



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 26th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KOCHUBEY (Ukrainian SSR)
(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. Burwin (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)
Father Lebeaupin (Holy See)
Mr. Alowais (United Arab Emirates)
Mr. Matane (Papua New Guinea)
Mr. Rajakoski (Finland)
Mr. Oyono (United Republic of Cameroon)
Mr. Eilan (Israel)
Mr. Mkwizu (United Republic of Tanzania)
Mr. Cherkaoui (Morocco)

* 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. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic):

Disarmament is a most important question commanding the attention of all parties.

There may be agreement on the principles of the reduction of armaments or on disarmament itself, but there are differences on priorities and responsibilities, on verification and on those factors that have any influence on disarmament. The same is true of the need to create an atmosphere that is conducive to equality and justice in international relations and respect for the sovereignty of peoples who want to practise a policy of independence, non-alignment and sovereignty over their natural resources.

My country supports the efforts that have been made on all sides to achieve disarmament. Those efforts led to the convening of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, on disarmament, last year. That special session ended with the adoption of a Final Document containing, in its 129 paragraphs, a preamble, a Declaration and a Programme of Action. The document defines the bodies concerned with disarmament. It reflects the views of the majority of Members, and the changes made in disarmament bodies such as the deliberative and negotiating organs.

Despite the progress achieved in the organization of the activities of the disarmament machinery, we note that there remains overlapping and duplication of issues. This leads to a loss of time and effort. Therefore the Committee on Disarmament should put an end to these negative aspects and prepare a programme enjoying majority support, dealing with issues and avoiding duplication.

Before going on to another subject, I should like to congratulate the Committee on Disarmament on its work and on its report in document A/34/27.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Some speakers have suggested the creation of new disarmament organs, but we wish to say that we consider it imperative that the Committee on Disarmament in its new form be given another chance, since the creation of new machinery at this time might well lead to a squandering of efforts and prevent concentration and delimitation of responsibilities.

The responsibility for disarmament is a joint one, although the major share lies with the nuclear Powers. As far as priorities are concerned, we feel that the highest priority should be given to nuclear disarmament, and then to the elimination of weapons of mass destruction. Once these results have been achieved we shall have succeeded in building the necessary confidence among peoples and nations. We could then turn to conventional weapons.

We should point out that some delegations, such as those of Italy, Spain and India, attach great importance to these matters. Although we ourselves are convinced of the need to eliminate conventional weapons, we feel that present world conditions prevent these hopes from being realized. Indeed, how could they be when the world is divided into blocs, military alliances, ideologies and areas of conflict. There are territories occupied by force, there are peoples struggling for independence, there is vile racism, there are foreign practices and pressures aimed at preventing the developing countries from carrying out independent political, economic and social policies. Moreover, there is interference in the internal affairs of States and attempts are being made to prevent them from exercising sovereignty over their natural resources.

The present economic order is riddled with gaps and negative factors. Technological and other problems compel the developing countries to spend on armaments funds which they need badly. Hence, these problems cannot be isolated from other factors that have a bearing upon them.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

In this connexion, my delegation supports the statement of the representative of India in this Committee when he said:

"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." (A/C.1/34/PV.24, pp. 7 and 8)

Generally speaking, all weapons should be eliminated once justice and equality reign on earth.

The international community must begin its action with disarmament because armaments constitute the main danger for human life and the human environment. We yearn for a world where well-being, peace and security will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the Observer from the Holy See.

Father LEBEAUPIN (Holy See) (interpretation from French): The delegation of the Holy See wishes to thank the First Committee for being good enough to allow it to express its interest in the subject being dealt with here, namely, disarmament.

Now that Disarmament Week has come to an end, the Holy See is happy to be able to give its views, in keeping with its spiritual responsibility. By virtue of its experience, its concern for the social welfare of mankind, and its attentiveness to the conscience and heart of man, the Holy See has a unique vantage point. Speaking before the General Assembly on 2 October last, His Holiness Pope John Paul II posed the question whether the arms race would be the legacy of our times to succeeding generations. Thus one may well wonder what ails our world for armed defence to be considered the most reliable means of achieving world political equilibrium. It is all too obvious that what ails it is insecurity.

Insecurity is always at the root of man's efforts to preserve himself and to create ways of making defence ever more effective against aggression, whatever may be its source. That is why the various aspects of the solution to the problem now before us are rooted in the pursuit of security. Disarmament cannot create security; quite the contrary, it is the latter which can create the conditions necessary for the former. To disarm in our time is, first of all, to establish a favourable framework for security, which is why we believe it to be of primary importance that international organizations undertake a determination of the quality of the human environment so that the human person, who is always capable of making choices, and is thus free to choose between good and evil, can act according to his nature.

We should like to touch on two aspects, among others, of the human environment as a condition for genuine disarmament. On the one hand, to disarm presupposes an economic environment which is organized for man; on the other hand, to disarm consists in setting up a social environment organized with man in mind.

(Father Lebeaupin, Holy See)

As regards the economic environment which would make disarmament possible, it is clear that man's capacity to understand and master nature through his intelligence explains the qualitative progress in armaments. Science and technology at the service of armament and of any defence system is a fact which raises questions, requiring that serious decisions be taken one day by a large number of States so that intelligence may be placed at the service of works of life, and not works of death. The longer such decisions are delayed, the more difficult they will be to take - especially in these times, when we are witnessing a grave economic crisis. It is obvious that the economic consequences of those same decisions will require a plan to be established by stages, but any initiative leading towards the peaceful use of scientific research and of technology cannot but be welcomed and fostered.

The transformation of certain economic structures which are based on the arms race - whether involving the sale or the purchase of weapons - will likewise have to be undertaken in order that peoples will not be faced with an unacceptable choice; either their personal well-being or international peace on a local or world-wide basis. The economic consequences of these disarmament measures may be found within the framework of the question of development. The relationship which exists between disarmament and development cannot be illustrated by the image of connected vessels where whatever is saved on armaments will automatically go towards development. It seems to us that decisions promoting development must be favoured above those promoting armaments. It is thus a matter of looking afresh at the relationship which exists between development and armament.

The second condition for true disarmament resides in the establishment of a social environment organized with mankind in mind. The Holy See agreed to participate in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, from its preparatory stages, because this gathering of States was conceived in humanistic terms, in other words, that confidence, which makes defence unnecessary, should become the motive force in relations between peoples. We therefore feel that disarmament is possible only when human rights are respected and it becomes clear that to "open wide the gates" is no longer to provide an opportunity to be attacked and vanquished, but the hope of enriching oneself through the differences of others. Whatever can lead to an improvement in international relations, first on the local, then on a worldwide plane, must be supported if it is to progress.

It would be utopian to assume, at the beginning of our reflections, an ideal man, for it is true that the human being always has the possibility of choosing to dominate his fellow-creature. This is why disarmament can be achieved only in an organized international society in which law plays its regulating role in human actions. It is this that explains the Holy See's accession, in due course, to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in order to make clear its position in favour of the special function of legal structures in the establishment of peace. Anything that leads to dialogue, to organization and to the rationalization of international relations for the true good of all, will always receive our approval, for it is to the human person that all rules of law are directed, and those who lay them down should bear this in mind.

(Father Lebeaupin, Holy See)

The creation of an environment conducive to genuine disarmament must involve a common meeting-ground. And what site offers better than this one, the United Nations, the opportunity to all, great and small, rich and poor, to break down walls, to do away with false problems and to seek points of convergence. His Holiness Pope John Paul II, in his statement to the General Assembly, also formulated the hope that the United Nations would always remain the "forum of nations".

Whether in the Disarmament Commission or in the Committee on Disarmament, the course chosen is the right one because it should lead to specific results assuring international society as a whole of the goodwill of all concerned. It may be that practical decisions will be taken elsewhere, but nothing will ever replace the preparation represented by the discussions and the points of view expressed here. This difficult work may sometimes seem chaotic, but it remains essential; those involved in it would do well to resist the pangs of listlessness.

Mr. ALLOWAIS (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic):

We are grateful for the opportunity to speak in this Committee on an important question which affects world security, and in particular on nuclear disarmament and the prevention of a nuclear war. My delegation is of the view that the most important and most urgent task in the field of disarmament is to adopt specific measures of nuclear disarmament. That is what the peoples of the world desire. It is why we appeal to the General Assembly to adopt, during this present session, a resolution calling for the conclusion of an agreement whereby the nuclear countries would limit their production of nuclear weapons and devote their tests to humanitarian ends in the service of the peoples of our planet. We attach the utmost importance to the negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation of strategic offensive arms. We hope that in the near future an international agreement will be reached which will be an effective instrument for the complete prohibition of chemical weapons and the elimination of all means of waging bacteriological warfare.

(Mr. Alowais, United Arab Emirates)

We stress this objective because we are convinced that such a measure must be realistic and that the same must apply with regard to nuclear disarmament. The tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, has so far led to no solemn and binding commitment on nuclear disarmament, because the Committee on Disarmament, which was set up as the result of that session concentrated on procedural questions, whereas negotiations on substantive matters are to continue between the two great military Powers.

The SALT II agreement is a first step towards the limitation of nuclear weapons. It was the result of direct negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States. That is why we consider SALT II as only a preparatory step which should lead to the negotiations on a SALT III agreement on a substantial reduction of nuclear weapons. That agreement should be placed within the framework of more far-reaching efforts, including the participation of all States, with a view to bringing about nuclear disarmament under effective international control.

Some third world countries are still suffering from poor living conditions and malnutrition. What is worse, thousands of human beings are the victims of hunger, disease and ignorance. To remedy this state of affairs, it would suffice if, instead of being squandered to such an extent on the acquisition and perfecting of weapons, resources were used for the benefit of the peoples of the third world. In this connexion consideration should be given to the proposal made at the tenth special session of the General Assembly by Guyana to the effect that the resources freed by disarmament should be devoted to development by creating a special fund under United Nations auspices to set in motion programmes of social welfare, particularly in the countries of the third world.

My country is located in the Gulf area; that is why we attach great importance to the declaration of the Indian Ocean and its natural extensions as a zone of peace free of nuclear weapons and sheltered from great-Power rivalry. My country supports General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) of 16 December 1971 declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. Furthermore, the States of the Non-Aligned Group also attached great importance to this matter, as is shown by declarations made by their Movement

(Mr. Alowais, United Arab Emirates)

at all levels. However, most of the resolutions adopted have not been acted upon because some of the great Powers failed to have new talks among themselves on ways and means of implementing the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. The maintenance of military bases in the Indian Ocean area and the growing military rivalry are disquieting and constitute a major obstacle to the application of the Declaration.

Everyone knows that the Gulf is the natural extension of the Indian Ocean and that much of the coastline of my country is on the sea of Oman, which extends through the Straits of Hurmuz to the entry to the Red Sea.

I wish to make it clear that the tankers that transport oil from my country and Gulf countries to the east coast of Africa and the coasts of the Far East and Japan must necessarily pass through the Indian Ocean and that if they are to reach their destination they must proceed by way of a region that is safe and free of any tension. Hence, my delegation appeals to the great Powers to exclude the Indian Ocean region from their area of rivalry, for peace is to be achieved through understanding and certainly not through the acquisition of weapons and the exacerbation of tension in that critical zone.

My country is striving to have all international rivalry and conflicts among the great Powers removed from the Gulf region. In this connexion we cannot fail to express our concern at statements emanating from certain responsible authorities, and from less responsible sources, in some Western countries on the use of force against the oil-producing countries, particularly those in the Arab region.

Ours is a peaceful country which seeks peace and international justice, and we endeavour to forestall the use of force in any conflict, whatever it may be. We believe in the value of dialogue and understanding in any dispute that may arise among nations, and moreover we whole-heartedly condemn interference in the domestic affairs of other countries.

(Mr. Alowais, United Arab Emirates)

My country is also part of the Middle East, a region far from enjoying true peace, and one whose problem has come to be among those causing the greatest concern in the world. This situation is due to the policy of Israel, which is endeavouring to increase its stocks of arms to acquire the most sophisticated and modern weaponry and to put the finishing touch to its nuclear armament. This year Israel's military expenditures reached \$4 billion. That is a clear indication of the policy of aggression followed by Israel and international zionism. We see in it proof of the aggressive and expansionist designs of Israel, which continues to occupy the territories of certain Arab countries and still refuses to comply with United Nations resolutions calling on it to withdraw from those occupied territories and to recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Certain sources indicate that the military budget of Israel for the year 1974-1975 reached \$3,700 million, or some 38 per cent of its national budget which is equivalent to more than one third of its national income.

(Mr. Alowais, United Arab Emirates)

At present the military budget amounts to about 45 per cent of national income. With regard to Israeli nuclear armament, we shall speak on that subject during consideration of the relevant item on our agenda.

In conclusion, I should like to say that general and complete disarmament, including the need to prevent Israel from acquiring nuclear weapons, is an aim that we should all endeavour to achieve. We hope that the General Assembly, in the course of its present session, will take effective and specific measures to bring about nuclear disarmament in the Middle East region as well as justice and peace in our part of the world.

Mr. MATANE (Papua New Guinea): Each and every State of the international community seeks to live in peace and harmony within secure boundaries. In order to protect and preserve these boundaries, some States create armed forces. These armed forces are equipped with weapons to carry out their duties effectively in the event that disputes arise. The mere act of creating the armed forces is in itself an indication of the development of an insecure environment. This insecure environment then leads to the acquisition and development of more arms, conventional as well as nuclear. In other words, each State now seeks to have more advanced and sophisticated weapons in case of an attack from others. As we all know, this process threatens peaceful coexistence. We do, however, note that it is an unavoidable responsibility for a nation to provide a sufficient level of defence of its security in view of the insecure world in which we live. Thus the process of the development and accumulation of arms continues to expand in both the conventional and the nuclear field. The opening words of the Declaration on Disarmament contained in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly state:

"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" (resolution A/S-10/2, para. 11).

It is time for the international community to take appropriate steps to reverse this dangerous trend and to seek security in disarmament through a gradual but effective process commencing with a reduction in the present level of armaments. Unless genuine and immediate steps are taken to prevent further developments and the stockpiling of nuclear as well as conventional weapons, the continuation of the arms race means a growing threat to international peace and security and even to the very survival of the human race. It could mean the end of civilization as we know it today.

Disarmament has thus become the imperative and most urgent task facing the international community. We are disappointed to note that no real

(Mr. Matane, Papua New Guinea)

progress has so far been made in the crucial field of the reduction of armaments, although certain positive changes in the international situation in some areas of the world provide some encouragement. Some partial measures have been taken to limit certain weapons or to eliminate them altogether, as in the case of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction. The fact remains that these agreements are limited; the arms race continues in spite of various attempts to curb it.

In the world in which we live today, we are faced with limited resources. We therefore cannot afford to overlook the close relationship between expenditure on armaments and economic and social development, because over-expenditure in one area will have an adverse effect on the other. Unfortunately, this seems to be happening today because the facts and figures indicate that military expenditures are increasing at an alarming rate, particularly in the field of production of nuclear weapons. We know that the world military expenditure today is estimated at over \$400 billion a year. In real terms, this represents an almost fourfold increase during the 30 years since 1948. The biggest spenders, the United States and the Soviet Union, together account for about 51 per cent of the 1978 total, although their share of the total world military expenditure has been decreasing during the past 10 years.

It goes without saying that in non-industrialized countries in particular, there are millions of people who are in need of food, housing, proper medical care, education and better welfare standards. Those very countries are faced with the problem of not having enough resources for the development of their people. Yet those countries spend enormous amounts of their national budgets on buying military equipment and building up military forces. While we do recognize that diversion of expenditures from the military build-up could not solve all the economic and social problems of the world, we do believe, however, that it would lighten the burden with which we are faced today. Just and lasting peace in the world cannot be built on poverty, starvation and inhuman living conditions. As long as

(Mr. Matene, Papua New Guinea)

there exists a disparity between the poor and the rich, there will always be insecurity and instability in the world.

The international arms trade is one of the most alarming factors contributing to the growing militarization of the world. The arms trade with the non-industrialized countries has elicited the most attention and concern, both because it represents to a large extent an extension of the conflict between East and West, and because the weapons supplied to those countries have been used extensively. It remains a fact that practically all wars since 1945 have been fought in the so-called third-world countries, with conventional weapons supplied by the main industrialized countries. Disarmament negotiations during this same period have, however, concentrated on the technical issues of nuclear weapons and on the political issues of preventing the outbreak of a major war between the major nuclear Powers.

During the early 1970s, supplies of major weapons to non-industrialized countries rose at an average annual rate of 15 per cent. In the period 1974-1978, this growth accelerated to 25 per cent per year. Today, the non-industrialized countries account for 70 per cent of the global arms trade. The total value of the international arms trade is today estimated at \$20 billion per year at current prices. While the arms-manufacturing countries once supplied primarily second-hand or obsolete weapons to the so-called underdeveloped countries, in recent years they have transferred many of the most advanced conventional weapons to the non-industrialized countries. Very sophisticated weapons can often be purchased on the arms market, even before they enter the arsenals of the producer countries.

(Mr. Matane, Papua New Guinea)

Although the bulk of military spending is going towards the upkeep of conventional weapons and forces, nuclear weapons are by far the greatest threat to the survival of mankind. In 1945 two nuclear bombs with a total explosive power of about 30,000 tons of high explosives destroyed the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in Japan, killing about 300,000 persons. Since that time the world's nuclear arsenals have grown to the equivalent of over 1 million Hiroshima bombs. If only a fraction of these weapons were used in war, many millions would be killed both by the explosions and by the effects of world-wide radioactive fall-out. Civilization as we know it today would cease to exist.

It is clear to us all that the nuclear-weapon Powers have a potential for mass destruction unparalleled in history, and the risk of horizontal proliferation needs to be emphasized. A by-product of the nuclear-power-generation industry is plutonium-239, which can be used as an explosive in nuclear weapons. Materials that can be used for nuclear weapons are being produced in an increasing number of countries. The technology of nuclear weapons is now widely known. For instance, at the end of 1978 16 non-nuclear-weapon States were operating 66 thermal-power reactors. There is therefore an evident need to prevent the diversion of fissile materials from peaceful to military purposes.

That is the aim of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which entered into force in 1970. We understand that under the Non-Proliferation Treaty the nuclear-weapon States are committed not to transfer, while the non-nuclear-weapon States are under the obligation not to control them. The non-nuclear-weapon States are obliged to conclude safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) covering all their peaceful activities in order to ensure that there is no diversion of nuclear material to the manufacture of nuclear explosives. All parties to the Treaty have the right to exploit nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, and those in a position to do so must co-operate with other countries in developing peaceful nuclear technology. All parties are committed to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures contributing to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, including a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Matane, Papua New Guinea)

However, the Non-Proliferation Treaty sets no limits as to how close a country may come to the assembly of nuclear weapons. A number of countries which are well able to construct nuclear weapons once they make the political decision to do so and which have access to fissile material are not parties to the Treaty. In fact, we do not know which countries have produced nuclear weapons, since this can be done on a small scale and secretly. Moreover, nuclear-weapon design is now so well known that the reliability of weapons can be assumed without testing.

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of agreements freely arrived at among the States of the regions concerned constitutes an important disarmament measure. In the process of establishing such zones, it is important that the characteristics of each region be taken into account. It is equally important that States participating in such zones undertake to comply fully with all the objectives, purposes and principles of the agreements or arrangements establishing the zones, thus ensuring that they are genuinely free from nuclear weapons or the testing of nuclear weapons.

In this connexion my delegation wishes to draw the attention of this Committee to General Assembly resolution 3477 (XXX) of 11 December 1975, which deals with the concept of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific. Such a regional arrangement and other similar arrangements in other regions would be in conformity with the objectives of the Final Document of the tenth special session, on disarmament.

Papua New Guinea is a member of the South Pacific community. As such we are naturally concerned about the security as well as the welfare of the people in the region. The peoples of this region are very anxious to keep the South Pacific free from the risk of nuclear contamination and conflict. We are equally anxious to see that the region does not provide an avenue for big-Power rivalry. On 3 July 1975 the Heads of Government of independent and self-governing States members of the South Pacific forum issued a communiqué to this effect. The communiqué went on to commend the idea of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region as a means of achieving that aim. The agreement was then followed by General Assembly resolution 3477 (XXX) of 11 December 1975 endorsing the concept.

(Mr. Matane, Papua New Guinea)

However, contrary to the South Pacific forum communiqué and that General Assembly resolution, testing of nuclear devices in the South Pacific is still being carried out on the island of Mururoa, in French Polynesia. Underground nuclear tests are being undertaken by France every year. As recently as July and August this year two nuclear tests took place. These tests resulted in the deaths of two persons from a laboratory explosion and in a tidal wave. This is only the beginning. Further tests will cause more serious damage to life, property and the environment. Who knows, the marine life in and around the test site could already have been contaminated with radioactive material. In view of the foregoing, my delegation requests those responsible for conducting these tests to provide to this Committee any information on the safeguards they have instituted to prevent the pollution of the marine life in and around the Mururoa atoll.

In 1963 a partial comprehensive test-ban Treaty was signed. Though limited, it successfully reduced atmospheric testing and the contamination of the environment by radioactive substances. But we should like to see all five nuclear Powers working together to speed up the process of negotiations with the common objective of concluding the Treaty. As requested under General Assembly resolution 32/78, we hope that all those States parties to the Treaty will be able to have the Treaty open for signature before the next special session on disarmament. We also hope that the other two remaining nuclear-weapon States will become parties to this Treaty.

Papua New Guinea welcomes the SALT II agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union and hopes for early ratification of the treaty by both Governments. For some of us, this is a sign of hope in that the agreement sets specific limits on strategic offensive weapons systems. My Government welcomes this agreement because of the political climate it provides for future efforts towards general and complete disarmament. However, we express concern at the development of new weapons systems, as it counteracts the efforts being made to halt the arms race.

(Mr. Matane, Papua New Guinea)

Complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction is one of the urgent measures of disarmament. My delegation fully supports efforts directed to this end. We should therefore like to see negotiations towards a convention in this regard given serious consideration. After its conclusion, all States should contribute to ensuring the broadest possible application of the convention through its early signature and ratification. My delegation recognizes that the primary responsibility rests with the big Powers. But the countries that do not possess vast nuclear and missile arsenals have the advantage and the obligation of being able to work towards controlled disarmament.

Finally, I wish to emphasize that genuine and lasting peace and security in the world cannot be achieved by the accumulation of weapons or the formation of military alliances. Nor can this be sustained through poverty, starvation and inhuman living conditions. Genuine and lasting peace and security can be brought about only through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations, through the speedy reduction of arms and armed forces and through international agreement and mutual example with the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Meanwhile, the causes of the arms race and of threats to peace must be reduced, and to this end effective steps must be taken to eliminate tensions and to have disputes settled by peaceful means.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): My delegation has in its statement of 19 October already put forward its views on several issues, particularly the disarmament situation in Europe. I should like now to address myself to a number of other questions, most of which are related to nuclear disarmament.

My Government has firmly supported efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. We have done so because we believe that the emergence of additional nuclear-weapon States, just as the vertical nuclear arms race, runs counter to the security interests of all States, whether nuclear or non-nuclear, aligned or non-aligned. We have voiced our concern over developments which we have considered contrary to these efforts. Two years ago my delegation took the

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

initiative of proposing in this Committee a comprehensive draft resolution on the question of nuclear non-proliferation. Introducing the draft resolution, my delegation referred to one of the examples of the dangers of proliferation, that is, the possible plans of South Africa for nuclear-weapon capability.

Only a few days ago the General Assembly on the basis of reports received requested the Secretary-General to conduct an investigation into the possibility of a recent nuclear test. These reports - whether true or false - serve to underline the danger and even the mere suspicion of the danger of nuclear proliferation whenever and wherever it might occur.

This is the danger that my delegation has tried to combat by assuming an active role in promoting the Non-Proliferation Treaty ever since 1968. Finland continues to believe that the Non-Proliferation Treaty is the best instrument to avert the danger of the spread of nuclear weapons and to reach international consensus on co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. This conviction holds now just as it has held ever since the inception of the Treaty.

Non-proliferation is an integral part of the efforts of the international community to eliminate the danger of nuclear war and it is intrinsically linked with other aspects of nuclear disarmament. As stated in the Final Document of the special session on disarmament, the nuclear-weapon States have the primary responsibility for ending the arms race and initiating nuclear disarmament. A comprehensive nuclear test ban and the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States would be measures towards these ends. The Final Document also makes mention of the obligation of all States to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

Non-proliferation measures should not jeopardize the right of all States fully to benefit from the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, provided that they accept effective non-proliferation safeguards. On the contrary, properly designed non-proliferation measures should enhance the exercise of this right and stimulate international co-operation in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

All these goals are embodied in the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The vast majority of the international community is already party to the Treaty. The constantly increasing membership in it testifies to its significance. Finland welcomes the recent adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty by a number of countries, most recently Bangladesh, Barbados, Indonesia and Sri Lanka.

In a document shortly to be circulated in this Committee, the Nordic Governments have expressed their concern about developments affecting non-proliferation. The following is quoted from that document:

"The Nordic countries wish to emphasize their conviction that the development and achievement of nuclear explosive capability by any additional State or States would pose a grave threat to the international community as a whole and also be detrimental to the efforts to promote international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. It is their strongly held hope that no non-nuclear-weapon State will attempt to develop or otherwise acquire nuclear explosive capability and that all States will do their utmost to enhance international confidence and trust so that nuclear-weapons proliferation to additional States will not take place. Such confidence and trust are essential for the security of States and international peace."

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

International nuclear co-operation has not proceeded without difficulties and disappointments. It should not be overlooked that a number of customers perceive the situation as an inherently discriminatory oligopoly. Some receiving countries see the conditions of supply as infringements of their sovereignty. Uncertainty about the continuity of supplies has also caused concern. It has even been argued that the safeguards régime adopted in pursuance of the Non-Proliferation Treaty is discriminatory and hampers access to nuclear energy. Underlying these arguments there are legitimate concerns about economic and social development and the availability of energy.

However genuine these arguments are, it seems to me that this criticism fails to reach the crux of the matter. The basic reason for the difficulties - whether perceived or real - in international co-operation in this field is not the inadequacy of supplies or the alleged restrictive practices of suppliers. We do not believe that any government would seriously want to challenge the premise that peaceful nuclear activities should be subjected to controls against diversion to military purposes. This premise would in effect be undermined were peaceful nuclear programmes to be used - as they are being used - as an excuse for creating capability for nuclear explosives. The difficulties in international co-operation stem from a fear - a justified fear - of nuclear proliferation. The fear exists because assurances against military diversion are not considered adequate. We firmly believe that once this fear is dispelled, the difficulties should disappear.

The fear of proliferation can be eliminated by a universal political commitment on the part of the non-nuclear-weapon States to renounce the nuclear-weapon option, that is, by the universalization of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Failing this, States not parties to the Treaty should give non-proliferation assurances to the international community by accepting safeguards on their entire nuclear fuel cycle. According to the Annual Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency for 1978, the number of non-nuclear-weapon States in which unsafeguarded nuclear facilities are in operation may increase even further. Do we need a stronger reminder of why the fear of proliferation is real and justified?

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

The political commitment to non-proliferation of States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty is coupled with the system of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. In this regard, my Government looks forward to the future results of the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation programme, which -- among other questions -- is involved in a search for fuel cycles as resistant to proliferation as possible. In face of new technologies, we also consider it vital that the capabilities of the International Atomic Energy Agency be strengthened so that it can effectively exercise its twin role of preventing proliferation and promoting peaceful nuclear energy.

The second Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty should be approached as a further effort to broaden international consensus on these matters. The increased adherence to the Treaty is an encouraging development. Further adherence and effective participation in the preparations of the Conference would enhance its chances of succeeding. While emphasizing the importance of the political non-proliferation commitment, the Conference should, for its part, ensure that future applications of peaceful atomic and nuclear non-proliferation also remain technically compatible with each other. In this regard, the work of the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation could mark an important contribution.

In its earlier intervention in this Committee, my delegation stressed the importance of continuing and broadening the strategic arms dialogue. At the same time, we expressed our concern about the qualitative aspects of the nuclear-arms race. We also urged the participants in the tripartite negotiations on a comprehensive test ban to continue their efforts and we called for a treaty which would put constraints on the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and on their proliferation. The cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes would be another measure that should be considered with a view to facilitating nuclear disarmament.

All approaches to disarmament should be explored. While the challenges of disarmament are global, and while commitment to its search should be universal, a regional approach may prove fruitful where proper politico-geographical conditions exist.

The Treaty of Tlatelolco continues to demonstrate the viability of the zonal approach to arms limitation. The Treaty has been an obvious success. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is the subject of a number of items before this Committee, and other proposals have been made outside the United Nations. We hope that further progress could be made towards the establishment of such zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. Nuclear-weapon-free zones would be a contribution to non-proliferation and could also check the introduction of nuclear weapons into new areas.

My Government was gratified at being able to observe the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean. We believe that the Meeting was a further step towards the creation of a zone of peace in the area.

The main objective at the regional level should be to ensure the security of all States of the region at as low a level of armaments as possible. A year ago, the General Assembly decided to undertake a systematic study on all aspects of regional disarmament. Finland is represented in the group of governmental experts helping the Secretary-General to carry out the study. We look forward to the conclusion and recommendations that the group will submit to the General Assembly at its next session.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

As the General Assembly requested last year, the Committee on Disarmament has considered the question of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. Although the discussion was of a preliminary nature, there seems to be wide recognition of the urgent need to reach agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons. There was no objection in principle to the idea of an international convention, although some difficulties in this regard were pointed out. We believe that all possibilities of solving this crucial issue should continue to be explored, and Finland, for its part, is ready to participate fully in that discussion.

Mr. OYONO (United Republic of Cameroon) (interpretation from French): More than ever before, mankind is aware of the need to find a new approach in order to avert the apocalypse of a nuclear war. One of the great paradoxes of our day is that, after having solemnly pledged ourselves to maintain international peace and security by signing the Charter of the United Nations, we should immediately have set forth on a suicidal nuclear adventure. Since 1945, in fact, we have noted that the major concern of a large number of Member States is still directed towards the unbridled race in ever more sophisticated armaments.

In the face of the grave threat represented by the accumulation of these weapons, it is time that international relations turned resolutely to a new path of mutual trust and the strengthening of international peace and security advocated by the Non-Aligned Movement, whose moderating influence with regard to existing antagonisms needs no emphasis. In fact, as we stated during the last Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries:

"It is impossible to achieve international détente and peace through the balance of forces, spheres of influence, great-Power rivalry or the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race."

Therefore we must reaffirm the urgent need to bend every effort to speeding up the process of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, in order to embark upon the building up of a lasting peace based on the democratization of relations among States and the establishment of a New International Economic Order.

(Mr. Oyono, United Republic of Cameroon)

The convening of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, responded to that need. Unfortunately, 10 months after the adoption of the Final Document of that special session, the rattle of weapons only grows louder in the world.

Military expenditures, constantly rising in geometric progression, have reached the fantastic amount of \$480 billion, whereas the assistance given to development is shrinking and represents, respectively, 0.33 per cent of the gross national product of the Western countries and 0.03 per cent of the gross national product of the socialist States. At the same time, two thirds of mankind continues to vegetate in a state of abject poverty and to suffer hunger, thirst and destitution.

Moreover, experts are in agreement that the present stockpiles of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, would be sufficient not only to wipe out all life on earth but to blow up our planet several times over.

Nevertheless, despite their declarations about reducing their weapons, the great Powers continue to increase their nuclear arsenals, and the medium-sized Powers also are aspiring to reach the same level of armaments as the great Powers, while we see the number of States that are anxious to acquire nuclear capability growing each day.

My delegation expresses the hope that the present debate in the First Committee will make everyone aware of the imperative need to implement without delay the decisions and recommendations that were adopted by consensus at the tenth special session of the General Assembly. One of those decisions was precisely to reactivate the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation participated in the work of the inaugural session of that body held between 14 May and 8 June 1979. We are gratified by the consensus reached by the Committee on the definition of the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament. That document, which flows from and completes the Programme of Action of the tenth special session, should be approved by the General Assembly without difficulty.

With regard to the negotiating organ, it is perhaps too soon to judge the results obtained from the new formula laid down by the tenth special session. However, we can already congratulate ourselves on the widening of the restricted negotiating framework in which the two great military alliances for two decades showed their inability to achieve any significant progress in the field of disarmament. Let us hope that very soon the nuclear Powers that are

(Mr. Oyono, United Republic of Cameroon)

still holding back will also join in the negotiations and give them the true international dimension without which the atmosphere of confidence necessary for success cannot be created.

Furthermore, it does not seem that the Committee achieved anything but the adoption of its rules of procedure. My delegation must therefore deplore that, contrary to the consensus that was arrived at at the tenth special session, there is in the rules of procedure no mention of the possibility of giving all non-nuclear-weapon States an equal right to belong to that Committee shortly.

We have repeatedly expressed our convictions on this subject. If, to be effective, negotiations must take place in a relatively restricted Committee, nothing, on the other hand, would justify the drafting of conventions to ensure our collective security being monopolized for all time by a minority of States.

We reaffirm the need to reintroduce the notion of reasonable rotation in the composition of the Committee on Disarmament on the basis of democratic distribution. Last year my delegation made clearly known its desire that, when establishing the rules for the renewal of the mandate of its members, the Committee should adopt the principle of periodic rotation, the period to be not longer than two or three years. We repeat that appeal.

(Mr. Oyono, United Republic of Cameroon)

We hope also that when it resumes its work on the agenda it has adopted the Committee will be able to make real progress in the preparation of a treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and of a treaty or convention on the total and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all types of chemical weapons and on their destruction. We also attach importance to the continuation of negotiations on a binding international convention that would safeguard non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

But it is obvious that these negative guarantees, as they have been called, can only be of relative and limited interest because of the climate of mistrust prevailing in the world. The sole effective and credible safeguard lies in general and complete disarmament under effective and verifiable international control. This is recognized by the nuclear Powers that have been pursuing arduous bilateral negotiations on the limitation of strategic weapons. In this connexion, my delegation welcomed the signing, on 18 June last, of the SALT II agreement. We consider it a positive measure likely to build confidence between the major military Powers. While not a genuine disarmament measure, SALT II nevertheless proclaims the approach of SALT III, open to all nuclear Powers, and apt to serve as the prelude to an international treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear tests.

My delegation would also like to express its satisfaction at the United States-Soviet initiative in submitting to the Committee on Disarmament an "Agreed Joint USSR-United States Proposal on Major Elements of a Treaty Prohibiting the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Radiological Weapons". That document warrants the full attention of the Committee as soon as it resumes its work in Geneva.

(Mr. Oyono, United Republic of Cameroon)

It is to be hoped that the great Powers will redouble their efforts to achieve similar agreement on those problems on which the rest of the international community are already agreed. We are thinking specifically of General Assembly decisions endorsing the agreement among States of certain regions to declare those regions nuclear-free zones. Whether in Latin America or the Indian Ocean, everything must be done to respect the will of the States of those regions to live in zones of peace, safe from the nuclear threat.

As far as Africa is concerned, the denuclearization of which was decided upon in 1964 by the Heads of State of the Organization of African Unity and proclaimed by the General Assembly in a number of its resolutions, it can readily be understood that my delegation is particularly concerned by the situation created and developing there as a result of South Africa's access to nuclear technology and of the racist schemes of the Pretoria régime.

The announcement of a recent nuclear explosion to the south of our continent bears out our apprehensions and is apt to undermine the assurances given us in the past.

For some years now we have constantly been drawing the attention of the international community to the criminal designs of the Pretoria régime, bent as it is, in the show of force it has been mounting for more than 30 years against the United Nations with respect to southern Africa, on maintaining and strengthening its policy of apartheid and colonial domination in Namibia through the acquisition of nuclear weapons.

Whatever the General Assembly and the Security Council may have managed to do to stem this dangerous development of Pretoria's hegemonic and aggressive schemes which have been threatening international peace and security in that part of our continent, the resolutions and decisions we have adopted have constantly been circumvented. This applies to the recent resolution 33/63 of our Assembly, which called upon South Africa to refrain from carrying out any nuclear explosions on the African continent or elsewhere, and also invited all States to cease all nuclear co-operation with the racist régime.

(Mr. Oyono, United Republic of Cameroon)

Apparently these appeals have fallen on deaf ears. Under the most dubious pretexts, some nuclear Powers, including Powers which profess a desire for non-proliferation, have not only continued but have intensified their co-operation with South Africa. As far as Cameroon is concerned, we condemn any co-operation, military, nuclear or otherwise, with the apartheid régime, against which the Security Council has decreed an arms embargo. My delegation will support any initiative designed to ensure that the Security Council shoulders its responsibilities at last by adopting strict economic sanctions, beginning with an oil embargo, against the racist minority in power in Pretoria.

In the face of that régime's persistently arrogant attitude towards our Organization, the only effective measure left to us is recourse to the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter. While we await the Council's decision on this matter, we express our trust in our Secretary-General and would encourage him to do all in his power to bring about the speedy conclusion of the investigation entrusted to him following South Africa's nuclear explosion.

We are aware of the difficulty of the task, which is why we make an urgent appeal to the nuclear Powers to extend to the Secretary-General all the necessary technical and political assistance in the fulfilment of his duties. By so doing, those Powers will be contributing to a strengthening of the United Nations role in the field of disarmament. My delegation takes this occasion to congratulate the Secretary-General for the diligence he has shown in implementing recommendations of the tenth special session. We have particularly in mind the disarmament fellowship programme. My country is happy to be participating in the first seminar, which will be concluding in a few days. I am sure we shall derive great benefit from it.

(Mr. Oyano, United Republic of Cameroon)

We are also following with interest the setting up of a number of studies requested by the Assembly. The one closest to our heart concerns the relationship between disarmament and development. The report of the Secretary-General (A/34/534) shows that the group of experts nominated to conduct that study sees the problem in all its breadth. My delegation supports the definition of the mandate of the experts and the guidelines for their research as they have been established.

We also support the first efforts of the group charged with the study of the relationship between disarmament and international security. We have always stressed that the unbridled arms race was directly linked to the deterioration in international relations. The search for spheres of influence, hegemonistic rivalries and interference in the internal affairs of other States are so many causes of insecurity which stem from the thirst for arms.

In conclusion I should like to say that we owe it to ourselves to seek as exhaustively as possible measures capable of increasing confidence and trust among peoples and nations. The groundwork must be laid for a new international morality based on the democratization of relations and on solidarity. In a word, we must establish the New Economic Order for which the sixth special Assembly session provided the guidelines and which, by granting to all peoples the feeling of being able to share in the common abundance, will also give them the hope for collective and lasting peace.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): The general debate on disarmament, under your very able guidance, Mr. Chairman, has covered a wide field of subjects and has once again expressed mankind's complete awareness of the disastrous path we are treading and our tragic inability to summon our moral will to call a halt to this drive towards self-destruction.

We in this Committee should face the unavoidable limitations of a body such as this in being able to alter the course of events, and rather than quibble over the wording of paragraphs in repetitive draft resolutions we can and should at least warn the world in clear terms of the true nature of the modern arms spiral.

In the past the arms race was confined to the main contenders for supremacy, the major Powers of the day. This was true of the situation prevailing prior to the outbreak of the two world wars and also during the 1950s and 1960s.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

A number of factors have contributed to a change in the character of the arms race. Even the very term "arms race" is misleading, because the competition for the acquisition of more arms is being conducted simultaneously in different regions of the world. Rather than having one race with several competitors running, so to speak, on the same track, one witnesses today the existence of a number of tracks over which the gruesome and ultimately futile competition for military advantage is being run. The novel situation is a result of the concomitant effects of the proliferation of conflicts in the post-colonial era, the scientific revolution and, above all, the availability of unprecedented financial resources to Middle Eastern oil-producing countries, which accelerates the production and widens the spread of sophisticated arms the world over.

With the increase of armed conflicts, there is a growing international demand for arms. I should like to quote the Foreign Minister of Singapore, who said, in his statement of 24 September 1979,

"Since 1945 there have been in all some 135 major and minor wars involving some 80 countries and responsible for some 25 million casualties. With rare exceptions the armies involved were from third world countries. Today the fighting armies are wholly from third world countries."

(A/34/PV.6, p. 41)

He went on to say that

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

He further noted that

"An even more telling evidence of militarization is the third world's share of global military expenditures over the past decade. According to an estimate made some five years ago, it shot up from 15 per cent ... to 23 per cent ... In the light of the proliferation of new wars since then, such as the major one in Indo-China, the percentage has probably increased. A quarter of the third world devotes more than a quarter of its public spending to arms". (ibid., p. 42)

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

It is probably not surprising that the ancient rivalries which had existed in the pre-colonial era would come to life again after liberation from colonial rule. The tragedy is, however, that the availability of sophisticated weapons on a vast scale serves to exacerbate and prolong the armed conflicts, causing enormous suffering to civilian populations. There exists a tragic discrepancy in the third world between the lack of development on the one hand and the presence of modern sophisticated means of destruction on the other. We have witnessed in the last decade the gruesome spectacle of MIG 21s with computerized weapons systems being flown over fields that have never seen a tractor and where sowing is still done with the help of a wooden plough. One would wish that the dispensers of modern technology to the third world would be as liberal with aid in agriculture as they are in modernizing warfare.

In this Committee we have often heard the complaint that while enormous sums are being spent on research and development on armaments, comparatively little is being spent on helping developing countries of the world. This is a justified grievance. It must be noted, however, that the process of research and development of modern armament is a competitive business, inasmuch as the buyers are in a position to demand the latest models and will turn to another supplier if they fail initially to acquire the most destructive type of tank, missile or plane in as short a time as possible. If the customer is a Middle Eastern oil-producing country, the price is irrelevant. This mad scramble for the latest in means of destruction has a double effect.

On the one hand, competing with each other for the recycling of petrodollars, the industrialized countries are forced to direct ever larger sums to research and development. This in turn means an accelerated transition from one weapons system to another. Military specialists are in the habit of talking in terms of "generations of arms". Unlike human generations, the lifespan of modern arms is only a few years.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

On the other hand, the swift transition from one weapon system to another enables each of the Middle Eastern oil-producing countries to have at its disposal large stocks of outdated equipment which would be considered elsewhere as still quite modern. These accumulated stocks are frequently distributed to political client countries in the third world, which, as I said before, contributes to the proliferation of armed conflicts the world over. What better way to stoke the furnaces of third world conflicts?

An unspoken taboo has prevailed in the United Nations for too long which has prevented an unbiased discussion of the full impact of the soaring costs of petroleum on the world economy, on the amount of economic assistance to developing countries, and on the proliferation and stockpiling of modern arms in parts of the world that have hitherto been spared the deadly contagious disease we call "the arms race". Recently, the submerged anxieties over oil prices have erupted into open outbursts in some United Nations forums. The extensive discussions on disarmament in this Committee, encompassing a variety of factors present in the international arms build-up, can no longer be considered valid unless and until the oil factor is included.

The rise of oil prices since 1974, and the consequent cataclysmic economic repercussions, have posed tremendous problems for developed and developing nations alike. It is obvious that the high cost of oil imports is directly responsible for the increase of deficits in national balances of payments and the mushrooming of foreign debt.

Industrialized nations were caught in a process of "stagflation" - inflation of prices to an unprecedented level occurring simultaneously with an increase in unemployment. This phenomenon also causes international imbalances in the world monetary system, and thus imperils the lowering of trade barriers as proposed in United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) meetings, and North-South dialogues.

Developing nations have been especially hard-hit by the energy stranglehold. Between the end of 1973 and the beginning of 1978, the total foreign debt in the third world countries which do not produce oil has increased from an estimated \$95 billion to \$210 billion. According to the

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

World Bank report published at the end of September, 1979, the total balance of payments deficits of these countries will be increased by \$10 billion this year. As a result, most of these countries are forced to postpone urgently-needed improvement projects, and many will face poverty and continued deprivation. In some developing countries, economic growth and selective industrialization have been thwarted at the very moment when results were beginning to become evident.

The crucial connexion between disarmament and development should be of main concern to this Committee. The primary basis of this link is negotiable currency or, more specifically, the resources that money can buy. The traditional comparison used by many speakers at the United Nations illustrated the spectacular gap between the amount of money spent on armaments and the amount of aid sent to developing countries. We have not yet observed any serious attempt to examine the effect of the flow of currency into oil-producing nations - the "nouveaux haves" in this "have" and "have not" world. It seems there is enough evidence to suggest that the vast amounts of petrodollars accumulated by several Middle Eastern oil-producing countries became a significant and an independent factor acquiring a momentum of its own in the rise of stockpiling and proliferation of modern conventional arms. It might be argued, successfully, that the dizzying climb of the world's arms race is fueled by fuel.

A publication on the arms race by UNESCO in April 1979, examines the distribution of arms transfers in the world market, and provides some interesting observations. Entitled "The Ever-Rising Tide of Military Expenditure", the article says that the total value of military goods and services transferred world-wide in 1975 reached an estimated \$13 thousand million at current prices.

The article divides this staggering figure into three major groups. I quote from the UNESCO Courier of April 1979, p. 8:

"About one-third of the total is traded among industrialized countries; another third approximately is made up of exports to oil-exporting developing countries mainly in the Middle East, and the remaining third goes to all other developing countries".

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

It should be noted, as the article says, that this breakdown refers only to trade in arms. It excludes training services and construction related to armament which, if added, would show that the share of oil-exporting countries in the Middle East exceeds this "one third" of the world arms transfer.

In the words of the representative of Sweden in his statement in this Committee on 29 October 1979:

"It is estimated that annual export orders for new conventional weapons approach \$20 billion and that some 75 per cent of current arms transfers in major conventional weapons go to developing countries." (A/C.1/34/PV.20, p. 28)

Alva Myrdal, former Minister of Disarmament of Sweden, and leading spokeswoman for the Non-Aligned in the Committee on Disarmament, draws a direct link between oil revenues and arms in her book, "The Game of Disarmament", published in 1976. I quote some extracts:

"With the monopolistic rise in oil prices, some underdeveloped countries have suddenly become very rich and these countries have become major importers of highly sophisticated and expensive weapons."

Referring to the delivery by the super-Powers to the oil-producing countries, she explained that almost all the developed Western countries

"have been racing to please the Arabs and simultaneously reap profits. There has been a resultant strong upsurge in trade according to a new pattern of arms-for-oil deals."

For instance, Alva Myrdal refers to the States of the Persian Gulf in which one country with approximately only a million inhabitants:

"will have one of the world's most modern air defence systems, and all the Gulf sheikdoms are acquiring sophisticated counter-insurgency weaponry".

The transformation of the arms market can be seen in the increased volume of trade and also in the business of arms transfers. Moreover, the changes in the terms of transfer have developed a built-in factor in the delivery process which affects both the arms transfer market and the economic

(Mr. Eilan , Israel)

structure of the supplier States. The UNESCO report to which I referred earlier explains:

"... there has been a major shift towards transactions on commercial or near-commercial terms. For most suppliers commercial considerations have become predominant to an unprecedented degree and the only remaining constraint appears to be the resources recipients are able and willing to commit to the purchase of armaments."

In the past, arms transfers were executed mainly within the framework of military aid programmes, whereby the supplying Government was in a position to impose its own terms as to the volume and levels of sophistication of arms delivered. During the 1970s, there has been a dramatic shift towards government-to-government foreign military purchases for cash and credit and commercial sales.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

As Leslie H. Gelb, the former New York Times correspondent on security affairs and Director of the Politico-Military Affairs Bureau of the United States Department of State, observes in Foreign Policy (winter 1976-1977 issue), the shift was substantial. "As aid declined, sales rose", and the driving force was clear:

"The offsetting increase in sales was not surprising as more states became economically able to pay cash and with the oil-producing states rolling in petro-dollars".

There is no doubt that the shift from a seller's to a buyer's market has changed the nature of the transfers. Conditions and specifications are now dictated by the recipients to the suppliers. In the past, political leverage was held by the suppliers over the recipients within the controlling framework of military aid programmes. This framework has evaporated and suppliers are now pressured by demands and occasional warnings or tacit threats from new buyers who can and do turn to a competing supplier.

The changes in the terms of trade were accompanied by a shift in the type of weapons. Inflation and the increasing volume of more sophisticated weapons have caused a constant rise in the costs of the international arms trade. In markets dominated by rich buyers, relatively little surplus or second-hand equipment is traded. In the rapid process of modernization of weapons, some orders become obsolete by the time of delivery. On the other hand, relatively outdated arms equipment is often disposed of by Middle Eastern oil-producing countries, by transferring it to other areas of tension in the third world.

A reading of the figures on the subject of the growing volume of arms transfers reveals an undeniable fact: the greatest single boost to arms sales in the last decade came with the oil cut-off, the subsequent crisis and the resulting quadrupling of oil prices. The billions of dollars which are poured first into oil-producing countries, and then into the arms market, were spent primarily by those same Middle Eastern oil-producing countries which happened to be the largest exporters of energy resources.

As a result, any international effort to curb the spread of weapons has to face the existence of what one may now call the military-oil complex.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) 1979 Yearbook (pp. 177-85), three of these Middle Eastern oil-producing countries, the "nouveaux Haves", have made three international records in the import of weapons.

Another aspect of the problem is the historic environmental fact that Middle Eastern oil-producing States have been unable to build credible non-oil-based economies.

There is no doubt that countries with an oil surplus were completely unprepared to face this sudden huge influx of oil money. Immediately, without any financial constraints, they attempted to make the most profitable use of their new riches.

Roy A. Werner, in the fall 1977 issue of Orbis, says that the relationship between oil and weapons is inevitable:

"Liquid financial assets, fear and prestige drive producer States to become weapons arsenals".

A leading Middle-Eastern African oil-producing country, whose oil revenues are expected to jump to \$16 billion this year, has been unable to absorb the huge arsenals of sophisticated weapons which it has purchased. That State has therefore invited foreign military advisors, pilots, officers and technicians to manage its new weaponry. Moreover, that State has introduced another deadly innovation related to the oil-weapons connexion: the re-exporting of arms. As stated before, by means of this new Process, petrodollars are used to establish weapon arsenals which are made available to different regions of tension throughout the world.

Another characteristic of the military-oil complex is that it crosses the barriers of East and West and spreads itself the world over, without regard to ideological demarcation or military alliances.

The recent projection of a decline in Soviet oil output in the 1980s makes it clear that the Soviet Union will be forced to buy from oil-exporting nations. Drew Middleton, the New York Times military analyst, wrote in September 1979 that that would encourage the Soviet Union to deliver greater amounts of sophisticated weapons to Middle Eastern oil-producing countries as barter to meet the costs of its oil imports.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

From the point of view of development the new trend in the arms market is more devastating than the frequent upheavals in the international monetary system.

Investments of oil revenues in some sectors destabilize the existing structure of the world economy. According to the Wall Street Journal of 20 September 1979, there is a consensus that in the international stock exchange, "the Middle East has been very, very big" in the recent skyrocketing of gold prices.

American observers of the oil industry, according to the New York Times (21 September 1979), explain that Middle Eastern producers are acquiring so much money that they cannot spend or invest it productively, so they put it into various channels, including gold.

However, there is still some difference between investments in gold and investments in military expenditures. Although both are unproductive in terms of development, gold is somewhat convertible (depending on the frequently hysterical rise and fall of the speculators' market), while the money spent on the purchase of sophisticated weapons is never refunded, and consequently never reinvested.

Our comments would be incomplete if we failed to consider the results of the upheavals in the arms market as they affect the broader context of the world economy. The damage is twofold: first, an incremental restructuring process is taking place in the industrialized economies; secondly, the gap continues to widen between the rich and poor countries within the international system.

The recycling of petrodollars has undoubtedly become a powerful engine of the arms traffic. The popular public cry in some industrialized countries was to bring those dollars back home. The growing volume of arms transfers under the new terms of trade has become an economic necessity for the recovery of balance-of-payments deficits. In some major industrialized European countries, defence industries have become dependent on export markets.

This new oil-arms connexion has grown into a vicious and uncontrolled spiral; the impact is manifest in the restructuring of some economies.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

There are major industrialized nations which are influenced by this linkage when deciding their own economic priorities.

A refusal to sell arms to Middle Eastern oil-producing States might provoke economic retaliation in the form of oil price increases - increases which could generate even stronger pressure to recoup petrodollars through arms sales to those same countries.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

Faced with economic difficulties, recession, unemployment and growing deficits in the balance of payments, these industrialized nations are compelled to produce tanks instead of more tractors, guns instead of more butter. The demand of the international market has forced the production of sophisticated weapons as a necessary industry.

On the other hand, the non-oil-producing developing countries lack the necessary conversion capabilities to compensate for the oil imports which constitute a crushing burden on their shattered economies. The oil-weapons connexion is creating a strange phenomenon: while developed and developing countries alike are paying the exorbitant price for oil imports, the recycling of these petrodollars is restricted principally to the industrialized countries which are able to satisfy the demand for arms exports.

It is a sad fact that the bulk of foreign aid provided by these oil-producing Middle-Eastern countries does not go for development purposes. Most of the aid goes to other countries which are themselves in the process of amassing weapons. Some of the money is simply being allocated directly to funds established to finance arms procurement for régimes engaged in military confrontation or for non-governmental organizations committed to the spread of violence.

The prophets of Israel foresaw two possible futures for mankind. One is Isaiah's immortal phrase inscribed in stone across the road from this building. But there are also prophecies such as that of Ezekiel, who said:

"On the mountains and in all the valleys, its branches will fall and its boughs will lie broken in all the watercourses of the land; and all the peoples of the earth will go from its shadow and leave it." (Ezekiel, xxxi, 12)

The choice is ours. Let us not wait until we have lost our choice forever.

Mr. MKWIZU (United Republic of Tanzania): The maintenance of international peace and security is the primary duty and responsibility of the United Nations as stipulated in the Charter. In this endeavour, the United Nations has set itself the noble goal of general and complete disarmament under strict and

(Mr. Mkwizu, United Republic of
Tanzania)

effective international control, the realization of which requires a truly comprehensive programme. To this end, at its tenth special session in 1978, the General Assembly took decisions by consensus which not only spelled out an international disarmament strategy, but at the same time reformed the disarmament machinery, providing for an all-Member Disarmament Commission and an enlarged Committee on Disarmament, both of which have started to make some contribution to the evolution of a programme for the implementation of that strategy.

My delegation is of the opinion that the priorities as spelled out during the deliberations of the Commission meet the approval of the majority of Member States. The priorities should provide for sustained global action and negotiations on all the elements of the programme. Multilateral, regional and bilateral initiatives should be encouraged in the implementation of the disarmament programme and in sustaining the momentum generated by the tenth special session. In ensuring the right of each State to security, the programme should continue to entail the elaboration of the modalities of disarmament, bearing in mind that the nuclear-weapon States in particular, and those States that are militarily significant, bear special responsibility for ensuring that this programme is implemented. My delegation believes that nuclear disarmament should have priority in this endeavour.

Conventional weapons have continued to proliferate and claim more money, manpower and lives. We understand and do support the initiatives aimed at launching measures to regulate international arms transfers. However, we wish to emphasize that these measures should genuinely serve to regulate such transfers and not to deny legitimate transfers necessary for the security of nations, peoples or liberation movements fighting against colonialism and apartheid in the exercise of their right to self-determination and independence. For this reason, we maintain that while it is desirable to embark on concurrent nuclear and conventional disarmament, special emphasis and priority should be directed towards nuclear disarmament. We are concerned that the Conference on certain conventional weapons deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects, which took place at Geneva in September of this year, was unable to emerge with concrete

(Mr. Mkwizu, United Republic of
Tanzania)

results. It is our expectation that greater determination will be demonstrated by the international community in dealing with this urgent matter. My delegation will therefore continue to support any positive initiatives in this direction.

The news that the racist minority régime of South Africa has detonated a nuclear device is the most shocking and deplorable of all the recent developments related to international peace and security. It confirms Africa's repeated condemnation of the evil designs of that régime to acquire nuclear weapons and constitutes a standing indictment of those States that continue to see logic in increasing nuclear and other co-operation with South Africa, in total defiance of international opinion and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. It is this support that has enabled that régime not only to mount massive repression in the country, but also to entrench the evil policy of apartheid and colonialism. It is unfortunate that such a development takes place at a time when international initiatives are in progress to implement the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. This act is a flagrant violation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa adopted by the Organization of African Unity in 1964, as well as General Assembly resolutions 1652 (XVI) of 1961, 32/81 of 1977 and 33/53 of 1978, which called on all States to respect the continent of Africa, including Madagascar and the surrounding islands, as a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

The bloody record of the apartheid régime and its savagery in committing acts of atrocity, oppression and terrorism against the people of South Africa, as well as its repeated violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring African countries, are too well known to require further elaboration. The fact that apartheid South Africa has acquired nuclear capability is as tragic as the fact that some Members of this Organization are accomplices to this fraudulent flouting of international morality. Clandestine nuclear collaboration with the apartheid régime has been reported before in the media, but now the racists and their collaborators in the concoction of horror weapons can no longer hide their inhuman designs.

(Mr. Mkwizu, United Republic of
Tanzania)

It is ironical that these very countries which have all along been willing to support and subsidize the South African nuclear programme should now pretend to be shocked and surprised by the detonation of a nuclear device. It is these double standards, highly irreconcilable as they are, which my delegation considers a disservice to humanity and to international peace and security.

(Mr. Ilkwizu, United Republic of
Tanzania)

This development poses a serious threat to international peace and security and a challenge to the international community. We expect the Security Council to respond to this challenge with appropriate speed and action. Africa holds the United States of America, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and Israel responsible for this treacherous development, for they are helping that régime to prepare for the wrong war. For the war against apartheid within South Africa will never be won by nuclear weapons. My delegation condemns this introduction of nuclear weapons on the continent of Africa.

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace is an idea that is acquiring increasing significance in the over-all context of disarmament. My delegation supports initiatives and conventions to this end, provided that these zones and the modalities of establishing them are mutually agreed upon, that they give due consideration to the unique characteristics of each region, that they enhance the security of States within them and that they are widely recognized by other States. This prospect would represent a willingness of States establishing such zones and those nuclear-weapon States agreeing to them to maintain peace and security at minimal levels of armaments and cost. But such zones are desirable only if they enhance the security of States. They should not provide a pretext for perpetuation of the dominance of a State or group of States over those in the area. It is in this context that my Government supports the initiatives launched in this regard.

The meeting of Littoral and Hinterland States in July of this year provided an opportunity to harness their positions regarding the envisaged Conference on the Indian Ocean. Despite some minor shortcomings, the meeting made commendable efforts and adopted a final document. My delegation understands and respects the right of every delegation to express reservations on any decision of importance relevant to that document. We hope that the delegations that expressed reservations on the July document will consider the possibility of supporting future measures geared to the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

(Mr. Mkwizu, United Republic of
Tanzania)

My delegation deeply regrets the suspension of the bilateral talks between the United States and the USSR regarding their military presence in the Indian Ocean, conceived in the context of great-Power rivalry. It is even more disturbing that the United States has made clear its increasing deployment of the Fifth Fleet in the area. For, while we are cognizant of the differences that exist between the great Powers, we reject the extension of these differences being manifested through their military rivalry in the Indian Ocean. My country, Tanzania, being a littoral State of the Ocean, is alarmed by these developments, which are not only inconsistent with the implementation of resolution 2832 (XXVI), on the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, but also pose a serious threat to the security of the States in the area in particular and international peace and security as a whole. We find neither logic nor merit in the so-called strategic reasons given for such deployment of naval forces in the area. Rather, they are an excuse motivated by the desire to perpetuate their presence in the area in a bid to frustrate the efforts of the littoral and hinterland States to implement the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

The suspension of the bilateral talks between the USSR and the United States of America on the Indian Ocean for no clear reason, and the expression of their strong reservations on the conclusions of the July Meeting of Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, as well as the announcement of increased naval deployment in the area, have not come about at this point in time by mere coincidence. My delegation earnestly hopes that the United States of America and the USSR, together with other Western permanent members of the Security Council and the major maritime users, will desist from actions that frustrate the objective of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace and cause undue difficulties for the littoral and hinterland States. They should unconditionally agree to serve on the expanded Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and contribute towards the preparation of the Conference on the Indian Ocean due to take place in Sri Lanka in 1981. My delegation also supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace in South-East Asia, the Middle East and Latin America. It is encouraging to note that almost all

(Mr. Mkwizu, United Republic of
Tanzania)

nuclear-weapon States have ratified or are considering ratifying both Additional Protocols of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, recognizing Latin America as a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Closely related to the establishment of the nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace is not only the absence of nuclear weapons from the areas but also the implied non-use of those weapons against the States of the areas. Both Additional Protocols I and II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, for example, provide for this guarantee. It is the view of my delegation, therefore, that the guarantee of non-use of nuclear weapons against the States of the area is part and parcel of a nuclear-weapon-free zone and a zone of peace. For this reason we hold the view that the proposed international convention on negative security guarantees does not explore new horizons, nor constitute a comprehensive approach towards disarmament or genuine security guarantees.

We believe that the purpose of extending these negative security guarantees and ensuring the non-use of nuclear weapons cannot be adequately served by the conclusion of the envisaged convention. The guarantees extended by the three nuclear Powers in Security Council resolution 255 (1968) covered the purpose of safeguarding the security of non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The extension of similar guarantees by all nuclear Powers to all non-nuclear States would be a step in the right direction. For this reason, it is the view of my delegation that this initiative should be expressed differently and not only should cover and explore new horizons but should depart from the prerequisites and conditions stipulated in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Accordingly, we do not accept the implied condition that only those States which undertake obligations similar to or more far-reaching than those of the Non-Proliferation Treaty will be parties to the Convention.

While it is evident that nations which opt not to produce or acquire nuclear weapons contribute significantly to the horizontal non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, we do not find such options to be of any significant relevance to the whole question of disarmament. This must be closely linked to vertical proliferation. The proposed convention will have limited effect if it is not

(Mr. Mkwizu, United Republic of
Tanzania)

considered within a new perspective of re-examining the whole approach to disarmament. This approach should entail recognition of the right and duty of each State to assume an enhanced role in determining the course of the disarmament negotiations. These negotiations should ensure the rejection of the tendency of the more powerful States to seek to perpetuate their dominance over the less powerful.

(Mr. Mkwizu, United Republic
of Tanzania)

Conventions and treaties cannot be a substitute for disarmament. We believe that the best security guarantee to the non-nuclear weapon States and nuclear States alike is actual nuclear disarmament. To this end, my delegation has continued to look forward to the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We are disturbed by the slow pace of the tripartite talks, which makes it impossible for the Committee on Disarmament to consider the issue. It is also disturbing to learn that nuclear-weapon tests are still being conducted, despite the ongoing negotiations. We urge those involved to expedite negotiations in this regard.

Peace and security to an impoverished man means more food, better shelter and greater security from economic underdevelopment. To the extent that the arms race gobbles up so many scarce resources and so much manpower while the majority of the people of the world live in abject poverty and misery, my delegation shares the view that disarmament and development must inevitably be linked: linked by the coexistence between the lavish expenditures on armaments and the need for economic development, on the one hand, and by the insecurity posed by those armaments and that caused by this economic hopelessness, on the other.

The statistics on these glaring and irrational contradictions are indeed staggering. In considering the link between disarmament and development, therefore, the need for ensuring that disarmament makes a positive contribution to the social and economic development of the impoverished countries and the speedy establishment of the New International Economic Order is imperative. To this end, the technology used in the armament sector should be harnessed to civilian uses, and the resultant savings in the budgets of nuclear-weapon States and other major military spenders should be reallocated to economic development, particularly in the developing countries. Concurrently, concrete measures should be taken to move as quickly as possible to general and complete disarmament under strict international supervision. This, we submit, is the only viable path to genuine and durable international peace and security.

(Mr. Mkwizu, United Republic of
Tanzania)

We wish to express Tanzania's hope that, despite the inability of the Committee on Disarmament to deal adequately with any substantive issue during its last session, appropriate measures will be taken by those who failed to facilitate the work of that Committee. We especially look forward to the full participation of all nuclear-weapon States in its deliberations, which should greatly benefit from its recent enlargement and democratization. My delegation is confident that the Committee provides a viable forum for constructive international dialogue and co-operation.

With regard to the work of the Centre for Disarmament, we should like to express our satisfaction at the launching of the Disarmament Fellowship Programme, which we feel should continue on an annual basis. If we are to work towards the mobilization of world public opinion in favour of disarmament, it is pertinent that we should build in this field a reservoir of qualified personnel in the developing countries. This would enable the developing countries to develop national policies supportive of the process of global disarmament and to participate more actively in the complex negotiations entailed in that process.

Finally, my delegation wishes to underline the view that the international disarmament strategy should be synchronized and co-ordinated with the international development strategy for the 1980s in order best to realize the twin aspirations of all peoples for peace and prosperity based on global justice.

Mr. CHERKAOUI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, the Moroccan delegation is convinced that under your leadership the work of our Committee will be conducted with efficiency and that we shall achieve substantial progress in the consideration of the important items on our agenda.

The tenth special session of the Assembly, devoted to disarmament, raised enormous hopes. The fact that it adopted by consensus a Final Document outlining a comprehensive Programme of Action is in itself an event of considerable import. That document now constitutes a solid basis for pursuing the course of genuine disarmament. It is, of course, regrettable that despite the general support for that programme, little progress has yet been achieved. Some might become discouraged by the meagre results obtained or by the slow pace of the disarmament negotiations, but we must not permit the impetus created by the special session to wane so quickly. The goal of general and complete disarmament - in particular, nuclear disarmament - is an arduous undertaking which requires patience and tenacity on the part of the members of the international community. Our task here in the United Nations is to work, steadily and efficiently, towards the setting up of a new international order based on security, peaceful coexistence and the acceptance of sovereign equality among States.

Although the Committee on Disarmament has not so far been able to engage in any substantive negotiations on the priority issues entrusted to it, it is fortunate that the deliberative and negotiating machinery established by the Assembly at its special session has started to operate. The Moroccan delegation is gratified that the reconstituted and expanded Committee on Disarmament, in adopting its rules of procedure and its Programme of Action, was able to lay the foundation for procedure and substance which will allow it to carry out fully the enormous task which has been entrusted to it.

(Mr. Cherkaoui, Morocco)

Moreover, the Disarmament Commission, by adopting the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme, has also made it possible to expand the basis for more fruitful negotiations within the framework of the Committee on Disarmament, and this augurs well for the new machinery thus set up. My delegation welcomes in particular the statement of Ambassador Lai, representative of the People's Republic of China, on the forthcoming participation of his country in the work of the Committee on Disarmament. China will thus be taking its rightful place as a nuclear Power.

Nuclear disarmament is of the highest priority in regard to disarmament negotiations. In this respect, the special session devoted to disarmament enunciated a programme of action for nuclear disarmament involving measures designed to block the present nuclear arms race and to effect reductions which would ultimately lead to the elimination of all existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons. It is the nuclear-weapon States which bear chief responsibility in this regard. Unfortunately, however, those States continue to display in this field what Spinoza called "the tendency of the being to persevere in being", and results have been meagre.

In view of the increasingly serious threat looming over humanity as a result of the unprecedented accumulation of destructive weapons, it is urgent for nuclear-weapon States to take bold decisions leading to genuine disarmament measures. Hence the conclusion of a total nuclear test-ban treaty becomes imperative. The Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States must rapidly conclude their tripartite negotiations on this matter and submit positive results to the Committee on Disarmament. All Committee members, moreover, should contribute to the progress of the negotiations and to the adoption of concrete measures so ardently awaited by the international community. A total nuclear test-ban agreement would prevent proliferation and thereby constitute a substantial disarmament measure.

(Mr. Cherkaoui, Morocco)

As regards chemical disarmament, the bilateral negotiations entered into four years ago by the United States and the Soviet Union have, unfortunately, not borne fruit. My delegation hopes that an agreement will be concluded as soon as possible and that the Committee on Disarmament will be able to consider it in all its aspects, because chemical disarmament is of overriding importance to many countries.

(Mr. Cherkaoui, Morocco)

While there is reason to be gratified at the SALT II agreements signed between the United States and the Soviet Union, it is to be hoped above all that they will strengthen détente and will contribute to the establishment of a favourable climate for pending disarmament negotiations.

The Kingdom of Morocco, which has acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, attaches the greatest importance to the goal of non-proliferation, as well as to the development of international co-operation in regard to the peaceful application of nuclear energy. We continue to feel that the Non-Proliferation Treaty is an effective instrument for nuclear disarmament. That system must be constantly strengthened by further accessions and by the full exercise of the inalienable right of all States to apply and develop their means for the peaceful use of nuclear energy with a view to their economic and social development. This is why my country attaches primary importance to the preparations for the second review conference of the parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The Moroccan delegation was gratified last year at the initiatives advocating the conclusion of an international convention to strengthen the security guarantees of non-nuclear States. The General Assembly had asked States possessing nuclear weapons to conclude binding arrangements guaranteeing the non-nuclear States against becoming victims of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We hope that the Committee on Disarmament will be able to deal, at its next session, with the elaboration of an effective instrument for the protection of non-nuclear States.

The establishment of denuclearized zones on the basis of arrangements freely entered into constitutes an important disarmament measure. In this respect, it is disturbing to note that the efforts made by the African countries, as well as resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, aimed at sheltering the African continent from nuclear weapons, are constantly defied by South Africa. The Pretoria régime, which has definitely chosen the nuclear alternative as a military means, continues to receive the technology, the supplies and the equipment necessary for the development of its nuclear programme. According to recent information, it has just conducted a nuclear test. In this connexion, the Security Council must take all appropriate measures to eliminate this serious threat which hangs over the African continent. The Kingdom of Morocco also condemns any collaboration by nuclear States with South Africa.

(Mr. Cherkaoui, Morocco)

Equally, the question of the denuclearization of the Middle Eastern region is of primary importance for our Organization. Israel, which is developing its nuclear programme beyond the reach of all control, should accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and accept its obligations. The international community is quite rightly disturbed to see Israeli nuclear arms constituting a serious threat to the States of the region.

Paragraph 64 of the Final Document concerns the establishment of zones of peace in various regions of the world. The Kingdom of Morocco, aware of the relationship between security in Europe and security in the Mediterranean, remains greatly concerned by the tensions which affect the Mediterranean region. We trust that this region may become a zone of peace and co-operation, protected from external rivalries. We hope that the session of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe which is to take place in Madrid in 1980, and in which my country hopes to participate actively, will take particular account of the specific nature of the questions connected with security in the Mediterranean.

The majority of the speakers who have preceded me have laid stress on the importance of the ties which exist between disarmament and development. While aid to the developing countries is constantly decreasing, the sums swallowed up by armaments are increasing at a dizzying pace, thus increasingly blocking the establishment of fruitful international economic co-operation.

My delegation is gratified at the work being carried out by the group of qualified governmental experts appointed by the Secretary-General in conformity with paragraph 24 of the Final Document. We hope that this work will result in concrete proposals and will truly demonstrate that disarmament must be at the service of development. The survival of mankind depends upon it.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling upon those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply, I should like to make some brief statements.

First of all, I had intended to announce the plan for the second phase of our work, but as we have decided to follow strictly the rule of ending our meetings on time, I would ask members to be patient. I shall present the plan of work at the end of tomorrow morning's meeting.

(The Chairman)

On behalf of the members of the First Committee, I wish to convey, through the Cuban delegation, to its Government and people, sincere condolences upon hearing of the demise of Mr. Jose Luis Perez, who was Cuban representative to the First Committee and a member of the advisory body to the Secretary-General on disarmament.

Finally, a matter of general information. Representatives know that when they inscribe their names for the purpose of making statements they are requested to state the approximate length of those statements. I hope that it will be borne in mind for future reference that when the stated time is exceeded it creates some difficulties for subsequent speakers. I should state, in the interest of fairness that while ending a statement before the stated time may also create difficulties, I as Chairman, and I am sure the Committee, would much prefer that kind of inconvenience. I hope that the motto of this session will be "brevity is the soul of wit".

I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

Mr. LENNUYEUX-COMNENE (France) (interpretation from French): I listened with great attention and interest to the statement made this afternoon in the general debate by the representative of Papua-New Guinea. My delegation appreciates the contributions of all States Members of the United Nations to our highly important debate on disarmament problems. None the less, my country having been the only one mentioned specifically in the statement to which I have referred, I am obliged, although without any desire to enter into polemics, to make the following clarification, if only for the verbatim record.

The representative of Papua-New Guinea referred in his statement to two nuclear tests to have been conducted this year at Mururoa and to have resulted in incidents in a laboratory or on a beach of that atoll. I think that the representative of Papua-New Guinea was referring to the incidents that were indeed recorded on Mururoa on 5 July and 26 July 1979.

(Mr. Lennuyeux-Cornene, France)

In this connexion I can only refer members of this Committee to the statement of the representative of France before the Special Political Committee on 19 October during the debate on the agenda item devoted to the report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. In that statement, the representative of France indicated that the incidents in question could in no circumstances have been the consequence of nuclear tests as such, in as much as one resulted from a work accident in a laboratory and the other was a physical phenomenon of slippage recorded on the sedimentary surface of the undersea bed of the atoll - a phenomenon, incidentally, comparable to the one recorded on the Mediterranean coast of France a few days ago in which, regrettably, seven persons died.

Hence, if the representative of Papua-New Guinea will be good enough to refer to the record of that meeting of the Special Political Committee he will, I hope, find the details and the assurances which will allay his concern.

Mr. AL-ATIYYAH (Iraq): In the statement made by the representative of Israel there was a slanderous attack on the developing countries, particularly the oil-producing countries. I should point out that third world countries, including oil-producing countries, have to import weapons for their own defence. On the other hand, Israel, an aggressor State, is not only arming itself to the teeth but has embarked on a huge programme for its armaments industry. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) for 1979, Israel now holds tenth place in the ranking order of all major weapons exporters. In addition, Israeli arms, manufactured in Israel, are exported to countries that are well known for their oppressive and dictatorial régimes.

The reference made by the Israeli representative to the oil-producing countries and the armaments race was a total distortion of the reality of the situation. The fact that not a single oil-producing country has unleashed its armies or weapons outside its own territory testifies to the intentions of those nations, although Israel, a non-oil-producing country, has occupied, and still occupies by force, the territories of three neighbouring States, to say nothing of its denial to the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights.

Israel is able to take this position in disregard and defiance of international world opinion and all the relevant United Nations resolutions because Israeli military supremacy is behind its policy. Israel is not content with conventional arms supremacy, but has embarked on nuclear supremacy, a subject on which we shall elaborate at a later stage.

Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): We listened to the representative of Israel lecture us at length about world economies. He emphasized the question of energy when he reserved a great part of his lecture to attacking the petroleum-exporting Arab States. All this in no way disconcerts our delegation because we have been accustomed nearly every day and in every Committee of the General Assembly to listen to such cheap and false pretensions from the representative of Israel. He departed from the subject we are considering in this Committee, namely disarmament - especially nuclear disarmament. The First Committee attaches particular importance to nuclear weapons, not to energy problems.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

We have all heard the news transmitted by information media and the world press concerning the nuclear explosion carried out by South Africa on 22 September last. We also know that Israel is the State primarily responsible for this nuclear explosion because it is Israel that offers nuclear assistance to South Africa. The Israeli representative claimed that the oil-exporting Arab countries spend huge amounts on armaments and that some of these States now possess arsenals of weapons. I should say that the representative of Israel should be the last person to speak about armaments since the arsenals of deadly weapons held by Israel were not available to the Atlantic Alliance and that tremendous quantities of these sophisticated weapons will be used by Israel in its aggression against the Arab States and the Palestinian people.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.