



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 15th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 30 TO 45, 120 AND 121 (continued)

- General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Lechuga (Cuba)
Mr. La Rocca (Italy)
Mr. Sitsi (Malawi)
Mr. Makobero (Burundi)
Mr. Ortiz Martin (Costa Rica)

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/34/PV.15
26 October 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.00 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 30 TO 45, 120 AND 121 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. LECHUGA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): It is becoming as difficult to speak of disarmament as to achieve it really and effectively. The complexity of the subject, the proliferation of topics and the virtual impossibility of not repeating those topics year after year - because negotiations are so slow that there is practically no way of bringing in new criteria or of referring to new events - combine to turn these interventions into a recital of good wishes and a catalogue of frustrations.

While it was thought, for instance, that the laborious SALT II negotiations had yielded a definitive result on the still long road towards the achievement of a substantial limitation or total elimination of strategic nuclear weapons, we find that the agreement announced to the press with fireworks and fanfare has almost dissolved in the corrosive acid of the reactionary forces of one of the parties thereto. The desire for peace is propounded in public but new attempts are made to install new offensive weapons in sensitive areas of the world, or to produce new weapons of mass destruction which are, indeed, announced with joy and gladness as if this new awakening of terror would lead to healthy objectives.

(Mr. Lechuga, Cuba)

The escalation of war-mongering propaganda, which seeks to bring us back to the cold war era and a climate of uncertainty, is also before us and seeks the most sinister aims.

Instead of our noting signs of a reduction in expenditures on weapons, especially on nuclear weapons, the astronomic sums are growing as an inhuman response to the plight of millions of under-privileged people throughout the world who lack the most elemental needs because of a lack of resources. In other words, what is being done or being attempted in the field of disarmament must be placed within a very limited framework of optimism. On the other hand, for instance, it must be placed in a broader context than that in which the Committee is acting. As stated at the Sixth Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement, held recently at Havana, negotiations regarding the control of nuclear weapons and the process of détente between the great Powers are but a part of the march towards peace that should extend to all corners of the earth and should benefit all countries equally, and for that peace to be effective and significant it should lead to the elimination of all hotbeds of tension and to the end of aggression, occupation, intervention and foreign interference as well as of the political and economic exploitation of the weaker countries.

That decisive action, which in international language is termed "political will", plays an important role in all negotiations. This is what happened with the tripartite talks on the prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests, although actually it could be applied to all processes carried out in this Organization and to the process of universal détente mentioned at the Havana Conference, to which I have just referred.

The cessation of nuclear tests would have an enormous psychological impact, apart from its inherent importance. No doubt, it would be an important step along the thorny road to general and complete disarmament, but so far we have not seen the light at the end of the tunnel. For the time being, we have to confine ourselves to taking note of the information provided to the Committee on Disarmament on the progress of negotiations and to urging that a treaty on the subject be concluded as soon as possible.

We also take note of the joint declaration of the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons,

(Mr. Lechuga, Cuba)

but in this instance there would appear to be promising signs, after long years of agonizing debate in Geneva, although attention to this subject never flagged. Proof of this is the fact that at the last session of the Committee on Disarmament 14 documents were submitted which in one way or another proposed solutions to that great aspiration of the international community. We acknowledge the existence of obstacles, but the need to halt the qualitative development of those horrendous weapons which become increasingly horrible as the days go by, given the development of science and technology, is greater than any possible objection.

To turn to the question of the denuclearization of Africa, the Cuban delegation, in giving its full support to that aspiration of the peoples and Governments of that continent, cannot fail to say that the key question is the all-round support that imperialism gives to the racist régime in South Africa. South Africa's nuclear capacity would not exist and, therefore, there would be no danger to peace if the United States and its allies - among them, of course, Israel - did not provide resources, technology and encouragement to the apartheid régime.

The same could be said of the denuclearization of the Middle East. The peoples in that area aspire to become free of nuclear weapons, but how can they achieve this unless American imperialism and Israel abandon their hegemonistic aspirations, their policy of aggression and their plans of exploitation? The struggle to establish a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East passes through the meridian of the struggle of the rights of the Palestinian people, the struggle against racism and against imperialism.

Let us continue to consider our agenda. For many years, the Committee has been debating the question of the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. It is obvious that there are dilatory attempts directed towards the alleged need to identify those weapons in advance before considering their prohibition. In our view, the logical thing would be to achieve agreement prohibiting all kinds of weapons in the future because once difficulties concerning prohibition arise they multiply, as the experience of all these years has shown.

(Mr. Lechuga, Cuba)

On the question of radiological weapons, our delegation takes note with satisfaction of the submission to the Committee on Disarmament of a joint proposal of the Soviet Union and United States. Like everyone else, we await the early conclusion of the treaty prohibiting such weapons.

The question of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace cannot be divorced, although some have attempted to do so, from the aims at imperialist domination in that vast region of the world. Which country maintains military bases there? Which is the country that does not wish progress to be achieved in the negotiations? Which are the powerful interests that are bent on having military equipment of all kinds in the Indian Ocean to oppose the liberation movements? Who speaks today of special military forces, which may be mobilized to any area of the world? Who would benefit from the military bases in Simonstown and Silvermine in South Africa, the Advokaat project and the intensification of military activities of the apartheid régime in that area? There is but one answer: American imperialism and its greater and lesser allies. It is in this true perspective that the Cuban delegation views the problem. Today as always, we support the wish of the littoral and hinterland States that the Indian Ocean be declared a zone of peace.

As regards another question of interest to the Committee, namely, that of guarantees relating to the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, my delegation supports the idea of having an international instrument regulate such guarantees. No doubt it would be a great contribution to the cause of disarmament and peace. However, as happens whenever we speak of peace, obstacles begin to emerge. Much is being said now about preconditions which hamper negotiations, and we must say that many of those preconditions are fabricated as part of a discriminatory policy and are incompatible with the continuation of hostile acts of an economic or military nature against non-nuclear-weapon States, as is the case with Cuba, which has for 20 years suffered from such hostile acts. We shall not elaborate on this point, and we reserve the right to speak in detail regarding our views when the time comes in the course of our discussions on this item, but we support the idea of an instrument governing guarantees.

To turn our eyes now to conventional weapons, we wish to point out that this subject is of great interest to the developing countries. To say the least,

(Mr. Lechuga, Cuba)

it is good business for weapons manufacturers at the expense of the weak economies of those countries. The other channel is the legal or illegal transfer of conventional weapons to promote local conflicts, to seek the destabilization of sovereign Governments which do now bow to colonialist and imperialist interests, to intensify repression against peoples rebelling against exploitation and assassination, to fuel the struggle against the liberation movements and to initiate aggression against independent States.

(Mr. Lechuga, Cuba)

We must pursue the efforts already undertaken in the recently concluded United Nations Conference on special types of conventional weapons, and we must continue to work on the basis of the documents presented, which appear to have won wide acceptance.

We should like now to mention the question of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session. The Final Document of that session, which was the product of arduous discussions and negotiations, constitutes a sound basis for future disarmament negotiations, although little has been done to comply with the provisions of that document, and especially of its Programme of Action.

At the beginning of our statement, we mentioned some of the important obstacles that are standing in the way of peace and disarmament. This undeniable state of affairs, quite logically, is not contributing to the implementation of what was agreed at the tenth special session.

It is appropriate to point out that a considerable number of the proposals formulated in the Assembly were not included in the Final Document because the necessary consensus could not be achieved, although they had wide majority support. The same thing occurred in the Committee on Disarmament when the broad programme on the subject was discussed and when there was consensus on such points as the dismantling of foreign military bases, the prohibition of the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons, and the prohibition of the use and deployment of conventional weapons of mass destruction.

We must ponder this question, for while it is true that the Final Document, as we have said, is a sound basis for negotiations because it was arrived at by consensus, it is equally true that actions that are being taken invalidate it in practice. Moreover, we must be wary of attempts to reduce its scope during the course of negotiations. In our view, we must promote compliance with the Final Document and its Programme of Action, while at the same time contributing additional proposals calculated to create a climate conducive to their application in the light of present-day reality.

(Mr. Lechuga, Cuba)

Lastly, we wish to refer to the question of convening a world conference on disarmament, which appears on our agenda.

The non-aligned countries have always supported the idea of convening such a conference, and at their Sixth Summit Conference in Havana, the hope was expressed that, after proper preparation, it would be held at an appropriate time and with universal participation.

We realize that there is not a consensus among all the nuclear-weapon States, but also we know that there is a majority support within the international community for the convening of such a conference. We must therefore pay close attention to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee, which states that the General Assembly could decide on the convening of the conference following its next special session devoted to disarmament.

Mr. LA ROCCA (Italy): I should like at the outset to extend my warm congratulations to the Chairman and other members of the Bureau on their unanimous election.

A year has elapsed since the conclusion of the work of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and now that the adjustment phase required for the implementation of the reforms indicated by the session has ended, it can be said that the time spent has not been unfruitful. On the contrary, the foundations have been laid for the future development and intensification of the disarmament process.

From the standpoint of the machinery for disarmament, the United Nations Disarmament Commission has already initiated a review of the topics entrusted to it by the General Assembly, concentrating chiefly on the important question of elaborating the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme. Italy welcomed the priority given to this study with particular satisfaction, since for over a decade we have stressed the need to incorporate the measures adopted or programmes undertaken in the various fields of disarmament into the global framework of a coherent programme to be implemented gradually and in stages.

(Mr. La Rocca, Italy)

The elements of such a programme have now been identified and drafted by the Commission, which has submitted them to this session of the General Assembly for approval and transmission to the Committee on Disarmament. Obviously, these elements - which were adopted by consensus - do not reflect entirely the viewpoints of every State, and at the close of the negotiations even my delegation expressed some reservations. None the less, beyond the wording used for individual elements, the fact that the Commission achieved the main result expected of it, namely, the drafting of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, is highly positive in itself. It stresses once again the need for the disarmament process to develop in a balanced manner and by co-ordinated phases, thus taking into account reciprocal security needs, with the final objectives of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

The activities of the Committee on Disarmament were initially affected by the need for the new body, as direct successor to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, in order to solve a number of procedural issues before confronting questions of substance. Despite the contingent difficulties encountered by the Geneva forum, our over-all judgement on its work is positive. As the special session recognized, the Committee's irreplaceable function of chief negotiating body for disarmament effectively ensures a conceptual continuity in the negotiations. At the same time, it is the guarantee that these negotiations will be coherently maintained within the framework of the comprehensive programme endorsed by the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Moreover, the Committee on Disarmament's limited membership allows for a pragmatism and an efficiency that are indispensable to negotiations as complex as those related to armaments and international security.

If constant and effective progress towards disarmament is to be achieved through the efforts of peace-loving countries, emphasis must be put on the search for constructive and parallel results in the sectors of both nuclear and conventional disarmament. Only thus will it be possible to ensure a constant advancement of the disarmament process, and at the time the best conditions for the reciprocal security of all States and the international community as a whole.

(Mr. La Rocca, Italy)

While recognizing the primary responsibility of nuclear-weapon States for nuclear disarmament, Italy must reiterate once more its hope that the Committee on Disarmament will soon - and on a priority basis - be able to reach agreement on a draft treaty for a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests. We are perfectly aware of the difficulties attendant upon such a negotiation, both in terms of conflicting interests and from a strictly technical standpoint. For these reasons, among others, the former Conference of the Committee on Disarmament did not raise objections when three nuclear Powers initiated restricted talks in order to overcome their divergences. However, we are convinced that the Committee on Disarmament should resume consideration of this issue, this time in greater depth, and that all its members should be allowed to contribute to the progress of the negotiations.

The Committee, as the direct successor to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, has ample experience in this field of disarmament as well as in others. I should like to recall in this context the work of the ad hoc group of seismic experts, in which Italy is participating actively through its qualified representatives.

(Mr. La Rocca, Italy)

That work is making an important and original contribution to the solution of the problem of verification, in an attempt to reconcile the diverging views of those who support national systems of verification and those who support international and on-site systems. We believe that the Group's work has from the technical standpoint currently reached a very advanced stage and that a closer link should soon be established between that work and the actual negotiations in progress. Furthermore, the seminars held last year in Tokyo, and more recently in Stockholm, have given proof that adequate instruments for resolving, at least in large measure, the thorny question of controls can be made readily available to the international community.

Still in the field of nuclear disarmament, we should like to reiterate the satisfaction at the signing of the SALT II agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union expressed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ireland, on behalf of the nine members of the European Community, in his statement in the general debate. This agreement provides for an initial reduction of certain intercontinental nuclear systems and for a limitation of the arms race in the field of the most destructive weapons. It is to be hoped that the SALT negotiating process will continue to develop successfully, thus ensuring the strengthening of international stability and security.

Italy, as a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, attributes paramount importance to the objective of non-proliferation as well as to the development of international co-operation in the field of the peaceful applications of nuclear energy. We consider that, under the existing international régime based on the Non-Proliferation Treaty, a balance should be maintained between the obligations of the nuclear-weapon States and those of the other parties to the Treaty. In this respect, however, we believe that special relevance should be accorded to the letter and the spirit of article IV of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and that in fact nothing in that Treaty must be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all its parties to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, without discrimination.

We therefore attach particular importance to the careful preparation of the second Non-Proliferation-Treaty Review Conference.

(Mr. La Rocca, Italy)

Turning now to the sector of other weapons of mass destruction, I should like to call attention to the urgent need to reach agreement on a treaty for the complete ban of chemical weapons and the destruction of related stockpiles. In entrusting the study of this issue to the Committee on Disarmament the special session stressed its high level of priority - a status fully justified by the singularly dangerous characteristics of this kind of weapon.

Italy for its part has never failed to make an active contribution to the rapid conclusion of the negotiations on this issue. To that end, we proposed on 6 February last to the Committee on Disarmament that a special working group, open to the participation of all members and, by invitation, of other interested countries be established for a comprehensive review of the problems still outstanding and obstructing the achievement of an agreement. We also indicated, in document CD/5, some of these points, namely, the field of application of the agreement, the question of the destruction of stockpiles of chemical weapons, the reconversion of plants and the problem of verification.

I should like at this stage to stress how basic the question of verification is in this case as well. Chemical weapons have peculiar characteristics; they occupy a relatively small volume in relation to their potential effects and are comparatively easy to produce wherever civilian laboratories are available. Adequate instruments are needed, therefore, to ensure the effective and correct application of a treaty and guarantee to every party that its own security is safeguarded in this respect beyond any possible doubt. The establishment of the group which Italy proposed - and I should like to recall that similar positive initiatives have been put forward by other delegations - would, in our view, lend considerable impetus to the progress of the negotiations taking place in the Committee on Disarmament similar to the continual flow of ideas and initiatives coming from all States in the framework of the Committee on Disarmament and beyond it. In this regard I should like to express my Government's appreciation for the important seminars organized by the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany on some of the delicate problems involved. Taken as a whole these contributions may provide a useful input to the bilateral talks taking place between the United States and the Soviet Union.

(Mr. La Rocca, Italy)

In this regard I wish to restate our opinion that the matter should be dealt with in a comprehensive manner in the Committee on Disarmament, in view of its indisputable competence in this field. Consequently, we shall at that body's next session request that the subject of chemical weapons be urgently taken up again and that all possible procedural solutions be sought in order to enable the Committee on Disarmament to resume the negotiation in depth and in all its aspects. It will be the task of the Committee on Disarmament and of all its member States to review and study thoroughly the results of the bilateral talks and, taking all observations into due account, produce the text of an acceptable multilateral agreement.

If we are to achieve gradual, balanced disarmament without reducing the security of States, while progressively reducing the level of armaments, it will be necessary to pursue measures of conventional disarmament on a parallel with nuclear disarmament to impose a ban on weapons of mass destruction. However, since conventional rather than nuclear weapons are the core of the defence systems of the overwhelming majority of States, a more complex and more articulated disarmament strategy than that applicable to nuclear weapons should be envisaged.

In a first phase, and on a global plane, we should seek a progressive reduction of the defence budgets of the most militarily significant countries, with the ultimate aim of levelling, at a later stage and as much as possible, the military appropriations of all countries. Italy therefore fully supports the study being conducted by the Secretary-General in order to define a standardized system of disclosure of actual appropriations for military ends. The results of this important study may indeed allow the international community to pursue effectively a reduction of military appropriations and expenditures.

One way of confronting the problem of conventional disarmament which seems to us likely to produce favourable results is the regional approach. The regions in which the problem is most acute should be identified and the States within those areas invited to open negotiations with the aim of strengthening the stability and reducing the level of armaments in their region without jeopardizing their security. Initiatives of this kind are already in progress in Europe.

(Mr. La Rocca, Italy)

In introducing in the Committee on Disarmament a proposal to limit the transfer of conventional weapons, Italy has taken into consideration the regional and global aspects of disarmament.

As I anticipated during the last session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, Italy proposes the establishment of a United Nations agency divided into regional committees in which both the major arms-suppliers and the recipient countries of a given region would be represented. The committees would define for each region the criteria to be followed to maintain the volume of conventional weapons at the lowest level possible. In this way the containment of arms transfers to a region would be achieved by consensus with the participation of all the States concerned on an equal footing. The Italian Government believes that its initiative is constructive and realistic, in so far as it aims at breaking a dangerous spiral of transfers of increasingly sophisticated conventional weapons.

Again in the field of conventional disarmament, the Italian Government has submitted to the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva a proposal aimed at the elaboration of an additional protocol to the Outer Space Treaty of 1967.

(Mr. La Rocca, Italy)

Recent progress in space technology, and the possibility that weapons which are not specifically prohibited under article IV of the Treaty may be used in outer space, make it necessary that we complete the existing legal system with new provisions. Our initiative proposes the total prohibition of non-peaceful military activities in outer space and would thus prevent the introduction of weapons which would add a new and more serious dimension to the arms race.

We hope that our initiative, which is fully in accordance with the guidelines approved by the special session, may at the appropriate time become the subject of concrete negotiations.

The limitation of the arms race and the existence of concrete initiatives to achieve effective disarmament are indispensable not only to ensure the reduction of international tensions, but also to strengthen the economic, commercial and social relations between industrialized and developing countries and thus to make a decisive contribution to the development of the latter. Indeed, it is intolerable that huge sums are wasted in the acquisition of weapons and military equipment when there is still so much to be done both to fight hunger and poverty and to promote the progress of mankind towards the standards of worth and dignity which are the goal of all peoples.

Therefore, we concur, as the special session on disarmament solemnly proclaimed that the growing spiral of armaments and that of underdevelopment must be broken, as much in order to enable mankind finally to live free from the threat of war, as to permit the resources which would be liberated through the implementation of disarmament measures to be utilized to promote the well-being and economic development of all peoples.

Mr. SITUSI (Malawi). My delegation is pleased to have this opportunity to make a statement on the subject of disarmament, which is currently under discussion in this Committee.

As Members are aware, one of the prime objectives of the United Nations is the maintenance and the promotion of international peace and security. This important objective, which is of universal interest, cannot be realized if the arms race remains uncontrolled.

(Mr. Situdi, Malawi)

No-one can dispute the fact that the arms race has led to the serious problem of armaments, the only solution to which appears to be disarmament. This is the problem which this Committee is striving to solve.

In this regard, my delegation supports the efforts made by the Committee on Disarmament in seeking effective ways and means to carry out disarmament measures. In spite of past failures we still hope that a just solution to this problem will be found.

One may wonder why armaments have become such a serious problem. In the view of my delegation, the arms race and armaments are not the problem but the result. The peoples of the world constitute the problem because they do not understand each other. Each nation behaves as if it were situated on its own planet. Indeed, each nation entertains suspicion and mistrust about the military activities of other nations. There is pathological fear and hate among nations.

Because of ideological rivalry between the major Powers, conventional arms transfers have been and are still taking place at an alarming rate. By virtue of their affluence, the super-Powers are causing those of us who are non-aligned to become aligned with one or the other super-Power.

Owing to fear and the feeling of insecurity, small nations have involuntarily been subjected to foreign domination. As a consequence, the world has experienced the problems of imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, and even hegemonism.

This sad situation has been created by the peoples of the world themselves, and is a threat to international peace and security.

Since all representatives gathered here agree that disarmament should take place, my delegation appeals to all nations, strong or weak, big or small, rich or poor, to work towards the realization of this sacred goal by removing the root cause of the arms race. Although this matter is primarily the obligation of a few nations that have armed themselves to the teeth, all members of the international community have a role to play in the search for general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Situsi, Malawi)

After all, both weak and strong nations would fall victim to the development, production and use of nuclear weapons and chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons.

What happened at Hiroshima and Nagasaki is too fresh in our memories to be condoned. Furthermore, my delegation abhors the destruction of human life and natural resources through nuclear-weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under the sea. My delegation condemns the development and manufacture of any lethal weapons, including semi-conventional weapons, which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects.

Disarmament is no easy task. Despite the efforts being made by the United Nations, all countries should individually and collectively play an active role in this matter. In the name of interdependence, it is the view of my delegation that there will always be merit in the policy of maintaining good neighbourliness and engaging in détente, contact and dialogue.

It is also the view of my delegation that the policy of contact and dialogue would allay all fears and suspicions among nations and would therefore make it possible for the international community to be involved in the control of the arms race.

In this connexion, my Government supports the conclusion of the second strategic arms treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in June of this year. The conclusion of the second round of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT II) does not mean the achievement of disarmament. But it is a step forward.

(Mr. Situsi Malawi)

As Mr. George Seignious, Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, put it, SALT II "is an obligation between two nations and it is an obligation of two nations to all nations". (A/C.1/34/PV.8, p. 27) On the whole, the mere fact that the two super-Powers, whose ideologies are diametrically opposed, met, discussed and agreed on something concrete is a great contribution towards the cherished goal of general and complete disarmament. We therefore look forward to the conclusion of SALT III.

With regard to all other situations in the world, no one can deny the fact that a solution to a political problem means a solution of any possible resultant armed conflict, and that the absence of war is, in itself, a means of controlling the arms race. In other words, peace is the only effective weapon which can be used to destroy armaments. Therefore, general and complete disarmament can be achieved through negotiations.

Turning to the third world and other developing countries, my delegation wishes to stress the importance of guarding against foreign domination. As I stated earlier, foreign domination takes many forms. Allow me at this juncture to state that my Government condemns domination in all its forms and manifestations. In this connexion my delegation appeals to all Governments to ensure that they do not give the super-Powers the chance to spread their political or ideological propaganda in their countries. As representatives are aware, it is under the cover of propaganda that major Powers ironically export arms and other weapons to developing countries, which are in fact badly in need of economic assistance.

Why should the world spend an annual sum of \$450 billion on arms while people in many places are starving, walking naked, sleeping under trees? Rich nations should be encouraged to provide economic assistance to poor countries. They should not engage in a policy of destabilization in order to further their goals. For their part, the developing countries must assert their independence; they should be truly non-aligned; they should respect each other's sovereign integrity; they should maintain good-neighbourliness; and they should not interfere in the internal affairs of other States.

Besides these proposals, confidence-building measures should be carried out among all nations in the world. Lastly, but not least, my delegation would like to point out that whatever the disarmament measures the United Nations General Assembly decides to take, they must not be discriminatory. By passing resolutions aimed at defending one or two States, the General Assembly would be missing the point.

(Mr. Situdi, Malawi)

Measures for general and nuclear disarmament should be applied to every nuclear State irrespective of ideology, policy or form of Government. To this end, we support the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various regions of the world, including Africa, Asia and Latin America.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to say to all nations, "Do not fear each other. Know each other better. Discuss your differences. Find peace and thereby render your arsenals useless".

Mr. MAKOBERO (Burundi) (interpretation from French): While appreciating highly the competence and discipline with which the Chairman is directing our deliberations, I shall abstain from addressing to him the customary congratulations in order to comply with his directive which, in turn, is in compliance with rule 110 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

In 1945, the peoples of this planet, sickened by the scourge of war - which in the space of 32 years had plunged the world into mourning and inflicted upon mankind two horrible wars with suffering unprecedented in history - decided to create our international Organization, one of whose principal purposes was "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace", whatever their source.

On the thirty-fourth anniversary of the establishment of this great undertaking, I should like briefly to recapitulate what the international community has been able to achieve in the sphere of control of the arms race and disarmament under the aegis of the United Nations. At the same time I shall attempt to outline what the Organization has still to do if disarmament is one day to proceed from a dream to a reality.

Since the Hague Conference of 1899, the States of the European continent, in quest of peace, have spared no effort to bar the way to the root causes of conflicts which lead to armed confrontation. Despite the efforts made, never, before the existence of our international Organization, did more than 30 years pass without an armed conflict breaking out somewhere on the continent.

From October 1945 to this day, however, despite the climate of distrust which could and still can be felt here and there, détente prevails and dialogue for the peaceful settlement of the legacies of the past has replaced the settlement of conflicts by gunfire.

There is no better evidence of this state of affairs than the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, whose Final Act, signed in Helsinki in 1976, demonstrates the firm will of the signatory States to promote better mutual understanding and closer relations between peoples, setting aside the confrontations of the past in order to advance along the course of dialogue, co-operation and, therefore, of peace. The fact that the two giants of the modern world, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, are among the signatories of the Final Act is a clear sign that a process for the establishment and maintenance of peace on the European continent is under way.

Although the United Nations as an organization was not the originator of this fortunate initiative, there is no doubt that it is thanks to the spirit of the Charter of our international Organization and to the contacts which the European States, the United States and Canada were able to develop and maintain in New York and at other international gatherings that the idea of the Helsinki Conference could be conceived and brought to fruition.

The Republic of Burundi, my country, a State Member of the United Nations, which, since its accession to national independence and sovereignty in 1962, has constantly lived up to its sacred duty to make its modest contribution to the establishment and maintenance of peace between peoples and nations on this earth, wishes to congratulate the States signatories of the Final Act of Helsinki. It supports their efforts to eliminate the causes of war in Europe and to establish a permanent peace in that very highly strategic part of our planet.

Whereas history describes the 1950s as years of cold war between East and West in general and between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in particular, the 1960s have seen a progressive détente between the two camps, a détente which has made it possible to conclude a number of accords and treaties of great significance.

The Soviet-American Moscow Treaty of 1963, relating to the prohibition of nuclear tests in space and under water, although it has not contributed to the elimination of all nuclear tests and the destruction of existing nuclear weapons, nevertheless has been the starting point for negotiations in this field. The States Members of the United Nations that still are without nuclear capacity and, in the name of peace, are unwilling to acquire it, make of that treaty the basis for their continuous pressure on nuclear-weapon States to cease their tests and destroy their existing stocks of weapons of this type, which are so highly dangerous for the survival of humanity.

(Mr. Makobero, Burundi)

The three treaties which followed, of which our Organization was the principal artisan, also have made a modest - although partial - contribution to the curbing of the arms race.

Although the Treaty of 1967 on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space was not able to designate an international authority, such as the United Nations, as the sole authority on the use of outer space, it nevertheless did categorically prohibit all nations from attempting to appropriate outer space for themselves.

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons of 1968 could not prevent proliferation, but it did provide a basis for the negotiations on the necessary guarantees to States that do not possess nuclear weapons that they will not become the victims of those weapons.

Although the 1971 Treaty prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear devices under water did not provide a security zone for the States requesting such a zone, it nevertheless did prohibit the emplacement of such devices on the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

Even if the principal artisan of those three treaties was the United Nations, we must not lose sight of the fact that if détente between East and West had not become a reality it would have been difficult to bring about co-operation between the two super-Powers. Their desire to co-operate, as a matter of fact, has been well demonstrated by the two treaties on the limitation of strategic weapons signed in Moscow and Vienna respectively in 1972 and 1979 by the Heads of State of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Whereas during these 34 years the dialogue maintained within our international Organization has promoted rapprochement between the European States and détente between the East and West, and whereas gunfire has ceased in those parts of the world and has been replaced by entente and co-operation for the establishment and maintenance of peace, elsewhere in the world, and more specifically in that part of the world which is referred to as the third world, persistent tensions, provoked and maintained in the majority of cases from the outside, are a daily phenomenon. In the Mediterranean and in the

(Mr. Makobero, Burundi)

Middle East, in Africa and in the Indian Ocean, in South and South-East Asia, and in Latin America, armed conflicts succeed one another, brother is pitted against brother, and the bastion of colonialism prevails in all its forms. Peace is precarious in those areas, the conditions for it being far from assured.

The spirit of the Charter and the dialogue within our international Organization which promoted better relations between peoples and nations of the other parts of the world must contribute to the elimination of the causes of war in the third world, which includes two thirds of the States Members of our Organization.

One of the causes of war is colonialism in all its forms. Colonialism, the worst form of exploitation of man by man, is a serious threat to peace. An eminent writer concerned with the activities of our international Organization has explained this undeniable truth in his book entitled Swords into Plowshares, on pages 350 and 351 of which he writes that peace (spoke in English)

"... is a function of a good society, in which all component groups enjoy justice, share in a mutuality of respect, participate in the value of economic and social progress and move toward political maturity. This idea cannot be reached so long as the system of colonial overlords keeps the map spotted with blighted areas, inhabited by people that are denied both the advantages and responsibilities of full citizenship in the human Commonwealth".

(continued in French)

It is difficult, in fact inconceivable, to speak of progress towards universal peace as long as there is a people under the colonial yoke in southern Africa and in other parts of the globe. In order to eliminate one of the causes of war and to trace the path towards peace, the whole international community must unite to combat and vanquish colonialism in all its forms throughout the whole world.

Another cause of war, no less dangerous than the previous one, is the military rivalry of the great Powers in the countries of the third world, and specifically in the Mediterranean and the Middle East, in Africa and the Indian Ocean, and in South and South-East Asia.

(Mr. Hakobero, Burundi)

There is a danger that this military rivalry might infect the zones which are free from nuclear weapons by introducing those weapons into those areas. In this connexion, Colonel Jean-Baptiste Bagaza, President of the Republic of Burundi, addressing the present session of the General Assembly on 26 September, stated:

"There is every reason to encourage the initiatives undertaken towards creating nuclear-weapon-free zones. Here we consider it imperative to take the appropriate measures for the application of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East and South Asia, and for the respect of the treaties and protocols banning nuclear weapons in Latin America." (A/34/PV.9, p. 17)

Speaking specifically of the situation prevailing in the coastal States of the Mediterranean and in South Asia and South-East Asia, the President of the Republic of Burundi added:

"In the face of increasing tension in the Mediterranean we call on those States parties to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe to transform the region into a zone of peace and co-operation. ...

"Peace is an indivisible whole. Security in Africa, Europe and the Middle East would indeed be precarious if Asia, where most people live, were faced with large scale conflicts. We have great respect for these peoples with their very old civilizations. Africa has ties of active solidarity forged through the history of the liberation of the African and Asian countries. We ask all South-East Asian States to settle all their conflicts or disputes themselves without outside interference, so as to safeguard world peace in this region. We sincerely hope that thanks to their own genius these States will be able to overcome the obstacles to their negotiations, so that the conditions for viable peace and fruitful co-operation in the region may be created.

(Mr. Makobero, Burundi)

"On the question of Korea, our Government supports the efforts towards the peaceful and independent reunification of that country.

(ibid., p. 16)

The world-wide economic imbalance is another cause of war and a serious threat to peace. At the time of the founding of our international Organization, an outstanding representative of Mexico stated:

(spoke in English)

"The Charter of the United Nations is not only our instrument of security against the horrors of war. It is also, for the people who have been fighting to uphold the principles of human dignity, an instrument of well-being and happiness against the horrors of a peace without hope, in which men would be subjected to humiliating privations and injustice. Blood, sweat and tears comprised the glorious but provisional rule of war. It must not become the rule of peace."

(continued in French)

A peace without hope for the vast majority of mankind which is vegetating in misery while billions of dollars are being spent each year for the manufacture and purchase of weapons of destruction is not a peace. The international community must unite not only in order to prevent and remove the threat of a nuclear war or, indeed, of any war, but also to eliminate poverty, which is a delayed-action atomic bomb that threatens all of us, both rich and poor.

As the head of the delegation of Nigeria stated in the course of his statement in the general debate at the present session of the General Assembly:

(spoke in English)

"The dangers we face as we enter the 1980s are too real for us to despair. Beset as mankind is, on the one hand, by economic burdens and, on the other, by fear of a nuclear holocaust, constructive and collective action through the United Nations remains the only hope and opportunity we have to face the challenges of the future. Only thus can we leave a legacy worthy of our civilization to our children, as we meet to consider their prospects and problems in this International Year of the Child."

(A/34/PV.30, p. 73-75)

ORTIZ MARTIN (Costa Rica)(interpretation from Spanish): I should like, first of all, on behalf of the delegation of Costa Rica, to express my satisfaction at the election of Ambassador Hepburn to the chairmanship of this Committee.

Whenever disarmament is discussed, Costa Rica, a country which loves peace and lives in peace, has something of value to say, for we did away with our army 30 years ago in the certainty that if there are no armed men there will be no war; and, by not squandering our resources on weapons, we can devote them to promote progress, social development, health services and education in freedom. That is why we speak in praise of the benefits derived by peoples when they do not have to invest their resources in costly armaments.

The Disarmament Decade is coming to an end and we see no important positive results on the horizon. We hear brilliant speeches delivered by great politicians, experts, technicians and wise men and women who tell us of the nefarious progress of nuclear science and the growth of conventional weapons to be used in wars between small and medium-sized Powers - although their small size does not diminish the horror of the destruction of cities, villages, roads, bridges, fields and human beings. No concrete progress is made in the field of disarmament, but the cost of weapons is on the rise. It is stated that the enormous sum of \$450,000 billion has been invested in the science of death, and those figures are responsible for the poverty in which thousands of human beings live. They should be repeated over and over again until all the inhabitants of the world get to know them and rise up in anger and indignation against so much injustice.

We shall not attempt to repeat the interesting data on the specific points of the various treaties on nuclear, chemical, conventional and bacteriological weapons, given here so eloquently and with supporting evidence derived from the studies that have been carried out. What we want to emphasize is the concern of all nations at this important and decisive problem. Some provide enormous capitals to manufacture weapons, others train armies to dominate their neighbours or to terrorize their own fellow countrymen; and the remainder are those who suffer when their cities are

(Mr. Ortiz Martin, Costa Rica)

razed, their industries bombed, their harvests ruined and who in the holocaust suffer great loss of life and see so many of their people killed or injured. It is a tragedy in which we all play our part. Mankind is not only a physical element destroyed by weapons; it is also a moral element that lights up man's existence.

In the United Nations Plaza, in front of this building, there is carved in stone the prophecy of Isaiah prohibiting weapons: swords shall be turned into ploughshares, spears into pruning-hooks, nation shall not lift up sword against nation, and neither shall man be taught to make war.

Very humbly and without presuming to interpret the prophet, the Government of Costa Rica has sought to offer the United Nations, so as to give man an opportunity to comply with the prophecy to prepare himself for peace, an institution to supplement disarmament, to be called the University for Peace. Among the fundamental canons of that centre of learning is "education for disarmament", which is combined with the subject under discussion since treaties must be finally adopted if the world is not to be annihilated; it is then that the world should have trained men who will live for disarmament. The University for Peace which Costa Rica is offering is an essential element if we are to set out with firm steps along the road that leads to peace.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.