

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records *



FIRST COMMITTEE
39th meeting
held on
Friday, 19 November 1976
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 39th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland)

CONTENTS

Reduction of military budgets: report of the Secretary-General [34]

Incendiary and other specific conventional weapons which may be the subject of prohibitions or 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]

Conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests [47]

* 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.39
22 November 1976

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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 10.40 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. HUSAIN (Bangladesh): The debate on disarmament this year, has brought into focus more sharply than ever before the essential priorities that govern our global society. First, there is the irrevocable linkage between security and development inherent in the recognition that peace and prosperity are indivisible. As the representative of Nepal so aptly stressed, there can be no freedom from want without concomitant freedom from fear. Second, considerations of national security are incompatible with disarmament so long as there exists no viable international security system based on law and order and the collective responsibility of all nations for maintaining peace, settling disputes and thereby guaranteeing disarmament. The real issue of disarmament therefore hinges around the balance between national insecurity and the degree of international trust and confidence that can be collectively reinforced. Such a balance assumes particular importance as we witness the growing insignificance of mankind as a whole, in the face of the means he has perpetrated for his own self-destruction. We cannot but endorse the conclusion of General Romulo of the Philippines that:

"There are no political goals important enough, no ideological tenets significant enough, no mistrust deep enough, to justify the continuing jeopardy of human existence on earth." (A/C.1/31/PV.22, p. 26)

These conclusions are self-evident in the light of the facts that are new extant. In the past 30 years resources devoted to the arms race have exceeded \$6,000 billion, roughly equivalent to the 1976 GNP of the entire world. Annually \$300 billion are being budgeted for the maintenance, expansion and means of destruction which is 20 times more than official development assistance. Included in this vast global budget for destruction are progressively more sophisticated nuclear and conventional weapons. Supplementing this escalating arsenal is an even greater potential menace -- the danger of nuclear proliferation. The credibility of the nuclear deterrence argument that the nuclear bomb may intimidate mankind into bringing order into its international affairs through the balance of fear has long since been eroded. The persistence of lesser conflicts since the

(Mr. Husain, Bangladesh)

Second World War at the rate of 12 wars fought per day, is ample testimony to this fact, keeping in mind the ever-present danger that involvement of great Powers in any such war could escalate into an all out war of annihilation. Stark in the background of this colossal waste is the position of countless millions of people in the developing countries subsisting on the margin of survival. The transfer of even a minimum amount from this unconscionable waste of resources that are finite can alleviate the problems of hunger and disease afflicting a vast portion of the human family.

Under the impetus of this reality, Bangladesh's position on the issue of disarmament is categorical and unequivocal. We are committed to the furtherance and achievement of disarmament through all approaches, partial or otherwise, the highest priority of which is the total abolition of nuclear weapons leading to general and complete disarmament. We are convinced that in this sixth year of the designated Disarmament Decade, the need to revitalize efforts to halt the arms race, nuclear and conventional, is imperative. Given our belief that the only viable framework under which disarmament is possible, viz., the strengthening of collective responsibility through an effective international security system, Bangladesh fully supports the proposal to hold a special session of the General Assembly as early as possible on the question of disarmament. Such a session would serve the purpose not only of highlighting dangers of the present developments in the armaments field, and in mobilizing public opinion and accordingly Governments to become more actively involved in the struggle for disarmament, but it could also promote the elaboration of priority programmes that could be undertaken in this field as well as lay the ground work for a future World Disarmament Conference.

Turning to the substantive issues before us, we share the concern of all Member States in the virtual standstill in disarmament negotiations during the past couple of years. The European Security Conference, the Mutual Force Reduction negotiations in Vienna, and the Salt II Accord notwithstanding, military technology and the quantitative and qualitative development of new weapons continue unabated. Hopes raised of some progress in the ban on chemical warfare have not been fulfilled. Results of the first Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference were not at all commensurate with expectations. On the contrary the

(Mr. Husain, Bangladesh)

major Powers seem to continue to rely even more heavily on the development and deployment of tactical nuclear weapons and on increased conventional forces in pursuit of the doctrine of flexible response and realistic deterrence. Given the fact that it is the super-Powers who bear the primary responsibility in promoting disarmament, their failure to make significant concessions with regard to vertical proliferation will have inevitable repercussions on the even greater potential danger of the spread of nuclear weapons horizontally.

It is, therefore, no wonder that the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty which has been hailed as the single biggest boost to arms control measures has come to a faltering halt in the number of new adherents. Bangladesh, as we have previously made clear, views the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty generally as a positive measure and we are seriously studying the implications of acceding to the Treaty. Our views on this issue, however, revolve around three interconnected concerns. Firstly, we consider that nuclear non-proliferation cannot be viewed as a discriminatory mechanism aimed at permanently dividing the world into nuclear and non-nuclear nations. As has been repeatedly stressed, the primary reason for the weakness of the Treaty is the fact that the nuclear weapon parties to the Treaty have failed to fulfil their main obligation under the Treaty to take effective measures towards disarmament. Common sense dictates that the longer the delay in moving towards total nuclear disarmament, the less the chance to keep the lid on proliferation and rope in the more important non-nuclear countries who are not in the Treaty. Secondly, a major incentive for adherence to the Treaty would be to safeguard the security of non-nuclear countries against nuclear attack or blackmail, not only through intervention or counteraction against any actual or threatened aggression including nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear State, but also by more forthright assurance that nuclear Powers themselves will guarantee not to use such weapons against them. The effective elaboration of such a Treaty commitment in our opinion will immeasurably enhance accession to the NPT.

The third issue revolves around the question of peaceful nuclear energy and in particular peaceful nuclear explosions. It has been argued that nuclear Powers cannot expect indefinitely to retain a monopoly option without significant guarantees ensuring the broad availability of peaceful nuclear energy under safe,

(Mr. Husain, Bangladesh)

economic and equitable conditions to non-nuclear States. Given the fact that commercial competition in the nuclear energy field and the vast profits attendant on the sale of nuclear technology have grown rapidly, the likelihood of collaboration and assistance to developing countries is becoming less and less possible. Meanwhile, the dangers inherent in the fact that, from a technical point of view, nuclear activities for peaceful purposes are indistinguishable from military nuclear activities and particularly so in the area of peaceful nuclear explosions continue to impinge upon the future validity of the NPT.

(Mr. Husain, Bangladesh)

These concerns notwithstanding, the fact that nearly 100 countries are parties to the Treaty and that moves are being made to strengthen the existing régime, including a second Review Conference in 1980, are important incentives governing Bangladesh's consideration of adhering to the Treaty.

The fact that the primary responsibility for hastening the process of disarmament rests with the nuclear Powers does not, however, preclude non-nuclear States from fulfilling their own obligations. It is therefore heartening to note that in recent years non-nuclear countries have stepped up ways and means of strengthening their own security. Perhaps the most welcome trend in this direction is the momentum towards regional approaches to nuclear disarmament apparent in such initiatives as the creation of zones of peace and nuclear-free zones. While there is an undoubted need to iron out difficulties with regard to definitions of both concepts and geographical locations as well as the obligations of nuclear Powers in respect of such zones, we fully agree with the conclusion of the Secretary-General that such "nuclear-free zones would in no way compete with or conflict with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and could indeed provide a means of extending and reinforcing the objectives of that Treaty and thus help to strengthen and promote the régime for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons".

As a country whose only seaboard fronts the Indian Ocean, Bangladesh supports the initiative of establishing the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, neutrality and denuclearization with the dual objective of excluding great Power rivalries and competition and strengthening regional co-operation and security. It goes without saying that the "disappearance" of great Powers need not automatically secure tranquillity in the area. While it would complement such a process, it cannot substitute for the obligations to be contracted by the countries of this region themselves to ensure their security. We therefore subscribe to the view that States in this region cannot in all earnestness advocate such a peace zone without themselves practising what they preach. We fully support General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) calling upon the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, the permanent members of the Security Council and other major maritime users of the Indian Ocean to promote the objective of establishing a system of universal collective security without military alliances and strengthening international security through regional and international co-operation.

(Mr. Husain, Bangladesh)

Bangladesh welcomes the move for a conference of littoral and hinterland States, including all major maritime users of the Indian Ocean. We believe that the major task of such a conference would be to strengthen guarantees and safeguards, with the object of precluding not only great Power military presence but also potential rivalry and competition among regional States.

Last year we had the occasion to welcome several important initiatives in the non-nuclear-weapon category, including advances made on the long-standing issue of the ban on chemical and bacteriological weapons. The United States ratification of the Geneva Protocol and the United States-Soviet agreement of July 1974 to consider a joint initiative at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) with respect to the conclusion of an international convention dealing with the most dangerous, lethal means of chemical warfare were hopeful signs that some positive developments would take place soon. It is therefore all the more regrettable that the negotiations in CCD have not lived up to expectations. One of the brighter aspects of the generally sluggish negotiations on disarmament is the progress with regard to the convention prohibiting the use of environmental modification techniques as a means of warfare. While we welcome this initiative, we have some concern over the limitations imposed on the prohibition, particularly with respect to peaceful uses of such techniques which cannot be distinguished from their military uses.

The progress of two other proposals initiated by the Soviet Union also deserves our attention. The first relates to the question of agreed limitations on military expenditure through a 10 per cent reduction of military budgets. We hope that the limitations expressed by developing countries can be overcome in recognition of the fact that sums now expended on non-productive and non-consumable military hardware could provide an essential boost to sorely depleted assistance programmes and the regeneration of international trade. The second relates to curbing the development of even more terrifying and lethal conventional weapons of mass destruction.

One of the most serious omissions from our agenda is the question of the growth in the conventional arms race. While the logic of nuclear deterrence may ultimately result in a balance of prudence among the nuclear Powers, the real threat to international security continues to emanate from conflicts in the third

(Mr. Husain, Bangladesh)

world States. In a world where the most pronounced phenomenon is the unequal relations among States, local wars arising from fear of domination, exploitation and interference in internal affairs constitute a continuing danger, particularly since they can and do draw into their vortex the bigger nations of the world.

In conclusion, I can only reiterate that disarmament will continue to remain a dilemma or be deadlocked so long as it operates in a global society that cannot combine its collective responsibility to guarantee all nations a viable system of world order and security. The means for the system are inherent in the Charter of the United Nations; all that is really needed is the will to implement its provisions.

Mr. BENKHAYAL (Libyan Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): This session, like other sessions, is engaged in discussions about disarmament; disarmament topics make up about one sixth of all the items on the agenda. This shows the concern of the peoples of the world, faced as they are by the arms race, by the proliferation -- vertical and horizontal -- of means of destruction; and, of course, the peace-loving countries are trying to safeguard themselves and others and to protect themselves from the scourge of war. My delegation is neither the first nor the last to express our concern in view of this dangerous phenomenon; many delegations in this Committee had already expressed their concern in this regard.

Delegations have raised many questions. Some have expressed optimism with regard to the possible solution of this increasingly serious problem, which poses the threat of the extinction of all human life on this planet. On the one hand, we see that the countries of the third world are engaged in the process of development, are facing considerable problems in this area, and of course have to use all the funds they have and all the credits they may command to resolve the problems of development. But we see, on the other hand, that the advanced countries spend enormous amounts of money -- billions of dollars -- in trying to develop new means of destruction while at the same time maintaining that their intentions are the best and that they genuinely want to establish a new international economic order which would be based on justice and which would give equal opportunity to all to try to fill the gap separating rich and poor. The practice followed by these countries is undoubtedly contrary to the spirit of their statements. The war industries have not only absorbed all the resources which would be necessary to produce food, to educate children, to treat the sick, but have drawn on man's ingenuity and exhausted it and diverted it from the struggle for a better environment; indeed, they themselves endanger the environment, posing a major threat to mankind. Peoples are living in fear. While they are struggling to improve their condition, they see the nefarious practice of exploiting and depleting the wealth of this world in the service of the production of new weapons of destruction. Peoples do not see any efforts being made to improve living standards or to speed up development. It has been said that there is a crisis of energy and primary commodities; yet no one has called for an end to the waste of

(Mr. Benkhayal, Libyan Arab Republic)

energy and primary commodities involved in producing arms and, in the final analysis, satisfying ambitions. The arms race is an enormous burden for mankind in every region of the world, and the threat of the strong also imposes a burden on the weak, who have to develop their armed defences in order to face the direct or indirect threats menacing them, which may take the form of sophisticated weapons, war arsenals and, in particular, conventional and non-conventional weapons throughout the world. All this reduces the resources available for the production of food -- so necessary for the children of the small countries -- the protection of health and the improvement of education. These resources are being wasted, while these countries are in a situation where they have to defend their natural resources and territorial integrity and must continue the struggle against colonialism and against the racist régimes which are being fed and fostered by imperialism through the provision of armaments. It also seems that what was officially stated in the resolutions on security in Europe has not brought about a slackening of tensions or put an end to the production and, indeed, proliferation of these dangerous weapons.

If understanding is to be based on a policy of balance of forces and on the creation of zones of influence, the competition among the blocs of great Powers and military alliances and the arms race will continue and, of course, they involve an enormous responsibility in terms of world peace and security. The countries which lack the means to preserve peace -- I am referring to the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America -- and which still cannot believe that a great Power will exterminate mankind by using only one type of weaponry, although the stockpiles of weapons in some countries are such that they can put an end to the very existence of man on this planet, these countries must play an essential role in the preservation of world peace and security.

Questions relating to disarmament were among the most important subjects which were discussed at the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in Colombo in August. An important Declaration was adopted, calling for the immediate prohibition of the use, production and stockpiling of nuclear weapons. It also called for the prohibition of the production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. The Declaration further demanded that an end be put to the arms race and to the use of

(Mr. Benkhayal, Libyan Arab Republic)

napalm and incendiary weapons, as well as of other means of destruction which cause enormous suffering, and called for agreement on world disarmament and on the convening of a conference so as to find a solution to the problem of how to achieve complete disarmament under effective international control. Also, the non-aligned countries called for a special session of the General Assembly to deal with disarmament and to work out a programme of priorities in this field.

My delegation wishes to become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution on the convening of a special session of the General Assembly which it is proposed to hold in May/June 1977. We are convinced that disarmament questions are among the most important and delicate matters and are directly related to the future and to the security of nations. The way in which these problems are being handled at the present time is not satisfactory. It is certainly a source of some discouragement for us. The results accomplished are very modest, and the holding of a special session on disarmament is therefore a most appropriate measure, because it will focus attention on this problem and will also enable peoples to become more aware of the evolution of the situation. This session will make it possible for peoples to discharge their historic responsibilities in this regard. They will also be able to take the necessary measures. We believe that the holding of a special session will be a contribution towards guaranteeing the safety of mankind.

(Mr. Benkhayal, Libyan Arab Republic)

My delegation spoke on item 45 of the agenda on the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques. The results of the work of the CCD and the other efforts made on all sides have brought about certain positive results within the general framework of the efforts made to limit the use of arms in our contemporary world. But we want to express our concern none the less because total agreement has not been reached and we also heard the views of some delegations which feel that the text of this convention is far from being complete and satisfactory. It is therefore most appropriate to concentrate our efforts on all these aspects because our main purpose is to achieve results which will be complementary in the over-all field of disarmament. Here I want to clarify that this text has been studied very carefully by my Government and by the specialized authorities in my country.

All the efforts aimed at strengthening the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament should be encouraged and developed, because this Organization, to which we are all dedicated and which we want to succeed in the discharge of its important tasks, must certainly have at its disposal the necessary means to accomplish its mission. My delegation feels that the questions of disarmament are extremely important and our delegation certainly must play a very important role in bringing about solutions in this area. And this is why we welcome the report of the Committee which studied the role of the United Nations in disarmament affairs. We want to express our appreciation to Madame Thorsson of Sweden for the role she played as the Chairman of this important Committee and for the efforts which were made in order to bring about a successful conclusion of its work.

In conclusion, we wish to stress that disarmament is not only a material process aimed at putting an end to the continuous improvement of the weapons of destruction and to do away with the existing arsenals and stockpiles. What we are after is not only the conclusion of a treaty which would institute more effective controls in disarmament but above all what should be achieved is a decision which must be made at a political level and which will enable the peoples to put an end to every attempt at massive destruction.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee notes that the Libyan Arab Republic wishes to become a sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.1.

Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): Mr. Chairman, speaking for the first time during this session in the First Committee, I should like, even at this late stage in the deliberations of the Committee, to extend to you my sincere congratulations on your election to preside over the work of this Committee. Your excellent record, your diligence and wisdom are guarantees for the successful conclusion of the Committee's work. May I also express my felicitations to the other Officers of the Committee -- the two Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur. Please rest assured of my delegation's full co-operation in the discharge of your heavy responsibilities.

The fact that we are deliberating on matters that comprise about one sixth of the entire agenda of the thirty-first session of the General Assembly is indicative, I believe, of the concern of the world community with the arms race and the urgent need for collective action to arrest it. Indeed, the question of disarmament was one of the first items on the agenda of the General Assembly. In 1946, the General Assembly adopted a resolution which called for specific proposals for the elimination of atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Since then, the question of nuclear disarmament has grown in complexity and the items on our agenda have multiplied. None the less, the United Nations has and is making constant efforts to achieve its ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Unfortunately, this task has not been easy; in fact, one area where the United Nations has not made any significant progress, after 30 years of hard work, is in the field of disarmament. I am not at all minimizing the important agreements that have been concluded so far, e.g. the partial test ban Treaty, the outer space Treaty, the non-proliferation Treaty, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the sea-bed Treaty and the bacteriological warfare Convention. These instruments are among the most notable first steps in international arms control agreements and they play a role in restraining the nuclear arms race. During this same period, however, the arms race has continued feverishly, new and destructive weapons have been developed and the mighty arsenals of nuclear, chemical and conventional weapons are increasing each year. As the Secretary-General, in the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization says:

"Unfortunately, my general remarks of last year on the lack of progress in disarmament still apply. We still live in the shadow of the nuclear as well

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

as the conventional arms race. Nuclear disarmament remains therefore the first priority. Scientific and technical development in the nuclear energy field has now advanced to a stage where widespread use of nuclear power in all its ramifications is rapidly becoming a reality of the present rather than just a prospect for the future." (A/31/1/Add.1, p. 11)

It is said that this huge arsenal of the super-Powers has the capacity to annihilate us all several times over. This is indeed petrifying! This state of affairs has been brought about by the high priority that military research and development enjoyed in the last 30 years. As a result, new and sophisticated weapons have appeared at an amazingly rapid rate with no sign of any relaxation. Billions of dollars are spent every year for the development and production of new and improved weapons. In this connexion, I should like to refer to the following statement in the 1976 issue of The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) -- World Armament and Disarmament:

"The post-war period is remarkable for the consistency with which large quantities of resources have annually been set aside for military purposes. Including 1975, cumulative world military expenditure since the end of World War II amounts to something like \$4,500 billion."

The same publication indicates that one third of this expenditure was devoted to the development and production of major weapons. It is indeed highly disturbing that such a large proportion of sorely needed resource is devoted to military use while a good part of the world population lives in abject poverty.

This huge resource devoted annually to military spending, the development of weapons technology and the transfer of its know-how has not only become alarming but also well-nigh impossible to control. In this connexion, my delegation views with the utmost concern the danger that such a widespread nuclear weapon proliferation poses to the world in spite of the non-proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

Recent events have changed the whole concept of the nuclear arms race. Gone are the days when the two super-Powers held a monopoly in either the possession, deployment or development of these weapons, both qualitatively and quantitatively, in an arms race confined to themselves. The last few years have demonstrated beyond any doubt the capability of many nations to acquire nuclear weapons. It is widely known that the key issue in the proliferation problem is the spread of nuclear power reactors - in most cases, the cheapest way of producing electricity. The inevitable by-product of this method is that an enormous quantity of plutonium is produced every year - a product which can be used as the fissionable material for the production of nuclear weapons. Again, I should like to quote from the 1976 issue of SIPRI's publication on this point:

"By 1980, if the present forecast is realized, 29 countries will have installed nuclear power reactors with a total electrical generating capacity of about 219,300 MWe, about eleven times the 1970 figures. Looking further ahead, it is probable, according to the latest predictions, that the 1980 figure will be multiplied more than sixteen-fold by the year 2000.

"By this time, if the present trend continues, nuclear power reactors will be commonplace on all continents and it will be rare indeed to find a country without one.

"A country with a nuclear power reactor has the capability to produce plutonium at a typical rate of about 100 kg per year for a 500 MWe reactor. Some research reactors can also produce plutonium at a significant rate, even though this rate is very much less than that of a power reactor.

"Breeder reactors may actually use plutonium as fuel. The development and spread of all of these types are, therefore, of considerable relevance to discussions of the ability to produce nuclear explosive devices."

In the light of this revealing statement, common interest and survival dictate that we strengthen the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) so as to prevent the ominous consequences of horizontal proliferations. In this respect, my delegation is encouraged by the increase of adherents to the Treaty from 80 to 100, the latest being Japan, a country with an advanced nuclear industry. Acceptance of this Treaty is the only way to build trust and confidence among nations and avoid

(Mr. Ibrohim, Ethiopia)

the catastrophic spread of nuclear weapons. We regret, therefore, that two nuclear Powers and many near-nuclear States have not yet become parties to the Treaty. My delegation urges these States as well as others to adhere to the Treaty at the earliest possible date.

We all recognize the paramount importance of the NPT and the vital role it can play in our effort to avert further proliferation of nuclear weapons, to achieve the cessation of the nuclear arms race and to undertake effective measures in the direction of nuclear disarmament and promote co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The effectiveness of this Treaty depends very much on how ready we are to implement its provisions. I regret to state, however, that while the non-nuclear-weapon States have met their obligations under articles I and II, the nuclear Powers have yet to fulfil their primary obligation under article VI. I need hardly emphasize the importance of this article - under which all parties undertake to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, including a treaty on general and complete disarmament. Unfortunately, six years after the Treaty entered into force, nothing has been done by the nuclear Powers to implement this article.

As we endeavour to prevent horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons, it is only natural that we also reach an early agreement to prevent vertical proliferation, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Unless we manage to prevent vertical proliferation, I am afraid our effort to prevent horizontal proliferation will be doomed. My delegation therefore believes that an early conclusion of comprehensive test ban treaty (CTBT) will not only immensely contribute towards a reduction in the arms race but will also strengthen the NPT.

The delegation of Ethiopia regretfully notes also that, since the conclusion of the Partial Test Ban Treaty in 1963, the CCD has been unable to report any progress on this most urgent question. The main obstacle that has created a deadlock in the negotiations has been the disagreement between the two super-Powers regarding verification. Of course, the inability to regulate nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes and the non-participation of two nuclear Powers in the disarmament negotiations so far have contributed to the complexity of the problem. My delegation is most grateful to the delegation of Sweden for its diligence and

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

painstaking efforts in facilitating the task of the CCD - firstly, by presenting a draft treaty in 1971 and secondly, through the initiative they have taken this year with regard to the complex problem of verification. Its initiative has led to the establishment, under the auspices of the CCD, of an Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events. The Ad Hoc Group has made a good start and in the near future the envisaged global monitoring system could perhaps assist in solving the intricate problem of verification.

A CTB is long overdue; too much time and effort has been expended by the international community in its endeavours to reach an agreement on a CTB. However, in spite of our endeavours, success has so far been elusive. We are not despairing; on the contrary, we believe that the prevailing political conditions for concluding a CTB are more favourable now than ever before. The 1974 Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the 1976 Treaty on the limitation of underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes between the United States and the Soviet Union, particularly the verification system in the latter Treaty, are encouraging signs. Although these instruments fall far short of our expectations, we view them as first steps towards the ultimate goal of achieving a CTB. Indeed, as Ambassador Martin of the United States said in his statement of 1 November 1976:

"... the Threshold Test Ban Treaty contains an explicit commitment to continue negotiations towards the cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests, and we are determined to fulfil that commitment". (A/C.1/31/PV.20, p. 42)

My delegation welcomes this positive attitude of the United States.

As I indicated above the main obstacle to achieving a CTB has been the much discussed problem of verification. In this connexion, my delegation is encouraged by and welcomes the accommodating spirit of the Soviet Union, as expressed in its memorandum on ending the arms race and disarmament, wherein it is stated:

"... However, even now some States suggest providing for the possibility of on-site inspection of actual circumstances if there is doubt as to compliance with obligations to stop underground nuclear tests.

"The Soviet Union is convinced that no particular difficulties should arise in elaborating such a compromise basis for an agreement as would ensure a voluntary framework for taking decisions relating to on-site ascertaining

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

of relevant circumstances and, at the same time, impart confidence to all parties to the treaty that the obligations are complied with. The Soviet Union stands ready to participate in a search for a universally acceptable understanding on this basis." (A/31/232, p. 7)

Because of these encouraging signs, it is my delegation's ardent hope that the two nuclear Powers will find it possible to narrow their differences and move towards concluding a comprehensive test ban agreement. By doing this, they will not only enhance the security of the world, but their action would also be a tremendous pressure on non-adhering States to stop testing.

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

The position of my delegation concerning the banning of chemical weapons is well known and I need not repeat it. These weapons have been employed in warfare for a long time and have caused incalculable sufferings and devastations on hundreds and thousands of people. They are weapons of horrifying potential, and the rapid development of more improved and sophisticated delivery system is threatening man with even more of this suffering. It is, therefore, imperative that a comprehensive agreement banning the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons be urgently concluded.

In July and November 1974, the United States and the Soviet Union agreed to present a joint initiative to the CCD with respect to the conclusion of an international convention dealing with the most dangerous, lethal means of chemical warfare. We very much regret that the promised joint initiative has not yet materialized.

We hope that the joint initiative will be forthcoming. In the meantime, however, the CCD should, at its next session, continue its substantive consideration of the question as a matter of high priority using as a basis the "draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction", submitted by the United Kingdom on 12 August, 1976. I should like to express my most sincere appreciation to the delegation of the United Kingdom for making this draft convention available to us. Since this draft convention takes into account the various suggestions and proposals put forward by members of the CCD, we believe that it can serve as a basis for initial negotiations. My delegation will carefully study this particular draft convention and will make its views known when the CCD takes up the question at its next session.

My delegation would like to stress the risk that is involved in any further procrastination of banning chemical weapons. We are confident, however, that at the next CCD session, a narrowing of differences could be reached on the most crucial problems of verification and identification, thus paving the thorny path for more meaningful negotiation. Ethiopia views this question as most pressing and we sincerely hope that we shall soon be in a position to supplement the 1925 Geneva Protocol and the Convention on Bacteriological Weapons with a comprehensive ban of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Ibrahim, Ethiopia)

The Foreign Minister of Ethiopia, speaking in the general debate on 12 October 1976, said:

"My delegation feels that there is need to inject a sense of urgency in disarmament talks and to generate some momentum. A special session of the General Assembly devoted to the consideration of all the outstanding problems of disarmament, as recommended by the recent Non-Aligned Summit, might achieve this purpose." (A/31/PV.28, p. 51)

We are pleased to note that the majority of the members who have spoken in this debate, have supported the convening of a special session devoted to disarmament.

My delegation feels that the convening of a special session on this question is most timely, for it will avail an opportunity to the most representative world body to review and reflect on the whole gamut of disarmament problems that have been plaguing us for the last 31 years. We should like to stress, however, that the convening of the special session should not be regarded as an alternative to or a substitute for the holding of a World Disarmament Conference. My Government has, without any hesitation, supported the convening of a World Disarmament Conference and we continue to do so.

We are hopeful, indeed confident, that the envisaged special session will lay down new approaches and guidelines for a more meaningful disarmament negotiation. As the representative of Canada said on 5 November 1976: "It must not be a dialogue of the deaf. Our objective for the session must be to infuse a new sense of purpose into the quest for peace and security." (A/C.1/31/PV.24, p. 56)

In this short statement, I have sought to express my Government's view on some of the items on our agenda. My delegation intends to make its views known on a number of questions when we start discussing the various resolutions that are before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Ethiopia for his very kind words addressed to me personally and to the other officers of the Committee.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Once again we are gathered here to review the progress or lack of progress in the field of disarmament. Speaker after speaker has pointedly referred to the urgent need of halting the arms race and initiating the process of disarmament as was done year after year, for many years now, without effect. It is an inescapable reality that of all the subjects before the United Nations over the years, the one that has shown the least meaningful progress, if one can speak of progress, is that of disarmament. This fact more impressively and disturbingly emerges as the time goes by.

Over 15 years ago the General Assembly unanimously resolved on general and complete disarmament and in 1961, that is the following year, adopted the joint declaration of agreed principles on disarmament, a very concrete document and specific in its provisions. High hopes were then raised that there was, after all, an agreement on effective steps towards disarmament. Those hopes, however, gradually dissipated in the relevant negotiations that followed, without any effect over the long years until they completely disappeared. Meanwhile, what has happened with the arms race? It has been vigorously escalating by leaps and bounds. The comparison between progress on disarmament and the arms race is astounding. It appears that the very fact that there was effort at disarmament actually generated an urge for the accelerated arms race. Weapons production in 1975 was large and widespread. The international trade in arms has been extremely brisk, and advances in military technology continued further to frustrate all efforts at arms control. It is noteworthy that this highly wasteful expenditure in arms, in what is an unrealistic preparation for a major war, is annually equivalent to first the combined gross national income for 1975 of all the 65 countries in Africa and Latin America, and secondly to the total world-wide expenditure on education -- the whole world expenditure on education is one year's on arms race -- and twice as large as the expenditures on health, while it is 15 times the value of all official assistance provided to the under-developed countries. While the world national product has risen five-fold in the last five years, the military spending is estimated to have risen ten-fold. At this rate the military spending will continue at least to double every 15 years. By the turn of the century, assuming there is survival, the world will be devoting to

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

unproductive military uses a quantum of resources which is equal to the whole world's present output. The militarization of world economy is now more pronounced than ever. Military employees dominate public employment roles in most countries, outnumbering all other types of employees paid by public funds. The militarization is now marked by the spread of modern military technology, and the arms producing industry into some or even among the least developed areas of the world is also extending. And this is inevitable in a world where the signal is given from the top for arms competition and preparation for war.

Under the present structure of States, which is a relic of the past when war was a legitimate exercise of sovereignty and the usual practice of policy, defence and military ministers normally controlled the largest share of the national budget, enjoying a correspondingly powerful position within the organization of the Government.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

They do so today, when war is prohibited; when the Charter of the United Nations provides for the solution of problems, not through war, as was legitimately expected in the past, but through peaceful means. So we are emulating the past in matters which were so different from that past. As a result, world military expenditure annually averages \$12,300 per soldier, while in, let us say, education, public expenditure per school age child is only \$219.

The distinguished representative of Sweden has earlier pointed out that military expenditures are inherently responsible for the inflationary tendencies since they result in no consumable products.

But even such unbelievably enormous economic waste and social costs might be thought tolerable if the arms race were at least necessary for world security and to avert the dangers of war. But it is obvious and certain that the very opposite is clearly the case. Vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons and delivery systems and the accelerating distribution of the most sophisticated conventional arms can hardly be said to serve the cause of peace. They are leading to the total annihilation of the human race.

We must look to the concept of balance of power in its true light, as an interim and temporary measure, which may, at the same time create, through its accompanying arms race, the very conditions that inevitably lead to war and probably a nuclear war with utter destruction. It does not provide any real security, but intensifies the climate of antagonistic hostility preventing true co-operation under the Charter. It was because of the realization, after two world wars, that balance of power is a false hope for international security, that the United Nations was established. And we are now, after 30 years of the United Nations, to rely increasingly on this false concept, in disregard of the Charter and its essential provisions, with the result that as never before we find ourselves in a world of international anarchy and insecurity, in an escalating arms race.

A closer examination of the concept of balance of power, is pertinent and essential, particularly in this forum, if we are to comprehend the basic nature of the task we have before us, namely, to curb the arms race and initiate substantial measures on disarmament. The plain fact is that no matter how disconcerting it may sound, the real measures of disarmament are inconceivable in

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

a world still based on balance of power concepts. The two are antagonistic to each other: balance of power and disarmament. The United Nations was conceived to achieve the maintenance of international peace and security as its primary and paramount responsibility, through a system of collective security, a system of mandatory obligations under the Charter. That system has not been implemented, nor has any other system of international order for maintenance of peace been constructed in the meantime. So how can we hope to achieve disarmament? In the absence of an international legal order we have anarchy, unstable balances of power and their progeny, the many-faceted arms race.

In facing the task before us, either in this forum or in others, we must not turn away from the basic causes of the problem and its possible cure. As the distinguished Foreign Minister of the Philippines, General Romulo, said in his statement:

"We have dealt with disarmament as a disembodied problem, not bearing on the other factors which surround it ... Disarmament cannot be conceived of outside the context of an international security system, a system of international law and order which is a viable alternative to national arms ..."

(A/C.1/31/PV.22, pp. 29-30)

This has been my delegation's position over the years. In 1968 Cyprus introduced draft resolution A/C.1/L.449/Rev.1 which recognized that the progress on disarmament was interdependent with progress on international security through the United Nations and called for a study of the interrelated problems of disarmament, collective security and economic development. It was felt at the time that it was premature to establish such a study, and it was postponed for a year or so or a later time. But there did not seem much readiness for recognition of this need.

With regard to the latter, the connexion of disarmament with economic development, recognition has, after all, come. And now it is fully recognized that the two are interconnected and interrelated.

But with international security, which is the more essential connexion, as disarmament depends on international security, it still remains without its recognition, and there is rather, a tendency to shun the concept of international

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

security. Indeed, while innumerable committees and fora have been set up over the years to study methods and details of disarmament, not one of which has arrived at any result, not one committee has been established to examine the question of international security through the United Nations.

After all, the Charter provides for certain means of achieving international security, for the effective implementation of Security Council resolutions. Yet these resolutions have been completely ignored, and the authority and prestige of the Security Council as an instrument of the United Nations for international security and peace is as nothing because its resolutions are, if not openly, at least privately laughed at as mere paper resolutions.

Is that not a matter of concern to the membership of the United Nations, a matter it should look into? Why has there not been at least one committee to examine the situation and come out with a report to the effect that that part of the Charter was nonsense, or was impractical, or had been agreed upon in a time different from the present, when there were not the difficulties we are facing today.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

But this is not true, because this same membership of the United Nations in 1970 adopted unanimously, except for one vote -- I do not know whose it was -- the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, paragraph 9 of which recommended that the Security Council take steps to facilitate the conclusion of the agreements envisaged in Article 43 of the Charter in order fully to develop its capacity for enforcement action as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter. Therefore at that time, 1970 -- only six years ago -- it was still thought that it was possible and practical and needed to be applied. So I am still wondering, and I repeat the question for everyone to hear: why has there been such obvious indifference towards the implementation of Security Council resolutions? It cannot be that there is a secret known to some and not to others. I for one do not know the secret and I would like to know, because it is undoubted that, as the Charter provides, the maintenance of international peace and security is the primary and paramount responsibility of the Security Council and the *raison d'être* of the Organization. Even the Preamble to the Charter begins with the need to put an end through international security and by peaceful means to the scourge of war. When this part of the Charter is violated, we are not concerned. We are concerned with minor violations, and we set up innumerable committees to deal with them, but not with the basic cause of disarmament. We want to ignore it when we talk of disarmament, and I have noticed that in all efforts it is bypassed. Why are we not open enough to discuss it? We are ready to discuss it, and to be persuaded that it is useless and we must proceed to disarmament without international security.

Under such circumstances, it is no wonder that most of the speakers in this Committee have expressed their deep concern that, despite the repeated requests by the General Assembly for the implementation of effective measures aimed at the cessation of the arms race, this race, particularly of nuclear armaments, has continued to increase at an alarming speed, siphoning off enormous material and human resources from the economic and social development of all countries, thus constituting a growing danger for world peace and security. My delegation cannot but deplore the lack of achievement in all disarmament negotiations during the last several years. We might in this context recall that, shortly after the atomic bomb was dropped over Hiroshima, Albert Einstein, the great man of the time, said

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

that the splitting of the atom had changed everything, save our modes of thinking. Now here I am not in complete agreement with Einstein. It is not our mode of thinking. Our thinking functions all right. It is our moral approach to problems. Our thinking is turned towards self-centred views of national sovereignty or national security or whatever it is -- self-centred -- in a world that requires a broader spirit to meet the common dangers and common needs that threaten humanity as a whole. Therefore, nothing is wrong with our thinking. It is our moral standards. And, in an age in which science and technology have reached such high levels that we can destroy the whole environment on this earth and we can travel to Mars and the moon, moral standards must rise comparably, otherwise the gap between the two will bring an explosion that will be another cause of destruction.

The ever-spiralling arms race and the undeniable failure of our efforts to stop it prove that we should look for tentative means and ways that would make feasible the cessation of the arms race. As things are now, we unfortunately have to admit that we are living in a world full of crises, a world in which many crises of aggression remain unremedied and have been aggravated by the ineffectiveness of the Security Council, resulting in serious and growing threats to international peace and security. I might mention, without attaching particular importance to it, that a recent and glaring instance of the collapsed nature of balance of power on which so much is dependent and, at the same time, of the failure of effective international security through the United Nations is the Cyprus crisis since 1974. The aggressive occupation of its territory by violating its territorial integrity and independence has continued for two years now, in contemptuous disregard of the unanimous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, which remain wholly unimplemented and ineffective, as though paper resolutions. What is the lesson to be drawn from this state of anarchy and insecurity by other States, particularly the smaller and the non-aligned, which do not depend on weapons and military alliances for their security? Indeed, the violation of the independence and territorial integrity of one State Member of the United Nations is a violation of the independence and territorial integrity of all Member States; and this is the concept of the United Nations. Such crises as I have mentioned show that détente does not seem to have reduced the struggle for

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

influence which is going on in all continents or to have extinguished the hotbeds of tension.

The Colombo Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries stressed that relaxation of international tensions could not be secured through a policy of balance of power, spheres of influence, rivalry between power blocs, military alliance and the arms race. For such reasons, the Conference called for the global relaxation of international tension and for the participation of all countries on an equal basis in the solution of international problems so that co-operation for international security through the United Nations may be effectively achieved.

I am not here suggesting that efforts towards a cutback in military expenditures and stockpiling are not to be determinedly pursued, despite their failure over many years. Efforts over the details of these methods can certainly be pursued, in the hope that by some miracle they may arrive somewhere, and we still entertain the hope that some effective progress may be made in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). However, all this does not solve the problem or save us from the growing dangers and threats of the arms race which is here with us as a fact of life and a prospect of death. In fact, we must beware that minor control measures do not end by temporarily masking the deep-lying ailment resulting from the lack of agreed measures under the Charter to give the necessary authority to the Security Council through the due implementation of decisions in order to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security through the United Nations.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The Charter of the United Nations provides for both machinery and measures, but its provisions remain unimplemented and inoperative. As the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, so cogently pointed out in the introduction to his report of this year on the work of the Organization:

"It is therefore in the interests of all Governments, even at the cost of some short-term disadvantages, to support and respect the authority of the Security Council and to contribute to its central role in developing a system of world order. ... The responsibilities of Governments do not cease when a resolution of the Security Council is adopted; indeed, resolutions usually require determined action by Governments, in addition to the parties directly concerned, if they are to be translated into reality." (A/31/1/Add.1, p. 10)

So, there is real concern in the world about this lack of international security, so much so that it was stressed in the introduction to the report of the Secretary-General. Therefore, may I suggest again that we have a study carried out on this problem by an appropriate committee or another body. Unless the security interests of Member States are met by the machinery provided for that purpose in the Charter, or by improved machinery -- if the provisions of the Charter do not prove adequate -- let us either apply the Charter or see how we can review the Charter to make it applicable and ensure that its provisions are implemented. Nations cannot be expected to divest themselves of national security armaments in a vacuum, without an alternate international security. Herein lies the stern dilemma of our times and one which is not responsive to the existing definitions of arms limitation and disarmament.

It is for these reasons that my delegation strongly supports a world disarmament conference or, failing that, the call for a special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. In a more focused and longer session than our cursory discussions here in the First Committee can provide, we ought to be able to go deeper into the problem of disarmament in relation to international security and illumine some of the complexities and interrelations which have hitherto apparently eluded us.

How profitable such an exercise ultimately will be depends on the degree of progressive and objective approach to the problem by the main participants in the conference who, we hope, will not be influenced by considerations of supposedly

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

national interests outside the common collective interests of mankind for peace. We express the hope that a special session may rise to the occasion and may prove to be a worth-while accomplishment of the Disarmament Decade.

We naturally support, as we have done in the past, such interim and partial measures as might perhaps emerge from the SALT negotiations or from the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament or other fora. Consequently, we welcome the modest gains in the establishment of a "threshold" Nuclear Test Ban provided this threshold is to be progressively and rapidly lowered. In our view, there is no real bar, either technical or strategic, to a comprehensive test ban treaty initiated between the nuclear Powers, the super-Powers, either through successive downward increments in the threshold or through bold initiatives from one or both of the nuclear Powers, taking the lead in establishing a new state of affairs, namely a total end to nuclear tests in all environments, with an open invitation to all other nuclear Powers to follow the example.

We also continue to support the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in the same spirit, acknowledging its weaknesses and current frailty. A change in the life expectancy of the Non-Proliferation Treaty will depend both on the reversal of vertical proliferation by the nuclear super-Powers and on restraint and self-denial by other Powers.

I wish now to refer to the draft convention of the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques. The use of advanced technological means to influence the environment for evil purposes of war is an attack against nature and the very environment of our planet. We therefore welcome a convention prohibiting military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques for war purposes, irrespective of the extent of the effects from such modification techniques.

We pay tribute to the Soviet Union for having taken the initiative for such a convention. Regarding a provision in the convention which appears restrictive of the prohibition, we feel that efforts to overcome such a restriction are positive and desired. However, we express the hope that any such effort would not be the cause of long delaying in a manner that would become frustrating to the very purpose of the convention. We express the hope, therefore, that it will be possible to deal with this matter expeditiously by some agreement.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

With regard to chemical weapons, and particularly lethal ones, the early completion of their relevant prohibition is increasingly becoming a compelling need. I will not dwell on the horrifying effects of napalm bombings and the agonizing suffering for days and weeks on end before death, and on their uselessness as strategic weapons as described by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). We in Cyprus have had a tragic experience of the use of napalm in the slow-burning alive of human beings and the destruction by fire of miles and miles of pine and cedar forests. These weapons should be urgently banned in an age supposed to be civilized.

To summarize, disarmament, in my submission, cannot be conceived without the cessation of the arms race, and the cessation of the arms race is not conceivable or possible without providing alternative means of national security other than armaments, which involve the relevant antagonistic competition and end up in the arms race in a useless preparation for war. The only alternative to armaments and war is international security through the United Nations as provided by the Charter.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the last speaker for this morning's meeting, I should like to announce that Australia, Japan and New Zealand have become co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.1, and that Belgium has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.11.

Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): Were it not for the seriousness of the subject of disarmament, which is the most urgent and dramatic of the items before the United Nations, and were it not for the respect that we owe the 145 sovereign Governments that are Members of this Organization, we would have to believe that we are really watching an exercise in world self-suggestion. Indeed, if what the representatives, speaking officially on behalf of countries, say in this hall is to be taken as valid and logical, we have to believe that what is happening outside the hall, in the manufacture of weapons, in the use of scientists for such production and the sales in weapons reflect a case of international schizophrenia, because of the complete contradiction between the ideas voiced and the conduct followed by many countries. We could not otherwise explain to ourselves the constant opposition between the need to obtain resources from the world to reduce tensions

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

that are reaching incalculable dimensions in their gravity and daily affecting wider numbers of humans suffering under national and international injustice, and the growing dedication and terrifying devotion of such resources to the most colossal and sterile arms race that the history of man has registered and that may lead even to the destruction of the planet.

From those days when the minority of 51 nations founded the United Nations in 1945 until today, we have, for more than 30 years, constantly dealt with the question of disarmament. The truth of the matter is that if this problem is important for the great Powers it is equally important for the middle-sized and smaller nations, because in this matter anything that they may decide or cease to decide upon has direct and essential effects on the living of our majorities, on the quality of their lives and the destiny of our limited economic resources.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

Any other discussion in the United Nations and I would venture to say in any other international organizations, in Parliaments, in Governments and in the communications, research or investigation media of any country, must inevitably be affected, if not hinge upon, disarmament, not only because of its political and historical importance, but because of its incredible impact on the economic and social aspects of life.

In the General Assembly's first resolution in 1946 we were already seeking concrete proposals to eliminate atomic weapons and other means of mass destruction. From then to today all measures have been resorted to on the level of recommendations, a voluminous chapter has been written into the new International Law all full of good intentions but with almost imperceptible effects. It is an old Spanish saying that the road to hell is also paved with good intentions. In the light of the astronomical squandering of moneys in weaponry in a world that is suffering because of all sorts of needs and gaps, the peoples' impatience is growing with a feverish danger, to the point that it may explode so uncontrollably as to cause a casual and catastrophic use of nuclear or non-nuclear weapons that are being piled up as a symbol of the self-destructiveness of our species all over the world.

While we listen to the authorized views of the representatives of highly respected countries on the increasing efforts to achieve disarmament, we cannot banish from our minds the growing figures and the inexorable amounts of moneys that are devoted to weaponry. The successive Secretary-Generals of the United Nations warned us one after the other, in 1962 that the arms race had gobbled up \$120,000 million, in 1970 \$200,000 million; today in 1976 the figure has risen to \$300,000 million. Where then is this space ship earth headed, the fate of which we all will share if we follow this course?

According to the 1976 Yearbook of Armaments and Disarmaments of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, it appears that in 1976 the escalation towards a catastrophe has acquired terrifying proportions. The sale of weaponry to the countries of the third world has grown by 40 per cent. The nuclear weaponry productive capacity has grown in a most disquieting fashion. It seems that very soon in 1980, 80,000 kilograms of plutonium will be manufactured -- sufficient to make 10,000 nuclear weapons. Thirty-three nuclear explosions were carried out last

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

year by only four countries. It is most serious and lamentable for human history to have to register that almost 400,000 engineers and scientists of the two greatest Powers should be devoted to matters of weaponry and related questions. This is almost half of the human resources that might serve progress and welfare and peace in this decade. But as the new great industry of weaponry has emerged, so too the trade in the elements of destruction has grown as the most prosperous of international activities. In the meantime, the two greatest Powers have also continued to launch reconnaissance satellites at the same rate as they did in the two previous years. This is of particular concern to those countries living in the equatorial zone, for reasons that have already been put before this Committee during the discussion of the item on the peaceful uses of outer space. But in all respects we know that this process is destructive, even if, as we hope, these macabre toys of the arms psychosis are not used, because the arms race has become the major ingredient of the process of inflation created by the richest countries and paid for by the inhabitants of the world. This process obliges the poor countries to use up meagre resources that could be turned to meet the more obvious and urgent needs of their less favoured population. World inflation is to a large extent due to the financing of large-scale armament, and, as a corollary to the recurring deficits in the national budgets of some of the great Powers. This inflation cannot be attributed to the cost of oil that has merely reached the right level when compared with the costs of major industrial products -- a level which should also be obtained for the other raw materials of the developing world. Although it is true that Latin America, according to the latest figures published by authoritative foreign bodies, is the region that devotes the least percentage of its budget to military expenditures, our resources might be still better channelled to the fields of education and health if we could obtain from the major Powers an international guarantee of their will to take some action -- however modest -- on the declarations subscribed to by all countries in the appeals and the resolutions dealt with in this Committee. This is why my country raised the question of "the need for moral disarmament", because without political will and human responsibility, no progress can be achieved in the matter. We should undertake a more thorough action in this field, approaching the matter from the standpoint of co-operation from the public and private sectors, particularly of

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

the great Powers. We should have a programme to reactivate the mandates of UNESCO in the original postulate of wiping out the causes of war from man's mind, a programme that will include the energetic action of the means of communication, of educational and research institutions, (including the revision of textbooks used), of the religions and of the political parties and of the intellectuals all over the world -- in one word a programme that would involve all those who share the responsibility of forming our present civilization for which disarmament and peace are the main prerequisites.

We have listened with great attention to the statements made by the countries that have addressed the Committee in this debate, and with considerable anxiety we see that many of them are discouraged at the little progress achieved in the field of disarmament. We are entering the second part of the Decade of Disarmament, and yet there seems to be but little of the political will which is necessary on the part of those countries that should set the example in solving the problems involved in the arms race. I shall recall that in his statement of 30 September, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of my own country stated, and I quote:

"To maintain international peace and security it is necessary to make a decisive attack on the factors which threaten them. ... Nevertheless, we attribute very special importance to disarmament and we stress the need for disarmament of the spirit in order to open the way to a genuine will to understanding, as called for by the Charter. If political peace is a truce, lasting peace requires a just international organization which will secure a better life for all peoples." (A/31/PV.12, pp. 74-75).

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

My country shares with others the view that the CCD has not been able to find new areas of agreement and that its weakness stems from the fact that it was not established as an integral part of the structure of the United Nations, but we cannot deny its authority as a multilateral standing negotiating body. We believe that the international community requires a negotiating body if it wishes to establish, at the world level, treaties on disarmament and arms control. But we also believe that these must represent the opinions of the majority of the Members -- not only of the CCD, but also those that are not members of that body, so that they will be acceptable to everyone.

Ecuador co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.11 on the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament because we feel that the report submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee is a valuable contribution to the examination of the role of the United Nations, although we share the opinion of other delegations that as far as the effects of the recommendations are concerned we can hardly expect that the political obstacles that for years have impeded the conclusion of various agreements on disarmament will suddenly disappear because of a procedural reform as proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee.

My country believes that apart from the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee the position of the United Nations on disarmament will be strengthened by the convening of a special session of the General Assembly to study this subject -- a proposal that was supported by the Colombo meeting of the non-aligned countries. My delegation feels that this would be an important step towards a world disarmament conference, an idea that my country has also supported in the past. In this regard I should like to say that for such a conference to succeed, it must be preceded by careful preparatory work, and the participation of the great nuclear Powers and all militarily important countries is essential. Such a conference can contribute to the attainment of many objectives of the broad disarmament programme. We might also consider the possibility of inviting the world's outstanding scientists to such a conference. They share the responsibility for the future, whether for construction or for destruction, with the statesmen and the politicians. Perhaps their participation might have an influence on the weight and the soundness of the decisions to be adopted and in leading youth and the world of science toward a conviction commensurate with the action required.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

The recent Conference of the non-aligned countries suggested that the programme of the special session of the General Assembly should include the setting of priorities and the drafting of recommendations in respect of disarmament. I would like to say that my delegation would support programmes or strategies designed to achieve general and complete disarmament tied to political commitments that are also concrete and binding.

My delegation would like to congratulate the delegation of Sweden on its country's co-operation for the conclusion of a total nuclear test-ban treaty, in presenting a working paper to the CCD on measures of international co-operation with regard to verification of the observance of such a treaty.

Ecuador also feels that the memorandum submitted by the Soviet Union at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly also contains useful ideas for the conclusion of concrete agreements to limit armaments and ensure disarmament. My country believes that nuclear disarmament can be achieved only with the participation of all States that possess nuclear weapons. If we want to encourage détente, if we want to continue the process of relaxation of tension at an international level, the serious, responsible and positive participation of all countries is necessary for the attainment of significant nuclear disarmament as part of the process of total disarmament.

One of the ways of avoiding the proliferation of nuclear weapons and of speeding up general and complete disarmament is by establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones, a matter on which the Treaty of Tlatelolco still stands as the shining example. The representative of the Soviet Union was very encouraging when he stated:

"The Soviet Union continues to be ready to co-operate with interested countries in creating nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace in different parts of the world. It is important, however, that such zones should be genuinely free of nuclear weapons and genuinely zones of peace in total conformity with universally acknowledged norms of international law."

(A/C.1/31/PV.20, p. 22)

We have therefore supported the resolution that recalls that the United Kingdom, the United States, France and the People's Republic of China are already parties to Additional Protocol II for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, which appeals to the Soviet Union to sign and ratify that Additional Protocol to the

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

Treaty of Tlatelolco. For the same reason my delegation will also co-sponsor any draft resolution which calls for the immediate cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. This is a matter of grave concern to us, particularly those of our countries that border the Pacific Ocean, the mare nostrum of the peoples on our side of America, of Asia, Australia, New Zealand and so many others. For the waters of the Pacific contain basic resources that are the heritage of our people.

My delegation believes that we would be well-advised to recall resolution 3093 (XXVIII), in which the General Assembly recommended to States permanent members of the Security Council and those with a major economic and military potential to reduce their military budgets by 10 per cent from the 1973 level. The funds thus released should then be used to provide international assistance to developing countries through the appropriate machinery, within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with the targets set for the Second Development Decade. The study undertaken last year by the Group of Experts pursuant to resolution 3463 (XXX) is a further step towards the attainment of the possibility of a reduction of military budgets as a supplementary disarmament measure.

Another matter which is of concern to Ecuador is the question of limiting the export of conventional weapons. It would be wise to adopt international measures to regulate and control the international traffic in weapons. The Japanese suggestion on this matter is interesting because it would ask that studies should be undertaken on the present situation with regard to the transfer of weapons so that States will be moderate in the export and purchase of conventional weapons. My delegation echoes the support given by other delegations to this concept.

Ecuador subscribes to the objective of the horizontal non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The increase in the number of States that possess nuclear weapons endangers international security. The nuclear Powers should discharge the special responsibilities towards the international community arising from their monopoly position in this sphere. It is obvious that in this problem of horizontal non-proliferation we must bear in mind the legal principle of the sovereign equality of States. But we must not forget that the possession of nuclear technology does not necessarily mean progress or prestige for a State, because to possess nuclear weapons is tantamount to conspiring against the security of all. The matter lies in the fact that the idea of prestige and political influence is still confused with the possession of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

However, this picture is not entirely negative. The United Nations has made the slight progress in various aspects of disarmament that we must cling to and support. As positive achievements, I would cite the existing agreements: the Treaty prohibiting nuclear tests in the atmosphere and in outer space and under water; the Outer Space Treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction; the Treaty of Tlatelolco; the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; the Treaty prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed. We have, furthermore, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction and the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) between the United States and the Soviet Union, which deserve our approval and encouragement.

Another positive feature in our view is the existence of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), although we would like to see more results from its extensive efforts. We would, for instance, be gratified if the draft convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, which was prepared by the Working Group of the CCD and received such a favourable reception at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, were referred back as soon as possible to this Committee with the consensus of all the members of the CCD, in keeping with its negotiating capacity. It is for this reason that we have expressed our willingness to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4, together with Argentina, Mexico, Panama and Peru.

But in all this, as the representative of China so cogently put it in reiterating the call of the small and medium-sized nations, if there is to be disarmament, there must first be disarmament on the part of the super-Powers. It is also a subject of concern that today there exists the possibility of artificially producing earthquakes and cyclones or modifying the ocean currents, as though the scourges of nature, which particularly afflict the developing countries, were not enough to contend with. Accordingly, resolution 3462 (XXX) of the General Assembly is particularly timely when it mentions that "the ever-spiralling arms race is not compatible with the efforts aimed at establishing a new international economic order".

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

Because, or perhaps despite, what I have said, we reiterate our hope in the United Nations, perhaps as the last opportunity of understanding for action and, as far as disarmament is concerned, as the very *raison d'être* of the world Organization. All religions, all philosophical concepts, all political doctrines, all peoples in general, both today and tomorrow -- if there be a tomorrow -- will be judging us for the way in which we fulfil our responsibilities at this moment in international affairs. We will be judged both by what we do and by what we do not do.

The CHAIRMAN: I have been requested to announce that Upper Volta has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.1.

We have thus concluded the general debate on disarmament items at the current session of the First Committee. It may be of interest to representatives to know that we have had 94 statements in the debate, made by 83 delegations.

It has been rewarding to note that States Members of the United Nations attach ever-greater importance to questions of disarmament. One of the signs of this trend in the debate has been the high level of presentations offered by individual delegations. We have had the honour of listening to three Ministers for Foreign Affairs and five representatives of ministerial rank, while most other statements were made at the ambassadorial level. The debate was also attended by a number of high-ranking representatives from parliamentary quarters and members of specialized governmental agencies from a number of States.

On Monday, 22 November, as was decided by the Committee yesterday, we shall start a series of meetings devoted to introduction of draft resolutions already submitted, though not yet introduced, or those which will have been submitted by that date. The Committee will also take up discussion of the draft resolutions in question.

I now call on the representative of Saudi Arabia, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. AL-NUWAISSER (Saudi Arabia) (interpretation from Arabic): I shall be very brief. The representative of Colombia stated yesterday that my country was one of those that spend millions of dollars on armaments. I should like note

(Mr. Al-Nuwaissir, Saudi Arabia)

to be taken of my surprise at this. Why did he single out my country? Why did he choose Saudi Arabia? The fact that we are trying to purchase weapons is perfectly normal, if I mention what is happening in other countries, particularly in Israel. My country is ready to respect and always has respected the sovereignty of the countries of Latin America, for example, and particularly Colombia. Perhaps our colleague was influenced by certain propaganda that led him to say what he did. Perhaps he was swayed by statements that indicated that my country was arming itself, but by doing so he overlooked the aggression that is addressed against the Middle East and Palestine. I should like to tell the representative of Colombia that, rather than choose my country, he should have singled out another Member of this Organization, namely Israel, that is stockpiling weapons and has done so for many years.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Colombia, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. ZEA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): First of all, may I say that I am extremely pleased to receive the correction and comments made by the representative of Saudi Arabia in connexion with the words that I spoke yesterday. In the statement that I made yesterday I said that the data I was citing had been taken from the 1976 Yearbook of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), which indicates that the contracts of Iran and Saudi Arabia as of June 1975 for weapons from the United States amounted to \$4.3 billion. I wanted to stress those enormous expenditures and to link them to the petroleum dollars, since we know that those two countries are among the greatest petroleum exporters of the world. However, if there is any error in those figures, which were not mine but were culled from the SIPRI Yearbook, I must apologize to those countries, and I am happy to be corrected if I am wrong.

I should like to add that the general tenor of my statement was of grave concern over the immense amounts that are involved in today's transfer of weapons in the world. I did not specifically wish to point to all countries. We know well those that have problems of a war nature and therefore need to seek weapons

(Mr. Zea, Colombia)

constantly. But what is of great concern to all mankind is that that weaponry trade is endlessly spiralling and is consuming the wherewithal of the third world countries, which need all their monies and investments to combat the scourge of their own under-development.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia, but I would appeal to representatives not to prolong this debate. I think that the positions are clear and I should like to finish the general debate in a dignified way so I count on co-operation of representatives. I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

Mr. AL-NUWAISSER (Saudi Arabia) (interpretation from Arabic): I certainly do not want to cast any doubts on the figures which were mentioned by the representative of Colombia but the question I wish to ask is: Why did he choose Saudi Arabia and not Israel? That is all I ask.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Finland who asks to speak on a point of order.

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): I apologize for bringing up a point of order when the lunch hour and the weekend are approaching. I seem to have a fatal tendency always to keep this Committee for a few moments more than I originally planned on Fridays. As you may recall, I had the honour of making my first statement to this Committee on Friday, 5 November and the second one on Friday, 12 November. However, some of the points I wish to refer to have arisen in connexion with matters on which I had previously not planned to speak. In normal circumstances, I always prefer to speak in a planned manner and if possible on the basis of a prepared text. I hope that the Committee will be kind enough to listen to me for a very few minutes under rule 71 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, although my point of order is more by way of being a point of information.

This point of order arises from both of my previous statements, which I say again, were held on Fridays. The matter I am dealing with has to do with the question of the draft treaty on environmental welfare and I have asked to speak at this time to give a further clarification on that particular issue. Last Friday, I had to do so under the rule of procedure which specifies the rights of delegations in the exercise of their right of reply. That statement had to do with

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

the statement that the representative of Mexico had made on 9 November, if my memory serves me right. Today the delegations have received at their desks a paper under agenda item 45, entitled "Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques". I would draw the attention of the delegations to this paper and I hope it may not be out of order for me to read into the record the following introductory lines of that document, so that it will be adequately reflected in the verbatim records of this Committee:

"At the request of some delegations" (and my delegation as a sponsor of the draft resolution in question is naturally one of those delegations) "the Secretariat is circulating for information of members of the First Committee the agreed understandings of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament relating to certain articles of the draft Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques."

The reference, for the guidance of the delegations, is then given in parentheses, namely the Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, volume 1, Supplement No. 27, document A/31/27, and the particular pages which are referred to there, for easier reference for the delegations, are pages 91 and 92.

The purpose of this information paper is to throw a closer light on the matter under consideration. It is of some importance in our view to focus attention on the Report submitted by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in this particular context and to point out that that Report includes, besides a draft convention to prohibit environmental warfare and an annex concerning a consultative committee of experts, a number of understandings relating to articles I, II, III and VIII. I believe it is important to emphasize that these understandings were agreed upon by the Committee and that they form an integral part of the results achieved in the CCD even if they do not form an integral part of the draft convention.

Furthermore, the report contains a number of reservations. My delegation has seen fit to ask the Secretariat to distribute the full texts of the above-mentioned understandings as they have been agreed upon within the CCD.

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

This is why we have wanted to draw the attention of the Committee to the information paper by making this clarification and I am grateful that I have been allowed to do this under the rules of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting I should like to inform the Committee that there will be no meeting on Monday afternoon, and probably no meeting on Tuesday afternoon, but we shall take a decision on that on Monday morning. I intend to put some of the draft resolutions that have been submitted and introduced, or will have been submitted and introduced by then, to the vote or ask the Committee to take a decision on them otherwise, on Wednesday morning.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.