be widely disseminated. In 1984 UNESCO is preparing a series of studies on the problems of armament and its impact on the spheres of its own competence. This will comprise research on the theoretical and practical aspects of the concept of security through disarmament and multidisciplinary studies on the most important factors in the arms race and the consequences of that arms race on the regional and international conflicts, and also studies on the impact of the arms race on education, science and technology, culture and communication.

Furthermore, UNESCO intends to prepare background material to illustrate the progress which could be achieved through disarmament in the fields of competence of UNESCO.

The 1983 Yearbook of UNESCO, containing studies on peace and conflicts, which will appear shortly, includes studies on ways of tackling the problems of peace and security, and detailed information on the activities of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.

Like those published in 1981 and 1982, this edition also contains methodological studies on teaching and research, as well as information on the development of institutions in these areas. Furthermore, a work entitled "Strategic doctrines and their influence on disarmament prospects", is also being prepared.

To refer now to the meetings which were convened by UNESCO during the period under review, we should mention, inter alia, the European regional meeting of experts on education organized by the Polish National Committee in December 1983 in Warsaw, which was the first meeting of experts as a follow-up to the intergovernmental conference on education for international understanding, co-operation and peace and education concerning human rights and fundamental freedoms with a view to developing a state of mind conducive to strengthening security and disarmament, which was held in Paris in April 1983.

That meeting in the Polish capital drew up proposals relating to the implementation in the European region of the recommendations emerging from the intergovernmental conference. The question of education for disarmament also occupied an important place in the proposals which were drawn up. A multilateral

(Mr. Arsov, UNESCO)

consultation to define concrete steps which will help to promote initiatives to follow up the conclusions reached by the intergovernmental conference of 1983, particularly in the light of the International Year of Peace, and to advise the Director-General concerning an educational development plan for understanding and co-operation in the area of international peace, took place in Finland last June.

Suggestions for an educational development plan for understanding and co-operation in international peace were drawn up in the course of that consultation. It is to be hoped that the implementation of this plan will make a significant contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign.

On 17 and 18 September 1984, UNESCO organized an informal consultation to draw up a frame of reference for an international research project on the relationship between peace, disarmament and development. This informal consultation took place at UNESCO headquarters in Paris and brought together five experts from specialized non-governmental institutions who participated in their personal capacity. The United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research and the United Nations University were also represented by observers. A total of 1,700 institutions in 86 member States which are participating in the system of associated schools studied matters related to disarmament. An international congress, which was held to celebrate the thirtieth anniversary of the system of associated schools was convened in Sofia, Bulgaria, from 12 to 16 September 1983.

The congress designed a medium-term strategy to develop the system, one of the purposes of which was to contribute to the implementation of a plan of action concerning education for disarmament. The final report of the congress has been widely distributed throughout the world.

Finally, I should like to refer to what UNESCO has done in order to encourage the activities of other agencies in the field of peace and disarmament. Thus, an international jury, composed of nine distinguished personalities, including Mr. Echeverria, Mr. Obasanjo, and Mr. Senghor, former Heads of State, respectively, of Mexico, Nigeria and Senegal, recently awarded UNESCO's prize for education for peace, to two world-known heart specialists, academician Evgeny Chazov of the Soviet Union and Professor Bernard Lown of the United States, who are Co-Presidents of the International Association for the Prevention of Nuclear War, a federation of 53 national organizations of doctors.

(Mr. Arsov, UNESCO)

UNESCO was also represented at the seminar on human rights and peace of the World Peace Council held in Geneva on 27 June 1984 and also at the thirty-fourth Pugwash conference on science and world affairs, which was held in Bjorkliden, Sweden, from 9 to 15 July 1984. A consultancy contract was also granted to an expert, so that he could prepare a document synthesizing the activities of UNESCO on disarmament and peace for the purposes of a meeting which is to be held by the University for Peace in Costa Rica, on peace, development and human rights in Central America and the Caribbean.

As in the past, the UNESCO programme for 1984-1985, in keeping with the constitutional purposes of our organization, is simply designed to encourage thinking about those factors which contribute to peace particularly by undertaking interdisciplinary research on the causes and consequences of armed conflicts and their different interpretations, by studying factors which go to make for peace and also by analysing international relations in their political, social and cultural dimensions.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): I wish, on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community, to address agenda item 60 (a): "Consideration of guidelines for confidence-building measures; report of the Disarmament Commission".

The Ten are of the view that the consideration of this item at the last session of the Disarmament Commission allows us to draw up a balance sheet on this question and to register considerable progress towards the goal of agreed guidelines for confidence-building measures.

The Ten believe that the large majority of member States share the view that the pursuit of this exercise to a successful conclusion would make a valuable contribution towards the promotion of the concept of confidence-building measures, particularly in respect of the military aspects of security.

For the Ten, confidence-building measures, while not a substitute for disarmament, do provide considerable potential for creating conditions favourable to progress in the field of disarmament. For the approach envisaged in reaching agreements on such measures, the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations must be observed, in particular respect for sovereign equality, refraining from the threat or use of force, respect for the territorial integrity of States, peaceful settlement of disputes, non-intervention, respect for human rights, equal rights and self-determination of peoples and co-operation among States.

(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

The immediate objective in pursuing a course designed to achieve confidence-building measures is to reduce, and to the extent possible, to eliminate the causes of mistrust, fear, misunderstanding and miscalculations in respect of the military activities of other States. It is, however, essential to bear in mind, in approaching such measures, that neither mere declarations of intent nor a repetition of generally recognized principles can effectively dispel suspicion and perceptions of threat.

(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

If they are to contribute to international security, confidence-building measures must be concrete in nature thereby giving effect to the duty of States to refrain from the use or threat of use of force. In so far as confidence-building measures deal with the military aspects of security they should overcome the subjective misconceptions and lack of trust concerning the intentions of States which result from insufficient knowledge about opposing military forces. For this reason such measures require the provision of reliable information through enhanced knowledge of military activities and other matters pertaining to mutual security. Confidence building is an incremental process, developed gradually through the mutually perceived implementation by the parties to such arrangements, until there is established a comprehensive network of confidence-building measures that provide the sound basis on which more far-reaching agreements in the sphere of international security and disarmament can be built.

To be effective confidence-building measures must at least be politically binding, otherwise they will inevitably fall victim to vicissitudes in international relations. Equally they must be seen to be implemented through verification measures commensurate with the scope of what is to be verified, and such verification must guarantee that no State obtains advantages over others at any particular stage of the confidence-building process.

Measures of the kind we have been discussing lend themselves particularly to treatment in a regional context. The Ten are currently engaged at Stockholm in the Conference on Confidence- and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE). In conformity with the mandate agreed for the Conference, the Ten are actively pursuing in a first stage negotiated agreement on a set of militarily significant and verifiable confidence- and security-building measures covering the whole of Europe and designed to diminish the risk of military confrontation there. Success in this endeavour would pave the way to a second stage of the Conference where the participating States would continue their efforts for security and disarmament in Europe, in particular by controlled reductions of armaments.

(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

The Ten believe that the further elaboration and finalization in a United Nations framework of guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures and for their implementation on a global or regional level would be an important achievement. They consider that the Chairman's composite draft, submitted to the United Nations Disarmament Commission Working Group on this subject at its session earlier this year, offers a good starting point for the further elaboration of a set of guidelines which will prove acceptable to all. Member delegations of the Ten have already indicated their support, in principle, for these draft guidelines. We hope, therefore, that this Assembly will request the Disarmament Commission to continue and conclude its consideration of this item at an appropriate time.

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The Zionist representative of Israel spoke this morning and in his statement he included distortions.

The CHAIRMAN: If this statement is in exercise of the right of reply, I must say that time has been allotted for such statements at the end of today's meetings. Therefore, I ask the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to reserve his right to reply at the end of our meeting this afternoon. Some representatives who spoke yesterday afternoon have already indicated their desire to exercise their right of reply. We should adhere to the same principle for all such statements and hear them at the end of this afternoon's meeting. Is that acceptable to the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic?

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish also to reserve my right to answer at a later time the claims of the Zionist representative of Israel. I do not ask to exercise my right of reply this afternoon, but I reserve my right to speak at a later, suitable time to be decided by the delegation of my country.

The meeting rose at 12 noon