



UN DOCUMENT COLLECTION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 24th MEETING

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

later: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

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

- General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Singh (India)
Mr. Sharif (Somalia)
Mr. Erdembileg (Mongolia)
Mr. de Laiglesia (Spain)
Mrs. Thorsson (Sweden)
Mr. Rossides (Cyprus)

* 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.

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

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

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. SINGH (India). India's views on the broad spectrum of disarmament issues have already been expressed by the Minister of State for External Affairs in this Committee on 22 October. I shall confine my statement to certain aspects of agenda item 42, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session".

It is worth recalling that the Final Document of the special session stated:

"Mankind today is confronted with an unprecedented threat of self-extinction arising from the massive and competitive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced. Existing arsenals of nuclear weapons alone are more than sufficient to destroy all life on earth. Failure of efforts to halt and reverse the arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race, increases the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Yet the arms race continues." (resolution S-10/2, para. 11)

Had the special session been held this year instead of in 1978, I am sure that it would have expressed similar sentiments because the arms race, far from slowing down, continues to escalate.

The Programme of Action adopted during the special session rightly gave priority to nuclear disarmament for the simple reason that:

"Nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization." (Ibid., para. 47)

(Mr. Singh, India)

In paragraph 50 of the Final Document, the international community adopted a realistic and effective basis for nuclear disarmament consisting of the following elements: cessation of the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery; and a comprehensive phased programme with agreed time-frames for the reduction of nuclear weapon stockpiles and their means of delivery, leading to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, there have been no meaningful negotiations to implement the above measures. On the contrary, the nuclear weapon States continue to improve and develop their nuclear weapon systems. In this context, I should like to refer to the statement made by the representative of Finland in this Committee on 19 October when he said:

"The qualitative arms race has created new generations of nuclear weapons and is accompanied by new strategic doctrines which take into account the possibility of limited nuclear war." (A/C.1/34/PV.9, p. 43-45)

We have welcomed the conclusion of the SALT II Agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union as evidence of the willingness of the super-Powers to continue the process of negotiations in the direction of nuclear disarmament. There is no doubt, however, that SALT II, which we hope will be ratified by both sides, falls far short of the expectations of the international community in the field of nuclear disarmament. We feel that the General Assembly should urgently call upon these two States immediately to commence negotiations on a genuine disarmament treaty which would take into account not only the so-called strategic nuclear weapons but also the thousands of nuclear warheads which are deployed by both sides on the European continent. Given the indiscriminate and destructive effects of nuclear weapons, it would be small comfort to us in Asia if we were to be annihilated by the use of so-called "theatre" nuclear weapons in Europe instead of by strategic intercontinental weapons.

My delegation, in principle, does not object to the proposal for a cut-off in the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. In fact, we would welcome such a proposal if it were simultaneously linked to immediate cessation of the production of nuclear weapons. A ban on

(Mr. Singh, India)

the production of fissionable material without, at the same time, an immediate stoppage of the production of nuclear weapons would not be very meaningful since the nuclear weapon States would retain their capability to continue to add to their nuclear arsenals with their existing accumulated stocks of fissionable material. This idea has been recognized in paragraph 50 of the Final Document. It follows, therefore, that international safeguards for this purpose should apply both to the peaceful nuclear installations of non-nuclear-weapon States as well as to the military nuclear installations of the nuclear-weapon States. It is in this context that the proposal for a cut-off should be viewed.

Some delegations have focused their attention on the problem of non-proliferation. India remains opposed to vertical and horizontal nuclear proliferation. We note that a few delegations have referred to the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) which is to take place next year. I shall not reiterate our opposition to this discriminatory Treaty. We would, however, wish to express concern over certain statements made in this Committee to the effect that the Second Review Conference should consider some sort of preferential treatment to be given to States parties to the Treaty with regard to international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, as an "incentive" for adherence to the NPT. India would consider any such move as not only being directed against the solidarity of the non-aligned and developing countries but also as an attempt at coercion.

Justified concern has been expressed over the conventional arms race and the need for conventional disarmament measures. My delegation has no hesitation in supporting the concept of conventional disarmament as long as it is within the framework of general and complete disarmament, is global in scope and takes into account above all the central arms race between the nuclear-weapon States and their respective allies. We feel that certain initiatives which might be taken in the field of conventional disarmament, including "international arms transfers", would tend to divert the attention of the General Assembly from the priority problem of nuclear disarmament. Efforts are being made by certain countries to impose controls on international transfers of conventional arms. We should all note that such

measures would in fact operate against the non-aligned countries, as such controls would not be applied to members of military alliances or to other States which are parties to special interlocking arrangements of the nuclear-weapon States. We have to take into account the fact that many non-aligned countries still face grave threats to their integrity and national independence and have to contend with serious problems of natural obsolescence of their weapons in relation to the armaments possessed by the nuclear-weapon States and other industrially advanced countries.

(Mr. Singh, India)

The Committee on Disarmament, as constituted by the General Assembly at its special session last year, completed its first session during 1979. India took an active part in the work of the Committee. My delegation recognizes that the Committee completed the organizational aspect of its work which is an essential precondition for the successful undertaking of the substantive side of its mandate. At the same time, we are disappointed that the Committee was not able to initiate negotiations on some of the priority items on its agenda such as chemical weapons and a nuclear-test ban. My delegation believes that the negotiations on specific disarmament items which are being conducted outside the Committee should not in any way hamper or obstruct the negotiating mandate of the Committee. We trust that the 1980 session of the Committee will be more productive. In that context, my delegation notes with satisfaction the declaration of the representative of China that his country will participate in the work of the Committee next year. I should also mention that the Committee on Disarmament received valuable secretariat assistance during its session in 1979. It is essential that the Secretary-General should continue to provide such assistance and be in a position to increase its scope if the increased activities of the Committee which are expected should demand it.

My delegation shares the disappointment of many delegations over the absence of concrete progress on the question of chemical weapons. We received with interest the joint progress report submitted by the two negotiating States to the Committee on Disarmament earlier this year. We are firmly of the opinion that the Committee on Disarmament should initiate substantive negotiations on this subject at the beginning of its 1980 session.

The United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have submitted to the Committee on Disarmament a draft text containing the main elements of a convention on radiological weapons. That text is being examined in the appropriate departments of our Government and the Indian delegation will offer its comments on it in the Committee on Disarmament. At this stage, I should like to support the sentiments expressed by the Foreign Minister of Sweden in his statement in this Committee on 29 October, namely, that the proposed treaty on radiological weapons should

(Mr. Singh, India)

in no way be a substitute for genuine nuclear disarmament and that the greatest radiological danger is constituted by the monstrous arsenals of nuclear explosive weapons.

I cannot conclude my statement without referring to the ominous reports of the suspected nuclear explosion by the racist régime of South Africa. Whatever the truth behind the present reports, there is no doubt that South Africa is making every effort to acquire nuclear-weapon technology. South Africa's nuclear capacity presents a serious and immediate threat to world peace and in particular to all African States. It is essential, therefore, that urgent action be taken to ensure that there is neither further nuclear collaboration in any form with South Africa, nor financial or other assistance to its nuclear programme. The international community will have to adopt firm measures, in the form of mandatory economic sanctions, to prevent South Africa from continuing with its present nuclear programme. In view of the nature and record of the apartheid régime, no international or bilateral safeguards would be adequate. My delegation supports the proposal made by Nigeria to request the Secretary-General to investigate the reports of a nuclear explosion by South Africa. We urge the nuclear-weapon and other States to co-operate with the Secretary-General in that task.

Mr. SHARIF (Somalia): Since this is the first time I have spoken in this forum, I wish to extend to the Chairman my delegation's congratulations on his well-merited election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. I am happy that this important debate on urgent issues pertaining to international peace and security is taking place under his guidance.

It seems to my delegation that there is little ground for satisfaction over progress towards the disarmament goals set by the tenth special session of the General Assembly. A disturbing factor in this lack of progress is the general tendency, within our Organization, to reiterate accepted principles, priorities and programmes as though that exercise in itself constituted movement towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

(Mr. Sharif, Somalia)

Of course it is difficult for Member States and for the various bodies working on disarmament questions to move forward in a positive way, particularly on the question of nuclear disarmament, when the super-Powers, which have the heaviest responsibility in that regard, continue to put narrow group and national interests, and even material, strategic, economic, political and military gains before international peace and security.

The super-Powers, which have long possessed the ability to obliterate each other and the world, have not yet demonstrated a sincere willingness to stop the nuclear-arms race. This ever-increasing spiral, demanded by the principle of the balance of terror, will not be ended until that dangerous principle has been abandoned. Certainly the failure of the nuclear Powers to reduce their nuclear arsenals is totally inconsistent with their responsibilities under the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Without their moral and practical leadership, efforts to strengthen the régime of non-proliferation will hardly be successful.

My delegation welcomes the progress made so far towards the ratification of the SALT II negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Some degree of control of the nuclear-arms race is better than none, and it is to be hoped that SALT II will open the door to more significant measures of nuclear disarmament. However, until the SALT treaties begin to represent a balanced, mutual reduction of nuclear armaments, rather than a controlled increase in the quality and quantity of nuclear weapons and weapon systems, as is now the case, the rest of the world can take slight comfort from these negotiations.

(Mr. Sharif, Somalia)

My delegation is happy that the Committee on Disarmament is studying the question of international agreements that would guarantee the safety of non-nuclear-weapon States from nuclear attack, but we are profoundly conscious of the fact that the safety of no State can be guaranteed in the event of the unleashing, by design or error, of the strategic nuclear weapons of a super-Power.

If the demand of the non-nuclear-weapon States for an end to the nuclear-Power struggle seems unrealistic, our point of view must be posed against the shameful expenditure of \$300 billion each year on nuclear and sophisticated conventional weapons, while poverty and hunger, endemic in the world today, will probably affect 600 million people by the year 2000.

The reduction of the military budgets of nuclear Powers and other militarily significant States and the application of such savings to development must cease to be a pious aspiration and become a practical reality. These vast expenditures on armaments are a major cause of world inflation and are incompatible with the establishment of a new and just world economic order.

Above all, the irrational nature of a nuclear-arms race that threatens mankind's very survival must be universally recognized, and this recognition should lead to a new sense of responsibility on the part of those directly concerned for the peace, security and continuity of the human race.

Obviously the problems that must be overcome to achieve, first of all, nuclear disarmament and, finally, general and complete disarmament are gigantic and complex, but the international community has no option other than to tackle these problems and to go forward step by step with courage and political will.

The vast majority of Member States continue to call for the speedy conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. My delegation hopes that the States carrying on the tripartite negotiations will soon achieve this goal, which was given high priority by the tenth special session.

A similar consensus exists on the need for a ban on the development of chemical weapons, whose existence represents a retrograde step in the development of our world civilization. It is particularly abhorrent that such weapons have been widely used against people fighting wars of national liberation. It is long past time for all chemical weapons to be destroyed and for chemical warfare to be condemned and forbidden by international law.

(Mr. Sharif, Somalia)

The difficulty and complexity of the task of controlling existing weapons of mass destruction point to the necessity of devising effective measures to prevent the development of new weapons of mass destruction, whether such weapons have yet to be invented or their potential has already been explored. My delegation hopes that the negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States in this regard will soon bear fruit.

A vital factor in the establishment of agreements on the control or reduction of armaments, in particular nuclear armaments, is the question of verification. My delegation believes that great attention must be given not only to the technological aspect of this question - which is already being done - but also to its political and administrative aspects. We believe that there must be an international verification agency that would help to build confidence by its independent observation of arms control and disarmament agreements and that could also reduce the possibility of nuclear-strategic war occurring through error.

In this context my delegation places great importance on the proposal that an international satellite monitoring agency be established. We hope that the experts appointed by the Secretary-General to study this question will make good progress in finding solutions to the many legal, technical and financial problems that will be involved in such a venture.

Special reference should be made here of Israeli nuclear armament. Israel has demonstrated every kind of arrogance and defiance of the sensibility of world public opinion by refraining from signing the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Besides its continuous negation of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, its perpetuation of a premeditated policy of aggression, occupation of Arab lands and expansion, it uses nuclear armament as a means of intimidating and blackmailing the States of the region, thus destabilizing and aggravating the already deteriorated situation in the Middle East, and compels others to resort to nuclear armament in legitimate self-defence against permanent aggression.

No wonder there is co-operation between Israel and South Africa in the field of nuclear armament since they share the same policies of colonialism,

(Mr. Sharif, Somalia)

racism, negation of the political and human principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter and furtherance of a direction diametrically opposed to the trend of history.

Somalia, an Indian Ocean State, strongly supports the concepts of zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones. These concepts, already given practical expression in Latin America, can make a valuable contribution to world disarmament goals by encouraging the reduction and removal of regional tensions.

A major problem in the Indian Ocean is the steady expansion of the military and naval presence of the great Powers in the context of their strategic policies, hegemonist designs and global rivalry. The actions of the super-Powers in this regard are in flagrant violation of the General Assembly's Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. As their power struggle escalates in our area, we have increasing evidence of the kinds of tension and insecurity that the Indian Ocean Declaration seeks to guard against.

Talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on their Indian Ocean presence have unfortunately been intermittent, limited in scope and unproductive. We hope to see more sustained and fruitful efforts in the future.

Another dangerous element in the Indian Ocean situation is the strengthening of South Africa's racist régime through the military, naval, technological and financial support given by its allies. My delegation particularly deplores the fact that this co-operation has allowed South Africa to develop a nuclear-weapon capability and to threaten further the liberation struggle of the oppressed people of southern Africa who are fighting for self-determination and independence. The recent detection of a nuclear explosion in the region of South Africa lends added urgency to the concern over the militaristic and aggressive policies of the Pretoria régime. It is to be hoped that there will be a complete cessation by all States of any further supply of nuclear materials, equipment and technology to South Africa.

The increased gravity and scope of the problems of the Indian Ocean and the threat they pose to world peace make it imperative that an Indian Ocean conference be called as soon as possible. My delegation therefore strongly supports the recommendation of the recent Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean that the current session of the General Assembly fix a date and venue for a conference on the Indian Ocean as called for in resolution 33/68.

(Mr. Sharif, Somalia)

The best efforts of diplomats, experts and world leaders have not brought us very far along the road to general and complete disarmament. This is no doubt a compelling reason for the emphasis placed by the tenth special session on the need to mobilize world public opinion in support of the principles and policies outlined in the Final Document of the session. My delegation hopes that the influence of people everywhere, at the grass-roots level, can be directed against the continuation of the arms race and the threat of a nuclear holocaust. In this context we highly commend the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) for its plan to hold a Congress on Disarmament Education in 1980.

The tenth special session also stressed the need for confidence building in international relations in order to produce the climate necessary for disarmament. In this context my delegation strongly supports such practical confidence-building measures as the exchange of military information and the reduction of troops and armaments in accordance with regional agreements. We believe, however, that the most important approach to confidence building between States is to deal with the underlying causes of militarism, of dangerous regional conflicts and of the arms race in nuclear and conventional weapons. In our view, these are caused by imperialist and hegemonist policies and the denial of the right to self-determination and independence to peoples under colonial, racist or foreign domination.

As the world community prepares for the eleventh special session, and, beyond that, for a world disarmament conference, it must address itself forthrightly to these fundamental questions; it must guard against substituting words for action and it must be fully convinced that the tasks set by the tenth special session constitute a sober and realistic approach to world disarmament, without which there can be no world peace.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): The irrepressible aspirations of the peoples of the world to universal peace and their will and determination to avert the danger of the outbreak of a new world war have once again been strikingly manifested in recent days when, in all corners of the world, the week devoted to fostering the objectives of disarmament was widely acknowledged and marked. We can state with confidence that in this year, which is proclaimed International Year of the Child, the call for the cessation of the arms race for achieving genuine disarmament for the sake of a bright future for all children has made itself felt ever more widely and forcefully.

It is quite natural that in many countries of the world, including socialist Mongolia, important measures under this very slogan should have been undertaken during Disarmament Week, 1979. As the present decade gives way to the next, the world community is becoming more aware of the high priority, urgency and importance of the goal of halting the arms race and taking practical measures in the disarmament field. The indivisibility of peace, security and the economic and social progress of peoples has found real confirmation against the background of the course of events in the international arena, particularly in the last few years.

In response to the consistent efforts of peace-loving forces to bring about détente, the opponents of peace and disarmament are making every attempt to poison the international atmosphere and to whip up a war psychosis in order to attain their own militarist, expansionist and hegemonist ambitions. In the light of this, it becomes extremely important for States actively to try to call a halt to the policy of hegemonism in international relations, because it leads to a serious deterioration in the international atmosphere and to the appearance of new hotbeds of tension. In this regard the adoption of a decision of principle at this session of the General Assembly on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations, as proposed by the Soviet Union, would be an important practical step towards deepening the process of international détente.

It is universally acknowledged that the advance of détente and progress in disarmament are complementary and reinforce each other, and this is the premise upon which the socialist countries have based their initiatives aimed at strengthening trust and mutual understanding and developing friendly

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

relations among States. The sincere desire of the socialist countries and their determination to further détente and disarmament have once again been reflected in the new constructive proposals put forward in a speech by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, L. I. Brezhnev, in Berlin on 6 October this year.

The new peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, which constitute the result of the unanimity of will of all the countries of the socialist community, embrace both practical measures in the field of military détente and concrete measures of the strengthening of trust among States. The Soviet Union, in agreement with the German Democratic Republic and other States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty took a decision unilaterally to withdraw 20,000 Soviet servicemen and 1,000 tanks and other military hardware from the territory of the German Democratic Republic over the next 12 months. The Soviet Government has also stated its readiness to reduce from the present level the number of its medium-range missiles deployed in the western regions of the Soviet Union, provided that in Western Europe there will be no additional deployment of similar North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) weapons. The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic, in its statement of 22 October of this year, warmly welcomed and whole-heartedly supported these new initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

The timeliness and relevance of these new peaceful actions of the Soviet Union are thrown into particularly high relief against the background of the plans being worked out by the NATO countries for the deployment in Western Europe of qualitatively new types of American nuclear missiles, which are to be aimed at the territory of the socialist countries. The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic is convinced that the deployment in Western Europe of new nuclear weapons by the United States would not only contradict the spirit of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, but would also upset the existing military balance in that continent. That would inevitably lead to an exacerbation of the situation in Europe and to the poisoning of the international atmosphere as a whole.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The Mongolian People's Republic believes that the extreme importance and significance of the Soviet initiatives lies in the fact that they are designed to prevent an extremely dangerous escalation of the nuclear arms race and open up favourable prospects for embarking on effective measures in the disarmament field. The Mongolian People's Republic, like all other peace-loving States, expresses the hope that the United States and other leading NATO Powers will evince a proper sense of responsibility and realism and will respond positively to the new Soviet proposals, in the interests of the strengthening of peace, détente and co-operation among States. The Mongolian delegation believes that these new proposals in the field of international détente will promote progress in the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe and also in other talks which are in progress on various aspects of halting the arms race and bringing about disarmament. In our view they are all aimed at implementing the provisions of the Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons. In this regard we would particularly like to stress that the SALT II Treaty has laid the foundation for a further quantitative and qualitative limitation and reduction of the most dangerous and destructive types of weapons of mass destruction and has had a very favourable effect on the course of the ongoing negotiations on limiting the arms race and bringing about disarmament.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The new Treaty and other related documents are doing a great deal to reduce the threat of the outbreak of nuclear war and promote the strengthening and deepening of international détente. We hope that the supreme interests of strengthening universal peace, reason and statesmanship will prevail and that the Treaty will be ratified at an early date by both parties, thus opening the way to further talks on the substantial limitation and reduction of strategic armaments.

Having made a few remarks of a general nature, I should like now to turn to the position of the Mongolian delegation on individual items on the First Committee's agenda.

As representatives know, this year the Committee on Disarmament, for the first time since the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, got down to work with more representative membership, which includes a broad range of States, both nuclear and non-nuclear, both parties to military alliances and non-aligned countries. Undoubtedly, the nuclear-weapon States bear particular responsibility for disarmament; along with them, other militarily important States bear considerable responsibility for the adoption of practical measures to halt the arms race and bring about disarmament.

Therefore the general view would appear to be that, in such an authoritative international forum as the Committee on Disarmament, we must have the participation of all nuclear States that are permanent members of the Security Council. In this regard I should like to mention the recent statement in the First Committee made by the representative of China in which he pointed out that in the coming year China intended to take part in the work of the Committee on Disarmament. However, the negative positions of the present leadership of China on questions of disarmament are widely known. China continues to disregard the existing important international treaties and agreements on disarmament. It is constantly building up and improving its military potential, by adding both nuclear weapons and the latest types of conventional weapons, in complicity with the military industrial circles of the West.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

As a nuclear State, China should soberly realize its particular responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security - a responsibility that it bears as a permanent member of the Security Council. It should subscribe to the existing international legal instruments in the field of disarmament and unswervingly comply with their provisions. We understand the feelings of those who would like to see China sitting at the conference table negotiating on disarmament questions, because the constructive participation of that country would be in keeping not only with the interests of its own people but also with the general interests of ensuring international peace and security.

The Mongolian delegation shares the view that at its last session the Committee on Disarmament was notably active. The efforts and initiatives of the socialist countries contributed considerably to this. They came forward with constructive proposals which constitute a good basis for conducting further talks on individual disarmament items. It seems to us that in the course of the last session of the Geneva Committee, in spite of certain positive aspects of the work, no substantial progress was achieved on those items. Once again that has convincingly confirmed the correctness of the view that in such a complex matter as talks on disarmament questions it is important to have the positive political will of the participants in the talks.

It should be stressed that at the last session of the Committee on Disarmament a useful discussion was held on the concrete proposal of the socialist countries to begin talks on ceasing the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed. If that important proposal were carried out it would prove to be a practical step towards the implementation of the relevant paragraph of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, devoted to disarmament. Unfortunately,

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

the Committee on Disarmament was unable to begin a substantive discussion on the matter. It would be advisable for the General Assembly at the present session to take an authoritative stand in favour of the Committee on Disarmament's proceeding as soon as possible to consideration of the substance of the question.

An important measure in the field of disarmament would be the comprehensive strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation régime by ensuring that all States without exception subscribe to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In this regard, we attach considerable importance to the Second Review Conference of the Parties to that Treaty, to be held in 1980, in order to elaborate further effective measures for the development of international co-operation in strengthening the non-proliferation régime. The urgency of this problem arises primarily from the fact that a number of so-called near-nuclear Powers remain outside the scope of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The recent press reports about the carrying out by the racist South African régime of a nuclear-weapon test give rise to deep concern and alarm. Such an adventuristic step would represent considerable danger to the cause of international peace and security. The Mongolian delegation believes that the General Assembly at its present session must take a firm and unambiguous stand to prevent any further development of events. In this regard, we also support the timely proposal by Iraq to consider at this session of the General Assembly the question of Israel's nuclear armaments.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

Two other initiatives of socialist countries would also serve to strengthen the non-proliferation régime. These are proposals with regard to which the General Assembly at its thirty-third session adopted relevant decisions. I have in mind the resolution on the conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States and the resolution on the achievement of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons in the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.

As the Committee knows, on the first of those questions the Geneva Committee on Disarmament has already begun specific work by setting up a special working group, which has held a useful exchange of views on this question. In this regard, we support the conclusion of that special working group that it should continue at the next session its consideration of this problem and we hope that very soon the Committee on Disarmament will be able to reach agreement on the working out of a draft international convention on the strengthening of security guarantees for non-nuclear States.

The attainment of a genuine measure in the field of disarmament could also be facilitated by the bilateral Soviet-American agreement on the prohibition of radiological weapons. As we know, the fundamental elements of a future treaty have already been submitted for the consideration of the Committee on Disarmament. Prompt agreement on the text of the treaty would make it possible to open it for signature by States at an early date. In this regard, in our view, the decision of the General Assembly to propose that the Committee begin work immediately in order to reach agreement on the text of a treaty on the basis of the draft document submitted by the Soviet Union and the United States would be of considerable help. The forthcoming talks on drafting an international instrument for the prohibition of radiological weapons, of course, should not be allowed to divert us from the attainment of our major goal, that of preparing a draft treaty on the comprehensive prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. As we know, this question has been discussed in the Committee on Disarmament

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

with the participation of qualified governmental experts. We believe it to be important in the preparation of such a treaty to continue to bring in authoritative specialists in this field.

The Mongolian delegation would like to stress once again the urgent need for specific consideration of the question of the prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon. The draft convention on the prohibition of the manufacture, stockpiling, deployment and use of that weapon submitted by the socialist countries in the Committee on Disarmament, as we have repeatedly pointed out, could serve as a good basis for conducting talks on this question.

One of the high-priority tasks of the Committee on Disarmament still remains the preparation of a treaty on the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing. We believe that a certain amount of progress has been achieved in the tripartite talks, but if they are to be speedily concluded, there must be a manifestation of political will on the part of all participants in the talks so that such a draft treaty can be submitted for the consideration of the Committee on Disarmament at an appropriate time.

Among the urgent disarmament problems is the question of prohibiting chemical weapons. The Committee on Disarmament at this stage is making considerable efforts to work out the fundamental elements of the content of a future convention. In a joint statement by the Soviet Union and the United States in the Committee on Disarmament on the course of bilateral talks on this question a detailed account was given of their approach to the substance of this matter. The Mongolian delegation hopes that in the course of the next session of the Committee a further clarification will be given in regard to certain complex aspects of this problem and that the businesslike consideration of them will be continued.

The Mongolian delegation expresses the hope that the convening this year of the Review Conference on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction will serve as an encouragement to those States which have not yet done so to take appropriate measures to subscribe as soon as possible to that important international instrument, which is the first treaty in history to outlaw in its entirety one type of weapon of mass destruction.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The Mongolian People's Republic continues to attach great importance to the establishment of zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world. We have consistently held the view that such zones should be genuinely free of nuclear weapons. An important condition for the establishment of such zones, as we have repeatedly stressed, is the absence therein of foreign military bases. That is precisely how we view the question of converting the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. In this regard, my delegation believes it to be important for Soviet-American talks on this question to be resumed.

The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic is convinced that the consideration of the whole complex of problems associated with disarmament in the broadest and most authoritative international forum - that is in a world disarmament conference - would facilitate the adoption of effective decisions in this area. We believe that a world disarmament conference can and must play an important part in the whole machinery for the consideration of disarmament problems. In connexion with the emerging agreement on the time for the convening of such a conference, the Mongolian delegation believes it is necessary to broaden the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference and to endow it with appropriate preparatory functions.

Talks in the field of disarmament would be considerably facilitated by the adoption at this session of the General Assembly of the declaration on international co-operation for the disarmament, a draft of which was submitted by the delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. That document reflected a whole complex of important political principles which should guide all States in their approach to the vital problems of disarmament.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The adoption of such a declaration would considerably facilitate the implementation of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

In conclusion, I should like to say a few words about the week devoted to fostering the objectives of disarmament. I am pleased to point out that this decision of the tenth special session of the General Assembly elicited unanimous support and an active response throughout the world.

In the course of Disarmament Week in the Mongolian People's Republic, wide-ranging activities have been undertaken everywhere. In these days, Mongolian public opinion has again spoken out decisively in support of stepping up the efforts of the peoples of the world to deepen the process of international détente and to implement effective measures to halt the arms race and achieve genuine disarmament.

The Mongolian delegation notes with satisfaction the report of the Secretary-General in document A/34/436, which contains the elements of a model programme for Disarmament Week. The measures proposed by the Secretary-General could undoubtedly facilitate the work of Governments in carrying out local programmes to mark this week. In our view, the active co-operation of the United Nations and of international non-governmental organizations in marking Disarmament Week would do a great deal to help States in carrying out these programmes.

We consider that the Disarmament Week should continue to serve as an important means for intensifying the activities of Governments and of public and other organizations to mobilize public opinion in favour of total support for the cause of disarmament, both on the national and the international level. And we entirely agree with the view of the Secretary-General of the United Nations expressed in his report, to the effect that the week

"should be seen not merely as a one-week observance, but as the impetus for year-round efforts to increase public awareness of the danger of arms"
(A/34/436, annex, para. 34).

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

It is precisely from this standpoint that the Mongolian People's Republic views the importance of International Disarmament Week as confirming the devotion of the Mongolian people, together with all peace-loving peoples, decisively to defend the cause of peace and disarmament.

Mr. DE LAIGLESIA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): Not very long ago, barely a year and a half, many Heads of State or Government, Foreign Ministers and other leaders reminded us in a useful reiterative exercise of the \$400 billion being squandered yearly by mankind in the purchase of armaments. Those statements were made on the occasion of the tenth special session of our General Assembly, the first to be devoted exclusively to disarmament.

What has happened since? Those appeals to reason, those urgings addressed to our collective conscience, what have they produced? The answer is simple and disheartening. They have produced an increase in military expenditure exceeding by more than 10 per cent the levels recorded in the spring of 1978.

This piece of information is enough to compel us to reflect and to continue to consider what measures might prove effective in our world to halt this dangerous arms race, and thus to move towards the objective we have all accepted: general and complete disarmament.

Faced with this prospect, my delegation considers that the first requirement to be borne in mind is realism. Any proposal that may be made in this or other forums should always take into account the international situation of the world in which we live. Hence, such proposals must avoid approaches based merely on propaganda considerations or on a selfish concept of national interests.

Disarmament issues are of interest to all; therefore we must all give our views on them and in whatever we say we should always keep in mind the universality of our concerns.

It is understandable that we should give priority to nuclear disarmament and I need hardly stress yet again the devastating effect a nuclear war would have on our civilization. We would have wished to see more progress in this field, particularly in the area of the total prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests, a topic to which the international community, through our Organization, has for many years never ceased to draw attention.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

Likewise, no progress will be made on a matter as important as the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as long as those who possess them to not give unequivocal proof of their will to move on towards the goal of nuclear disarmament. Allow me to say once again that the cessation of horizontal proliferation is inconceivable unless new attention is given to the problem of vertical proliferation. To this end we only have to recall the information we received a few days ago to realize the gravity of a situation which, in our view, can effectively be ended only by measures which encompass all aspects of this problem.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

However, everything has not been negative. The conclusion of the second strategic arms limitation treaty between the two super-Powers constitutes a step in the right direction towards the limitation and control of nuclear weapons, which could subsequently lead to genuine nuclear disarmament measures.

We trust that the process which began with the signing in Vienna will be completed in accordance with the respective constitutional requirements and soon lead to the implementation of what was then decided. That would pave the way for SALT III, whose scope will, in the view of many countries, including my own, be much greater than that of SALT II.

The nuclear threat, the possibility that for whatever reason a nuclear war may be unleashed, is undoubtedly the most serious threat hanging over mankind. For this reason it deserves the vigilant attention to which our Organization subjects it. We cannot afford, even by way of hypothesis, to cease to consider it, but this must not cause us to forget that, as repeatedly stated in this Committee, four fifths of world expenditure on weapons is devoted to non-nuclear weapons, that is, conventional weapons. On the other hand, while responsibility for initiatives relating to nuclear disarmament lies with a very few countries, measures on conventional disarmament, on the contrary, not only affect all States but, as opposed to nuclear disarmament, are something to the effective implementation of which we can all contribute. For this reason, today I shall devote my attention particularly to the question of conventional disarmament. In my delegation's view, this is a question in respect of which tangible results can be achieved provided, of course, that countries show the indispensable political will. The Spanish delegation for its part will spare no effort to achieve progress in this field.

There are many aspects of disarmament in the field of conventional weapons. Doubtless the efforts made in this field by the international community for a long time now constitute valuable antecedents which we must not forget, since the desire to halt the arms race existed long before the United Nations came into being. To begin with, I should like to cite the joint Soviet-American proposal relating to "major elements of a treaty prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons", which constitutes a positive aspect of disarmament, although the text has still to be considered by the Committee meeting in Geneva, which we hope will deal with this question in the near future.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

Although this contribution of the United States and the Soviet Union shows a political will aimed at the adoption of measures relating to disarmament, like SALT I and SALT II it concerns merely bilateral agreements. We consider this to be a highly positive course of action, but the dialogue between the super-Powers must find immediate echo in the remainder of the international community, and that echo must be translated into just, well-balanced international agreements offering possibilities of universal acceptance. If this is not the case it will be difficult to achieve progress in this field, since in order to do so the co-operation of all States, the nuclear Powers and the militarily significant countries as well as those which lack powerful armies or sophisticated weapons, is required.

Spain recently ratified the Treaty on the prohibition of bacteriological weapons and took part in the work of the Committee in Geneva on the question of chemical weapons. In point of fact, we took advantage of the possibilities afforded by the new structure of that body to non-member States to put forward our ideas on this important issue. We believe that, while nuclear weapons are in the hands of very few States, chemical weapons are available to any country possessing a certain degree of technological development and that, for this reason, it is essential that measures be adopted which prevent their production, stockpiling and use. Similarly, it is important that the considerable existing stocks be destroyed as soon as possible. In our view, the stage of progress of the work on the preparation of a treaty with the aforementioned objectives makes it imperative that the negotiations in question enter a new phase to speed up a process on the slowness of which I need hardly comment. For this reason, a request to the Committee on Disarmament to initiate at its next session the talks necessary for the preparation of a convention prohibiting the production, stockpiling and use of such weapons, as well as the destruction of existing stocks, appears to us to be highly desirable at this time. However, we consider it essential that that request be specific and definitive so as to prevent its being deprived of the absolute priority which, in our view, it should have. We also wish to take this opportunity to express our gratification at the flexibility of the rules of procedure of the new Committee on Disarmament, thanks to which, as I said earlier, we are able to take part in work that we regard as being of the highest importance.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

As is well known, the Spanish delegation participated with great interest in the conference held last September in Geneva to discuss the question of the prohibition of the use of certain especially harmful conventional weapons. We deplore the small degree of progress attained and nourish the hope that, if the General Assembly agrees to having the conference meet again in 1980, the next session will yield more positive results. However, the complexity of the subject dealt with in the framework of that conference and the diversity of views of participating countries cause us to wonder whether in truth those topics are sufficiently ripe and whether it might not be desirable to continue discussing them at the expert level rather than to hold another conference. In any event, the Spanish delegation wishes to place on record the interest with which it follows the work in question and to which it attaches great importance. We are ready to support any formula that is likely to promote progress in this field.

Another matter with which we have dealt in past sessions of the Assembly is the question of the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction. The possibilities that technological development places within reach of mankind are incalculable, and obviously it is essential that we prevent such knowledge from being used for the production of even more lethal weapons. Hence, we regard as most positive the resolutions adopted to date on this subject by the General Assembly. This does not prevent us from believing that it is desirable that any measure which may be adopted should pursue very specific and clear objectives.

We believe that in the field of disarmament everything that is done to create favourable conditions for mutual understanding between States is highly positive. That is why we have always supported everything that has been done in the field of measures aimed at ~~promoting confidence~~. We continue to do so and we hope that at the meeting in Madrid in 1980, in the framework of the European Conference on Security and Co-operation, substantial progress will be achieved, leading effectively to détente in the region to which we, the participants at that conference, belong.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

The new machinery put into operation by the special session includes one body to which we attach great importance, namely, the Disarmament Commission. In fact, the results of its first session are of great interest, since the document on the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme represents a highly significant step along the road towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The Commission is scheduled to meet again in the spring of 1980 and, in view of this second substantive session, we believe that it is essential that it should not lose its concentration by covering too many items, but rather deal only with a matter which has not been sufficiently thrashed out in order that we may clarify our thinking on that particular subject. To that end, we believe that a broad consideration of all aspects of disarmament and control of conventional weapons could prove to be of great value.

In this context, I should like to recall that in his statement in the general debate during this session of the General Assembly, the Foreign Minister of Spain stated the following:

"But it is not only nuclear arsenals which must be controlled and eliminated; we must also maintain within reasonable limits the growing increase in conventional armaments with the objective of genuinely moving towards the desired goal of general and complete disarmament, without undermining our right to security. My Government is alarmed at the development of these arsenals and, above all, at the recent increase in the fraudulent and uncontrolled trade in weapons. Therefore, consistent with our purpose of moving forward to the adoption of effective measures for disarmament, even though they may be of limited scope, we intend to submit to this Assembly a specific proposal, namely, that the United Nations, which has established the need to arrive at general and complete disarmament, draft, in so far as it is possible to achieve this objective, a code of conduct, with clear, precise and universal validity, to govern, under the strict control of the United Nations, the sale of conventional weapons to third party countries.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

"These rules would establish the cases in which trading in weapons would not be allowed; they would establish by means of a certificate of final destination and other relevant requirements the necessary guarantees that those arms would not be the subject of later uncontrolled trade; and they would call upon the United Nations to set up the necessary machinery to insure strict compliance with these provisions.

"This action would effectively control the trade, so that Governments would assume their responsibility and adequately regulate this branch of their commerce and thus eliminate the figure of the uncontrolled trafficker and fraudulent merchant, who are the true enemies of mankind." (A/34/PV.5, pp. 57 and 58)

The Spanish delegation therefore attaches great importance to the question of conventional disarmament and in that context considers that the regulation of the arms trade, in order to prevent it from being carried out in an uncontrolled manner, would to a very large degree be beneficial to Member States and would contribute effectively to the strengthening of their security, which is a fundamental right of all States.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

We cannot ignore the difficulties raised by the preparation of a code of conduct on the subject, but we believe that studies aimed at a thorough consideration of the subject could be undertaken by whatever bodies are deemed to be appropriate. In the sector of trade in conventional weapons, we note that very little has been done and it is high time that, with due caution and respect for the security needs of States, the United Nations seriously considered existing problems in that field. There is no doubt that the greatest threat hanging over mankind is that which stems from nuclear weapons, although conventional weapons have had an infinitely higher number of victims. Thus, while, mercifully, only two atomic bombs have been used for military purposes, every day conventional weapons bring death and pain to many homes in different corners of our world. As I said before, in one and a half years, expenditures on armaments have increased by more than 10 per cent. That increase was for the most part earmarked for conventional weapons. If we do nothing to prevent this progression the work which we are doing in the United Nations will necessarily be judged very harshly by world public opinion.

Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden): Document A/34/534 contains the interim report of the Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, as requested in paragraph 94 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, and in General Assembly resolution 33/71 M. As I have the honour to be the Chairman of that Group, I have asked to speak this afternoon in order to make a brief statement introducing the report.

Delegates may recall that the Group was appointed by the Secretary-General in August 1978, following a request to that end by the General Assembly at its tenth special session at which it also approved the draft terms of reference submitted to it as contained in document A/S-10/9. At its first session in September 1978 the Group approved an organizational report, which was submitted through the Secretary-General to the thirty-third session of the General Assembly in document A/33/317.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

Before going fairly briefly into the substance of the present report I should like, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, to make some general remarks relating to the subject of the work of the Group.

In my view, disarmament measures must increasingly be treated as an integral part of a readjustment process on all levels in the present world system. If that does not happen there may be little to hope for in a constantly insecure international environment. Economic security lies at the heart of the matter. Thus unemployment, inflation, monetary disorder and a crisis of the main production systems in the world do not enhance security in the eyes of individual nations; nor do they enhance global security. The important role of armaments in the present world economic order has, however, been overlooked to a considerable extent in intergovernmental analyses and consultations on the troubles plaguing the world economy.

Having said that, it is only fair to state that during the last few years, while military research and development have proceeded with merciless automation, while armaments and the arms trade have drastically increased, we have also noted a renewed interest in the role of military expenditures in the international economy. It is true that we are still waiting for the results of empirical research in this field, but there is already a great deal of evidence that a causal relationship exists between steadily increasing military expenditures and world inflation. When it comes to national economic conditions, a number of researchers and research groups around the world have found that inflation and unemployment have more than offset the employment and income from the military sector. Also, heavy involvement in the military sector has caused production methods as well as the productivity of labour and capital to fall behind. The well-known American economist Ruth Leger Sivard, in her valuable survey "World Military and Social Expenditures", summarizes the views of these and other economists in stating that military spending feeds the inflationary spiral in the sphere of trade and economic relations.

The unabated arms race between the two leading military blocs is a threat to civilization in the northern hemisphere. The armaments culture is now spreading into the third world. At the same time, the fabulous costs of the

arms race in the North constitute one of the main obstacles to giving sufficient attention to the problems of development in the third world. The so-called RIO report in 1976 came to the conclusion that 5 per cent of the amount then allocated to military purposes would be enough to finance a fight against poverty in the most destitute regions of the world. In the present predicament of the world economy defence spending probably represents the only reserve available for the solution of development problems in the world. The mutuality of interests that thus exists between North and South would therefore seem to be a valid foundation for disarmament efforts, apart from the obvious moral imperatives involved.

A number of valuable studies relating to disarmament and the economic and social consequences of the arms race have been carried out over the years within the framework of the United Nations. The 1977 report of the Secretary-General on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and of military expenditures is a corner-stone of this work. The studies have pointed to the need for further in-depth analysis of concrete possibilities of converting resources now used for military purposes for productive use in the civilian sector. This is of course a highly complex matter, conceptually, factually and politically. Most researchers today agree, however, that conversion should be feasible from an economic point of view if the necessary political preconditions are established. Pending that, it is not futile but highly important to identify the mechanisms necessary for realizing the great productive potential of a disarmament situation.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

The Group of Governmental Experts reports, through the Secretary-General, to the Assembly and this Committee on its first year of work, in accordance with the decision of the Assembly at its tenth special session.

It should first of all be recalled that in accordance with its terms of reference the Group's study should take account of the current situation in the field of disarmament and of the importance of disarmament for détente, international peace and security, economic and social development, the promotion of international co-operation and their reciprocal relationships. Furthermore, the study should be made in the context of how disarmament can contribute to the establishment of a New International Economic Order. It was also urged that the study be forward-looking and policy-oriented, thus enabling it to serve as a basis for decisions on concrete actions to reallocate real resources released through disarmament measures to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of developing countries.

In the course of the four sessions that we have held so far, the Group has been able to pursue its work very much along the lines indicated in its organizational report last year.

Financed partly by voluntary contributions from a number of Governments to the United Nations Disarmament Project Fund and partly by national funding, the Group has approved a total of 45 research projects out of 75 research proposals received. These 45 projects are now being carried out in universities and research institutes all over the world. Of these projects, 41 relate to the terms of reference as set forth by the Assembly's special session devoted to disarmament, while four deal with the proposal to establish an International Disarmament Fund for Development, a proposal submitted to the Group in accordance with General Assembly resolution 33/71 I.

I should like to take this opportunity to express the sincere feelings of gratitude of the Group towards those Governments which have, by either of two financing methods, enabled the Group to initiate what might prove to be the most comprehensive disarmament research programme carried out so far within the United Nations, involving eminent scholars in 20 countries in our work.

Based on a set of criteria that are listed in paragraph 8 of the interim report (A/34/534), the task of selecting projects related to and covering

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

the research areas contained in the terms of reference was, of course, the Group's main preoccupation during our first year of work. It might be recalled that these three research areas can be summarized as follows: first, present-day utilization of resources for military purposes; secondly, economic and social effects of a continuing arms race and of the implementation of disarmament measures; thirdly, conversion and redeployment of resources released for military purposes through disarmament measures to economic and social development purposes. I might add that a full description of these main research areas is reprinted as Appendix I of the interim report.

It might also be of some interest to this Committee if I were to list just a few of the 45 research projects now being carried out as an important part of this exercise. Again I should like to say that a full list of the projects is added to the interim report as Appendix III.

Dr. Akinyemi of Nigeria is studying utilization of resources for military purposes in black Africa. Professor Encinas of Peru is examining the implementation of the Declaration of Ayacucho. The Marga Institute in Sri Lanka studies the armament culture - the diffusion of the values of militarization. Dr. Mary Kaldor of the University of Sussex in Great Britain has a project on the role of military technology in industrial development. Professor Seymour Melman of Columbia University in the United States is working on three models for economic conversion from military to civilian economy, in market economies, in planned economies and in the economies of under-developed countries. The project of Dr. Swadesh Rana of the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses in India deals with the reallocation of military resources in the areas of the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) to primary sectors in the developing countries, which is called the mutuality of interests in a third world perspective. Professor Kollner of the Federal Republic of Germany is studying disarmament, stability and the equilibrium of world monetary systems. One of the institutes within the USSR Academy of Sciences is examining the economic and social effects of a continuing arms race and of the implementation of disarmament measures. And Professor Vlad of Romania is undertaking a study of disarmament and the New International Economic Order.

These are just some examples of research projects that are now well under way.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

I should not like to neglect, in this presentation, to pay a tribute both to the United Nations institutions that have taken part as observers in the meetings of the Group and to the non-governmental organizations that, at our invitation, came to our third and fourth sessions in Geneva and in New York to exchange views with us on the subject of our work. We hope to benefit also in the future from the contacts thus established.

By referring to the volume of new research material that will flow into the Centre for Disarmament as of 1 January 1980 and that will form the basis of the work ahead of us towards our final report, I have already indicated the need for adequate and qualified staff assistance in order to cope in a satisfactory manner with the important task awaiting the Group. Something between 4,000 and 5,000 pages of research reports will be analysed and evaluated in order to establish a basis for the Group's own conclusions and recommendations. In the interim report, this matter is dealt with in the twenty-third and final paragraph. I am confident that the staff requirements referred to in that paragraph will be recognized by this Committee as essential to the successful completion of this rather ambitious undertaking requested of us by the General Assembly at its tenth special session.

The Group will submit its final report, through the Secretary-General, to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly in 1981. I should like to express the hope that by then - in 1981 - the general political situation will be more favourable to steps being taken towards real disarmament than seems possible today.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Sir, it is gratifying that the whole time of the First Committee is now devoted to disarmament and related international security and that our deliberations on these important subjects are being conducted under your competent and wise guidance.

We are now at the final stage of the Disarmament Decade. Among its few achievements is the ban on biological weapons which, in fact, is the only disarmament convention so far involving the destruction of armaments. There has been no other destruction of any kind of weapon. There are also the SALT I and SALT II accords. Although very limited in scope, by allowing a margin of

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

10,000 strategic warheads to each side and leaving unaffected, therefore, the arms race, they are nevertheless indications of some agreement between the super-Powers. We therefore hope that they may open the way to more advanced co-operation on SALT III and in other fields of disarmament.

A meaningful gain realized during this decade has been the convening of the United Nations special session devoted to disarmament. It has brought under world-wide focus the calamities of the arms race and the urgent need for its cessation. It also produced a Final Document, which in its implementation could lead the world a considerable way to real disarmament and peace. Among the important developments resulting from the special session is the reorganization of the Committee on Disarmament as a negotiating body and the establishment of the Disarmament Commission as a permanent United Nations institution with a deliberative and programming mandate on the over-all disarmament problem.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

This is a significant function because it means the Commission can deal more broadly with the arms race and disarmament with an imaginative yet no less realistic approach. Its guidelines will be passed to the negotiating Committee on Disarmament through the General Assembly.

If the report of the first session of the Committee on Disarmament, resulting only in the adoption of rules of procedure and an agenda, is a disappointment, the report of the Disarmament Commission is most encouraging. The Commission adopted by consensus the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament which is forward-looking and by no means the lowest common denominator. The comprehensive programme will undoubtedly become the centrepiece of the second special session on disarmament in 1982. This programme can be the necessary bridge between the Final Document and effective disarmament measures. It may help to revive the positive nature of the 1962 plans of the United States and the Soviet Union, which were based on the MacLoy-Zorin agreed principles on disarmament.

The problem of disarmament happens to be under discussion in this Committee at a most critical time in the history of the arms race and disarmament. While here we are calmly considering the possibilities of halting or reducing armaments competition, there are concrete indications that the arms race is on the verge of being intensified. As a result of recent qualitative changes in nuclear weapons and their possible uses, the prospects of modified or limited nuclear war bring us closer to the temptation to strike first and to the immense perils involved. Such developments are highly dangerous as they open the way to an all-engulfing nuclear war with cataclysmic consequences. This is a matter that concerns all nations, big and small, and all citizens of our technologically shrunken planet, as it affects the basic human right to life, a right directly linked to the fundamental purposes of this Organization and its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international security and peace. We therefore feel that the international community should turn its attention to the burning problem of the quantitative and qualitative development of nuclear weapons through the continuing arms race.

The disarmament endeavour has been going on for over two decades - now nearly three decades - in conferences, assemblies, committees, commissions and

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

other bodies within and outside the United Nations, but with very meagre results. There has been no reduction in armaments and, more significantly, no measure has been adopted which has affected in the least the escalation of the arms race, In contrast arms production and development have in the meantime been growing by leaps and bounds - an unprecedented phenomenon of feverish preparation for the irrationality of a major war, well known to be impossible. Yet such preparation has been going on unremittingly for decades on end. This preparation for war and the results of it are in themselves almost as destructive as war itself. To give a small example, land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles, which numbered only 30 in 1961 had increased in number by 1970, that is in nine years, to 2,450. Since 1970 newly developed independently targeted warheads have increased in number from 3,609 to 12,427 in 1979. During the same period, the total number of warheads on missiles and bombers increased from 5,800 to 14,200. Annual world expenditure on armaments increased from \$167 billion in 1960 to \$450 billion in 1979, as was stated in this room by the representative of the United States. That represents more than \$1 million a minute. All this graphically illustrates the rapidity with which the arms race is advancing in the absence of any effective measures by the international community of the United Nations to halt it.

In 1961, however, there was an auspicious beginning towards disarmament when the MacLoy-Zorin statement on the principles of disarmament was endorsed in a General Assembly resolution. And the relevant proposals from both super-Powers in 1962 raised hopes that further basic progress would be forthcoming. The conclusion of the partial test-ban Treaty in 1963 appeared to confirm those hopes; indeed that Treaty has proved beneficial in saving the earth's atmosphere at least from further radioactive pollution. Yet subsequent events and developments have turned the scales. The comprehensive test-ban treaty, the adoption of which was promised as the next positive step, has now been put off indefinitely, for years, without justification and in spite of repeated General Assembly resolutions emphasizing the urgent necessity for its conclusion. The Pugwash Conference on peace and international co-operation decided by consensus as early as 1970 that "the technical problems of verification are not the real stumbling block" and that "the problem is essentially political in nature".

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Furthermore, an international group of scientists with full United States and Soviet participation unanimously recommended the adoption of a complete ban on tests, which in their view "would not present any risks to the national security of either of the super-Powers". The signing of such a treaty brooks no further delay.

The existing stocks of nuclear and conventional weapons already pose a threat but the qualitative development of nuclear weapons constitutes a far graver danger of unprecedented proportions, and this has become particularly true recently. It is no mere metaphor to say that the competitive arms race has become a malignant growth on the body of mankind. How to stop this growth before it destroys mankind is unquestionably the most serious problem which confronts us collectively in the United Nations.

On a previous occasion at the beginning of this decade my delegation pointed out in this Committee that unless the qualitative arms race is halted or curbed the time will come when the nuclear weapon will be beyond control. It will be generating its own further development. We are on the brink of that contingency, if we have not already reached it. This technological process in the qualitative arms race for the development of more and more sophisticated weapons of global destruction exerts a dehumanizing influence upon those who are scientifically absorbed in it. It requires the spiritual force of an Einstein to rise above it and initiate, as he did along with Bertrand Russell, a warning manifesto condemning and denouncing the arms race and calling upon the Governments of the world "to realize and acknowledge publicly that their purposes cannot be furthered by nuclear world war", and urging them to find peaceful means for the settlement of matters of dispute between them.

(Mr. Rossides Cyprus)

Another warning came later from U Thant in 1969 when he said, referring to the decade that we have now completed, that from all the information available to him as Secretary-General he could only conclude that the Members of the United Nations had perhaps 10 years left in which to subordinate their ancient quarrels and launch a global partnership to curb the arms race and supply the required momentum to world development efforts. U Thant was obviously trying to turn the attention of the world to the worsening conditions on this planet in the coming decade which he was sensing. However, all warnings went unheeded and we are now completing this decade with the most ominous expectations for the future.

Indeed, this decade has excelled in upheavals, aggression and wars, without the United Nations being able to be effective in the maintenance of international security and peace, which, under the Charter, is its primary responsibility and its *raison d'être*.

The runaway arms race is the gravest of dangers. Starting from this premise we have to consider the causes of this destructive process. The arms competition results from the so-called balance-of-power concept as a supposed means of ensuring the security of nations. An outdated relic of the past, it is but the offshoot of force and domination as the sovereign right of nations, which in the nineteenth century was tempered by a balance between the force of five or six great Powers in the concert of Europe. This balance finally crumbled at the beginning of the twentieth century and was abolished. Yet in our polarized world of today it has been revived and has become a balance of weapons in a way that is wholly incompatible with security in the interdependent world of a nuclear age. For, by creating rivalry in weapons to attain or maintain a supposed balance, it engenders and perpetuates the pernicious arms race, which is the scourge of our time. Such misguided concepts of supposed security lead to rising levels of insecurity and near anarchy, bringing us ever closer to a nuclear war that is already looming on the horizon.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

This self-destructive course in a vicious circle is set in motion to a great extent by a cultivated fear that the other side is preparing to dominate the world by armed force and should, therefore, be checked by superior, or at least corresponding, force, and vice versa. This fear is but a myth. For one thing it is unrealistic to believe that in our present-day interdependent world with its technological progress any attempt to dominate by force could result in anything other than mutual suicide and total catastrophe. With the existing "over-kill" nuclear capacity there is ample deterrent without the need for an arms race. Furthermore, there has never been a balance at all; for considerable periods one side or the other had superiority and nothing happened. Therefore, this phantom fear and the so-called balance of weapons are put forward in order to impress the need for perpetuating and speeding up the arms race.

What can be the purpose of continuing this pernicious arms race? Is the phantom fear of armed domination so pervasive as to create an irresistible momentum driving humanity lemming-like into the sea of destruction?

To extricate mankind from this tragic downward course, world leadership and those in key positions, as well as public opinion generally, must become conscious of these realities and recognize that the absoluteness of national sovereignty must necessarily become qualified in a nuclear age. Nations have to accept a higher authority in all those matters that involve common dangers and common needs. The nuclear bomb imposes this reality and does not permit delay. The need for moral adjustment to the demands of a new world arises most convincingly. In these circumstances détente is a most essential factor. Détente is not an end in itself; it should therefore serve as a stepping-stone between confrontation and co-operation and create a climate of needed mutual understanding and trust.

However, a climate of détente cannot be realistically developed if sought in circumstances that take for granted the dominance of the balance-of-power concept and its accompanying arms race. If that is accepted and taken for granted, there can be no real development of détente - for détente and

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

balance of power are incompatible. Whereas détente requires that a spirit of amity and trust flower, the balance-of-power concept is the embodiment of hostility and mistrust - to such a degree that, unless there is actual parity, a war is bound to break out. In paragraph 12 of the Final Document it is stated that the arms race runs counter to efforts to achieve further relaxation of international tension. The answer to the problem is inseparably linked with the balance of power. On the other hand, détente can well grow in the soil of positive co-operation to achieve a system of international security and order concurrently with disarmament efforts, in compliance and in accordance with the Charter provisions. In complying with the Charter provisions, in promoting the Charter, there can be fruitful co-operation. That is where détente should start; that is where détente can flower.

My delegation welcomes the Soviet Union's decision to proceed unilaterally with the reduction of troops and armaments located in central Europe which is, apart from other aspects, a step towards détente. To withdraw 20,000 military personnel and 1,000 tanks now deployed in the German Democratic Republic is a move towards détente. We also welcome the Soviet Union's declaration of readiness to reduce the current number of medium-range nuclear missiles because it is in the sense of a reduction of forces. Whatever other considerations there are, surely any moves to reduce confrontation should be given due consideration, even if only as offering the possibility of negotiation on the subject, in which other proposals may be made in the same spirit of reduction of weapons and confrontation, and in any case as tending to create a better climate of relaxation of tension.

Since the admission of Cyprus to the United Nations in 1960 my delegation has been dedicated and committed to the quest for the best ways and means of making progress on disarmament and the related matter of international security, and in particular overcoming the inertia in the negotiating bodies and the resulting abnormality of the situation when negotiations are confined to marginal questions, which are meaningless in the light of the dimensions and trends of the armaments race and therefore fall outside the context of the security problems of States and the need for international security through the United Nations, in accordance with the Charter.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

In spite of all adversities and the suffering in Cyprus from the effects of invasion and continuing foreign occupation in disregard of United Nations resolutions, our faith in the Organization and its effectiveness remains wholly undiminished and firm.

It is in this sense and in a desire to facilitate progress towards normality in the island that my President, Mr. Kyprianou, submitted to the special session the official proposal for the complete disarmament and demilitarization of Cyprus, which proposal forms part of the Final Document of the special session and is included in the 10 agreed points of the intercommunal talks.

The development of a system of international security is and remains the primary responsibility of the United Nations under the Charter. The long-standing need for such development in the interests of peace has now emerged impressively in direct relation to the disarmament problem. That has been pointedly expressed in the Declaration of the Final Document of the special session, where it is stated:

"Enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence or doctrines of strategic superiority. Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces." (Resolution S-10/2, para. 13)

The need for international security to accompany disarmament efforts is also expressed in the Programme of Action of the Final Document, in paragraph 110. It is also expressed in the MacLoy-Zorin joint statement.

Furthermore, the decision of the special session to establish a study by experts on the relationship of international security to disarmament confirms the importance of the link between the two. Therefore we express the hope that the study will prove constructive in facilitating the halting of the arms race and positive progress in disarmament. The group of experts met in Geneva for its first session early in June 1977 under the chairmanship of Mr. Romulo, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, and submitted its report to the Secretary-General.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

I propose to submit a draft resolution on this matter, particularly in reference to the study of the relationship between international security and disarmament. The draft resolution runs as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Reaffirming its responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security,

"Reaffirming the role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament,

"Recognizing that genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces, by international agreement and mutual example, leading ultimately to general and complete disarmament under effective international control,

"Convinced that disarmament, relaxation of international tension, respect for the right to self-determination and national independence, the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the strengthening of international peace and security are directly related to each other,

"Recalling its resolutions 32/87 C, S-10/2 and 33/91 I,

"1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General entitled 'Study on the relationship between disarmament and international security' (A/34/465 and Corr.1);

2. Considers that the halting of the arms race should be the first step in the implementation of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (S-10/2);

3. Calls upon all States to eliminate tensions and conflicts in their relations and proceed towards measures for a system of international security and order concurrently with efforts at disarmament measures;

"4. Calls upon all States also to take measures and pursue policies to strengthen international peace and security and to build confidence among States;

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

"5. Requests the organs of the United Nations to initiate or accelerate work on developing and strengthening institutions for maintaining peace and security."

We shall submit that draft resolution for circulation.

The CHAIRMAN: A number of representatives have wished to inscribe their names to speak on specific draft resolutions on the various items, but this was not possible, since the draft resolutions have not been submitted. Therefore I would appeal to delegations to submit draft resolutions as soon as possible so that we might establish our programme of work for the next phase of our discussion.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.