

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1841st  
MEETING**

Wednesday, 1 December 1971,  
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda items 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 98 (continued):	
General and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament	
Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament	
Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament	
Establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency	
Status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2666 (XXV) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General	
Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security: report of the Secretary-General	
Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace	
General debate (continued) .....	1

Chairman: Mr. Milko TARABANOV (Bulgaria).

**AGENDA ITEMS 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 AND 98  
(continued)**

**General and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/8328, A/8337, A/8457, A/C.1/1018, A/C.1/L.588, 589 and 591)**

**Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/8457, A/C.1/L.578 to 582 and 592)**

**Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/8457, A/C.1/L.583 to 585)**

**Establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (A/C.1/L.594)**

**Status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2666 (XXV) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General (A/8336/Rev.1, A/8346, A/8435, A/C.1/L.587)**

**Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security: report of the Secretary-General (A/8469 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.593)**

**Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace  
(A/8492 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.590)**

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It might be thought at first glance that the delegation of a country of a modest economic condition, that lacks nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, that possesses only a limited number of conventional weapons and a very small army, ought to remain modestly silent when disarmament questions are discussed in this Organization. Yet it should not be so, for as soon as we examine these matters we must realize that they are of deep concern to all countries, and particularly, for reasons that I shall detail in a few moments, to the developing countries.

2. Indeed, in the report of the Secretary-General on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security [A/8469] a number of statements are made regarding the developing countries.

3. First, in paragraph 32 it is stated that:

“Although military spending in developing countries is very low in relation to that of the advanced countries, it is significant that in the decade of the sixties the rate of growth of military expenditures was appreciably faster in the developing countries than the world average—in contrast to what has happened in the six nations which are the major military spenders. Against a world rise of about 3 to 4 per cent a year, military spending in the developing countries has been increasing at a rate of some 7 per cent a year.”

4. Secondly, with reference to the number of personnel in the armed forces of the world in 1970, the report points out, in paragraph 37, that:

“Virtually all of the increase in military manpower occurred in the developing countries, whose share of the over-all total for the world’s armed forces is now about 37 per cent, in contrast to a 6 per cent share in military expenditure.”

5. Thirdly, in explaining the acceleration of the arms race, the report in paragraph 41 goes on as follows:

“The soldier does not wish to be outnumbered or ‘out-gunned’ by a potential enemy, or potentially out-

manoeuvred because of his greater mobility, or neutralized by his better defences. This applies as much to the developing countries which import their weapons as it does to the most powerful industrial nations which develop and manufacture them.”

6. Fourthly, with reference to the dissemination, during the past decade, of complex armaments in the developing countries, the report points out, in paragraph 46, that:

“... those countries have also been diverting more of their scarce technical manpower to military purposes, paying for them to be trained abroad, or employing foreign technicians ...”

7. Fifthly, the report explains, in paragraph 50, that the wealthy countries continue their participation in the technological arms race, among other reasons, because “... they can export modern weapons and so produce them on a larger scale, with reduced unit costs”.

8. Those few succinct excerpts should suffice to highlight the fact that since war is a contagious phenomenon which, as history repeatedly proves, tends inevitably to spread, the amassing of arms, which is one of its causes as well as an inevitable result, likewise spreads even among the developing countries, whose resources should normally be allocated to imperative collective needs rather than to preparations for war.

9. Thus the arms race among the great Powers that possess nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction, while it places the world on the verge of annihilating human as well as all other life, since it deprives the process of development of those immense resources that are devoted to military expenditure, is contributing to the increase of disease, ignorance, poverty and the numerous privations of the developing peoples, and, in fact, of all peoples.

10. When we know that the world invests two and one-half times more in military expenditures than it does for health purposes; that investment in construction of housing, demanded by people all over the world, was only between 3 and 3.5 per cent of the total of gross national product; that medical research used only \$4,000 million as compared to \$25,000 million used for technological research and development in the military field; when we know that between 1960 and 1970 almost \$1,900,000 million was devoted to military ends; that in the year 1970, military expenditures amounted to almost \$200,000 million, that is, between 6 and 6.5 per cent of the total world gross national product; that the developing countries—countries that urgently require resources to meet pressing collective needs—poured into military expenditures, according to a 1970 report, more than \$12,000 million—when, I repeat, we know all these facts, these astounding facts that indicate with dazzling clarity how human and material resources are being squandered, we arrive at the dramatic question of whether mankind is not in fact preparing the final catastrophe, from both ends, as it were: first, by stockpiling to the maximum material best designed for self-annihilation, and secondly, by proportionately increasing the aggressiveness that lies in the human spirit and that could cause the final explosion.

11. For human survival and for the attainment of a social co-existence that will meet the biological craving for order of human beings, we must absolutely stem the arms race, take determined steps towards general and complete disarmament, encourage economic and social development by every means at our disposal, and exchange aggressiveness and tendencies to violence for efforts that may lead to fair limitation and conciliation of possible conflicting interests.

12. Today the world picture is one of generalized violence both among certain organized societies and also in the internal functioning of many of them. Acts of aggression, border violations, assaults and outbursts of aggressiveness in general constitute virtually habitual features spreading through human communities on the national and international levels. Furthermore, with ever-increasing frequency we see the emergence of situations of instability capable of touching off grave crises and leading to bellicose conflicts which in turn can have chain reactions.

13. The truth, borne out by well-known facts, is that the race to accumulate nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and the ceaseless pursuit of technological perfection in the art of killing, far from ensuring the security of any State, plunges all States into the greatest insecurity and implies the risk of the elimination of all mankind.

14. The arms race no longer makes any sense, and the investment of further resources in it means only the curtailment of economic growth and social progress of all countries, the intensification of collective insecurity and fear, and the creation of a climate conducive to every kind of violence.

15. Therefore, we shall have to go back to the beginning of the race to accumulate arms, thus freeing the resources that stimulate the process of development. We appreciate the efforts that have been exerted to this end, both in this Organization and in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, but at the same time we are constrained to note that the results thus far achieved can at best be termed modest. Those efforts will have to be redoubled, they will have to be directed towards the goal of general and complete disarmament, so that patiently and perseveringly we may be able to achieve some gradual success that may stave off the risk of a war of extermination.

16. Uruguay signed the Treaty prohibiting nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water,<sup>1</sup> on 5 August 1963 in Moscow, and will support any measure leading to the banning of underground tests of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons.

17. On 27 January 1967, Uruguay signed the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies [*resolution 2222 (XXI), annex*] and on 28 April 1968 we signed the Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space [*resolution 2345 (XXII), annex*].

<sup>1</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480 (1963), No. 6964.

18. Uruguay also signed the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America,<sup>2</sup> on 14 February 1967, and on 1 July 1968 we signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*]. Furthermore, the Uruguayan delegation supported the four resolutions relating to the work of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States [*resolutions 2456 A, B, C and D (XXIII)*] and also the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof [*resolution 2660 (XXV), annex*]. As far as that last Treaty is concerned, we deplored the fact that the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction had not been extended to all the seas and oceans considered as a whole.

19. My delegation considers highly praiseworthy the proposal made by the delegation of the Soviet Union on the convening of a conference of the nuclear Powers [*see A/8328*]. Surely the responsibility for avoiding the cataclysm of a nuclear war, and of encouraging the use of nuclear energy in science, industry, agriculture, medicine and all those peaceful uses that will be beneficial to mankind, is mainly incumbent upon those Powers. If the nuclear Powers turn their study to nuclear disarmament they will, I am convinced, find adequate formulae to achieve it. But anyway, the holding of such a conference would in itself engender an atmosphere of *détente* and create confidence in international relations, which, in turn, would have a beneficial effect on the process of disarmament in all its aspects.

20. With regard to the draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction, prepared by the Committee on Disarmament [*A/8457, annex A*], my delegation considers that, generally speaking, it is a praiseworthy effort. However, we deplore the fact that it does not prohibit chemical weapons also, but we must admit that it is an important measure, since it would put an end to the possession of one of those abominable ways of killing people and because it attests to the determination, as the draft itself says, to achieve "effective progress towards general and complete disarmament including the prohibition and elimination of all types of weapons of mass destruction" as the ultimate goal.

21. My delegation will therefore support draft resolutions A/C.1/L.579, 580 and 581 on that draft convention as well as the Mexican proposal on the commitment to be assumed by States parties to the convention on bacteriological and toxin weapons to abstain from any additional manufacture of chemical agents for warlike ends [*A/C.1/L.578*] and the insertion in the preamble of that draft convention of a new paragraph which is contained in document A/C.1/L.582 and which affirms "that a substantial portion of the savings derived from measures in the field of disarmament should be devoted to promoting economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries". We believe that the extension of this principle—that is, the promotion and encouragement of development that should absorb the resources which today are wasted in military expenditure—

will be the one step that will give the peoples of the world security in an atmosphere of peace that will be increasingly clearer, stronger and more enduring as development progresses and becomes consolidated.

22. My delegation also supports the draft resolutions calling for the prohibition of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and also the initiative of Ceylon concerning the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace [*A/8492 and Add.1*].

23. Furthermore, my delegation is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/L.387 calling for the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, and hopes that all the nuclear Powers, by subscribing to that Protocol and ratifying it, will once and for all help to give full effectiveness to a peace treaty intended to ensure the absence of nuclear weapons in a vast inhabited zone of the world. Such signatures and ratifications, apart from directly consolidating the advantages of a treaty of peace of this nature, covering as it does the Latin American region, would I am sure also constitute a beginning of understanding among the nuclear Powers which the world demands and awaits.

24. I should like in conclusion to make two comments.

25. The first relates to the creation within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency of an international service for nuclear explosions under appropriate international control. I should like to point out that, because of its competence and its recognized efficiency, it is the Agency itself that should carry out this international service, without the establishment of a new international institute until circumstances determine that it is indispensable.

26. The other comment I should like to make relates to the convening of a world disarmament conference, proposed by the Soviet Union.<sup>3</sup> My delegation resolutely supports that proposal. Disarmament items are of interest to all States, developed or developing, wealthy or poor, because when all is said and done questions of disarmament are of interest to all mankind, since the fate of all mankind is at stake. It is for this reason that, at the proposed conference, organized by the United Nations and held within the framework of the Organization, full universality should be the goal, for the United Nations must try to achieve that as a permanent proof of its existence and its functioning. At the same time, high institutional importance would have to be attached to world public opinion, since all the aspects of disarmament would be discussed before the eyes of the world, from an end to the insane arms race and the elimination of all nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction to the adoption of the most appropriate measures to achieve general and complete disarmament and to ensure that resources being freed by disarmament shall be channelled to development and the progressive welfare of peoples.

27. Furthermore, my delegation understands that at that conference, as is the case here in the United Nations where

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 634 (1968), No. 9068.

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 97, document A/8491.

we all work, no important success can be chalked up for peace, no targets can be achieved in the problems arising out of the confrontation of interests that tend to precede warlike undertakings; and warlike conflicts themselves cannot be solved if we do not, first of all, disarm the minds of the people concerned, freeing them from the idea of gaining encouragement or impetus for the satisfaction of one-sided interests; if we do not free those minds of rivalry, mistrust, suspicion and hatred, and achieve such a degree of understanding that all will come to the United Nations, not to chalk up political successes or political points, but in order to win peace, through compliance with and application of the principles of understanding, conciliation, negotiation, as set forth in the text of the United Nations Charter, and, therefore, turn aggressiveness and the tendency to violence to channels that will lead to just limitations and to harmonizing conflicting interests.

28. Mr. VAN USSEL (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): In our general statement at the beginning of this general debate [1829th meeting] we did not deal with the matter of biological and chemical weapons; we reserve our right to make a separate statement on the subject. As we are coming to the end of our debate the time seems appropriate to offer to the Committee the comments of a country which, while following with interest the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, is however not a member of it.

29. Belgium, when viewing the draft convention just worked out on the prohibition of biological weapons and toxins [A/8457, annex A], sees several reasons for satisfaction.

30. First, we have always advocated, together with other delegations—especially the United Kingdom, which as early as July 1969 put forward a draft convention<sup>4</sup>—that, while continuing to deal at the same time with the two types of weapons, one should not indefinitely link the fate of negotiations on biological weapons to those on chemical weapons. Since the conditions for an agreement were met for biological weapons and since difficulties persisted in the negotiations relating to the other weapons, we thought that for the first category it was necessary to act fast before technological progress transformed biological weapons into an extremely dangerous instrument. Happily this is what has been done at a time when no State was yet basing its security on biological weapons, which is the reason that today we have a new international instrument in the field of disarmament.

31. The second reason for satisfaction, and a very important one, is the following. The draft worked out by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is, in fact, the first international measure aimed at the elimination of a weapon of mass destruction, since it provides for the elimination of existing stockpiles. We may be told that the agreement deals with weapons which, because of the unforeseeable nature of the effects of their use, have not yet acquired a recognized military value.

32. But the development of molecular biology has already reached such a degree that scientists were able to glimpse

<sup>4</sup> For the text of the draft convention, see *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1970*, document DC/233, annex C, sect. 2.

the horrifying possibilities of extermination which could result from large military investment programmes, and it is more than probable that the full import of the prohibition which the General Assembly will probably recommend to Governments will appear only in the future. We shall then be able to congratulate ourselves for having, through our foresight today, avoided terrible suffering for mankind.

33. A third reason for satisfaction is that the draft convention has confirmed the ability of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to conclude negotiation of an international disarmament convention within a most reasonable time. The actual talks started only after 30 March, but they have offered the possibility to each group of countries of putting forward its views and of bringing about appreciable improvements in the draft.

34. A fourth reason for satisfaction is that the text proposed by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is a good convention. In the course of negotiations it underwent substantial changes, which have enhanced its merits: I recall the fact that many amendments proposed by non-aligned countries have been taken into consideration; the introduction in article VII of an assistance provision modelled on the one advocated by the British delegation in the 1969 draft, and especially the changes made in article I which, according to the interpretation accepted by all delegations—if I am not mistaken—mean that the convention remains in force in time of war.

35. That, in our opinion, is the capital element of the last phase of the negotiations. For a long time, in international law, war has been considered as a brutal event, effectively abrogating existing treaties. But as time went on, especially for the past century, that principle became more flexible by dint of numerous interpretations. In order to avoid any ambiguity, the parties to the negotiations finally mentioned explicitly that the convention would remain in force in time of war. This is an important precedent, which ensures progress in the implementation of the law of treaties in the field of disarmament. The authors of future agreements shall from now on not be able to decline to specify explicitly the validity in time of war of the commitments and of the convention, especially if these commitments relate to obligations concerning non-production or non-acquisition. Thus the convention, if all the countries adhere to it, would make impossible in practice the use of biological weapons even in time of war. This situation should make it possible in the future to engage in a new assessment of the problem of reservations to the Geneva Protocol<sup>5</sup> expressed by many countries. Therefore, the Belgian authorities intend to study, after the entry into force of the new convention, the possibility, as far as biological weapons and toxins are concerned, of abandoning the reservations put forward by it during the ratification of the 1925 Protocol.

36. For the interpretation of various articles of the draft convention proposed to us we shall have at our disposal the records of the work of the Committee on Disarmament where, for three years, there has been a very close scrutiny

<sup>5</sup> Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV, 1929, No. 2138).

of the subject. Several statements made in this Committee, especially those of the Soviet Union and the United States [1827th meeting], have already given us a broad picture of the main problems of interpretation.

37. All these reasons have led Belgium to sponsor, with many other delegations, draft resolution A/C.1/L.579. By approving it, the General Assembly would pave the way to the signature and ratification of a new international instrument in the field of disarmament, an instrument which above all and for the first time has to do with actual genuine disarmament. In this connexion we understand the concern of non-aligned countries who sponsored the amendment in document A/C.1/L.582 relating to the use of savings resulting from disarmament. We hope that a text will be worked out in order to meet their concern, a text acceptable to all Member States of the United Nations.

38. Before leaving the field of biological weapons, I would like to say a few words about the role of the Security Council in the verification of respect for various prohibitions contained in the draft convention. Under article VI it is to the Security Council that complaints relating to breach of obligations are to be presented.

39. Several times in the Committee on Disarmament mention was made of a draft resolution which would be submitted to the Council and which would request that the latter declare itself ready to assume the role provided for it in the procedure for the lodging of complaints. Several delegations advocated the setting up of a technical phase of investigation before the Security Council takes up the political aspects of the complaint. The Belgian authorities share these views, and it must be recognized that the draft in articles V and VI has been improved so that to a certain extent it meets the concern of those who recommended that possibilities be given for technical consultation and investigation. Our delegation shares the interpretation of the British representative in the Committee on Disarmament of the existence of a link between articles V and VI. Data gathered under the procedures provided for in article V can serve as the technical foundation for a complaint lodged under article VI.

40. We would like in passing to draw the attention of the Secretariat, and later the depositary Government of the convention, to a divergence in the meaning of article VI between the French and English texts as they are to be found in the report of the Committee on Disarmament. The English word "initiate" is improperly rendered in French by *entreprendre* which gives to the French text a quite different significance.

41. We have in our files two draft resolutions, one from the United Kingdom,<sup>6</sup> the other, submitted on 10 August in Geneva, by Hungary, Mongolia and Poland [A/8457, annex C, sect. 21]; and to this day neither of these documents has become the object of negotiation.

42. As a member of the Security Council, Belgium wishes to see the Council take advantage of the opportunity offered by this new convention, and through a resolution to

determine its role in the machinery for verification of respect for contractual obligations. This role, in our opinion, would come within the general framework of the primary responsibility of the Security Council under the Charter in the field of strengthening of international security. Without prejudice to the powers granted to it by the Charter, especially in Chapter VII but also Chapter VI, relating to the peaceful settlement of disputes, the Council could work out in this fashion a doctrine on the way in which it is to discharge its obligations as a supreme arbiter and judge recognized to it by treaties such as the one which we are now considering. Such consideration should lead to an increase in the prestige of the Council and its authority and thus to the strengthening of international peace and security.

43. All these reasons for satisfaction do not lead us to forget that the draft is a result of a compromise, nor that many delegations are disappointed at not being confronted with a text which at the same time prohibits all chemical weapons. We readily understand this disappointment but—and this is not the least advantage of the draft—several paragraphs spell out the necessary link between chemical and biological weapons, and article IX sets forth a principle and an undertaking both of which are very clear. Despite difficulties in setting up a control system acceptable to all, the will to pursue efforts in the search for a solution has never been defined as clearly as today. Thus, we consider it to be the imperative duty for the members of the Committee on Disarmament during their next session to go beyond the present debate and, through imaginative action, to seek an agreement on chemical weapons.

44. Several delegations, such as those of Sweden and the Netherlands, made very interesting statements in the Committee on Disarmament and have attempted this year to ensure greater progress for the work of the Committee on Disarmament. But probably no result will be achieved if some indefinitely continue blandly to ignore the technical aspects of control. If we wish to succeed we have to go beyond simple political statements and undertake true negotiations.

45. Belgium possesses neither biological nor chemical weapons but its scientific possibilities, especially its highly developed chemical industry, would enable it easily to set up its own stockpiles. However, it wishes to state solemnly that it has not the slightest intention of doing so.

46. It expects to see in 1972 a considerable speeding up in negotiations on chemical weapons. It is our firm hope that all conditions will be fulfilled for all the great military Powers to take part in the talks which would enhance the chances of final agreement, because we must reasonably understand—while deploring them—the hesitations of Governments to move towards decisions as important as those which would prohibit the production or acquisition of chemical weapons, accompanied by the destruction of stockpiles, whilst States possessing considerable military forces and power were not parties to the talks.

47. Our hope to see negotiations on chemical weapons continue and reach their conclusion has led us to join in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/L.580. For the same reasons we are greatly interested in the memorandum

<sup>6</sup> See *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1970*, document DC/233, annex C, sect. 2.

presented last September to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament by the group of non-aligned countries. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.581 presented here by that group aims at the same objective as the text which we sponsored and we are convinced that consultations among the sponsors of the two drafts would lead to the submission of a common text.

48. Mr. TANAKA (Japan): I wish to make a brief statement on the proposal finally circulated today by Ceylon and some other countries, that is, the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace [A/C.1/L.590].

49. We have followed carefully the evolution of this proposal ever since it was requested by Ceylon for inclusion in the agenda of the current session [A/8492 and Add.1], and we believe that the present draft resolution embodies various suggestions and amendments put forward by the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean during the intensive consultations which took place thereafter in order to accommodate the wishes of the States in the region.

50. The Japanese delegation appreciates the endeavours made by the Ceylonese delegation to reflect in their proposal the ideals enshrined in the Lusaka Declaration.<sup>7</sup> We are indeed sympathetic to the aspirations of the States in this region to avoid the scourge of war and not to be involved in great Power rivalries. We whole-heartedly agree with the view that the countries of the Indian Ocean need conditions of peace and tranquillity in which to develop and modernize their economies and societies.

51. It is the earnest hope of my country that peace and prosperity may prevail in the whole region of Asia and my Government has a deep and abiding interest in the exploration of measures to ensure peace in the Indian Ocean, which is inseparably linked with Asia. Furthermore, to Japan, the Indian Ocean is one of the most important sea areas through which, for instance, about 90 per cent of our oil imports are transported. The Japanese economy is so overwhelmingly dependent on trade with countries all over the world that Japan is second to none in desiring peace in the ocean as well as freedom of navigation of vessels carrying our imports and exports through the seven seas. The preservation of a peaceful environment in the Indian Ocean is particularly vital for securing the regular and intensive flow of goods between Japan, the Middle East and Africa, as well as Europe. Therefore, we are prepared to co-operate with the littoral States and other major maritime Powers to explore the possibilities of finding out what would be the most effective and practical approach to the maintenance of peace and stability in the Indian Ocean.

52. In the past, a number of proposals were made and resolutions were adopted with respect to disarmament on a regional scale, in the various forums of disarmament. Three notable examples are the Antarctic Treaty,<sup>8</sup> the Treaty of Tlatelolco<sup>9</sup> concerning the nuclear-free zone in Latin

America, and the Organization of African Unity's declaration of Africa as a nuclear-free zone.<sup>10</sup> It is indeed in line with Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter that steps should be taken to strengthen international peace and security by having recourse to regional arrangements and action.

53. However, it must be borne in mind that since the zone of the Indian Ocean seems to refer to a vast but geographically ambiguous area, extending from Asia to Africa and Oceania, the determination of the zone of application of the proposed declaration could well be far more complicated than any of the previous cases of regional disarmament. We are not yet clear on whether the zone is limited to areas beyond national jurisdiction or whether it covers some areas within national jurisdiction.

54. Furthermore, the proposed declaration is not only confined to nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction but also comprehends military bases, installations and logistical facilities conceived in the context of great Power rivalry.

55. Also, we note that the draft declaration might imply that the free and unimpeded use of the high seas and the air space above may be restricted as concerns warships and military aircraft under certain conditions. With full respect for the security and territorial integrity of States in the region, we should like to point out that discussions are at present going on in the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction on the matter related to this subject and we have to take into due consideration the relationship between the general régime of the high seas and a regional arrangement concerning a part of the high seas.

56. In dealing with measures of disarmament and security in a specific region, it is axiomatic that such measures must truly reflect the interests and desires of the States in the region. We believe that the countries of the Indian Ocean region yearn to stand outside the military confrontation and competition of the great Powers. The present proposal before us seems to be a symbol of the request for peace by the States in the region and therefore it must be respected, even if some countries may have reservations on some aspects of its implications and implementation.

57. At this very moment, the peace of the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent is endangered, as a number of armed clashes testify. If the tension is exacerbated by the competitive build-up of rival forces in and around the Indian Ocean, we might face the possibility of an expansion of hostilities. In the light of the present situation prevailing in the region, we believe that the proposal as put forward by Ceylon and the other sponsors deserves careful consideration.

58. On 27 November 1971, five countries of South-East Asia bordering the Indian Ocean issued a declaration making South-East Asia a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality, free from interference by outside Powers [see A/C.1/1019]. The Declaration of the Association of South-East Asian Nations clearly expresses the wish of the

<sup>7</sup> Declaration adopted at the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Lusaka from 8-10 September 1970.

<sup>8</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 402 (1961), No. 5778.

<sup>9</sup> Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (*ibid.*, vol. 634 (1968), No. 9068).

<sup>10</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 105, document A/5975.



Asian countries to engage in positive efforts to solve problems of peace with which they are directly concerned. In this respect, the Declaration is based on a common aspiration which has also inspired the proposed declaration for establishing a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

59. In conclusion, I wish to stress that the proposed declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace merits careful and sympathetic handling by this Committee. Japan, as an Asian country, is naturally sympathetic to the aspirations and goals pursued by Asian countries. However, I feel that the present form of the proposed declaration would need further elaboration. We are prepared to co-operate in entering into consultations with the countries concerned on how to achieve our useful purposes. We hope that the Committee will be able to strike a reasonable balance between the far-reaching implications of the proposal, requiring thorough study, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the urgent necessity of arriving at an understanding among the regional States and the great Powers to refrain from taking steps that would aggravate or disrupt the delicate situation prevailing in the region of the Indian Ocean.

60. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia): My first duty in the observations that I am about to make is to extend the best wishes of the Liberian delegation to the representatives of the People's Republic of China in this Committee and to the delegation as a whole. It is our fervent wish that their membership and participation in the disarmament negotiations will contribute to the progress of the United Nations.

61. My delegation enters upon this debate on items 27, 28, 29, 30 and 98 with the greatest trepidation. If we make bold to speak now, it is only because we think it is better to ask questions if one does not know the answers. We are in a quandary as to the technical details and capabilities of inspection, complete disarmament, nuclear explosion for peaceful purposes, chemical and bacteriological weapons, the selection of one out of so many oceans as a zone of peace. Finally, we ask, what part are small nations to play in the peace of the world? Will the developed States put their savings from disarmament into the infrastructural development of the developing States?

62. Technological advancement has wrought drastic changes in the lives and attitudes of men. It is unanimously agreed that nuclear armaments pose threats not only to the developed nations, but also to the small States. Yet the nuclear Powers have arrogated to themselves the solution of the problems of the world without realizing that the views of the small nations at times may be clearer than the views of the few nuclear Powers.

63. While it is conceded that the specifics of so complex a subject cannot be negotiated in a General Assembly debate and that, therefore, a small committee should be appointed to sit continuously in order to negotiate details and meetings of minds, and while the responsibility for disarmament rests in the first instance upon the major Powers, we think that they should never lose sight of the fact that the developing countries have a vital stake in disarmament, not only for peace and survival, but because the consequences of its success or failure affect their social and economic development.

64. We often hear in this Committee of consultations taking place, but some of us have never been called in for consultation, even if others are called. On matters of such great weight the big Powers must show respect for us and our feelings even if they do not agree with our views. Power involves responsibility. It must be demonstrated not only when they need our votes, but at all times. Their long-term interest will not be jeopardized by doing so. The Good Book says: "He that is greatest among you let him be your servant."

65. The items before us do not lend themselves to resolutions and conventions. They are concerned in the last analysis with foreign policies of States and the morality of nations.

66. The debate thus far has not convinced some of us that genuine peace is sincerely envisaged in the inscription of these items. Instead of letting bygones be bygones and turning over a new leaf for peace, we have at times been entertained with outworn clichés and condemnations wholly irrelevant in such a period of serious reflection on the impending catastrophe of nuclear war. From all indications in this debate, the nuclear Powers are seemingly only competing for the leadership of the developing States.

67. Nuclear weapons of any dimension, be it for defence or offence, should be deprecated. They are a danger and a threat to the security of those without such capability. Human beings are not angels. Weapons of all kinds must be eliminated, especially those in the nuclear, chemical and bacteriological categories. The psychology of bigness and its effect on the security thinking of small States is demoralizing. Even in the absence of nuclear and bacteriological weapons, the mere size of a nation with conventional arms for so-called defence purposes poses a serious concern for all small neighbouring States.

68. In war and in peace, prestige is a factor to be reckoned with. Technological races always hold new surprises in store for men. Technicians and Governments are more or less confronted with fresh problems daily, and these problems are in need of constant reappraisal.

69. If the nations with nuclear and other weapons are for peace, as they would have us believe in this Committee, why do they keep on bickering among themselves? Why do they not let down the barriers to free inspection on the spot? The open society is the most desirable form of diplomatic practice. Treaties are binding only in an atmosphere of mutual interest. When national interests conflict, treaties, however laudable, are undermined. The reason is that the great Powers are not willing to rely on each other's good faith. Treaties and conventions are too elastic to bind them. Neither side wants to depend on promises alone. Mutual distrust is the concomitant of deep-seated antagonism.

70. Year in and year out the United Nations has considered ways towards disarmament. Committees upon committees, commissions upon commissions in and out of the United Nations have for many years grappled with the problem, only to meet with failure and frustration. Although all of us insist that the task is urgent, the outlook is still bleak. Hostility and mistrust create road-blocks to disarmament.

71. Notwithstanding all the obstacles we face, we must not give up the task. We must remember that "Rome was not built in a day", and behind all these talks—bickerings—there is a smiling face somewhere. Benevolent self-interest may in due course induce acquiescence in the schemes we may promulgate. A disarmed world under law requires some institution to settle disputes and enforce compliance; it requires some institution to assume the defence of any Power against violators. Although the attainment of this goal is extremely difficult, it is not necessarily impossible. Its achievement lies in the field of politics and law.

72. Self-preservation being the first law of nations and men, and with the present *détente* among the great Powers unhampered, we look forward to the day when words like socialist-imperialist, capitalist-imperialist and scientific-socialist will be thrown into the refuse heap of forgotten words. No one can win a modern war; even the victor loses.

73. Until we can generate feasible solutions for our present predicament, let us continue like Hamlet, preferring "to bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of". We must proceed step by step until the light breaks through.

74. My delegation is a sponsor of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.579 and 582. Although we have some reservations, we think they serve the purpose for the time being. Our thanks are due to the members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament for the excellent work they have done in introducing the draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction [A/8457, annex A].

75. The bugbear to banning nuclear tests is the problem of inspection; given the basic physical aspects of inspection—ground inspection and aerial inspection—its effectiveness is uncertain and inconclusive. Perhaps if non-physical inspection is added to the physical, we may make the task much simpler. This again depends on confidence to ensure adequacy. Perhaps a mutual defence treaty involving all the nations of the world might be an antidote to fear and suspicion.

76. The great Powers must disarm not to save money for the developing countries—much as they are in need—but only because they love peace.

77. In subscribing to the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, my delegation congratulates the Ambassador of Ceylon for inscribing the item on the agenda. Notwithstanding certain reservations, my delegation will support the item in any acceptable draft resolution.

78. As an earnest of our desire for disarmament and world peace, the Liberian delegation will support any constructive plan for effective disarmament.

79. Since war originated in the hearts of men, complete disarmament will come from human necessity. With responsiveness on the part of the great Powers to bear each other's burdens and to recognize the imperatives of our time, they

have a chance to ensure the survival of our planet. The path to normality in an immoral world is not a rosy one. There are thorns strewn all over our pathway. But we are confident that with perseverance, courage and patience we shall win. To permit the nuclear arms race to continue, with its perils for all mankind, would be madness.

80. My delegation reserves its right to speak on the draft resolutions when they are properly put before us.

81. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation would like to make a number of comments with respect to the debate on disarmament that has been taking place in the First Committee.

82. The discussion is of great interest. It reflects the concern of a wide circle of States at the growing arms race and has provided much material for the further consideration of concrete questions relating to disarmament. The debate touched on a large number of problems connected with general and nuclear disarmament and with regional disarmament, particularly the reduction of armed forces in Europe, and other related matters.

83. Of the concrete disarmament questions, a great deal of attention was devoted to the problem of the complete prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons. Many delegations expressed support for the draft convention on the complete prohibition of bacteriological and toxin weapons [A/8457, annex A] submitted by the Committee on Disarmament. At the same time, some delegations expressed their disapproval of the fact that chemical and bacteriological weapons had been separated and that the draft convention covered only the prohibition of one of these types of weapon. In this connexion we should like to point out once again that the Soviet Union, together with the other socialist member countries of the Committee on Disarmament, strove for the simultaneous settlement of both aspects of the problem in question. However, circumstances which are well known to all forced us to choose a solution to the problem which, in this specific instance, is the only one possible. Unfortunately, there was no other way. The distinguished representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, Ambassador Seaton, in his statement to the Committee at the 1836th meeting on 25 November, accurately indicated the arguments which were put forward by the Soviet delegation to explain the situation which led the Committee on Disarmament to produce a draft convention on the prohibition of bacteriological and toxin weapons alone. We should like to stress that the conclusion of a convention on bacteriological weapons will create more propitious conditions for the solution of the problem of the complete prohibition of chemical weapons. In the opinion of our delegation, this matter must be given priority attention in subsequent disarmament talks and all possible efforts must be devoted to ensuring its speedy solution. For its part, the Soviet Union will act with that very aim in view.

84. During the debate a great deal of attention was paid to the question of the prohibition of all nuclear tests. Many representatives stressed the urgent need for a solution to this problem. In this connexion, the representatives of certain Western countries persistently propounded the view



that to bring this about, that is, to settle the problem of the prohibition of all underground nuclear tests, would necessitate solving complex technical problems in order to ensure an adequate degree of control over the observance by States of their obligation to cease all nuclear tests.

85. The Soviet delegation again stresses that the prime requisite for agreement on the prohibition of all testing of nuclear weapons is a political settlement by the Powers which possess nuclear weapons. We note that our position in this regard was supported by many representatives during the debate on disarmament matters. For instance, the representative of Norway, Mr. Faremo, stated on 25 November: "My Government is also inclined to feel that the test ban problem now lends itself to a political rather than a technical approach." [1836th meeting, para. 95.]

86. During the debate, the United Kingdom representative, Lord Lothian, without going into the substance of the matter, expressed surprise that the Soviet delegation in the Committee on Disarmament rejected proposals for a partial solution to the question of prohibition of nuclear tests.

87. We should like to point out in this respect that proposals were made in the Committee on Disarmament for a partial solution to the question of the prohibition of underground nuclear tests. The United Kingdom submitted a proposal for the establishment of so-called "yearly quotas" for the testing of nuclear weapons by the nuclear Powers.<sup>11</sup> These quotas were to be reduced from year to year. The Soviet Union considers that a proposal to establish yearly quotas for nuclear tests does not constitute a solution to the problem of their prohibition. We have asked the United Kingdom delegation what would be the basis of the system of guaranteeing compliance with obligations under such a limited nuclear test ban. If the system is to be based on the use of national means of detection, then there is no need for "yearly quotas". On the basis of these means of verification it is possible and necessary to have a complete ban on all underground testing of nuclear weapons. We indicated further that, if underground explosions carried out on the basis of "yearly quotas" are to be monitored by means of obligatory on-site inspections, the whole question is once again caught up in the vicious circle created by certain Western Powers which make an unjustified demand for international on-site inspections and which thereby in fact block a solution to the problem of the prohibition of all testing of nuclear weapons.

88. In the Committee on Disarmament we expressed the view that the proposal to establish a so-called "diminishing quota" for underground nuclear explosions is in no way a solution to the problem of banning nuclear weapons; it does not even bring us any nearer to a solution. Not only will the obstacles which now stand in the way of a solution remain, but to them will be added many other difficulties connected with establishing quotas for individual States, with the periods of time over which the quotas would extend, and so on. Furthermore, to establish quotas for underground explosions would in effect be to legalize such explosions. We should also like to point out that the

questions we raised in the Committee on Disarmament in connexion with the United Kingdom proposal for "diminishing quotas" for nuclear explosions went unanswered.

89. The Soviet delegation, for reasons which we expressed in connexion with the United Kingdom's proposal, is also unable to support the proposals made by some representatives for a limit on the number and yield of underground nuclear tests. Unfortunately, those proposals do not provide any practical basis for the general cessation of nuclear testing and do not solve that problem.

90. The Soviet delegation would also like to express its views concerning the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

91. The Soviet Union fully appreciates the idea of establishing a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. We should like this idea to be realized in the form most appropriate to the task of strengthening the peace and security of States in the Indian Ocean region and of strengthening the general peace and security of all peoples. In this respect we should like to state that we share the opinion of the distinguished representative of Afghanistan, Ambassador Farhang, expressed at the Committee's meeting on 25 November, that this question: "... deserves careful and sympathetic consideration on the part of all Member States". [Ibid., para. 113.]

92. In expressing its sympathy with the idea of declaring the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, the Soviet Union, like many other States, is also interested in ensuring that the implementation of this proposal should indeed be a genuine measure to strengthen international peace and security and should guarantee the further development and strengthening of the generally recognized principles of international law. When considering the implementation of the proposal by Ceylon to declare the Indian Ocean a zone of peace [A/8492 and Add.1], it is necessary, in the opinion of the Soviet delegation, to take the following into account.

93. The creation of such a zone must provide for actual steps to limit the arms race and bring about disarmament in the region. The declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace must provide above all for the dismantling of existing foreign military bases in the region, which are a serious source of international conflict. In the absence of such action the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace will not achieve the objective of reducing international tension in the region and of strengthening universal peace.

94. The declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace must not lead to the undermining or weakening of the existing generally recognized principles of international law. The action must be undertaken in full accord with the generally recognized principles of international law on the freedom of the high seas, as laid down in the 1958 Geneva Convention on the High Seas.<sup>12</sup> As you know, this Convention provides for freedom of navigation for all vessels, including warships, and freedom to engage in scientific research using such vessels.

95. The Soviet delegation considers that the proposal by Ceylon to declare the Indian Ocean a zone of peace must be

<sup>11</sup> Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1967 and 1968, document DC/231, annex 1, sect. 8.

<sup>12</sup> United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 450 (1963), No. 6465.

the subject of careful consideration and agreement between the interested parties before the General Assembly takes a decision on the proposal.

96. During the debate, considerable attention was given to the organizational aspects of the disarmament talks—to the identity of the participants, the procedure for considering questions and so on. Those matters merit the most careful attention and consideration. The success of disarmament talks depends to a significant degree on who takes part in them, and in what manner and atmosphere they are held. The Soviet view on this question is that all possibilities should be employed to ensure progress towards reaching agreement on and adopting measures which will limit the arms race and bring about disarmament.

97. In this respect the question of the participants in the talks is of prime importance. The fact is that all representatives who spoke during the debate stressed the need for all nuclear Powers to participate in disarmament negotiations. Thus, the distinguished representative of Indonesia, Ambassador Sharif, said in his very thorough and interesting statement on this matter on 24 November of this year:

“With the People’s Republic of China in its rightful place, both in the Assembly and in the Security Council, we may expect full participation of all five permanent members of the Security Council in our joint responsibility to help develop the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments and disarmament, as a means of maintaining international peace and security under the Charter.” [1835th meeting, para. 22]

98. The Soviet Union shares the opinion that all the nuclear Powers must participate in disarmament negotiations. The representatives of the Soviet Union in the General Assembly, the Committee on Disarmament and other international forums have repeatedly declared that, to achieve success in the talks and in the formulation of agreed disarmament measures, all militarily significant States and, in any event, all Powers possessing nuclear weapons must participate in the talks and in the agreements on these matters. Thus one of the prime tasks in connexion with the organization of discussions on disarmament matters is to ensure the participation in the talks on disarmament—especially on nuclear disarmament—along with other States, of all the nuclear Powers.

99. The body in which multilateral negotiations are now being held and draft agreements on disarmament and other matters are being formulated is the Committee on Disarmament, comprising 26 States. We note that many of the speakers during the debate in the First Committee on this matter, including the representative of States which are not members of the Committee on Disarmament, spoke approvingly of that international body and expressed the view that it is advisable and necessary for the Committee on Disarmament to continue its work. That opinion coincides with the position of the Soviet Union on this matter. We think it would be incorrect at the present time to take steps which would undermine or weaken the activities of the Committee on Disarmament, which has shown itself to be a useful body for negotiations on disarmament matters.

100. At the same time, we cannot overlook the many critical remarks and opinions expressed during the debate

on disarmament matters with regard to the procedures and activities of the Committee on Disarmament. Some representatives pointed to the need to modify the organizational aspects of the activity of the Committee on Disarmament. In particular, criticism was levelled at the institution of co-chairmanship by two Powers in the Committee on Disarmament. In our opinion, this makes it necessary to give careful consideration to that question and also to the methods and procedures of work of the Committee on Disarmament as a whole.

101. We should like to point out, however, that we cannot agree with all the critical opinions and remarks expressed concerning the organization and work of the Committee on Disarmament. For example, during the debate some delegations tried to make it seem as though the situation in the Committee was that “two super-Powers”, by taking advantage of their position as Co-Chairmen of the Committee, were imposing their own decisions on the remaining members of the Committee. That view of the situation does not correspond to the facts. One has only to consult the documents dealing with the preparation of draft treaties and agreements and the records of the discussions in the Committee in order to reach the conclusion that, in point of fact, all members of the Committee, the large, the medium-sized and the small States, have made their contribution to the preparation and agreement of the draft treaties and agreements. There can be no doubt that the draft treaties and agreements which have been drawn up in the Committee on Disarmament were the result of the joint and collective efforts of virtually all the States members of the Committee on Disarmament. If we compare the original draft treaties submitted to the Committee—those on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, on the prohibition of the emplacement on the sea-bed and the ocean floor of weapons of mass destruction and on the complete prohibition of bacteriological and toxin weapons—with the final texts submitted for the approval of the General Assembly, we can easily see the great significance of the contribution made by many members of the Committee on Disarmament to the process of reaching agreement on those international instruments. One has only to look at the reports submitted by the Committee on Disarmament to the General Assembly in order to see the major practical contributions made by individual members of the Committee to the general consideration of disarmament matters and to the formulation of the agreed international instruments.

102. One cannot overlook the fact that disarmament problems are solved only through a long and complex process of obtaining agreement among many States on many problems. Questions arise of a political, military, legal and economic nature, necessitating a search for solutions acceptable to many States. This takes a great deal of time. The Soviet delegation actively strives to hasten the work of the Committee on Disarmament towards agreement on the problems under discussion. However, practical experience shows that this cannot always be done.

103. In assessing the over-all performance of the Committee on Disarmament, we should like to point out yet again that, although the Soviet Union is not satisfied with the absence of any substantial progress towards the solution of the fundamental disarmament problems, we nevertheless consider that the Committee is a necessary and useful

international forum for negotiations on disarmament questions; its work represents a useful contribution to international co-operation among States in an extremely important area of international life, namely, the limitation of the arms race, disarmament, and the achievement in this way of a reduction in international tension and the strengthening of universal peace.

104. These are the comments of the Soviet delegation in connexion with the consideration in the Committee on Disarmament of matters relating to disarmament.

105. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): The Foreign Minister of Mali, speaking on disarmament in the General Assembly on 27 September 1971, stated that the Government of my country has

“... followed with lively interest the negotiations resulting in the Quadripartite Agreement on Berlin, and the progress achieved in the talks on the limitation of strategic, conventional, biological and chemical weapons.

“Disarmament following upon a reduction of international tensions can, without doubt, free enormous resources that could be placed at the service of development.” [*1941st plenary meeting, paras. 180 and 181.*]

106. That observation by the chief of the diplomacy of my country, as you will not fail to note, sums up the pertinent conclusions of the report before us on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security [*A/8469*]. The international community should, in fact, encourage and support every initiative that might speed up progress towards general and complete disarmament.

107. To that end, my delegation once more welcomes the political courage with which the General Assembly, on 25 October 1971, restored to the People's Republic of China all its rights in the United Nations. We wish to take advantage of the opportunity now offered us to welcome to the First Committee the true representatives of the Chinese people, and at the same time to offer them our friendly co-operation.

108. Our Organization, having thus in more decisive fashion taken a step towards universality, can from now on tackle with better chances of success the great international problems, first among which is that of disarmament.

109. The first objective of the Charter enjoins us to devote our efforts to the maintenance of international peace and security. Yet since the end of the Second World War, the perilous arms race has only been intensified, thus constituting a permanent threat to peace. This tragic situation is indeed revealed by our eminent Secretary-General in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization, where he states that:

“Each of the two nuclear super-Powers has at its disposal sufficient nuclear ‘over-kill’ to destroy each other and the world many times over.”<sup>13</sup>

<sup>13</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 1A*, para. 42.

Similarly, in the same document we read that:

“International security also cannot be guaranteed as long as the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, continues, becoming an increasingly serious threat to peace.”<sup>14</sup>

110. All the reports prepared on disarmament lead to the same terrifying conclusion, namely, that man has never devoted so many economic, technical and human resources to the manufacture of arms as he has during the last decade. Hardly had the ruins caused by the Second World War been cleared than the great Powers hastened in a frenzy to the manufacture and stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction.

111. Let us not, however, forget to note here that that same attraction towards the arms race flows from the hunger for hegemony felt by the imperialist Powers immediately after the victory of the Allies over the forces of the Axis. The balance of terror was thus created. Intensive arming from then on seemed the most effective way of discouraging hypothetical enemies lying in wait along imaginary frontiers which, for certain blocs, lie far beyond their national boundaries. From 1961 to 1969 the world has spent more than \$150,000 million a year, at the current rate of exchange, for military purposes; and since 1970, that figure has risen to \$200,000 million, over 33 per cent more than in the decade of the 1960s.

112. According to authorized and accurate reports, if the arms race is not brought to a halt the world will be spending annually by 1980 the equivalent of \$300,000 million to \$350,000 million, at 1970 rates, for military purposes. The enormous resources mobilized to perfect and manufacture weapons of mass destruction could rise in the course of the Disarmament Decade to \$2,650,000 million, and, as the Secretary-General's report on the consequences of the armaments race states, one cannot but be terrified when one notes that at the end of the 1960s military expenditures “all but equal the gross national product... of the developing countries of South Asia, the Far East and Africa together, with a total population of 1,300 million” [*A/8469, para. 24*], that is, almost half the population of the world. Thus we can assess the enormous squandering of funds on self-destruction.

113. After this madness has been assessed it is imperative that all parties return to relationships among States in accordance with the terms of the Charter. It is survival that is at stake. Is it not only suspicion among States and among the blocs which has caused this enormous escalation of the arms race and made the allies of yesterday against the Axis into the enemies of today?

114. The Charter, that ideal instrument of tolerance and understanding among peoples, is there to help to dissipate these unwarranted fears and animosities. We need only use it to create an atmosphere of trust, mutual tolerance and understanding, which would then immediately deprive the arms race of any possible pretext or justification. Let us start by putting out the fires of wars waged by imperialism and colonialism in Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. Let us

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 168.

give life to our invitation to wisdom contained in the motto on the postage stamps dedicated to disarmament, namely, let us turn our swords into ploughshares. That will do away with those present-day gods of war, the military-industrial complexes whose interests are the antithesis of those of mankind freed from the spectres of a world conflagration.

115. Having freed the developing peoples from the nefarious interests of the military-industrial complex, we could then devote ourselves and the immense resources available to us to creating the world of peace and understanding to which mankind aspires. Such an undertaking calls for the participation of all States of the world, without any exception. Furthermore, it calls at the outset for a true political commitment, particularly on the part of the great Powers which assume special responsibilities in our Organization. Surely those Powers must have recognized by now that the arms race is not the true answer to the complex problems created by coexistence. It merely aggravates the fear of destruction that conditions and colours those problems.

116. However, we understand the justified reluctance on the part of certain great Powers to give an affirmative reply to the appeals of the international community for world disarmament. But we must dissipate their fears by acts of concrete appeasement, surrounded by convincing statements of political determination and a true show of a will for peace. The next step is up to the great Powers, which themselves possess all the weapons of mass destruction and alone spend more than four fifths of what is spent on weapons. It is they that must now prove their wisdom in turning back the arms race that has developed since the Second World War. Our success depends to a very large extent on their goodwill. Assessing the enormous responsibilities incumbent obviously upon them in the development of international affairs, they cannot but give an affirmative reply to the appeals that we launch.

117. With the immense resources that would be liberated by general and complete disarmament under effective international control in hand, they would be able to turn their attention to solving the grave economic and social problems that confront their own peoples, and at the same time contribute significantly to the development of the needy countries.

118. When we know that world military expenditures represent one and a half times the sums allocated to education, two and a half times those devoted to health and 30 times the total assistance given by the industrialized countries to the developing countries all over the world, we realize the highly constructive consequences that disarmament could have on the improvement of the world situation. Poverty, which is recognized by the international community as a potential source of tension and therefore a potential threat to peace, would then be done away with and our world would truly know an era of justice and progress that would ensure the welfare of humanity. We would then have achieved the objectives of the Charter, that is,

“to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our life-time has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human

rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.”

119. With regard to the draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and their destruction annexed to the report of the Committee on Disarmament [A/8457], the delegation of the Republic of Mali considers it a step towards general and complete disarmament. While congratulating the members of the Committee on Disarmament who prepared the document for us we would venture to make certain comments on the contents in order to make our humble contribution to the common undertaking for peace that is our mission.

120. First of all, my delegation feels that the draft convention should be completed by the following provisions: that the resources to be liberated as a result of the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and their destruction should be devoted to economic and social development, particularly of the developing countries. That is no more than a reaffirmation of previous decisions of our Organization, particularly paragraph 5 of the International Development Strategy in General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV). I believe that the Committee will understand that we are trying to ensure consistency in the acts of the United Nations when we make such proposals. I am sure that they will commend themselves to the members of other delegations.

121. Secondly, my delegation would like to say that the pertinent interpretation given by the Soviet Union [*1827th meeting*] to the exceptions, extraordinary events, protective, prophylactic and other peaceful purposes mentioned in the draft convention allays our fears regarding possible abuses under articles I and XIII of the draft convention, but we believe that the Committee should endorse such an interpretation in order to avoid any misunderstandings of these articles which are basic to the implementation of the convention.

122. Finally, my delegation deplores the fact that a document of this importance, which calls for very thorough study on the part of all our Governments, should have been distributed only in the course of our meetings. Thus the qualified authorities in our countries are unable to make a contribution to the elaboration of its final version. We would venture to hope that adequate provision will be made to avoid a repetition of this late submission.

123. My delegation is ready to co-operate with all members of the Committee in completing a convention such as the one submitted. However, we should like to add that success of this first step towards disarmament will ultimately depend on the goodwill of all the contracting parties, namely, each Government. We are convinced that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament—which, incidentally, we congratulate for the fruitful work it has done—will continue its efforts as provided in article IX of

the draft convention in order speedily to prohibit and destroy chemical weapons, in accordance with the recommendations of the General Assembly in its resolution 2662 (XXV). We shall thus have taken a very important step towards world disarmament.

124. The proposal made in the introduction to the annual report of the Secretary-General recommending a triennial study with the assistance of consultant experts on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race is one that should be supported by this Committee. I believe that this is the appropriate moment to thank all those experts and officials of the United Nations who have contributed to preparing the important report submitted on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race. For the first time the world is taking full cognizance of a document that allows it truly to seize the dangers inherent in the arms race. I trust that the reading of that document will lead all of us fully to assess the gravity of the situation and encourage us to greater co-operation for the benefit of mankind. I am convinced that we shall thus be getting closer to the main objectives that the authors of that document had in mind.

125. I could not conclude my statement without giving the total support of my delegation to the proposal of the Secretary-General recommending the addition of a third co-chairman for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, to be occupied by a representative of one of the non-aligned countries.<sup>15</sup> Such an addition can only strengthen the balance of the Committee on Disarmament. The very cogent arguments of the Secretary-General are sufficient to convince us of the timeliness of such an increase in the number of co-chairmen. In order to allow our Organization to follow closely the evolution of the important questions of disarmament, as the Secretary-General himself has requested, it would be appropriate for us officially and periodically to be informed of progress

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 52.

achieved in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). All means are now available to allow us to attain the greatest desire of mankind, namely, peace. But we hasten to add that man has never had available to him, too, so many means for the mass destruction of mankind. However, the instinct for survival should lead us to choose to build a world of peace, progress and justice. And it is to that ennobling task that the delegation of Mali wishes to invite all in the First Committee to bend their efforts, convinced as we are that we thereby share the hope of man today which, I am sure, is heeded by all delegations in this room.

126. Mr. TOUKAN (Jordan): Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my delegation's deep appreciation and gratitude for the warm and noble words of sympathy which you extended the day before yesterday to my Government and delegation, on your behalf and on behalf of the representatives in this Committee, concerning the brutal assassination of the Prime Minister of my country, Mr. Wasfi Al-Tal.

127. I should also like to express my delegation's sincere gratitude to the representative of Kuwait, chairman of the Asian group for last month, who was kind enough to extend his heart-felt condolences and sympathy, on his behalf and on behalf of the Asian group.

128. I will certainly convey to my Government and to the bereaved family those noble expressions of sympathy and condolence.

129. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Before I adjourn the meeting I should like to announce that the following delegations have joined in sponsoring the draft resolutions contained in the following documents: A/C.1/L.587—the Netherlands; A/C.1/L.584—Colombia and Ghana; A/C.1/L.592—Malta and Uruguay; A/C.1/L.593—the Netherlands; and A/C.1/L.594—Denmark.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*