

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records*



FIRST COMMITTEE
22nd meeting
held on
Wednesday, 2 November 1977
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 22nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary)
Vice-Chairman

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 33: ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ARMAMENTS RACE AND ITS EXTREMELY HARMFUL EFFECTS ON WORLD PEACE AND SECURITY: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 34: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 3473 (XXX) CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL I OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLAHELLOCO): REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 38: 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 (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 39: CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 40: 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 (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 41: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 31/67 CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL II OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLAHELLOCO) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 42: EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO IMPLEMENT THE PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DISARMAMENT DECADE (continued):

- (a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 43: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE DENUCLEARIZATION OF AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 44: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN THE REGION OF THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

/...

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

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

AGENDA ITEM 45: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH ASIA:
REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 46: 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 (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 47: REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-
GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 48: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A
ZONE OF PEACE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 49: CONCLUSION OF A TREATY ON THE COMPLETE AND GENERAL PROHIBITION
OF NUCLEAR-WEAPON TESTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 51: GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (continued):

- (a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY;
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 52: SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT:
REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL
ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 53: WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE
ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 33, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46,
47, 48, 49, 51, 52 and 53 (continued)

Mr. ERNEMANN (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Speaking from the rostrum at the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, Mr. Simonet, devoted the bulk of his statement to disarmament questions and, in particular, to questions of non-proliferation.

I shall confine myself to explaining here the main questions to which my Government attaches particular importance within the framework of the Committee's work.

The question of disarmament is, more than most others, a paradoxical one. On the one hand, the arms race has been developing speedily in the nuclear and conventional fields. Spreading by degrees, it has gradually come to affect all parts of the world, including those which had hitherto been spared from it. But, on the other hand, there are also encouraging signs. The magnitude of the problems and the dangers which threaten all mankind have had the effect of making people collectively more aware of the situation than they had been in the past. Similarly, there seems to be a more definite political will abroad than ever before.

Détente has become established in East-West relations. What we must do now is to consolidate and broaden this process, which is still too limited. Negotiations on disarmament have rarely been so intense. The convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is the most significant element in what I would describe as a new state of mind. Thus, it cannot be denied that, although the arms race has intensified, nevertheless nations seem more disposed than in the past to shoulder their obligations towards mankind. Undoubtedly, in the matter of disarmament more than in any other the path of negotiation is slow, and hope has often had to give way to disillusionment.

(Mr. Ernemann, Belgium)

The determination to achieve progress which Belgium seems to discern in the world should be based above all on constructive realism. Thus, in the words of my Foreign Minister in the General Assembly,

"... the disproportion between the enormity of the task and the paucity of results should not make us pessimistic ..." (A/32/PV.7, p. 37)

We must avoid both the trap of cynical negativism and that of sterile maximalism.

General and complete disarmament can only be a remote goal. In a world still largely dominated by competing interests, struggles for influence and ideological conflicts, security is as much a legitimate and paramount need as social and economic development, for which it is an essential condition.

General and complete disarmament will be brought about only on the day when the nations of the world truly feel themselves united by a common destiny. We have to concede that the international scene has not yet yielded any evidence to us of such an ideal situation despite the interdependence which is becoming daily more apparent throughout the world.

Security can exist at different levels of armaments. The highest level does not necessarily mean stronger security. On the contrary, the race to maintain equilibrium can at any moment give rise to destabilizing factors. If it is taken to extremes, it can only serve to aggravate the risk for mankind as a whole, and must in any case lead to the economic exhaustion of the protagonists. The beginning of disarmament lies in halting the arms race, particularly for the most deadly weapons. But apart from this general priority, defence constitutes a single whole. The final elimination of weapons of mass destruction can be conceived only in the light of a substantial reduction of conventional weapons, in a proportion to be defined according to the regions concerned, and beginning, here again, with the most powerful arsenals.

Belgium therefore believes that the question of halting the arms race in conventional weapons is something which should be faced here and now. The unprecedented development of arsenals of conventional weapons will in the end

(Mr. Ernemann, Belgium)

become an obstacle to nuclear disarmament. General and complete disarmament, if it can be contemplated only in terms of stages, is nevertheless a continuous and global process. It should aim at the gradual and balanced reduction of all armaments while at the same time providing an undiminished degree of security for each and every nation.

(Mr. Ernemann, Belgium)

The Belgian Government is pleased with the encouraging developments which have taken place in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), and it hopes that these negotiations which are in progress will be concluded without delay.

My Government also trusts that the trilateral negotiations on the halting of all nuclear tests will rapidly give rise to agreement on a general and final cessation of all tests. That will constitute a decisive step in the disarmament process, even if initially the agreement were to be limited only to the three present participants in the negotiations. That is an essential measure, without which any policy of non-proliferation could be only illusory.

My Government is also gratified at the resumption of negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons, and we hope that a treaty will be concluded at the level of the international community as a whole.

It has been said that disarmament is a continuous and universal process and that developments in this process affect the security and future of every State and every part of the world. While we do not wish to deny that the great Powers have special responsibilities because their military power alone is liable to determine, for better or for worse, the future of the world, disarmament is something which falls also within the daily responsibility of all States at their own respective levels and within their regional context.

Thus Belgium, together with its partners, embarked on the Vienna negotiations on force reductions in central Europe. Of course, more than four years of negotiations have produced no result so far, but my country intends to continue this exercise in the conviction that it must be possible to find a solution acceptable to all interested parties, a solution which would strengthen confidence and stability in a region where the stockpile of accumulated armaments is without equal elsewhere in the world.

But what goes for one region does not necessarily go for others. Conditions vary, as do the measures which may be contemplated. Each State should nevertheless ponder the possibilities offered by the regional approach in the light of the situation in which it finds itself, and on the understanding that in the final analysis each State individually will have to determine the conditions necessary for its own security. My country has already had occasion to set forth

(Mr. Ernenann, Belgium)

its views on regional disarmament. It is certainly not a matter of substituting a regional approach for a global approach, or of defining an order of priorities. As we see it, both approaches are necessary and they complement one another. Certain measures can only be conceived of at the global level, such as those which concern weapons of mass destruction. Others, however, can be applied immediately at the regional level, whether they be measures of reduction, control, stabilization or, quite simply, preventitive measures or those designed to increase confidence. Without recommending out of hand any particular type of measure for a given region - after all, it is for the States of the region concerned to do so - we must recognize that it is often easier to identify the complex problems of disarmament with all their implications, whether nuclear or conventional, at the level of a region or at the level of a group of States.

My delegation will of course have occasion to revert during this session to the question of the regional approach, to which it attaches great importance.

Much has already been said and for many years now about the link between disarmament and development. Now the question tends to be put in fresh terms. Essentially dominated in the past by the vicissitudes of the relations between East and West, the arms race must now also be viewed in its economic dimensions and in relation to the need for a just and humane world order. How could it be otherwise when the report of the Secretary-General on the effects of the arms race shows that military expenditures have taken up an amount of money so familiar to all of us? The vast amount and, even more, the constant growth of that figure, points to the size of the problem we have to solve, at a time when elementary economic and social needs continue to remain unsatisfied in the developing countries and also, for various reasons, in each of our countries.

To a growing extent Governments, including those of the richest countries, are faced with a difficult economic choice in the allocation of resources, which are inherently limited. States take the road of ensuring national security at the expense of development programmes, particularly in the economic and social fields. Perhaps that fact more than any other has helped to bring about this awakening that I have mentioned, but we should be careful about making any dogmatic statements. If disarmament can contribute, to an extent which

(Mr. Ernemann, Belgium)

remains to be verified in the initial phase, to the releasing of resources which could be made available for other purposes, there is not, a priori, any automatic link between disarmament and the increase of assistance for development. My country is convinced that the armament effort it has consented to make meets a need which cannot be considered to be superfluous, because it is a matter which affects its security. On the one hand, we subscribe to the idea of a balanced and controlled reduction in military budgets in circumstances which guarantee us an undiminished level of security. On the other hand, on the development level, without establishing any link between it and disarmament, my country intends to abide by its commitments and, if possible, to increase its assistance in the light of the resources available to it.

Belgium is pleased that a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is to be convened. We shall continue to participate actively in the preparation for that meeting, which we consider to be a fundamental milestone in the road to controlled, general and complete disarmament. But that session must bring together all the important military Powers, starting with the nuclear Powers.

Belgium sees the special session of the General Assembly not only as an opportunity to inject a new spirit into the negotiations on disarmament, but above all as a means of adopting and giving effect in the short- and medium-term, to specific, realistic and constructive measures.

The special session of the General Assembly should also deal with the structure of the negotiating instruments. In this area, the international community should be guided by a desire for effectiveness and fair representation. In this instance, the primary condition of effectiveness is to ensure significant and balanced representation. The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) therefore can only play a part when its structure has been adapted in such a way as to make possible the participation, at the very least, of all the nuclear military States.

(Mr. Ernemann, Belgium)

Last year, the Belgian representative's statement in this Committee did betray some signs of concern. We stressed the need to seek fresh momentum, which alone could make possible a halt in the trend, which had almost become automatic, towards an increase in world armaments. My Government notes that today there seems to be a much greater awareness of those problems in the international community as a whole.

I have pointed to a number of encouraging signs, but so far they represent only potential progress. It is up to each of our Governments to ensure that this heightened awareness can be reflected in specific measures that will constitute distinct stages along the long road to disarmament.

Mr. ABDEL RAHMAN (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic):

Since this is the first time I have spoken in this Committee, I am happy to congratulate the Chairman on his election to the chairmanship of this important Committee. As an African, I must say I am proud to see a distinguished African guiding the Committee's proceedings.

I am also happy to congratulate the two Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur and to wish all the officers of the Committee every success in the accomplishment of their duties.

Casting a quick glance at the agenda before us, we see how serious are the dangers threatening our world, because despite the successes of the United Nations in the last 32 years, especially in respect of the preservation of peace and security, there are still many unsolved problems. We would not hesitate to say that one of the most important of those problems is disarmament, with all its economic and social consequences and repercussions and its possible harmful effects.

The questions I have mentioned have been discussed year after year for a very long time, and they occupy an increasingly important place in the work of the General Assembly. But to our regret no material progress has been achieved since last year, when delegations spoke in this Committee. We are, however, among those delegations which feel that the time has come to take firm measures to eliminate this increasing danger. We feel that this session

(Mr. Abdel Rahman, Sudan)

should, more than any past session, contribute to the specific solution of disarmament problems. We could say that today there is a greater awareness of the fact that détente and not confrontation is the means of solving international problems. At the same time, we must say that all the peoples of the world feel it is necessary to end the arms race. That has, in fact, become their main preoccupation. In the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization, the Secretary-General says:

"... the United Nations cannot hope to function effectively on the basis of the Charter unless there is major progress in the field of disarmament. Without such progress world order based on collective responsibility and international confidence cannot come into being .. in an environment dominated by the international arms race, military and strategic considerations tend to shape the over-all relations between States, affecting all other relations and transactions and disturbing the economy."

(A/32/1, p. 12)

For its part, Sudan has always felt that the arms race and the resulting balance of terror represents a regrettable state of affairs, which is why we oppose it most strongly. The time has come to put an end to the arms race, because, apart from its inherent dangers, it absorbs vast resources, since annual military expenditures exceed \$550 billion, which imposes an abnormal burden on the world economy.

In his statement in the General Assembly a few days ago, the Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Sudan stated that the unbridled race to manufacture and stockpile deadly weapons is an important factor of tension in the world today. The developing countries note with regret that the great Powers are spending enormous sums on the arms race. In fact, arms produced last year cost more than \$300 billion, while millions of human beings in the developing countries are exposed to disease, hunger and death. It is therefore only natural that as a developing country we should emphasize the importance of agenda item 43, which relates to the economic repercussions of the arms race and its harmful effects upon world peace and security.

The question of disarmament and its relationship to economic development is being considered by virtue of General Assembly resolution 2602 (XXIV),

(Mr. Abdel Rahman, Sudan)

which, inter alia, recommends that consideration be given to channelling the resources freed by measures in the field of disarmament to promote the economic development of the developing countries. Time has passed, and those reductions have not been made. In fact, military expenditures are increasing steadily, while millions of human beings suffer hunger and are deprived of the most elementary means of existence.

Despite our limited resources - although of course we still have unexploited resources - we do everything in our power to improve the living standards of our people and to develop economically.

(Mr. Abdel Rahman, Sudan)

Our statement may seem somewhat contradictory if read in conjunction with the report of the Secretary-General in document A/31/1, where it is stated that for several years annual world military expenditures have been about \$300 billion, whereas the World Health Organization (WHO) has spent a very small sum to eradicate smallpox in the world - a sum insufficient to buy one modern supersonic bomber. The WHO programme has not been carried out in certain areas because of lack of funds. It is only natural that we should hope for disarmament, which would release the necessary resources for economic development, thus guaranteeing to all peoples a better life while reducing the dangers threatening the world as a result of the accumulation of weapons of mass destruction.

I must say that we have taken note with satisfaction of the working paper submitted by Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, which contains a proposal for an in-depth study of the economic and social effects of the arms race and should be studied in depth. We are convinced that the international community will be unable to establish a new world economic order so long as the enormous sums allocated to weaponry are not devoted to development purposes in the world and especially in the developing countries.

My delegation therefore asks that priority be given to the question of disarmament. While we await the achievement of general and complete disarmament it is necessary to proceed urgently to nuclear disarmament, which is the responsibility of all countries and particularly of the nuclear countries, which are all members of the Security Council. President Carter, speaking in the General Assembly at the beginning of October, gave us reason for optimism when he declared that his country was ready to reduce its stocks of nuclear weapons by 10, 20 or even 50 per cent. Mr. Gromyko, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, for his part, declared in the General Assembly that his country was prepared to discuss all nuclear disarmament questions seriously and in a business-like way.

I might refer here to the press reports concerning the statement made by Mr. Brezhnev on the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of the October Revolution that there is a growing trend in his country to accede to a treaty banning all nuclear-weapon tests. We are also gratified at the trend to impose

(Mr. Abdel Rahman, Sudan)

a limit on strategic weapons within the framework of SALT. We are also happy with the tripartite negotiations - with the participation of the United Kingdom - concerning the conclusion of a nuclear treaty.

We hope that these bilateral and trilateral negotiations will be successful, but we believe that there must be mutual confidence if they are to succeed. In addition, we expect a great deal from the special session on disarmament next spring. My country has the honour of being a member of the Preparatory Committee for that session. We are happy to state that we are prepared to spare no effort to ensure the success of the special session because we feel that it will pave the way for the convening of a world disarmament conference.

I should like now to touch on another question which is of great importance to us in Africa and in the Arab world. I am referring to the creation of nuclear-free zones. My country shares the concern of the neighbouring countries of the Middle East and Africa. We feel that plots against the region are being hatched from the north of the Mediterranean to the Cape, because of the existence of two racist States which co-operate with each other and are racing against time to establish a ring of terror through the threat of the use of nuclear weapons. It is natural that the interests of international zionism, represented by Israel, should be similar to the interests of the apartheid régime in South Africa. These two régimes co-operate closely in carrying out their expansionist racist designs at the expense of the Arab world.

From this rostrum we ask for the elimination of hot-beds of tension in the world and especially those represented by the existence of the racist régimes in South Africa and in occupied Palestine. We know that in the legitimate defence of their security the African and Arab States are compelled to spend enormous sums which they could devote to development. The situation has been changing rapidly and Israel and South Africa now have the possibility of expanding their military industry and increasing their production of conventional, nuclear and bacteriological weapons as well as other means of mass destruction.

(Mr. Abdel Rahman, Sudan)

We support the idea of creating nuclear-free zones and that is why we have asked that Africa be transformed into such a zone. Fortunately, many countries have gone along with us in this idea. The racist Vorster régime in South Africa is about to acquire a nuclear capability. This creates a very alarming situation which the United Nations should keep very much in mind. We want Africa to remain a nuclear-free zone and therefore we shall never agree that any State - and especially a racist régime - should acquire atomic or nuclear weapons.

We ask that all countries remain vigilant about South Africa's plans. The necessary countermeasures must be taken within the United Nations and elsewhere, in all other international bodies. In our view the Western countries must cease co-operating with South Africa, must submit their nuclear plans and programmes to the General Assembly, and must conform to the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency. We do not want the Middle East to become the prey of nuclear States. Israel in any event refuses to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty and this keeps our region in constant danger. We request that the Indian Ocean and southern Asia be declared zones of peace free of nuclear weapons.

I should like to refer briefly to the questions of the prohibition of the modification of the environment and the use of chemical and incendiary weapons. The prohibition of the use of environmental modification techniques is one of the accomplishments of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. As for chemical weapons, we hope that the efforts of the two big Powers will be crowned by success and that a treaty will be concluded prohibiting the use of such weapons. I do not wish to dwell on this question because what I could say has already been said by other delegations. Suffice it to say that all countries should become fully aware of the risks to which mankind is exposed and should set aside their personal interests and serve the cause of mankind, as is done by all peace-loving countries, through their adherence to the principle of disarmament.

Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia): Mr. Chairman, allow me to join previous speakers in extending to Ambassador Boaten, to you and to the other officers of the Committee the sincere congratulations of my delegation on your and their election to guide the work of this Committee. My delegation would like to express its conviction that under the experienced leadership of the Chairman, and with the assistance of the other officers of the Committee, we shall be able to perform the tasks assigned to us smoothly and successfully.

Our Secretary-General, when describing the present situation of disarmament, said in his foreword to the United Nations Disarmament Yearbook of 1976, dated August 1977:

"Over the years a number of international arms-control and disarmament agreements have been concluded but, despite their importance, they have not brought about a cessation of the arms race, nor have they led to progress towards real disarmament under effective international control. The world still bears the burden and the dangers inherent in a massive and growing arms race. Nuclear weapons capable of destroying the world many times over continue to be stockpiled, and their performance is constantly being refined. There is continuous accumulation of conventional weapons of ever-increasing sophistication. Under these circumstances, the maintenance of international peace and security, even the very survival of mankind, is in jeopardy". (p. iii)

My delegation fully agrees with that evaluation by the Secretary-General.

Indeed, no one can fail to observe that the arms race is continuing unabated. As a result, military expenditures have tripled during the past few years and are rapidly approaching the \$400 billion mark annually, certainly dwarfing the amount made available for development assistance. Even more frightening is the manner in which the vertical arms race is developing. New weapons and weapon systems of increasing sophistication and destructive capability are being developed. This constant and intensified arms build-up cannot but arouse global concern, not only

(Mr. Anwar Sani, Indonesia)

because of the danger inherent in it and the destabilizing effect it has on current disarmament efforts, but also because it hampers economic development, particularly in the developing countries, by diverting energy and resources which could otherwise be used towards meeting more urgent and basic human needs.

There is clearly a need for greater and faster progress lest the world fall behind in a race it simply cannot afford to lose. Feelings of frustration and seemingly insurmountable difficulties now surround disarmament. Nevertheless, we remain hopeful that the international community, now more than ever, will be prepared to make all-out efforts not only to agree on some lofty formulations of principles on disarmament, but to take concrete actions to implement them. My delegation is very much concerned about the success of disarmament efforts, and we cling to any glimmer of hope and any indication of progress even if all too often those hopes and indications fail to be translated into real progress.

Some recent developments have again rekindled the hopes of the world community. Among them is the decision of the General Assembly last year to convene a special session devoted to disarmament in 1978. We hope that the session will create the necessary momentum towards concrete disarmament measures. There is also a certain merit in the pronouncements made recently by the two major nuclear Powers indicating that significant arms agreements between them may well be at hand.

The problem is now how to turn these positive developments into what is called by the Secretary-General "a turning point in the effort to put an end to the arms race and ... begin the move towards real and substantial disarmament". (Ibid.)

Let me now touch upon some aspects which the international community is currently facing in its efforts to achieve disarmament. Priority goes to the two aspects of nuclear disarmament: first, to put a halt to the nuclear arms race between the nuclear Powers, and second, to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons to States not yet possessing them. Contrary to the experience of the past few years in regard to the two aspects

(Mr. Anwar Sani, Indonesia)

of nuclear disarmament, some hopeful signs are now appearing on the horizon. The negotiations between the two major Powers on the limitation of strategic arms, which have been stalled for some time, now appear to have made some headway. We hope that an agreement between the two major Powers on the limitation of strategic nuclear weapons is, as President Carter told the General Assembly, now indeed "within sight" (A/32/PV.18, p. 6).

Some positive developments have also presented themselves recently on another aspect of halting the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. In this regard mention must first of all be made of the new initiatives taken by the two major nuclear Powers in this area. Most helpful also was the flexible approach demonstrated by the Soviet Union during the recent talks of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) in Geneva regarding the complicated and long-standing problem of verification. Although other related issues are yet to be solved, we hope that this propitious moment will be seized so as to bring us one step nearer to the achievement of the goal of a comprehensive test ban. Another development of great importance is the decision of the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States temporarily to suspend underground nuclear-weapon tests without waiting for other nuclear Powers to accede to the future treaty. My delegation welcomes the decision of the Soviet Union to put a moratorium on nuclear explosions in all environments, including those for peaceful purposes, as has been announced by Mr. Brezhnev. In view of all those encouraging signs we sincerely hope that a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty will soon be within reach.

I should now like to touch briefly on the item submitted to this Assembly by the Soviet Union regarding the strengthening and consolidation of international détente. Indonesia has always been aware of the positive aspects of détente and has in fact always welcomed détente. We are therefore of the view that the initiative taken by the Soviet Union merits serious consideration by the Assembly. This is so despite the fact that some elements of the Soviet draft declaration, as has been pointed out by the Soviet delegation itself and by other delegations, have

(Mr. Anwar Sani, Indonesia)

been adopted earlier by various international meetings. Détente can without doubt enhance the co-operation between the two super-Powers, not only in their bilateral relations but also in regard to the search for solutions of important international problems. However, we would like to observe at the same time that this process does not always run parallel with the desire of smaller and medium-sized States to strengthen the role of the United Nations and to bring about a democratization of international relations.

We would also like to be convinced that détente would indeed be able to contribute positively to the establishment of a new international economic order. These and other related questions need to be clarified if détente is to be meaningful not only to certain countries or certain continents but also to the world at large.

With regard to the problem of horizontal proliferation, I would like to point out that the non-proliferation Treaty clearly sets out a balance of obligations between nuclear- and non-nuclear-weapon States. The non-proliferation Treaty not only obliges non-nuclear-weapon States to renounce their right to acquire or manufacture nuclear weapons or other nuclear devices, but at the same time charges the nuclear States with the responsibility

"... 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 ...". (Article VI)

(Mr. Anwar Sani, Indonesia)

There is undeniably sufficient reason for the growing doubt in regard to the effectiveness of the non-proliferation Treaty. One of the major causes of that concern is the fact that the obligations of nuclear Powers as set forth in article IV of the non-proliferation Treaty have so far remained largely unfulfilled. The newly acquired nuclear-weapon capabilities of certain countries are a further source of grave concern. No acceptable solutions have yet been found to such problems as the regulation of peaceful nuclear explosions and the accommodation of the legitimate interests of States in acquiring nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Furthermore, the security needs of those States which have renounced the right to acquire nuclear weapons have yet to be met. Of particular importance in that regard is the fact that the non-nuclear States have not received unqualified assurances from the nuclear-weapon States. Despite those and other misgivings, the Government of Indonesia, realizing the growing dangers of continued nuclear proliferation and in response to the appeals made by the General Assembly, has submitted the non-proliferation Treaty to the Indonesian Parliament for ratification in the expectation that the nuclear Powers will carry out their part of the bargain.

One issue closely related to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is that of the dissemination of information on nuclear technology. It is important that these two issues be dealt with separately. We mention this in the context of the restrictions on the transfer of nuclear technology which some nuclear Powers are attempting to impose unilaterally. We believe that restrictions on the dissemination of information on nuclear technology are futile and can only weaken efforts to implement the non-proliferation régime. Both the objective of non-proliferation and that of unhampered access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes can best be served by adopting guidelines which are acceptable to all parties concerned.

Another issue is the establishment of nuclear-free zones, which will contribute to greater progress in nuclear arms control. Indonesia has

(Mr. Anwar Sani, Indonesia)

supported the concept of nuclear-free zones, provided the zones are established on the initiative and with the agreement of the countries in the region concerned. Indonesia has therefore maintained that the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in a particular region should receive the solid support of all countries in that region.

The objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace have been steadily gaining wider recognition in the international community. Nevertheless, in order to accelerate implementation of the Declaration and regional disengagement by the super-Powers, more resolute political action would clearly be necessary. My delegation notes the bilateral negotiations between the two super-Powers on the question of their military presence in the Indian Ocean. We hope that this will lead to a reduction of that military presence in the region. My delegation hopes that those two Powers will in the future extend greater co-operation to the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in the implementation of the purposes and principles of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

As for my delegation, it continues to support the proposal for convening a meeting of the littoral and hinterland States as a first step in the implementation of that Declaration. That meeting should, in our opinion, be entrusted with the task of exploring further actions to be taken in implementing the Declaration by formulating a common viewpoint among the countries of the region. Furthermore, my delegation supports the idea of entrusting the Ad Hoc Committee with the task of making adequate preparations for the meeting.

Touching now upon the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to be held in May and June next year, I should like first of all to commend the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session, Ambassador Ortiz de Rozas, for the exemplary manner in which he has conducted the Committee's work and for the excellent report submitted by the Committee.

Earlier in my statement I referred to the decision taken by the General Assembly last year to hold the special session as one which it could be hoped would generate the necessary momentum leading to concrete

(Mr. Anwar Sani, Indonesia)

disarmament measures. Indeed, after more than three decades of dismal failure to control, limit and reduce arms, there is now a unique opportunity to take a fresh approach to this urgent task and, furthermore, to mobilize general support for action. One of the main tasks of the special session will be to formulate and adopt a declaration on disarmament. The task that lies ahead of the special session is extremely difficult; it is one which must be discharged successfully. My delegation hopes that such success will pave the way for further progress towards effective disarmament measures. It is for that reason that my delegation continues to support the holding of the world disarmament conference as a forum which would offer an opportunity for all countries to participate in negotiations and to take concrete disarmament measures acceptable to all countries.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate Indonesia's stand that, while we do not in the least doubt the extreme importance of bilateral, regional or other disarmament forums, the United Nations remains the sole universal forum for discussing and finding solutions for the basic problems of disarmament. Indonesia is determined to work together with other countries to strengthen the role of the United Nations in achieving a world without war - the ultimate desire of mankind.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): More than two-thirds of the Disarmament Decade has gone by, but the disarmament impasse continues and is even aggravated. Once again there is an abundance of agenda items on disarmament before this Committee, but these various items and even the resolutions adopted constitute only tiny foot-notes made by this world Organization to the world's armaments race, which by any measure is continuing and ever escalating. However, today there is one difference: we are in the very midst of constructive planning for the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Thus a main preoccupation in this Committee during this session will relate to that coming event in the life of the Organization.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

What is the significance of the special session? The significance is not that it will provide more and more effective technicalities in the disarmament process or that it will achieve many collateral measures encouraging the way to disarmament. We know very well that collateral measures and technicalities of disarmament have not helped in any way to arrest the arms race or even to curtail it. The importance of the special session is that it will provide the opportunity and the time for in-depth study of the whole problem of disarmament in its relation to the arms race, which is the scourge of our time.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The Charter of the United Nations, in its Preamble, speaks about "the scourge of war". Now we have another scourge, the scourge of the arms race, which has to be stopped. Many studies have been made on the consequences of the arms race; we have a recent study by the Secretary-General on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security. We have had many studies before about the effects of the arms race. We know very well the evils of it, but perhaps we do not quite realize that the arms race in itself, independently of a nuclear or any major war, is leading humanity to its doom because the arms race is a destructive, negative force. To base the security of the world on the concept of armament is a negation not only of the Charter of the United Nations, but of any positive thinking towards the attainment of security and peace, otherwise than through armaments in a confrontation, in a spirit of hostility and mistrust, which the balance of power implies. It implies the negativeness of such hostility, such mistrust, such hatred, that each side is ready with its arms to fly at the throat of the other side were it not for the deterrence of the other side's armaments.

Is this a logical world, in the United Nations era and in the nuclear age? Has this any relation to human thinking and human interests in the world of the United Nations where we sit discussing this subject?

This is a matter which requires more elaboration and a study.

In the meanwhile, before I come to the problem of halting the arms race, I should like to turn to some of the items before us, progress on which may prove encouraging to the special session and contribute, in some measure at least, towards making it a success.

The most promising collateral measure on disarmament now appears to be an agreement on a comprehensive test ban. We have had an agreement on a partial test ban, and we are very fortunate to have had it because testing in the environment was a threat to the environment by radioactivity. We have avoided that. But it

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

has proved impossible to proceed to a comprehensive test ban, although it was expected when the partial test ban was concluded that it would soon be followed by a comprehensive test ban. Why has it been impossible to arrive at an agreement on underground testing which, by all accounts, could be inspected and controlled? It was definitely refused on each occasion. The reason is that underground testing offered the only possibility of testing in the development of improved nuclear weapons. There was no desire at that time to stop the arms race in qualitative development of nuclear weapons by a comprehensive test ban treaty. But it is hoped that we may have reached a stage now in the United Nations - having regard to other circumstances to which I will refer later - when an agreement is possible on a comprehensive test ban. We therefore express the hope that the three negotiating Powers will make a special effort to reach agreement on a comprehensive test ban, or at least, a moratorium on all tests, until such time as the nuclear-weapon States sign a universal convention. Such a comprehensive treaty, or even an agreement on a moratorium of three to five years, would produce an auspicious climate for the special session. Indeed, some disarmament steps are needed in advance of the special session to give it the psychological climate so necessary to encourage other political decisions within the conference itself.

Another disarmament measure which would create a genuine atmosphere of hope would be the achievement of successful results in the second phase of the SALT negotiations. The world is anxiously awaiting the conclusion of the second phase and, indeed, of the third phase, considering that the reduction of studies in nuclear weapons would be a factor in halting or curbing the arms race and continuing the non-proliferation régime.

A third disarmament measure awaiting completion is the elimination of the production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons. While the production and stockpiling of all biological weapons was banned in 1975, the negotiations to conclude the production of chemical weapons have been hampered and unnecessarily protracted. The deadline of the special session may perhaps exert an influence on the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to reach agreement on a treaty on chemical weapons early in 1978.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

A further measure encouraging for the special session would be a moratorium on the production of fissionable material for weapons and the reduction of the relevant stockpiles.

These measures have become perennial items of the First Committee. However, the relevant negotiations now appear more hopeful and nearing agreement and every effort should be made towards their conclusion. Encouragement in this direction should be given by the adoption of strong resolutions in this Committee.

The Secretary-General's report on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race in document A/32/88 is significant, and particularly so in respect of the special session. In dealing with recent studies on the future of the world economy, the report notes the "remarkable omission" from those studies of any consideration of the implications thereof on the arms race. The report urges that both aspects of the economic problem need to be taken into account, namely, the volume of resources consumed in the arms race and the socially constructive uses to which they could and should be put. More efforts are needed to strengthen the link between development and disarmament, between the new international economic order which grew out of the second special session and the new disarmament order to grow out of the eighth special session. Such a study provides a needed intellectual base.

The Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation of International Humanitarian Law produced two valuable protocols, but unfortunately it did not result in any new instruments to ban indiscriminate weapons.

The effort to convene a world disarmament conference continues to be truncated, but perhaps may be less so after the special session.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

We hold that a world disarmament conference should be convened as soon as possible. That would be a continuation of the special session. If, however, the convening of such a world conference continues to be politically impossible, then we would hope that a second special session would be convened within three years or so, partly to assess progress and partly to continue what was done at the first special session.

The work of the Preparatory Committee for the special session has been very thorough, thanks to the skill and effectiveness of its Chairman, Ambassador Carlos Ortiz de Rozas, and I need not discuss it at length here, particularly since my delegation is a member of the Preparatory Committee.

As the Secretary-General concludes in his report on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race:

"Effective action to reverse [the arms race] would seem to presuppose some agreement as to where the problem lies and what it consists of".

(A/32/88, para. 171)

My whole experience in this Organization leads me to warn that all the disarmament measures on the agenda of this Committee or in the programme of action of the special session, even if they were by magic crystallized into multilateral agreements, could not stop the arms race or bring disarmament proper much nearer realization. For indeed, if the arms race is not stopped there is no prospect of disarmament and no meaning in disarmament.

The consequences of the arms race have been studied repeatedly, as I have already said, in this Organization and outside it. By now we have a clear picture of the results of this disastrous race and the waste in manpower and resources, and, indeed, the increase in tension and even the outbreak of wars. However, we have much less understanding of the causes of the arms race. We know its results; they are detrimental; but what causes the arms race? What is behind the arms race that makes it impossible to halt it, whatever we do? We have détente; détente appeared here and there, but not in the least with regard to the arms race. There must be some cause, and if we study the matter we shall find the cause. We may, in our mind, understand the causes, but that is not enough. There must be a study in depth of the causes, and if the special session does not proceed with such a study of the arms race it will somehow be wasting its time. There is the crux of the problem - the arms race.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Central to the whole question of disarmament is the halting of the arms race. Bilateral measures or even agreements on technicalities of the disarmament process proved of little avail to halt or to curb the arms race, as experience has so far shown. Seven multilateral treaties and 10 bilateral United States-Soviet Union agreements in the last 15 years have not to any degree slowed down the arms race, which continues on its own momentum and motivated by its own forces, irrespective of what is done with regard to disarmament efforts.

The arms race is, in the final analysis, but the natural consequence of the notion of "balance of power" as a means of maintaining international peace and security in our world of today. It is a negative notion that runs counter to all the concepts of a United Nations era and to the provisions in the Charter aimed at harmonizing international relations towards security and peace. True peace cannot hang from the thin thread of a "balance of power", implying hostility and hatred, but must be based on the positiveness of co-operation, understanding and love among nations. As long as we rely on the notion of a "balance of power" we shall live and die with the arms race. This notion of a "balance of power", the outdated relic of a time when the use of force and domination was the accepted norm in the relations of nations, has no place in our closely interdependent world of today. So many young nations that have attained independence and have been looking forward to a world of justice, co-operation and understanding, find themselves in the midst of a "balance of power" concept that constrains them to arm excessively at the expense of their development.

The time has come to go to the fundamental causes of the arms race and try to stop it so that disarmament may become possible.

Now this "balance of power" in our time, where there is a polarization of forces between two sides, is not the "balance of power" of the nineteenth century, where it was a matter of five or six Powers that balanced the power among themselves and ruled the world. It was not a world of justice, but it was a world in which there was a certain degree of order kept by those five Powers during the nineteenth century, called "this concert of Europe", by the balancing of their power without the need of an arms race.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Now, with the polarization between the two sides and their spheres of influence, any kind of "balance of power" means a "balance of weaponry", and such a balance necessarily implies an arms race to attain or to retain the balance. There is no other way to a balance but by an arms race, and of course every step forward in armaments by one side immediately results in a counter-step by the other side. Very often, on the pretence that the balance is threatened, one finds an escalation in expenditures of billions and billions of dollars. This is the kind of world that we live in and this is the situation that we have to deal with in relation to disarmament. It is becoming all too obvious, therefore, that so long as we continue to operate on the principle of a balance of weaponry, the arms race will continue to be with us in an ever-escalating tempo.

The new requirements in a world transformed by technology are quite different from the requirements of previous worlds. This has been recognized globally by the acceptance of the Charter, which decrees that there shall be no use or threat of the use of force. It implies an end to the concept of "balance of power". We have accepted this change by the Charter and those who were among the drafters of the Charter and the founders of the United Nations sincerely and faithfully believed that this new world of the Charter should and would apply. Now the universality of the Organization renders more compelling the Charter's order.

So let us be sincere in what we profess by complying with the Charter and approach the problems of the world through the spirit, meaning and provisions of the Charter. The Charter provides for international peace and security through positive co-operation in the actions of nations in meeting common dangers and common needs of the world community as a whole. These aims cannot be attained through self-centred and self-seeking pursuits on the part of

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

nations to the detriment of the whole international community. Such pursuit becomes in the long run detrimental to the individual interests of the nations concerned.

If the intellect of man proves unable to follow the course provided by the Charter for the conduct of nations, then the spirit of man must come into play to bring sanity and optimism through the application of ethical values and moral principles in the conduct of public affairs and in relations among nations.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

I must say that we feel some optimism with regard to such developments. I consider as a reason for optimism the fact that there has been an event signal in recent history in that the head of a nation has been overwhelmingly elected by the people on a platform of ethical principles and moral values in the conduct of public affairs and the relations between States. This is a signal event and should be so viewed, because it is a commitment by the leadership of a great nation that it will follow the wishes of the people for a policy of open diplomacy, putting aside the Metternichian methods of the past and forging ahead on the basis of honesty, openness and ethical values upon which alone the international community can find positive progress towards peace and the survival of our civilization.

But I must come back to the actual theme, that we must study not only the consequences but also the causes of the arms race. A very distinguished and eminent personality, the Foreign Minister of the Philippines, General Romulo, who, as representative of his country was a founding Member of the United Nations, in his statement in this Committee a few days ago emphasized the point I am making when he said:

"... the world does not have a reliable and adequate system for the maintenance of international peace and security which will give assurance to States that their legitimate security needs will be met in a disarmed or disarming world. ... nations cannot be expected to, and will not, disarm into a vacuum devoid of effective security guarantees."

(A/C.1/32/PV.11, p. 36)

Therefore I submit that, having regard to what I have said and to what the Foreign Minister of the Philippines also emphasized, a study is necessary not only of the consequences of disarmament and the relationship between disarmament and economic development, but also of the causes of the arms race and the interrelationship of disarmament and international peace and security.

In this connexion I should like to refer to the provisional agenda for the special session of the General Assembly which, in its paragraph 9, provides for:

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

"Review and appraisal of the present international situation in the light of the pressing need to achieve substantial progress in the field of disarmament, the continuation of the arms race and the close interrelationship between disarmament, international peace and security and economic development."

(A/32/41 and Corr.1, para. 17)

With regard to the interrelationship of disarmament and economic development there is the Nordic proposal for a relevant study which will be before the special session. Therefore my delegation, together with other delegations, will propose the necessary completion of the provisions of the aforesaid item on the agenda by a study of the interrelationship of disarmament and international security, which is more vital, indeed, because it goes to the very root of the problem of the arms race. The suggestion would be that such a study be prepared by the Secretary-General in consultation with experts; that a progress report by the Secretary-General be presented to the special session and that the final report, since the matter is very important and may require time, be presented not later than at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. I am not making a specific proposal now but the matter will come up in due course in this Committee.

Meanwhile I should like to add that on the work of this Committee, no less than on the work of the Preparatory Committee, will depend to a large extent the success or failure of the special session.

Mr. FALL (Senegal) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, speaking for the first time before this Committee I should like to extend to you my congratulations upon your election to the Chair of our Committee.

Another year has elapsed without any significant progress having been achieved in the field of disarmament. The two super-Powers, which account for 70 per cent of the world's military expenditures and whose military might exceeds by far that of all the other countries put together, pursue their unbridled arms race.

Recent trends show that those two super-Powers are perfecting their armaments while improving their precision and power. They have thus rendered nuclear war inconceivable. The fear of mutual destruction which had up until now had a restraining effect in the area of nuclear war is being eroded by the latest technological progress which has made possible a limited nuclear war.

(Mr. Fall, Senegal)

In the light of these developments we cannot but wonder whether the policy of détente as practised by the super-Powers is capable of preventing nuclear war.

If the United States and the USSR pursue their war preparations and undermine the concept of dissuasion by endowing themselves with the necessary means for a first strike, then all we can say is that the present policy of détente rests on very fragile bases.

According to SIPRI's estimates military expenditures at constant prices, have doubled during the last 15 years. There has been no slow-down in the pace of nuclear tests since the signature of the nuclear arms limitation treaty.

The danger of nuclear proliferation has considerably grown.

Instead of voicing an optimism that is in contradiction with bleak reality, the super-Powers should seriously endeavour to halt the arms race. The complete prohibition of nuclear tests would be an important step in that direction.

The question of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, the usefulness of which is still uncertain as compared to the risks they entail, should not delay the conclusion of such a treaty. It is to be hoped that the negotiations at present under way between the United States, the USSR and the United Kingdom will not lead once again - as in the case of the 1963 Moscow Treaty, to yet another partial prohibition.

The most pressing danger confronting the international community now is the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It increases the probabilities of war and renders the arms control measures meaningless. It is therefore necessary to consider urgently the best means of strengthening the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

While all States must have equal access to nuclear technology, it is necessary to prevent its being used for the manufacture of atomic weapons.

Countries exporting nuclear technology should require importing States to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or to subscribe to the IAEA safeguards system. In the latter case, those safeguards would apply to all their nuclear installations, whether imported or of local origin.

Nuclear technology exporting countries should also realize that it is the height of irresponsibility to be guided solely by commercial considerations where the dissemination of nuclear technology is concerned. It is this attitude that

(Mr. Fall, Senegal)

has enabled aggressive régimes like that of South Africa to acquire the means to manufacture atomic weapons, thus threatening the security of African States. By so doing they have indirectly helped to increase the possibility of a nuclear war in Africa. Therefore, today, more than ever the security of non-nuclear States must be guaranteed. In my delegation's view, the IAEA safeguards could not in themselves eliminate the risk of nuclear proliferation. Political measures aimed at dissuading States from acquiring and using nuclear weapons are called for.

Another very alarming question is the production and unbridled transfer of extremely sophisticated and lethal conventional weapons.

Consideration of this question cannot be divorced from the policies practised by producer countries who are both exporters and importers.

There is no doubt that the volume of transactions in conventional weapons would be smaller today if certain Powers did not use them as a means of extending their sphere of influence in their rivalry for world hegemony. Arms exports represent for such countries a means of ensuring the dependency of the importer country. Another category of countries which contribute to the marked increase in the supply of armaments is that of countries motivated by trade interests. These countries supply weapons of every kind indiscriminately, thus being instrumental in aggravating local conflicts.

In my delegation's view, the conventional arms race question has for too long in these past years been considered solely from the supply angle. If we truly wish to make progress in this field, it is high time we consider supply and demand together and impartially.

The establishment of a new international economic order has become one of the priority objectives of most countries in the world. It is the indispensable complement to the concept of disarmament. For there can be no peace unless we attack the roots of war. And the latter are to be found, in part, in the existing inequality between nations which leads to the aggression and exploitation of the small by the powerful nations. If we are to achieve a lasting disarmament, we must eliminate the causes of the arms race. In my delegation's view the chances for development of many countries would increase with the transfer of the considerable resources released by disarmament.

(Mr. Fall, Senegal)

This rapid review of the situation shows (1) that the danger of nuclear war has grown considerably in recent years, (2) that the arms race encompassing weapons of every kind has been intensified and extended to all parts of the world and (3) that the objective of general and complete disarmament seems more remote than ever.

And yet, an arms control system has been under consideration for 15 years and has led to the adoption of eight multilateral treaties and 10 bilateral agreements. Unfortunately, the main short-coming of all those agreements is that they deal with only minor or peripheral questions.

The fact that arms control should be given priority over general and complete disarmament appeared at one point in time the only realistic alternative to the frustrations resulting from the stalemated disarmament negotiations. Control over the arms race in order to maintain the balance between the principal adversaries; the prevention of the destabilization of the international military environment; the limitation of the risks of war arising out of situations of crisis and the reduction of human and material loss in the event of war could all contribute to the relaxation of international tension, promote mutual trust and awaken the necessary political will to trigger the disarmament process.

We must, alas, acknowledge that those hopes have been dashed. Only a relaxation of tension between the super-Powers appears to have been achieved. There is still no mutual confidence. By way of proof suffice it to mention the obstinacy with which the super-Powers avoid discussing true disarmament measures and confine their negotiations to secondary questions. In point of fact, the purpose of those negotiations has never been the reduction of armaments but rather the maintenance of strategic balance between the two countries.

Unfortunately, that balance is becoming daily more precarious. The numerous agreements which were so laboriously elaborated have been overtaken by the dynamics of technological innovation.

Paradoxically, negotiations tend to encourage the development of new destruction techniques which serve to strengthen the bargaining power of those who possess them at the negotiating table.

(Mr. Fall, Senegal)

The concept of mutual dissuasion on which the balance of terror rests is thus being undermined by the destabilizing effects of technological innovations.

We have therefore come to the conclusion that arms control agreements have not served to strengthen the security of the States concerned. Those agreements have in fact failed to a very large degree. That is why we must seek a new approach to disarmament.

Senegal hopes that the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will help us to get out of the rut and enable us to get down to serious negotiations. In a world threatened by paucity of resources and pollution, beset by hunger, ignorance and poverty and haunted by the spectre of a nuclear holocaust the arms race is a luxury we shall not be able to afford for too long. Disarmament affects all States, large and small. Security, today, can only be collective and must be based on co-operation.

My delegation has chosen to speak not simply to level a negative criticism at anyone or to minimize the efforts and agreements of the last 15 years, nor yet to question the sincerity of those involved, but rather to join those who have expressed concern at the growing dangers threatening us and who feel that what has been achieved in this field, as compared to what should be done is clearly insufficient.

We are sitting on a powder keg which the smallest spark could explode. We must rid ourselves of the illusions nurtured in us by an arms control system that is cut off from the objective of disarmament.

We must therefore cease taking small steps which give the impression we are merely marking time, and embark on true measures of disarmament. This is a task that the big Powers, prisoners of their rivalries and their mutual suspicions will be unable to undertake unless the international community supplies the required momentum.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): When I last made a statement in this Committee during the current debate on disarmament, I indicated the intention of the Ghana delegation to make another intervention in due course to highlight another aspect of the general topic of disarmament. Today, therefore I

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

wish to take the opportunity to focus the Committee's attention on agenda item 43, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa".

As members of the Committee are no doubt aware, this is not a new topic for the Committee. It has been the subject of debate since the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, when all States were called upon to respect and abide by the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa issued by the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity in 1964. Since then, the General Assembly has renewed its call annually on all States to abide by the important wish of Africa and Africans that their continent remain a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

The fact that this agenda item is still with us is a reflection of the fragile peace under which we continue to live and also proof enough that the fears of Africa have not been allayed. There is a persistent threat to our security which constitutes the basis for concern by the international community for Africa and international peace.

Many views have been expressed in this forum in the last few weeks concerning the threat posed to mankind by the rapid development and stockpiling of nuclear arms by a number of Member States of the United Nations. The threat that we face, a threat not only to international peace and security but, more importantly, to our very existence, has been described in such lucid language and in such great detail as I cannot hope to surpass in this statement. However, it is Ghana's view that the implication of the nuclear arms race for Africa will bear further emphasis today because Africa and Africans are in grave danger of extermination in the future because of a technological achievement that we are not a party to and which we have repeatedly voiced our dissociation from and condemnation of.

The denuclearization of Africa, that is, the freeing of the continent from a nuclear-weapons build-up, may be regarded as a local problem only by cynics, as its grave implications are such that it should properly occupy the attention of the international community. For it is now an accepted fact that the unleashing of a nuclear arms race in Africa is bound seriously to affect the security of the rest of the world, at a time when human ingenuity and efforts are seriously directed towards the creation of a peaceful and more secure world. In such a situation, each country becomes its brother's keeper in our comity of nations. The Ghana delegation submits, therefore, that our call for the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa constitutes or ought to constitute an integral part of the global disarmament programme that we are all seriously engaged in. Africa is a developing continent and may, at this time, lack the considerable wealth and sophisticated technology of the industrialized Powers. But it would be dangerous to accord the continent less consideration from the point of view of security because of our level of economic and military development. For, the destructive power of nuclear weapons and the current situation with regard to power relationships are such that an outbreak of nuclear war on the continent would most certainly have serious consequences for the entire world.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

About two decades ago, the international community embarked on the earnest task of curbing the proliferation of nuclear arms. That effort resulted in the conclusion of an international nuclear non-proliferation Treaty nine years ago. In agreeing to introduce such a Treaty to articulate the urgent and grave concern of the world over the development of nuclear arsenals on a global scale, the international community was motivated by an indisputable concern for a world in which ideological blocs were competing with each other for the capacity to produce the most modern and powerful means of destroying our common civilization. That Treaty, when it eventually became a reality, even though on a limited scale, also encompassed in its scope the security of the continent of Africa. Its signatories, as of now, include a number of African States which are entitled to the fulfilment of their wish to be secure. To permit the development and stockpiling of nuclear arsenals in Africa, therefore, constitutes a denial of the genuine fears that brought that important Treaty into force.

The history of the nuclear arms race is also the history of the ideological conflict of the two major blocs of our time. In this conflict, the survival instinct of the two super-Powers has driven them on to the accumulation of the most deadly weapons of mass destruction that threaten not only the direct contestants but even those of us who prefer to remain non-aligned. Such is our unwilling involvement in the ideological conflict that our continent has gradually become the jousting ground for the major Powers. I need hardly prove to this Committee that in some parts of Africa today, the competition between the ideological blocs for spheres of influence has become so keen that flames of African conflict have been fanned deliberately by foreign ideological interests at the tragic expense of Africans. The need to use more and more sophisticated weapons in the conventional wars that have broken out is increasing at such a rate that one wonders whether it will be long before the thirst after more powerful weapons will begin to be satisfied with the supply of strategic nuclear arms from abroad.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

But, the clamour of African States today for the denuclearization of Africa stems from an even greater and more immediate threat to the continent - that of the nuclear-weapon programme of the Vorster régime in South Africa. For many years, the world has speculated on the probability of South Africa's pursuing a nuclear weapons programme. But, today, we know for a fact that Vorster and his régime are on the threshold of acquiring a nuclear-weapon capability. It is an achievement that Vorster and his colleagues now openly boast of, and the world can no longer be left in any doubt about the possible introduction into our continent of nuclear weapons, a development which we have, since 1964, sought to prevent.

The logical question that arises from a recognition of the existence of and progress in the South African nuclear programme is, to what purpose is South Africa hurriedly seeking to equip itself with such deadly arms. Certainly, it is not merely to enter a prestigious arms race with the major Powers in Europe, for that would be expensive, senseless and suicidal. The obvious intention is to use such a possession as a bargaining instrument for the perpetuation of the socio-political system known as apartheid which the rest of the world has condemned and which we are committed to eradicating.

Secondly, the intention of South Africa in acquiring nuclear arms is to use them to terrorize the rest of continental Africa which continues firmly to support the struggle against the racism and racial discrimination that Vorster's régime stands for.

Thirdly, the eagerness of South Africa to develop a nuclear-weapon capability is to enable it to preserve its control over spheres of influence in southern Africa, that is, in Zimbabwe and Namibia. In this regard, the possession of nuclear weapons would enable it to fulfil its imperialistic aspirations at the expense of indigenous Africans.

All three reasons have been carefully considered, at one time or another, by the international community, and our condemnation of such aspirations and of the practice of the doctrine of apartheid has been unequivocal. Does it not stand to reason, under the circumstances, that Vorster and his fascist colleagues are being encouraged by some Member States of the United Nations to hold the rest of Africa to ransom? And can any Member State of the United Nations guarantee that Vorster and his régime will, when that country becomes a nuclear Power, respect the international safeguards that go with becoming a nuclear Power?

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

These are the grounds for the genuine fears of the Ghana delegation, and hence our call to the international community not to ignore the compelling arguments for the denuclearization of Africa. For the world will know no peace if we condone the nuclear-weapon programme of a paranoid régime that has proved itself incapable of balanced and rational judgement.

It is the view of my delegation that we, the Member States of this world body, should not shirk our solemn responsibility to remove the threat that hangs ominously over Africa in this nuclear age. Our condemnation alone of Vorster and his clique is not enough. Our words must be backed by resolute action if we are to save mankind and its achievements from the tragedy of a nuclear holocaust.

At this stage I wish to draw attention to the same concern expressed by the 117th session of the Executive Committee of the World Federation of United Nations Associations which met in Accra in March of this year. In a resolution adopted at that session, the World Federation of United Nations Associations condemned apartheid and also called attention to the dangers to world peace of nuclear proliferation as a result of the possession of nuclear weapons by the Government of South Africa. That resolution has been circulated as General Assembly and Security Council documents A/32/63 and S/12305, respectively, dated 24 March 1977. It is the pleasant duty of the Ghana delegation to recommend the provisions of the resolution to the serious consideration of all Member States of the United Nations because they represent the voice of reason in a world that is in danger of destroying itself.

For the reasons that I have just outlined, the Ghana delegation wishes to place some proposals before the Committee for its consideration on the question of the denuclearization of the continent of Africa. We believe that if the international community could concentrate its efforts in the direction indicated by the proposals, Africa and the rest of the world would be rendered safe from nuclear destruction.

First, we recommend that Member States of this Organization give their unqualified support to the Declaration of the Organization of African Unity on the denuclearization of Africa as a first step towards our common goal.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Secondly, we urge all States to desist forthwith from extending nuclear collaboration to South Africa, including the transfer of technology and personnel that could prove beneficial in the early development of a South African nuclear-weapon capability.

Thirdly, we strongly urge all States to place an embargo on the sale or supply of arms, including nuclear fissionable material and machinery, under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

And, fourthly, we call for international pressure to be brought to bear on South Africa with a view to preventing it from conducting its intended nuclear explosions in Africa.

The Ghana delegation has deemed it crucial to place these serious proposals before the world body in the hope that they will receive the serious consideration of all States, particularly the industrialized ones. A failure to act decisively in the matter would most certainly lead to disastrous consequences not only for Africa but also for the rest of the world. Ghana is certain that if nuclear weapons are allowed on the African continent, the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty and, therefore, the security of the world will be severely jeopardized, for the acquisition of nuclear arms by South Africa or any State on the continent is likely to lead to a fundamental reconsideration by some African States of their attitude towards the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty that represents one of the best hopes for mankind.

Permit me, finally, to observe that from the humble beginnings and **with the** advantages of the industrial revolution we have reached a nuclear age in an atmosphere of ideological conflict and racial bigotry. Our failure to distinguish reality from illusion, truth from falsehood, and racial harmony from deplorable racism may very well prove the most expensive mistake that mankind has ever made in history. In our view, we have the capability and the ingenuity to ward off the impending disaster and we must do so to save all that is noble in ourselves and in our world. We must all recognize that the situation in Africa today constitutes perhaps the weakest link in our collective security and should not therefore allow it to endanger global security unduly. To be successful in this endeavour, the Ghana delegation invites all Member States to respect and abide by the wish of Africa not to become the depot for the stockpiling of nuclear weapons.

Mr. N'DESSABEKA (Congo) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, first, on behalf of the delegation of the People's Republic of the Congo, I should like to take this opportunity to convey to you our warm congratulations upon your unanimous election. We should like to express our gratitude to your fellow officers and to the Secretariat which, we are convinced, will be of considerable assistance to you in your heavy responsibilities. Of course, the co-operation of my delegation goes without saying.

In the general debate of the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, many Heads of delegations devoted particular importance to problems of disarmament. That priority is the fruit of a growing awareness on the part of the public and of Governments of Member States. There has been some agonizing self-questioning going on in various quarters about where the development and improvement of arms, which are ever more sophisticated, will lead in the end.

The provisions of the United Nations Charter on this subject are disregarded but there are many countries which today genuinely and honestly want to see an effective halt to the arms race. Non-aligned countries succeeded at the thirty-first session of the United Nations General Assembly in securing adoption of resolution 31/189 B which provides for the convening in May and June 1978 of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to the question of disarmament.

This is a new move which will undoubtedly make possible the early convening of a world conference on disarmament. My Government is grateful to the members of the Preparatory Committee for their work.

But we have no illusions about the initial results of that special session of the General Assembly. However, we have the right to expect from its work certain positive definitions with regard to the stages and, particularly, the time-table of the progressive reduction of nuclear arsenals, assuming that the good faith which has been expressed actually does move from the level of intention to that of practice. My delegation has no doubt whatsoever about the wish of the Soviet Union to arrive at a treaty on that subject; there are many indications of that. As for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries, however, we cannot expect any major concessions because the system in which they are confined makes virtual prisoners of them.

However that may be, my Government will work steadfastly towards that goal which is, first, the cessation of the arms race by the **great**, medium-sized and small nuclear Powers; secondly, the reduction of nuclear arms; thirdly, the destruction of all arsenals of nuclear and chemical weapons; fourthly, the control by the International Atomic Energy Agency over all the arrangements mentioned above; and, fifthly, the reduction of military budgets.

(Mr. N'Dessabeka, Congo)

The special session devoted to disarmament problems should not be allowed to get bogged down and should not be allowed to lose its point, as has been the case with the last two special sessions devoted to the new international economic order. One of the difficulties which my delegation would like to raise is the diabolical obstinacy of the NATO countries, which in 1978 will be accumulating other means of destruction by acquiring and perfecting the neutron bomb. This is an additional difficulty, and is an indication of the scorn for our Organization on the part of certain Member States, which have been trampling relevant resolutions under foot with impunity and have been behaving really irresponsibly. The Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, stressed with regret the fact that the other party had called into question a substantial part of the Vladivostok agreements in his statement of 27 September 1977 to the General Assembly:

"Yet subsequently much of what was agreed upon has been called into question - not by us.

"What is the reason for this? The reason is clear. What is involved here above all is the decision of the United States to begin deploying a new type of strategic weapon, the so-called cruise missiles. Thus yet another channel has been opened for the strategic arms race and of course it would be naive to think that the other side would be a passive onlooker."

(A/32/PV.8, p. 71)

The Government of my country would like to see that the Vladivostok agreements are fully respected and that in the final analysis international security should be consolidated for the good of the whole of mankind. We are pleased to note the Soviet-American agreements and the Soviet-French agreements on the prevention of the accidental outbreak of nuclear war. However, there still remains a great deal to be done on the part of all the nuclear Powers.

My delegation considers that the Soviet Union and the United States should continue and increase their efforts to reduce their present differences with a view to concluding a second series of SALT agreements.

Since 24 November 1961 the General Assembly, in resolution 1652 (XVI) called upon all States to consider and respect the continent of Africa, including the States of the continent and all the island territories connected to Africa,

(Mr. N'Dessabeka, Congo)

as a denuclearized zone. General Assembly resolutions 2033 (XX) of 3 December 1965, 3261 E (XXIX) of 2 December 1974, 3471 (XXX) of 11 December 1975 and 31/69 of 10 December 1976 vigorously reaffirm these provisions. But unfortunately since 1961 South Africa has acquired the information, technology and the equipment necessary for the manufacture of nuclear weapons, of course with the complicity of the Western Powers.

Were it not for the vigilance of the Soviet Union at the beginning of August this year world public opinion would never have been alerted to the imminent explosion of an atomic bomb by the racist régime of Pretoria in the Kalahari desert. That is why, through our Foreign Minister, the Government and people of the Congo, on 27 September 1977, in the course of the general debate, pointed an accusing finger at the western Powers who actively assisted South Africa in acquiring its nuclear potential.

Once again the Soviet Union demonstrated that it was the true friend of the African peoples, and not the reactionary forces which govern the NATO countries, who show their profound scorn for the destiny of Africa as a whole by satisfying and supporting the demands for an increased military potential on the part of the Pretoria racists.

Proof of this was provided recently by the negative vote of the five representatives of NATO in the Security Council, three permanent members of which used their veto on Monday, 31 October 1977 with regard to the embargo on all forms of arms for South Africa. It is a shameful thing to swim against the current of history.

Africa must more than ever redouble its vigilance in order to defeat the procrastination of the Western Powers in the face of the machinations of Pretoria. The security of the African peoples is today seriously threatened. It would not be surprising, if tomorrow the NATO Powers were to perfect their most recent and most deadly discovery, the neutron bomb, to learn that the South African racists have also acquired this weapon. That is why my Government appeals to the common sense and sense of remorse of Western leaders to prevent the irreparable.

The wastage, through the enormous expenditure occasioned by the arms race, of resources which should have made possible the harmonious development of the Members of our Organization is becoming intolerable. Indeed, to devote

(Mr. N'Dessabeka, Congo)

\$350 billion exclusively to military purposes in 1976 shows that the economic and social development advocated by the United Nations remains a dream.

Yet in stating in 1969 that the decade beginning in 1970 would be a disarmament decade and the decade of the social and economic development of the countries of our planet, the United Nations meant that military budgets would be gradually reduced for the benefit of the well-being of the peoples of the world. A medium-sized Western European Power is going to triple its military co-operation budget - one could even say an armed intervention budget - in Africa in 1978. Its parliament is debating this question at the present time. That is a retrograde development. It would have been better advised to triple its budget for economic co-operation by adding to that budget the money earmarked for armaments. Thus its intervention in the economic and social development of Africa would have contributed to meeting food requirements and improving housing and highway building in that continent.

My delegation considers that the problem of economic development is linked to that of general disarmament. So long as nations have occasion to distrust each other the arms race will remain with us, something which diverts the attention of Governments from their primary concern, which is to ensure the economic and social development of their peoples.

My Government hopes that political determination will not be lacking at the forthcoming special session, which will be devoted to disarmament in May-June 1978 for the good of the whole of mankind.

The CHAIRMAN: I have no more speakers on my list for this afternoon but the delegation of Finland has asked to speak in exercise of its right of reply. I call on Ambassador Pastinen.

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): If I have asked to speak in the exercise of my right of reply under the appropriate rule of procedure, I have not done so in the polemical sense in which the right of reply is sometimes used, but rather in a constructive sense in order to provide a response to our colleague, the representative of Pakistan, with reference to a statement that he made last Monday.

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

On Monday, the representative of Pakistan made a statement in which he was good enough to refer both to my person as well as to the draft resolution which bears the number A/C.1/32/L.3 submitted by the Finnish delegation under agenda item 51. I shall address myself to the latter point, which is at issue in this Committee.

Let me say first that I sincerely welcome the remarks of the representative of Pakistan. I welcome them first of all because of the seriousness with which the delegation of Pakistan has studied our draft resolution. This seriousness in fact reflects the concern for the proliferation of nuclear weapons which - in the words of the representative of Pakistan - his delegation shares with my delegation. We know that this is a long-standing position of the delegation of Pakistan, and we appreciate it as such.

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

It is in that spirit, then, that I feel that my delegation owes the representative of Pakistan the clarifications which he is seeking both on the general purpose of the draft resolution presented by Finland and on certain specific formulations in it. Let me say, however, that our text should at this point be considered a working paper rather than a draft resolution in the classic sense. We have been receiving and are continuing to receive valuable suggestions from a great number of delegations. They will be adequately reflected in a revised version or versions of our draft resolution.

I welcome this opportunity to clarify the position of the Finnish delegation all the more because, obviously, the question of nuclear proliferation is certainly not a concern shared only by the delegations of Pakistan and Finland. It is truly a most momentous concern which is shared by all the countries represented in this Committee -- and in fact by the international community as a whole. That has been reflected in practically all the statements made so far in this Committee.

The most topical and alarming example of that concern has been expressed by the African representatives and the representatives of Sudan, Senegal, Ghana and the Congo have addressed themselves to the problem this very afternoon. That concern relates to the information regarding the possible plans of the Government of South Africa for acquiring a nuclear explosive capability. Nothing could be a more graphic example of the evil of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the dangers which it involves. This is the danger which my delegation for its part has tried to combat by assuming an active role in promoting the non-proliferation Treaty ever since 1968. This is the danger which our present effort also tries to combat. For our part we refuse to believe that it is too late. And even if it were, the international community cannot afford to go by default in the face of the problem. We must do and we must be seen to be doing our utmost to stop this evil from spreading. Vertical proliferation is evil enough; it should not be compounded by the evil of horizontal proliferation.

This is the reality of the danger; and that danger is not diminishing, it is increasing. I am sure that we all agree that every possible effort should be made to stop it. The question remains how.

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

To us the reply is straightforward. We think that the non-proliferation Treaty remains the best instrument for the purpose. The overwhelming majority of the international community think likewise. That is why they have become parties to the Treaty. Another instance of this is the announcement made by the representative of Indonesia in his statement this afternoon that his Government has submitted the non-proliferation Treaty for ratification -- an announcement which we warmly welcome. There are others who think otherwise. But if they do, certainly it would be reasonable to expect that they would show us the means by which our aim can be better accomplished.

The representative of Pakistan spoke mainly about the concern of many developing countries about access to peaceful uses of nuclear energy. That is a concern which my delegation fully shares with the Pakistan and, I believe, many other delegations, and it is reflected in our draft resolution.

My delegation recognizes the right of all countries -- both industrialized and developing -- to use nuclear energy for their social and economic development. Indeed, the exercise of this right should be facilitated by joint efforts. That is the spirit and the letter of article IV of the non-proliferation Treaty. In our view, there is nothing irreconcilable between the policy of non-proliferation and an intensified use of peaceful nuclear energy. On the contrary, we see them as complementary not as contradictory aims.

We fully agree with the representative of Pakistan concerning his assessment of the right of non-nuclear-weapon countries to make peaceful use of nuclear energy in the light of the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the non-proliferation Treaty. Indeed, as he stated, there is a clear balance in those documents between the provisions for the promotion of the peaceful use of nuclear energy in non-nuclear-weapon States and a commitment not to divert nuclear technology to military purposes. Also, as he said, the IAEA Statute assures the developing countries of special consideration for their needs. Those needs are strongly emphasized in draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3, which, in its operative part, calls for an essential increase of the technical assistance given by the IAEA to the developing areas of the world, within an effective and comprehensive safeguards system.

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

According to the representative of Pakistan, a premise of the Finnish draft resolution is, in his words, "that the spread and development of nuclear energy would be detrimental to the goal of non-proliferation". (A/C.1/32/PV.17, p. 28) In no way is that a premise of our draft resolution, and we believe that the draft makes this amply clear. We do think, however, that without adequate safeguards the spread of nuclear energy is indeed detrimental to the goal of non-proliferation. That is why we view non-proliferation safeguards as a positive, indispensable element in international nuclear co-operation. The role of safeguards is, to our mind, to facilitate, not to hamper, access to nuclear technology. The fact is that difficulties in the way of intensified international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy stem from a fear - and a justified fear - of nuclear proliferation. Once that fear can be dispelled - either by making the non-proliferation Treaty universal or, failing that, by other reasonable assurances against proliferation of nuclear weapons, such as full cycle safeguards - these problems should disappear. That is in fact the main thrust of our draft resolution and, more particularly, of its operative paragraph 6.

As to the concept of effective non-proliferation restraints in connexion with the export policies of nuclear supplier States, our position is straightforward and simple: effective non-proliferation restraints imply membership of the non-proliferation Treaty or the application of safeguards at least as comprehensive as those required by the non-proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

The representative of Pakistan pointed out that the stated objective of the Finnish draft resolution is to prevent any further - and I repeat the word "further" - proliferation of nuclear weapons and he justifiably raised the question what stage of proliferation the phrasing refers to. The word "further" used in our text is not meant to legitimize the acquisition of nuclear explosives by any country. The word "further" could be omitted altogether. The objective of the draft resolution is to prevent any - I repeat, any - proliferation of nuclear explosives.

My Pakistani colleague went on to say that in the draft particular concern is expressed about proliferation taking place in areas of the world where the maintenance of international peace and security are already endangered. Certainly that is the language of the third paragraph of the preamble to our text. But our approach, and the approach reflected clearly in the draft resolution, is a global one: any proliferation anywhere poses a threat to the security of the international community as a whole. That is expressed, we believe, with sufficient clarity in the second paragraph of the preamble. The perception of the particular danger of proliferation in areas of conflict should be an additional impetus to the international community to tackle proliferation. Need I repeat my point about South Africa?

To our mind, the reference in the draft to the security of non-nuclear-weapon States is more than "perfunctory", the word that the representative of Pakistan used. The objective of strengthening the security of such States is clearly and emphatically stated in the operative part of the draft. We are aware of Pakistan's interest and activity in this matter. My delegation endorsed the goals expressed in the draft resolution which was introduced by Pakistan at last year's Assembly session and which became resolution 31/189 C; we therefore voted in favour of that resolution. Furthermore, to our mind, draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3 clearly spells out the obligations of the nuclear-weapon States to reverse the nuclear arms race and bring about nuclear disarmament; it goes into considerable detail about that particular obligation.

As in our view the adoption of a system of safeguards is intended to facilitate the peaceful uses of nuclear technology rather than hamper them, we cannot agree with the view presented in the statement of my Pakistani colleague

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

that the adoption of our draft would give international sanction to the coercive and restrictive approach unilaterally adopted by some of the supplier States (A/C.1/32/PV.17, p. 29-30). On the contrary, the draft resolution purports to eliminate the fear of proliferation and thereby increase international nuclear co-operation. Further, it is recognized in the draft that common efforts are needed between suppliers and recipients to reach mutually satisfactory arrangements for the adequate supply of nuclear fuels and other materials and facilities for the implementation and operation of national nuclear energy programmes. In this perspective, we also regard the aims of the draft resolution as fully consonant with the aims of the recently launched international nuclear fuel cycle evaluation programme.

The representative of Pakistan drew our attention to a terminological imprecision in the draft resolution. He referred to the varying usage of phrases denoting the concept of complete nuclear fuel cycle safeguards (ibid., p. 28). His remarks are very much to the point. We have already taken note of his comments and will be revising the text to include more uniform and unambiguous language on that point.

In conclusion, my delegation is most grateful for the useful comments made by the representative of Pakistan, as well as for this opportunity his statement has offered to us to clarify our position and thinking. While we believe that the draft resolution that my delegation has presented to this Committee reflects the views and interests of an overwhelming majority of the General Assembly, we are prepared to develop the draft further in co-operation with other delegations.

The CHAIRMAN: As the representative of Finland has indicated, his statement was really on a point of clarification rather than a statement in exercise of his right of reply. But even had I been informed of what was to be said, I would have called on him, because it was a useful clarification.

Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan): I too do not consider the statement that I am about to make as a statement in exercise of my right of reply to what we have just heard Ambassador Pastinen say. It is not a subject indeed on which there need be any polemics or even argument between our two delegations.

I listened with great attention to Ambassador Pastinen's observations on the statement made here the other day by the Pakistan delegation. We are grateful to Ambassador Pastinen for the promptness with which he has responded to the concerns expressed by my delegation - indeed the concern - were felt not by my delegation alone but by many others.

My delegation shares and has always shared the concern of the Finnish delegation and of the group to which he belongs - indeed of the vast majority of the members of the international community - at the danger of nuclear proliferation in all its aspects and manifestations. As Ambassador Pastinen was good enough to note, from the beginning Pakistan has been actively engaged in finding ways and means of dealing with this problem in a world in which vertical proliferation continues unabated and has indeed intensified; horizontal proliferation may well have taken place since the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Ambassador Pastinen himself referred to the case of South Africa. That is dramatic evidence of the reality within which we have to operate. And South Africa is probably only one of the countries whose nuclear programmes are causing doubt and concern in a world in which nevertheless the needs of energy for economic and social development, particularly of the developing countries, cannot take place without recourse to nuclear energy, at least in the foreseeable future.

The danger inherent in nuclear energy can be controlled. Unfortunately, the consensus which has existed on this matter for the last 10 or 20 years seems to be in danger of being dissipated by some recent moves and trends. We were therefore gratified to hear that the delegation of Finland is not unaware of these negative tendencies, and that the draft submitted by it is not designed to further the coercive and restrictive policies which are being advocated in some quarters.

(Mr. Akhund, Pakistan)

We are also glad to hear that the Finnish delegation is revising its draft and is prepared to develop it further in co-operation with other delegations. At this stage, therefore, I shall not enter further into the substance of the matter. From the statement that we have heard from the Permanent Representative of Finland, it would seem that our positions are not as far apart as the draft would indicate.

In the same spirit, my delegation has prepared some amendments to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.3. We propose to circulate those amendments informally at this stage for comments. I hope that through consultations it will be possible to find a mutually satisfactory way of dealing with the subject during the current session.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that at this stage of our deliberations it was useful to have this exchange of views on this subject, though when we come to consider the draft resolutions the Committee will have ample time to discuss details.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.