

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records \*



FIRST COMMITTEE  
29th meeting  
held on  
Thursday, 11 November 1976  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 29th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)  
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

- Reduction of military budgets: report of the Secretary-General [34]
- Incendiary and other specific conventional weapons which may be the subject of prohibitions of restrictions of use for humanitarian reasons: report of the Secretary-General [35]
- Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [36]
- Urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [37]
- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3467 (XXX) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) [38]
- Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean [39]
- World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference [40]
- Effective measures to implement the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade [41]
- Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa [42]
- Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects: report of the Secretary-General [43]
- Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East [44]
- Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [45]
- Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia [46]

/...

\* 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 LX-2332.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/31/PV.29  
12 November 1976  
ENGLISH

Conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests /47/

Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /48/

General and complete disarmament /49/:

- (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency;
- (c) Report of the Secretary-General.

Strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Review of the Role of the United Nations in the Field of Disarmament /50/

Implementation of the conclusions of the first Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons /116/

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50  
AND 116 (continued)

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to set forth the position of the Mongolian delegation on the disarmament issue, which should be positively resolved in the interests of strengthening peace and progress.

The discussion of the problems of disarmament, both at sessions of the General Assembly and in other international forums, is taking place in a climate of further deepening détente and growing awareness by the international community that, in order to make the process of détente irreversible, we must continue to take practical steps to halt the arms race and to bring about disarmament.

We firmly believe that improvement of the international political climate should be buttressed by genuine disarmament measures. The further deepening of the process of détente promotes the strengthening of the atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding among States and is conducive to the adoption of effective measures in respect to disarmament. In their turn, practical steps in halting the arms race and achieving disarmament help to reduce the material basis for the outbreak of war and armed conflict, and to create a firm foundation for international co-operation among States in various fields, particularly in resolving the vital problems of development.

As is known, the countries of the socialist community, and in the first place the Soviet Union, are in the forefront of the struggle of the peoples of the world for the halting of the arms race, for disarmament and for détente. Their efforts, supported by all peace-loving States, have yielded certain positive results. A number of important treaties and agreements have been concluded, designed primarily to curb the nuclear arms race, to prevent nuclear war, and to limit strategic armaments. Bacteriological weapons have been excluded from the arsenals of States -- the first important measure of genuine disarmament. Steps are being taken to prevent the use of the latest advances of science and technology for the development of new methods and means of warfare. Thus the Conference of

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), at its summer session, agreed on the draft text of an international convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, and submitted it for the approval of this session of the General Assembly. It should be stressed that this draft convention takes account of the views of the States participating in the talks.

The Mongolian delegation believes it important for the General Assembly at this session to approve the draft convention in the form in which it was submitted by the CCD, and also believes that the convention should be open for signature as soon as possible. This would be a new and positive contribution by our Organization to halting a new trend in the arms race and to preserving the human environment for the benefit of present and future generations.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

In spite of the progress made in the field of disarmament, the arms race is escalating. Certain circles of monopoly capital are continuing to develop military preparations, which is a major obstacle to the attainment of concrete progress in efforts to halt the arms race and bring about disarmament. And this is something which is directly served by the policy and actions of those who are whipping up military hysteria for the sake of their great-Power ambitions. Aware of the great complexity of the problems of disarmament, we must not lose sight, however, of the fact that the resistance of the forces of imperialism and reaction may threaten the effectiveness of measures already agreed upon for limitation of the arms race and disarmament.

It is therefore incumbent on all States, particularly nuclear States, and also those which possess considerable military potential, to strive for the consolidation of measures which have already been achieved and to strive to put into effect new practical measures in the field of disarmament. In this regard we would like to stress the relevance of the memorandum submitted by the Soviet Union on questions of ending the arms race and disarmament. The important new Soviet proposals in our view constitutes a genuinely constructive approach to the solution of these complex problems in the interest of ensuring lasting peace on earth.

The Mongolian People's Republic continues to hold that on the road to complete and general disarmament the problems of eliminating the threat of nuclear war and the implementation of nuclear disarmament are of the highest importance and urgency. At this stage of the talks on nuclear disarmament, when a key and decisive issue is the struggle for the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime of nuclear weapons and the attainment of a comprehensive prohibition of nuclear-weapons testing, the significance of the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes, signed between the USSR and the United States of America on 28 May this year, becomes ever clearer. The successful solution of the complex and difficult problems of a technical and political nature in the course of the Soviet-American talks on the conclusion of this treaty will undoubtedly promote the solution of the problem of conducting nuclear tests for peaceful purposes with a comprehensive prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. Therefore we can say with conviction that the Soviet-American Treaty on Underground

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes along with the Moscow Treaty of 1963 and the Treaty between the USSR and the United States of America on the limitation of underground tests of nuclear weapons, is an important measure designed to bring about the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

At the same time this Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes helps to strengthen the non-proliferation régime, since this international instrument, as we see it, may be of considerable service in resolving certain problems involved in the conclusion of appropriate agreements under article 5 of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. In our view, the Treaty is of considerable assistance in the work of the special consultative group on peaceful nuclear explosions, established by the Governing Council of IAEA. Furthermore the Treaty, including the Protocol and the agreed statement, covers not only underground peaceful nuclear explosions conducted on territory under the jurisdiction or control of the two States Parties to the Treaty, but also those conducted by these States on the territory of other States on their request.

At the same time we recognize the danger which may be caused by involving a growing number of States in international co-operation in the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, particularly those which have not yet acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It is our view that nuclear equipment and material should be given only through the channels of IAEA under strict international guarantees. The interests of peace and disarmament make it imperative to exert new efforts to further strengthen the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the non-proliferation régime as a whole.

The Mongolian delegation believes it important at this session for the General Assembly to devote particular attention to this problem and to appeal to all States, which have not so far done so, immediately to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or to ratify it, in the highest interests of preventing the threat of nuclear war.

On the way to the solution of the problem to halt the nuclear-arms race, the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear weapon tests is of paramount importance. As is known, on the initiative of the Soviet delegation, the General Assembly of the United Nations at its thirtieth session considered the question of concluding

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapons testing, and an appropriate draft international treaty to this effect was presented. In resolution 3478 (XXX) the General Assembly called upon all nuclear-weapon States to enter into negotiations not later than 31 March 1976 on talks designed to achieve agreement on complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and invited 25 to 30 non-nuclear-weapon States to take part in these negotiations.

It is generally known that a large number of socialist and non-aligned States, as well as the USSR, have stated their readiness to take part in talks for the drafting of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. Unfortunately we cannot but note that as a result of the negative attitude of certain nuclear Powers this resolution has so far not been carried out.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic is firmly convinced that a treaty which would outlaw all nuclear weapon tests could be effective only if all States, without exception, which possess nuclear weapons, were to associate themselves with it. New efforts should be made to begin talks as soon as possible on the basis of the draft treaty submitted by the Soviet Union.

Here the Mongolian delegation would like to express its profound concern in connexion with atmospheric tests of nuclear weapons in direct proximity to our southern frontiers. The Government of the country which conducts these tests bears a serious responsibility for its actions which are a threat to the environment and health of the populations of neighbouring States.

The creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world occupies an important place among those measures which are of direct practical significance for the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime and the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons.

Since the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic has set forth in detail its position in its reply to the Secretary-General on 17 August 1976 (A/31/189), I shall confine myself here, simply, to confirming this position of my Government. It is our belief that nuclear-weapon-free zones must be genuinely free of nuclear weapons. We should not permit any loopholes which would allow a breach of their nuclear-free status, and the implementation of measures in the creation of such zones should be carried out in total compliance with universally acknowledged norms of international law.

My delegation in expressing its views on the problem of nuclear disarmament, would like, once again, to confirm the importance of the earliest possible conclusion of the talks going on to work out a new agreement on the limitation of strategic offensive armaments on the basis of the Vladivostok accord which took place at the highest level.

The Mongolian People's Republic stands by its position of principle as to the need for a comprehensive prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and the destruction of stockpiles of such weapons. On this basis, our delegation remains of the opinion that the draft convention submitted by the socialist countries in 1972 for the consideration of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, is a good basis for conducting talks on this subject.



(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

However, taking account of the reluctance of certain Western Powers to agree to a comprehensive prohibition of chemical weapons, the socialist countries have agreed to a stage-by-stage approach, with the ultimate aim of attaining complete and general prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. My delegation last year pointed out here that in this an important part would be played by the attainment of agreement between the USSR and the United States to consider the question of putting forward in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament a joint initiative providing for the conclusion of a treaty which, as a first step, would ban the most dangerous and lethal chemical means of warfare.

The informal meetings, with the participation of governmental experts, which took place in the course of the summer session of the CCD, were useful for a broader and more profound discussion of this problem. They revealed general recognition of the need for the application of the purpose criterion in defining chemical agents which would come under a ban and, also, confirmed the common position of States with regard to the views we expressed before that the criteria of toxicity could serve as an addition to the purpose criterion in the various approaches to solving the problem of banning chemical weapons.

As to the problem of ensuring control over the ban on chemical weapons, the informal meetings cogently demonstrated the qualitative growth and increasing sophistication of ways of exercising control by national means.

Having noted the positive elements in the discussion of the various technical aspects connected with the banning of chemical weapons, our delegation would like to stress, once again, that a solution to the major problem depends on the political will of States.

Turning to the problem of prohibiting the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, my delegation would like to emphasize the urgency of the early conclusion of an international treaty in this field.

As is known, the General Assembly at its thirtieth session, approved the idea of concluding such an international treaty and instructed the CCD to proceed as soon as possible, with the assistance of governmental experts, to work out the text of such an agreement. At the spring and summer sessions of the Disarmament Committee, informal meetings were held of governmental experts which enabled us to

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

realize better the tremendous danger of the creation of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction and also to identify the technical aspects of this problem. We believe that the preparation of an international agreement would be best begun by defining the concepts of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. The model formulation presented by the Soviet Union of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction is, in our view, a good basis for agreeing on such a definition.

Like many others, we believe that the preventive nature of the Soviet proposal not only facilitates to a considerable degree the attainment of this goal, but is also of tremendous importance for the general cause of disarmament in that it would ban the development of the arms race in new areas. I should like to repeat that it is important now to solve the problem of defining the concepts of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction so that we can proceed as soon as possible to work out the text of a document.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

One of the practical measures designed to curb the arms race and to bring about disarmament is a reduction of the military budgets of States. The position of the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic has been repeatedly expounded on this subject, particularly in the course of the discussion of the question of reducing the military budgets of permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent, and using part of the funds thus saved for the provision of assistance to developing countries, a proposal which was presented by the Soviet Union.

A distinctive feature of this Soviet initiative is the fact that in a practical way it would link the two major problems, those of disarmament and development. If this proposal were to come into effect, all States without exception -- great and small -- would stand to gain, and above all, the cause of strengthening international peace and security and development.

However, because of the resistance of certain permanent members of the Security Council, upon whom the Charter has conferred particular responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the resolution of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly has so far not been implemented.

At this session, the Soviet Union has reconfirmed its readiness to work to achieve concrete results in this matter, and has proposed, without prejudging the scope of the reduction of military budgets, to come to an agreement on any concrete figure which might be used as a beginning for such reduction.

We are entitled to expect from other States members of the Security Council a similar realistic and flexible approach. We express the hope that they will come forward with their own concrete proposals if they are genuinely concerned to preserve international peace and security.

The present state of affairs in the world, more than ever before, requires that all States combine and increase their efforts to search for practical and universally acceptable ways and means of solving the problems of halting the arms race and bringing about disarmament.

As we have repeatedly pointed out, this is a goal which would be served by the earliest possible convening of a world disarmament conference. Such a world forum with the participation of all States of the world could discuss a broad range of questions relating to the limitation and halting of the arms race and disarmament.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The imperative need for convening a world disarmament conference was once again confirmed at the Fifth Conference of Heads of State and Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in Colombo. It was proposed there that a special session of the General Assembly should be held, which would also discuss the problem of convening such a conference.

In our view, a special session of the General Assembly on disarmament questions can be useful if, in a practical way, it helps to find ways and means of solving disarmament problems, and constitutes a relevant preparation for the holding of a world disarmament conference.

The Mongolian delegation calls upon the members of the First Committee to take note of the report of the Special Committee for the World Disarmament Conference and to work out a common view with regard to the need for extending the mandate of the Special Committee by the General Assembly, so that it can prepare a report containing ideas and proposals on all relevant aspects of a world disarmament conference in order to facilitate discussion of the question of convening a world disarmament conference at the special session of the General Assembly.

In conclusion, I should like to add that the Mongolian People's Republic has consistently spoken out for the enhancement of the effectiveness of the United Nations as an important instrument in the maintenance of international peace and security. We have all seen that the discussion of disarmament problems is occupying an ever more important place in the work of our Organization. Talks on various aspects of disarmament in the United Nations have convincingly demonstrated that the overwhelming majority of States of the United Nations are determined to step up their efforts to achieve practical measures in the field of disarmament.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It warms my heart to see a brother representative from Africa in the Chair this morning.

In a universally interdependent world like ours, it is only natural that the problems of disarmament are of vital interest for all the States and peoples of the world. Big or small, all States -- regardless of their military strength and of the types of weapons they possess -- must have the right to participate in the

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

consideration and adoption of disarmament measures, to defend in negotiations their legitimate security and development interests. This being said, one should stress that the general approach to the question of disarmament cannot and should not preclude actions on the regional level. To the contrary, efforts at the regional level cannot but strengthen the universal effort toward general and complete disarmament.

Today I would like to address myself to the question of measures at regional level aimed at improving good neighbourly relations among States and the establishment of zones of peace and co-operation, free of nuclear weapons.

In this context, I would like to recall that the political declaration adopted by the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in Colombo this year stated that détente as proclaimed in official declarations did not seem to have reduced the struggle for influence which was going on in all continents or to have extinguished the hot-beds of tension. Détente was still limited both in scope and geographical extent. Tensions and conflicts existed in other areas; and aggression, foreign occupation, intervention and interference as well as economic exploitation continued unabated in various parts of the developing world. The relaxation of international tension could not be secured through the policy of balance of power, spheres of influence, rivalry between power blocs, military alliances and the arms race.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

In recent years, there has been increasing interest in the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones and increasing importance attached to them as measures to control the nuclear arms race. The comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects constituted a real contribution to a better understanding of the subject and, I am sure, to future United Nations action in this field. The study was not an aim in itself. It was not the end of a process but rather the beginning of a world-wide effort to encourage States to move towards the desirable objective of creating additional nuclear-weapon-free zones. In fact, the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones is considered as the most effective and positive formula for contributing to nuclear disarmament. Isolating the nuclear Powers and limiting the territories in which such weapons may be used by surrounding them with nuclear-weapon-free zones covering a large part of the surface of the planet is a practical, feasible and unquestionably effective contribution to reducing to a minimum the possibility of a nuclear confrontation, and thus constitutes an essential contribution to the maintenance of peace.

It is the view of my delegation that, in establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone, the following principles should be taken into account: nuclear-weapon-free zone arrangements must ensure that the zone would be and remain effectively free of all nuclear weapons; the initiative for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should come from States within the region concerned and participation must be voluntary; the zone arrangements must contain an effective system of verification to ensure full compliance with the agreed obligations; the arrangements should promote the economic, scientific and technological development of the members of the zone through international co-operation on all peaceful uses of nuclear energy; nuclear-weapon-free zones should have clearly defined and recognized boundaries which would be determined in accordance with international law; nuclear-weapon States should pledge themselves to respect the nuclear-weapon-free status of the zone and not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against any State in a nuclear-weapon-free zone. That should imply undertakings: (1) not to install, deploy or stockpile nuclear weapons in the zone and, if they have done so in the past, to withdraw them from the zone immediately; (2) to guarantee that, if they have military bases in the zone, such bases contain no nuclear weapons and, possibly to

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

allow the bases or establishments to be inspected; (3) not to provide the States of the zone with any assistance in the development, production or acquisition of nuclear weapons; and (4) to co-operate in the establishment of a safety area adjacent to the zone, if special circumstances exist.

My delegation considers that States members of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should receive adequate and effective security assurances from the nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against members of the zone. States members of the zone have a right to expect such assurances on the basis both of the general principle that States should refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force and the nature of obligations which the non-nuclear-weapon States undertake in creating the nuclear-weapon-free zone.

We feel that the United Nations can play a positive role in the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. In view of the over-all responsibilities of the United Nations in regard to arms limitation, disarmament and collateral disarmament measures, it would be appropriate for the parties to a nuclear-weapon-free zone treaty to convey to the United Nations, through the Secretary-General, or in any other way, periodic information about the implementation of the purposes and provisions of the treaty.

My delegation is particularly happy that the General Assembly, at its last session, solemnly adopted the declaration on the definition of the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone and on the definition of the principal obligations of the nuclear-weapon States towards nuclear-weapon-free zones and towards the States included therein. In doing so, the General Assembly strengthened the new efforts being undertaken and the achievements already made in regard to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. It is the strong conviction of my delegation that this declaration of the General Assembly, as contained in resolution 3472 (XXX), should be reaffirmed by the United Nations General Assembly, at this session. The General Assembly should also decide to make this question one of its continuing concerns. I suggest that the comprehensive study, together with the declaration solemnly adopted by the General Assembly on the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones, be transmitted to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

We in Africa are committed to the denuclearization of our continent, as evidenced by the solemn Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) at its first ordinary session, held at Cairo from 17 to 21 July 1964, and endorsed in October of that year by the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries. The General Assembly, which lent its valuable support to the efforts of the African States, should at this session reaffirm its call upon all States to respect and abide by the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, reaffirm further its call upon all States to consider and respect the continent of Africa as a nuclear-weapon-free zone and reiterate its call upon all States to refrain from testing, manufacturing, deploying, transporting, storing, using or threatening to use nuclear weapons on the African continent. In this context, we wish to express our concern over the threat posed by the militarization and nuclear programme of South Africa to the independence of African States, to peace in the Indian Ocean and South Atlantic zones and to the security of the people of southern Africa.

As an African country in the Indian Ocean, Mauritius is particularly concerned with the situation prevailing in our part of the world. We whole-heartedly support the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 2832 (XXVI), which seeks to protect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States in the region and calls for the elimination from the Indian Ocean of foreign bases, military installations and logistical supply facilities, the disposition of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction and any manifestation of great Power military presence in the Indian Ocean conceived in the context of great Power rivalry. In calling upon all States to consider and respect the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace free from great Power rivalries and competition as well as bases conceived in the context of such rivalries and competition, we by no means intend to limit the right to free and unimpeded use of the Indian Ocean by the vessels of these countries in conformity with international law, as long as such vessels pose no military or strategic threat to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the littoral and hinterland States.



(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

I wish to recall to this Assembly that the Fifth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries held at Colombo condemned the establishment, maintenance and expansion of foreign installations such as the Mauritian territory of Diego Garcia -- it is a Mauritian territory because we still hold economic rights over that island -- by the great Powers in pursuit of their strategic interests as well as the continuing escalation of great Power military rivalry and tension in the Indian Ocean, as they constitute a direct threat to the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and peaceful development of States of the region.

The urgent need to implement with the least possible delay the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace is underlined by recent developments. Of particular concern is the existence of South African military bases in the area and the close military co-operation between the Pretoria régime and certain Western Powers in the region. We condemn in particular the existence of the Simonstown and Silver-mine bases as well as project Advokaat, whose objectives included surveillance of African national liberation movements.

In view of the situation in the Indian Ocean, concerted action of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean is under way, with a view to convening a conference on the Indian Ocean as soon as possible, in accordance with United Nations General Assembly resolutions 3259 (XXIX) and 3468 (XXX), to adopt measures for the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean contains a general presentation of the position and views as well as the suggestions of States. We hope that all States, in particular the great Powers and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean, would co-operate in a practical manner with the Ad Hoc Committee in the discharge of its functions. I take this opportunity to call upon all delegations here to fully support the draft resolution contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean (document A/31/29).

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Mauritius for his particular reference to me.

Mrs. BORODOWSKY (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Undoubtedly the arms race is one of the primary obstacles to the strengthening of international security, economic and social progress and the establishment of a new just and equitable economic and social order. The desire to control the wealth of others and to exploit the resources of other countries has led mankind to two world wars and to countless international conflicts such as the Viet Nam war and many others. All were due to the policy of the aggressive and reactionary forces in their ambition to dominate the world, which is the very root of the arms race.

We must consider in depth the causes of the arms race, for we cannot be superficial and view the problem from one angle alone. It is true that today there are nuclear Powers but their reasons for becoming nuclear Powers are not the same: some did so for purposes of aggression, and others in self-defence.

Let us consider the history behind the emergence of the nuclear Powers. Suffice it to recall who used a nuclear weapon for the first time in the history of mankind against Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It is undeniable and only fair to acknowledge the fact that many countries made an important contribution to the defeat of fascism and yet the historic unquestionable fact is that it was actually the Soviet people and the Soviet armies who bore the greatest brunt of that war. The United States never felt directly the horrors of war. The loss of human lives was of little concern to imperialist monopolies whose primary aim was to increase their profits, which amounted to over \$US 100 billion. As opposed to this, the Soviet Union lost not only 20 million of its countrymen but a large part of its wealth as a result of the Nazi aggression. At the end of the war, practically all the gold in the world was in the United States. The Soviet people set about the arduous task of reconstruction of their country under constant threat of the sinister cold war, which blocked its access to markets and technology, thus rendering the task of reconstruction even more difficult.

(Mrs. Borodowsky, Cuba)

It was thanks to the emergence of the socialist camp and the consolidation of the political, economic and military power of the Soviet Union that fundamental changes came about in the international balance of power in the post-war period, and paved the way for the sweeping movement of world liberation that led to the emergence of independent countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The might of the socialist camp and its solidarity with those peoples put a brake on the ambitions of imperialists and colonialists who could not condone the demolition of the system of colonial exploitation and the national independence of countries determined to exercise their inalienable right to dispose of their wealth.

The report of the Central Committee of the Cuban Communist Party to the First Congress submitted by Comrade Fidel Castro, First Secretary of the Cuban Communist Party and Prime Minister of the Revolutionary Government of Cuba, states:

"There are those who deplore the fact that the Soviet Union should be a powerful country. That extraordinary might was acquired by the Soviet Union in the economic sphere thanks to the unstinting work of its people and without exploiting the fruits of the labours of other peoples; and in the military field as a result of the imperious need to defend itself from interference, invasion and the string of strategic bases with which the imperialists surrounded it. We Cubans deplore the fact that Yankee imperialism, the enemy of peoples, is powerful. But no true revolutionary in any part of the world will ever deplore the fact that the Soviet Union is mighty, because without that might mankind would never have freed itself from fascism and the countries which struggled for liberation in the last 30 years would have found no one to provide them with decisive assistance; for the imperialists would have again shared out the world amongst themselves, and all the small under-developed nations -- and they are legion -- would have once again been turned into colonies."

In the report itself it is emphasized that:

"Never was the struggle for peace more necessary because never have weapons acquired such destructive power and never before have the dangers of extermination of the human species been potentially greater. The Revolutionary Government of Cuba associates itself with all endeavours undertaken

(Mrs. Borodowsky, Cuba)

internationally to achieve general and complete disarmament. Various disarmament proposals offer the possibility of handing over to the cause of international development a part of the present enormous war expenditures of the capitalist and socialist countries parties to antagonistic pacts."

The capitalist countries have in their military industry an enormous source of profits. The arms race has become a lucrative business. For instance, in a single day three enterprises received contracts from the United States Government for \$US 532.3 million for war material. The Chrysler Corporation, which has been producing the M-60 tank for over 10 years, received a contract for \$US 251.5 million to build the tank and its guns. The Boeing Corporation received a contract for \$US 159.8 million to work on the Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile.

(Mrs. Borodowsky, Cuba)

The General Electric Company received a contract for \$21 million for the engines and the 30 mm cannon of the A10 support aircraft. The RCA Corporation received a contract for \$159.2 million from the United States Navy to work on the testing site of the Aegis missile, and in addition a contract for \$9.2 million to operate installations for weapons-testing in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

In the 1977 fiscal year the United States Government's military expenditures will reach the figure of \$104,300 million, and this figure is \$360,000 million less than the requested amount. Consortia such as General Dynamics, Dupont, McDonnald-Douglas, Boeing, Lockheed, North American, General Electric, Martin, United Aircraft and others, manufacture weapons of mass destruction or equipment for the Pentagon in accordance with contracts concluded with the latter. For the owners of these consortia, those contracts have become inexhaustible sources from which they draw millions of dollars of profits. By decision of the Senate Commission for Armed Forces Affairs in the fiscal year 1977, the colossal sum of \$31,900 million is earmarked for the purchase of weapons. Official information from the Pentagon shows that the United States' sale of weapons to NATO comes close to \$1 billion, whereas the United States purchases \$100 million in Europe.

The figures and information we could quote would make this statement endless. Those military expenditures weigh heavily on many countries and on the shoulders of the masses of the population, who must face increased living costs as a result of inflation and the economic crisis. The arms race prevents people from enjoying a large part of their wealth and resources. An amount equivalent to only 8 or 10 per cent of world-wide military expenditures would suffice to put an end once and for all to hunger, disease and illiteracy. It is for this reason that it is incumbent on the progressive forces of the world, precisely because they are alien to any ambition for colonial or neo-colonial domination, to take the most important initiatives in favour of disarmament.

A number of subjects are included year after year in the United Nations agenda. The consideration of resolutions on these items, the positions taken, the results of votes either in favour or against, show that it is the socialist countries, the non-aligned countries and some capitalist, uncommitted countries to the colonial and neo-colonial exploitation which pursue a policy favourable to disarmament.

(Mrs. Borodowsky, Cuba)

The question of the reduction of military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council -- an item introduced by the Soviet Union in this Assembly -- has made no progress, precisely as a result of the position of those countries which continue their policies leading to increased military expenditures; yet the release of those financial resources could be devoted to economic and social development. Incendiary and other conventional weapons, the use of which could be the object of prohibition or restriction on humanitarian grounds, which are to be considered primarily in the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts, is another matter for concern that should be the object of thorough consideration. As stated by Algeria at the last session, a larger number of African, Asian and Latin American countries should participate in that conference, inasmuch as the additional protocols to the Geneva Convention which are under discussion and which may be adopted will be primarily contributed to by Europe as a result of its experience in the last two world wars. And yet the continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America could well make the contribution of their own experience with their struggle for national liberation.

As for chemical and bacteriological-biological weapons, Cuba has always been in favour of the general and complete prohibition of both, as evidenced by its adherence to existing instruments on the subject, such as the Convention on the Prohibition of Bacteriological Weapons and the 1925 Geneva Protocol, and by its co-sponsoring of draft resolutions on the subject. Concerning the urgent need to cease nuclear and thermonuclear testing and the conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests, my delegation wishes to mention document A/31/228, which states in paragraph 2 that by a note dated 8 April 1976 (A/10509), the Secretary-General communicated to members of the General Assembly the text of a communication received from the President of the General Assembly, from which I shall mention the following passage:

"From the outset, the consultations were complicated by the fact that from among the nuclear Powers only the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was prepared to participate in those negotiations."

(Mrs. Borodowsky, Cuba)

Those negotiations should have been established between nuclear-weapon States under resolution 3478 (XXX). Further on, that note gives the names of non-nuclear-weapon States which had expressed their readiness to participate unconditionally in those negotiations and among which we find Cuba. The note goes on to say:

"Since, however, only one nuclear-weapon State has thus far agreed to participate in the negotiations, the conditions set forth in paragraph 2 of the resolution for the initiation of the negotiations have not been met."

I believe that there is hardly any need for comment as the situation is quite clear.

As regards the convening of a world disarmament conference, the idea has been strongly endorsed by the majority of the members of the international community. The idea has been given expression in documents and resolutions of the non-aligned countries in a number of joint government communiqués, in United Nations resolutions, in interventions in this Assembly, and in the replies sent to the Secretary-General. It is high time that action be taken on this question through the immediate holding of the conference, the convening of which has been blocked so far by those for whom the arms race and war are a business.

My delegation fully shares and endorses the views put forward by the distinguished representative of Nepal on the subject. The convening of a special session of the General Assembly with a view to reviewing the problem of disarmament and of promoting the elaboration of a programme of priorities and measures in this field as stated in the resolution on disarmament of the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Colombo, includes among the three priority items on its agenda, according to the Colombo Declaration itself, the question of the convening of a world disarmament conference to which the special session would be a fundamental and most valuable contribution.

(Mrs. Borodowsky, Cuba)

Resolution A/C.1/31/L.7, submitted by more than 30 countries, includes in preambular paragraph 4, the specific suggestions contained in the Colombo Declaration and Resolution on Disarmament, clearly spelling out its purposes and objectives in connexion with this subject.

My delegation considers that the prohibition of the development of new types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction would put a brake on the ever increasing expenditures for the arms race. It is alarming to see how science and technological progress is at the service of the development of the war industry, whereas in the greater part of the world the minimal and essential human needs are not met. We must strengthen and develop the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes; this is the bright future of mankind, and for the countries lacking in natural energy resources this represents the qualitative leap towards economic development, and it is for this reason that the international community must be assured that nuclear energy will be used solely for peaceful purposes, and that nuclear development will not become a means of destruction to satisfy the militaristic, warmongering and commercial adventures of those who wish to continue to subjugate other countries less privileged in this field.

It was only after the triumph of its revolution that our country began to apply nuclear technology essentially to medicine, although we see in the offing its use in agriculture, industry and development plans, and are therefore considering the establishment of a nuclear power station for which safeguard agreements will be signed with the IAEA.

We cannot fail to mention, in the context of general and complete disarmament, the question of the elimination of foreign military bases which, as was indicated by the last Summit Conference of Non-Aligned States, constitutes a "threat", and I quote from that Declaration:

"The Conference stated that the presence of United States military bases in Latin America, such as those existing in Cuba and Panama, represents a threat to the peace and security of the region and renewed its demand that the Government of the United States of America immediately restore to these countries the inalienable parts of their territories occupied against the will of their governments and peoples and also demands dismantling of the military bases that exist in Puerto Rico." (NAC/CONF.5/S.2, p. 33)



(Mrs. Borodowsky, Cuba)

The Conference also "strongly condemned the development, maintenance and expansion of military bases such as the one in Diego Garcia".

These are a few general considerations that my delegation wishes to make in respect of these important subjects while reserving the right to intervene as the work of the Committee proceeds. But, in conclusion, I should like to recall some quotations from the Second Appeal of Stockholm launched in the World Council for Peace:

"Victories for peace and détente have created a new international climate, new hopes, new confidence and new optimism among peoples. The defence of peace is possible. The building of a peaceful world is within our reach. The main obstacle to the irreversibility of the process of détente is the arms race. The arms race and the stockpiling of weapons by the imperialists encourage and stimulate the forces of aggression of militarism and fascism, of colonialism and racism. Détente is a vital factor for increasing the efforts made by all people to consolidate their national independence, justice and social progress. International public opinion has greater responsibility and potential than ever. It can put a brake on those who benefit from the trade in weapons, those who propitiate the cold war, the enemies of mankind."

Obviously one of our present decisive tasks is that of curbing the arms race which runs counter to the establishment of a new, just and prosperous economic order. As stated with great vision and foresight by our independence leader of the past century José Martí "anything that is contrary to human nature will fall".

Mr. FARTASH (Iran): We have begun our general debate on disarmament against the background of a multitude of fresh reminders that although modest steps have been taken in some areas, progress in many vital aspects of this issue has either been lacking or the pace has been extremely slow.

This despite the fact that, over a number of years, about one sixth of the entire agenda of the General Assembly has been devoted to disarmament, and the problem as a whole has remained for no less than three decades, a major, if not the major preoccupation of this Organization.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

This is an area where, though closely and crucially related to a world order based on collective responsibility, the United Nations has registered the least progress. It is also an area in which the increasing urgency and vital importance of the problems involved, and the efforts exerted, have not been matched by equally positive results.

Ever since the earliest days of the United Nations, concern about the destructive potential of nuclear weapons has been a paramount source of global apprehension. Starting with the immediate post-war period, when many unsuccessful attempts were made to place atomic energy under acceptable control, we have lived in the shadow of the nuclear arms race and we still continue to do so. In fact this shadow has been looming larger every year despite on and off negotiations and some well-intentioned efforts.

To be sure, general and complete disarmament remains the ultimate goal of the international community. Confidence-building and partial arms control agreements, while steps in the right direction, cannot and should not be taken as a substitute for genuine measures to arrest and eventually reverse the nuclear arms race.

During the past several years the scientific and technical development in the nuclear energy field has advanced to a stage where widespread use of nuclear power in all its ramifications has rapidly become a reality of the present rather than just a prospect for the future. This has brought into sharper focus the general question of horizontal proliferation. While the dangers of horizontal proliferation cannot be overstressed, it is an oversimplification to treat it as a distinct issue from, and unrelated to, the undiminished vertical arms race.

The tendency of the nuclear Powers to ignore this fact has left the prospect of the prevention of horizontal proliferation hanging in the balance. The régime envisaged under the Non-Proliferation Treaty has also suffered from a host of other complex issues which again have much to do with the attitude of the nuclear-weapon States with respect to their own obligations under that Treaty.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

One of the most controversial aspects of horizontal proliferation has been the role and the responsibility of the nuclear Powers in respect to issues affecting peaceful nuclear explosions, and the conclusion of safeguard agreements with the IAEA.

For my delegation, the arms control implications of the peaceful nuclear explosions have been much too obvious to advocate treating them with anything less than an effective international control. We have, therefore, made our view known on a number of occasions. We fully support the role of the IAEA as the appropriate body through which peaceful nuclear explosions should be carried out and their benefits made available to non-nuclear States.

In this connexion, we welcome the conclusion of a treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union on 28 May 1976 as a companion agreement to the threshold test ban treaty. It is our earnest hope that its final ratification could pave the way for further progress, among other things, on peaceful nuclear explosion agreements for the benefit of non-nuclear Powers.

Important as all the above issues are in the context of the prevention of further horizontal proliferation, it is the attitude and the policies of the nuclear Powers with regard to their own arms race that could, in the final analysis, be the decisive factor. We strongly support the view that the cessation of the nuclear arms race, and eventual nuclear disarmament, are integral elements of a non-proliferation régime, and nuclear Powers have at least a moral commitment to match their efforts in preventing horizontal proliferation with concrete actions in halting vertical proliferation.

In the realm of vertical proliferation some issues have been recognized as crucial tests of the will and the desire of the nuclear Powers for progress. These issues have revolved around the questions of the halting of nuclear tests, the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty (CTB), and the limitation of the strategic armaments. The question of CTB has, in one form or another, been on the international agenda for the past 20 years. For several years now, the CTB has been a high priority agenda item of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) which has held extensive discussions on both its technical and political aspects.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

It is indeed unfortunate that despite the vital importance of the issue, the efforts of the CCD in this respect during 1976 have been of no avail and the stalemate has remained as formidable as in previous years.

My delegation expresses its dissatisfaction at the lack of progress on this crucial question. We do not underestimate the importance of the universality for a comprehensive treaty, and in particular adherence by all the nuclear States, but this goal should not be allowed to stand in the way of progress in this direction.

It is the understanding of my delegation that the groundwork has already been laid. What is required is wise and courageous initiative by the two major nuclear Powers which has unfortunately been lacking in 1976.

There are signs, however, which make us more hopeful when we consider the prospects of future discussions of a CTB at the CCD and elsewhere. This sense of optimism against the background of our dissatisfaction with the progress made in 1976 is not based on tired slogans and unsatisfied yearnings. There seems to be rising concern about the snail pace of movement towards an agreement on underground test bans -- even among the two super-Powers. The dire consequences of a further nuclear arms race have seriously alarmed them.

It has also been brought home to them by their own calculations based on expert views of their own authorities that they are running against time in a futile devastation race, in which there will be no winners and through which the very existence and future of mankind may be endangered.

We tend to read the relevant portions of the statements of the United States Secretary of State and the Soviet Foreign Minister in the light of the above considerations. We attach likewise particular weight and importance to the memorandum submitted by the Soviet Union as it appears in document A/31/232, dated 28 September 1976.

Before moving on to other items on our agenda, I wish to touch upon some of the important questions which were reviewed by the CCD during 1976.

When the Convention on the Prohibition of Possession of Bacteriological (Biological) Weapons finally came into force in March 1975, the CCD was still left with a related, unfinished business of high priority, namely, the conclusion of a chemical weapons convention.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

We all know that the CCD has been grappling with this problem for the past several years, and has had before it the text of a Japanese draft convention since April 1974.

The field of prohibition of chemical weapons, we are glad to note, is one area in which the CCD has been able to report some encouraging progress. There are, indeed, indications that the possibilities of concluding an agreement in the near future may be in the offing. Following a proposal by the Federal Republic of Germany, very useful informal meetings on chemical disarmament took place at the CCD, with the participation of experts. Important papers and discussions centered on the questions of defining chemical warfare agents, as well as on technical verification possibilities. Despite serious differences on the latter question, some progress was recorded on the issue of delimiting the chemical agents to be banned and the problem of phasing of the process of chemical disarmament.

My delegation is gratified at the valuable contribution made by the delegation of the United Kingdom in the form of a draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, which was presented towards the end of the last CCD session. Representing a careful effort to incorporate proposals already made on this subject, their contribution proved of special interest and held out the prospect of more viable and productive deliberations on the subject in 1977.

The reactivation of the United States-Soviet accord on a joint initiative to prohibit the most dangerous and lethal chemical means of warfare as a first step towards a complete ban, has perhaps been the most significant move in this direction.

We have noted with keen interest their announcement that they had held a number of meetings on this subject in Geneva recently. In this connexion we have studied carefully the relevant part of the Soviet memorandum (A/31/232). We take it that these meetings, bolstered by the sensible approach of the super-Powers, portend the revival of new and serious efforts on this issue -- especially when the CCD takes up the matter again in 1977.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

Mr. Chairman, one of the items on our agenda since 1974 has been related to the question of the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification (ENMOD) techniques. Weeks of hard work and collective effort in the CCD have resulted in the amended draft convention which is now before the General Assembly.

There can be no doubt about the importance of preventing the use of these terrible new methods of warfare. It is equally important that the rights and obligations of the parties to the convention be clearly spelled out to avoid subsequent disagreements. It should be possible, however, to accomplish this task in a business-like fashion, without lingering too long, for it would be unreasonable to spend a disproportionate amount of time on this subject while items of greater priority await our undivided attention.

Different parts of the draft convention before us have, at various stages, been the subject of reservations by a number of delegations -- including my own.

Understandably the strongest reservations were spelled out in respect of the limited scope of the draft convention. Therefore, its first article, which also sets forth the basic obligations of the parties, has been -- and remains -- the most controversial one.

The modifications of the draft preamble and of article III on the peaceful uses of ENMOD techniques have been useful in clarifying the text.

In respect to article V, my Government has often expressed its preference for arrangements which would in no way give a privileged position to any group of States. Although the establishment of a consultative committee of experts with fact-finding functions does not entirely meet this objective, it is quite an improvement over the original draft provisions. However, we welcome particularly the provision made for review conferences which assures the possibility of revising the convention as necessary in the light of experience.

In view of this fact, and seeing considerable merit in the draft convention as a whole -- while finding no merit in sending the draft back to the CCD, which has items of greater priority on its agenda -- my Government has decided to join a number of other Member States to co-sponsor a resolution recommending the adoption of the draft before the Assembly.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, proposed by the Soviet Union, figures among the important items on our agenda. This item to which a number of meetings of the CCD were devoted in 1976, deserves much attention. Discussions in the CCD on this item, although limited, revealed the complexity of the issues involved and the two series of informal meetings held with the participation of experts, understandably broke little new ground. However, the Soviet working paper offering a definition of new weapons of mass destruction provided an opportunity for some elaboration. But given the lack of general agreement on the precise scope and nature of the problem, further effort should be channelled in this direction and a more serious approach is called for to make the elaboration of a treaty on this important item a reality.

I indicated earlier that one of the crucial aspects of vertical proliferation bearing on general and complete disarmament is the question of the limitation of strategic armaments. I need not rehash the high hopes and much publicized expectations which were raised in the world in the wake of the SALT agreements, despite their quantitative and qualitative insufficiencies. Nor need I express the general understanding and appreciation of their essentially bilateral nature. It would, however, be unrealistic to expect the General Assembly to be indifferent towards this issue which goes to the heart of general and complete disarmament, and over which no appreciable progress has been reported since the Vladivostok agreements in 1974. Nevertheless, we are heartened by the explicit expression of determination of both super-Powers to invigorate their ongoing efforts and we hope that the coming year will witness further advance in this field.

Among the items treated under the disarmament question, the proliferation, in recent years, of items on nuclear-weapon-free zones or related matters has assumed striking proportions. For valid and practical reasons, many countries of the world think that this is an issue whose time has come: it is an idea which cuts across many of the items discussed above. As the distinguished delegates are aware, during the last General Assembly session, the resolution co-sponsored by Egypt and Iran on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East was adopted by near unanimous support. It is our intention, due to the continuing existence of the basic concerns underlying our original proposal, to

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

present in due course a follow-up draft resolution. It is, therefore, unnecessary for me to dwell at length on this subject at this moment. Suffice it to say that we attach great importance to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone under an effective system of safeguards in the area and consider it of vital regional as well as global consequence.

In this connexion, I wish to point out our keen interest in the efforts undertaken for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other areas of the world. May I reiterate that we support the declaration on the denuclearization of Africa and the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as well as the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific. While on this subject let me emphasize that my delegation is aware of the complexities involved in establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone and has had occasion to address itself in a realistic manner to some of its most sensitive, peculiar and controversial aspects, in our reply to the Secretary-General concerning a comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones (document A/31/189).

We have followed with great interest the question of the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, of which we are an original member, deserves separate treatment. It is, however, fitting to point out here that in the absence of any appreciable progress in 1976 -- despite the laudable efforts of its distinguished Chairman -- the time may have come for a review of our work in the Ad Hoc Committee: to re-examine our goals and assess them against what we have achieved and what we have failed to accomplish; to reflect on how the Ad Hoc Committee has fared in carrying out its mandate and what direction it has gradually been forced to take. It is perhaps time both for reinvigorating our efforts and a search for a fresh approach, not only by the coastal and land-locked States but by all the countries concerned, and especially the great Powers and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean.



(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

When the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference was introduced by Mr. Hoveyda, the Permanent Representative of Iran, in his capacity as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, he presented us with a full account of what had transpired in connexion with this important item. Inasmuch as I intend to touch upon the question in this context I can only commend the seriousness and general impartiality with which the Ad Hoc Committee has approached its mandate in 1976. The focal point of its present report, as requested by General Assembly resolution 3469 (XXX), has been the elucidation of the conclusions set forth in the previous report. By its objectivity and accurate reflection of the situation surrounding the question of the world disarmament conference, the Ad Hoc Committee has shown a sense of responsibility without any hint of either undue optimism or unnecessary pessimism.

The views of my delegation in respect to the convening of a world disarmament conference have been expressed several times during the past four years. Therefore I do not propose to reiterate those views in this context. However, as regards the future of the Ad Hoc Committee, it is natural to expect that the mandate of the Committee be renewed only if clear guidelines emerge as to how and in what general direction we wish our efforts to be channelled.

We recognize the reflective mood prevalent in this forum during the present session with respect to the possible ways and means of convening a special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament. We are prepared to explore, in a positive and constructive manner, the avenues open to us. We stand ready to support a draft resolution to this effect and to take part in the necessary preparatory work as required.

Periodic calls for overhauling and strengthening the machinery of disarmament negotiations have, over the years, reflected both the strong desire for improvement and the occasional mood of frustration of the international community at the slow pace of progress in this vital area. The decision of the General Assembly in 1975 to establish an Ad Hoc Committee to carry out a review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament was therefore very opportune.

Resolution 3484 B (XXX) of 12 December 1975 was adopted against the background of a revival of global attention regarding the basic responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and the failure of the Organization to achieve any significant progress in the recent past. To be sure, the United Nations could

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

look back with pride at a number of important agreements which had been reached for the limitation and control of armaments as a result of its efforts. Yet the fact remained that progress in the major areas of either nuclear or conventional weapons was negligible and the trend towards increased armaments alarming. The uncontrolled arms race and the increasing danger of nuclear proliferation -- among a host of other disturbing events -- continually promised new and more terrible developments which could no longer be treated lightly by the United Nations. Hence the initial suggestions to review the basic role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and the eventual adoption by the Assembly of a resolution which was the culmination of the initiatives and efforts of a number of delegations, in particular that of Sweden. A large measure of community of idea and interest was discernible regarding the extent to which the general circumstances necessitated the adoption of such a resolution.

I must admit, as did my delegation in the course of our deliberations in July and September, that we shared with some delegations misgivings about certain underlying premises of our united approach to the question and the appreciation of the method of work related to streamlining and strengthening the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. We voted for resolution 3484 B (XXX) in spite of such misgivings.

We believed then, as we continue to believe today, that the rationalization of methods of work should not be confused with the hard issues that impair the ability of the Organization to play its full role. We have been convinced that the problem we confront is one of substance rather than modalities.

In our reply to the Secretary-General dated 14 June 1976 (A/AC.181/1/Add.5), we had occasion to outline our views and suggestions on what we considered to be the main underlying causes and how we believed these basic and rudimentary problems should be approached. At the same time, we referred to a number of institutional and procedural deficiencies in the negotiating machinery of disarmament. Nevertheless, we stressed the point that, to the very marginal extent that procedural modifications and innovations of technique might improve the situation, they should be arrived at and be responsive to the fundamental shortcomings evident in that field.

The content of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee, as it appears in Supplement No. 36 (A/31/36), is obviously a far cry from the above basic considerations. However, we must admit that, given the complexity and sensitivity

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

of the issues involved, the preparation of the agreed text is by no means a meagre achievement.

The recommendation on the publication of a United Nations disarmament yearbook and the eventual publication of a disarmament periodical adds a new dimension to the significance of disarmament activities of the United Nations system. This is a decision which, if carried out judiciously, could produce far-reaching results. At the same time, this is an issue in respect to which the very impartiality and the dependability of United Nations information on disarmament questions stands to be tested.

There is one other important aspect of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee, namely, the strengthening of the resources of the United Nations Secretariat, which deserves much attention. We have voiced our support for strengthening the effectiveness of the Disarmament Affairs Division. I would like to reiterate this position. It stands to reason that the resources and capabilities of the United Nations Disarmament Affairs Division should be enhanced in such a way as to enable it to carry out its expanding responsibilities efficiently.

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

Having stated the views of my delegation on the report of the Ad Hoc Committee, I would be remiss if I failed to pay a tribute to the delegation of Sweden for its constructive approach and hard work in the course of the formal and informal discussions on the issues involved. I should also like to pay a special tribute to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, Mrs. Thorsson, whose unswerving devotion to disarmament matters has rightly won her international recognition. The Director of the Disarmament Affairs Division and his efficient staff also deserve our gratitude for their valuable assistance in facilitating the task of the Ad Hoc Committee.

I have tried to explain in general terms the views of my delegation in connexion with the current situation in the field of disarmament. In the course of this exercise, I have dealt with a number of issues on our agenda. The modest progress registered in certain areas has been pointed out; the over-all state of affairs in the major and priority areas of disarmament has been discussed in more detailed fashion.

Irrespective of varying assessments of and differing degrees of emphasis on the issues involved, there are some cardinal facts which speak for themselves. General and complete disarmament remains as unattainable as it has ever been. Partial arms limitation efforts are not commensurate with the pace of the arms race.

Notwithstanding the complex interplay of many factors involved in considering disarmament problems, the question of security remains the pivotal issue. No amount of rationalization could blur the intricate relationship between security, on the one hand, and armament programmes on the other. Whatever one's perception of the notion of security, the inescapable truth is that it is there and it is real. In an era of nation States, security is the paramount concern of any State.

If, in today's world, peace is rightly described as a moral imperative, so too are the security, national independence and territorial integrity of States.

It is true that the entire membership of the United Nations shares collective responsibility and has a vital stake in disarmament. However, the key to any appreciable progress in this field lies primarily with those countries which control

(Mr. Fartash, Iran)

the most formidable conventional and nuclear weapon power. If those States do not lead the way -- through fulfilling their own commitments -- how then can other States reasonably be expected to do so?

Arms limitation and disarmament have a cause-and-effect relationship with the policies and programmes of the super-Powers. They are the ones that must replace the ethics of the arms race by the ethics of arms control; they are the ones that, while trying to advance the cause of disarmament, must try to develop parallel and plausible alternative systems of assuring dignified peace and security for other States.

In short, the ultimate challenge confronting the international community in general -- and the super-Powers in particular -- is to equate the forcefulness of rhetoric on disarmament and the arms race with the ability to provide an answer for the security needs of States.

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting I should like to announce that Mozambique has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.1, and that Guinea, Niger and Norway have become co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.1

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.