



UN/DA COLLECTION

FIRST COMMITTEE
17th meeting
held on
Thursday, 25 October 1979
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 17th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

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

- General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Jamal (Qatar)
Mr. Kane (Senegal)
Mr. Glaiel (Syrian Arab Republic)
Mr. Imam (Kuwait)

* 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.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/34/PV.17
29 October 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.00 p.m.

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

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): The multitude of disarmament items that have been placed before this Committee are proof of the extreme importance that the international community attaches to this complex problem. It also attests to the hopes that the world has placed in the United Nations playing an effective role in solving the most serious problem confronting mankind today. Most of the other questions dealt with by the United Nations concern the way in which man lives and the quality of his living conditions. But this subject that is submitted to us deals with the very survival of man. We must all recognize that the world of today is facing the most dangerous period of the history of mankind. For the first time man has discovered the weapon that might well lead to the destruction of the whole of humanity. There are in the world today enough nuclear weapons to kill a population equal to four times that of this planet. What the world spends today on armament exceeds by many times what is spent on health and education. Nevertheless the arms race has become more intense year after year.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

There are always new and sophisticated weapons more deadly and horrible in their effects on the inhabitants.

The world today is spending an enormous percentage of its resources and capacities on armaments, and this amount rises to about \$400 billion annually - which is four times what was spent on armaments 30 years ago. In 1978, the amount spent by the two super-Powers was 51 per cent of this total. We can well understand the dramatic dimension of this expenditure on armaments if we realize that there are 400 millions of hungry human beings living in the world today. The inevitable result was the enormous squandering of material resources, human potential and technical know-how that might well have been directed towards the economic and social development of mankind and the improvement of the lot of poor peoples in the different parts of the world. The rivalry for possession of weapons has had a most detrimental effect on the efforts exerted with a view to establishing a New International Economic Order, reducing the intensity of international tension, promoting co-operation among peoples and helping struggling and persecuted peoples to exercise self-determination and eliminating occupation and the domination of racist régimes.

While we discuss disarmament today - and before going into the details of the complex problem, I should like to define the positive results achieved since the issuing of the Final Document adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly. However, it is noted in the light of all the reports that have been referred to this Committee, that very little has been achieved so far and that there is a most urgent need to exert broader and more concentrated efforts. However, we do not feel that we have failed but hope that our Committee will contribute to significant progress towards the complete elimination of the risk of unleashing a new nuclear world war and towards general and complete disarmament, and the consolidation of the mainstays of international peace and security, in conformity with the principles of the Charter of our international Organization. Not enough time has elapsed yet since the end of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which itself was a turning point in the history of the efforts made in this field, and which gave the United Nations an important role to play in the field of disarmament, a role that did not really exist before that special session. But despite all

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

endeavours to achieve international détente and, furthermore, despite the signing of the SALT I and SALT II agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union, the spectre of nuclear warfare still threatens mankind. The SALT II agreement places a ceiling on many means of delivery of strategic attack weapons but does not restrict the manufacture of new nuclear weapons nor does it limit the production of more nuclear warheads as it does not bind other nuclear States. It will lose its significance if it is not followed by other talks leading to the conclusion of a SALT III agreement. Consequently, our Organization should request both super-Powers to ratify this treaty and pursue their negotiations to reach further agreement in this field.

My delegation has studied with satisfaction the report submitted to this Committee by the Disarmament Commission. The Commission successfully fulfilled the mandate entrusted to it by the tenth special session and mentioned in paragraph 118 of the Final Document, namely the consideration of the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme. The Commission discussed and co-ordinated the elements of the comprehensive disarmament programme. This will allow the Committee on Disarmament to discuss the wording of this programme next year. We are also satisfied at the suggestions that were contained in the report of the Commission concerning its programme of action for 1980, which it has not been able to examine in detail this year. Among these are the different aspects of the arms race, and more specifically the nuclear arms race, nuclear disarmament, reduction of nuclear stockpiles and of military budgets, and the channelling of resources allocated for military purposes to economic and social development, especially that of developing countries. The Committee on Disarmament, which the tenth special session established as a negotiating body, must therefore deal especially with two subjects which are among the most important and serious problems of disarmament, namely the ban on chemical weapons and the comprehensive ban on nuclear tests. But the discussions in the Committee and the replies it received from the negotiating States - the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom - though expressing their determination to exert further efforts towards that end, do not show that any real progress has been made yet on these two vital issues.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

We appeal to them for further sincere and concentrated efforts in this field with a view to enforcing the implementation of a comprehensive ban on all nuclear tests everywhere and interrupting all operations aimed at improving the quality and development of nuclear weapon systems, as we also appeal for radical measures to reduce stockpiles and means of delivery of such weapons.

With regard to the tremendous dangers to mankind inherent in chemical weapons, my delegation emphasizes once more the importance of reaching without delay an effective agreement on a comprehensive ban on the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their ultimate total elimination, as was done in the case of biological and toxin weapons.

We also attach great importance to signing a convention banning the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons. There are also conventional weapons which cause unnecessary suffering to civilians. For human and moral considerations, and in appreciation of any efforts exerted in the field of disarmament, my country is deeply interested in the success of the United Nations Conference on banning and restricting the use of traditional weapons causing extreme damage such as napalm and cluster bombs.

There can be no doubt that the constitution of nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world is one of the important measures taken in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

Items 35, 36 and 37 of our agenda deal with matters that my delegation considers extremely important; they are related to the constitution of nuclear-weapon-free zones in Africa, the Middle East and in south Asia. The resolutions of the OAU, of the Islamic Conference and of the non-aligned Conference, have recently emphasized the importance of making these areas nuclear free. Because of its national and its geographical location, my country is particularly eager that our area be spared the threat of nuclear weapons, and we are greatly concerned at the nuclear activity of both the racist régimes in occupied Palestine and southern Africa. We denounce the nuclear co-operation that exists between these two similar régimes, aimed at promoting their nuclear capability to serve their aggressive racist interests in our Arab region and in the African continent. Such activity and nuclear co-operation between the two said régimes not only threatens the two areas but also exposes international peace and security to the most serious dangers.

Terrorism is a compulsory element inherent in the nature of any racist régime. But when such terrorism reaches the stage of nuclear blackmail, the results become very serious for the whole world. The Final Document (A/S-10/2) of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, emphasizes in paragraph 63 the importance of the Security Council playing an effective role in creating a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. My delegation reaffirms the importance of the Security Council playing this role in imposing upon nuclear States guarantees and rules, and a clear commitment to prevent the transfer of any fissile or nuclear materials to the Israeli régime or to the racist régime in South Africa. The Security Council is also requested to play a role in eliminating tension in these regions by putting an end to occupation and ensuring self-determination for the Palestinian people and the people of Namibia. My country also attaches great importance to item 121 which is before the Committee this year concerning Israeli nuclear armaments. The whole world now knows that Israel does possess nuclear weapons. The world Press has affirmed it, as well as the reports of the Central Intelligence Agency and Israeli leaders have recognized it in their declarations.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

I am citing as an example the words of former Prime Minister Shimon Perez in May 1977, in a dialogue with Menachem Begin during a television debate: I quote the "Jewish Journal" of 20 May 1977:

"We have our planes, our tanks and our rockets, and we also have something in Daimona".

Daimona, in the Negev desert in the south of Palestine is the location where Israeli authorities set up a nuclear research institute and a nuclear reactor. What is that thing to which Shimon Perez was referring while speaking of planes, tanks and rockets, if not nuclear weapons?

We are not now discussing whether or not Israel possesses nuclear weapons. What the United Nations and especially the Security Council ought to deal with, is the elimination of the Israeli nuclear danger which constitutes a threat not only to the peoples of the area but also to those of the whole world. The Security Council must assume its responsibilities in safeguarding international peace and security, and provide sufficient and positive guarantees so that the peoples of the area shall not be subjected to nuclear threat.

The question of providing guarantees to non-nuclear States of the region has been awaiting a solution since 1966. The Committee on Disarmament received three working papers containing draft international treaties on the question. But there still are many difficulties preventing such a treaty from being reached. Consequently we appeal for further efforts with a view to reaching that important target.

My country attaches extreme importance to the initiative of declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. The General Assembly responded to the initiative of the non-aligned countries when they adopted resolution 2832 (XXVI) to this effect. We welcome the meeting held by the States of the region with some other countries, in July last in New York with a view to paving the way for the Conference on the Indian Ocean, and we trust that this session will give all the required importance to the results and recommendations of that meeting with a view to reaching a mutual understanding on the measures to be taken in order to implement the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace; this would serve the

interests of all the peoples of the area and promote international peace and security. We trust that this session will adopt a resolution declaring the 1980s a second Disarmament Decade, and that it will adopt, to this effect, the draft submitted by the group of non-aligned countries. This Decade will be necessary for assessing the results achieved during the first Disarmament Decade that was declared in 1966, and also to implement the tasks outlined in the first decade and make plans for the future. We also trust that the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament will be held in 1982 as the General Assembly decided at its last session.

Measures for building confidence among Governments and States play an essential part in the field of general and complete disarmament. The Government of the State of Qatar, convinced of the importance of this role and responding to resolution 33/91 B of the General Assembly, has determined the measures which it considers as helping confidence building, as contained in the Secretary-General's report (A/34/416) and among which we would mention:

- A commitment by all States to the principles of international law, respect for international covenants and agreements, and strengthening of the role played by international organizations, primarily by the United Nations;

- Reaffirmation of the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force;

- The settlement of international disputes by peaceful means and the substitution of dialogue for confrontation;

- Non-interference in the internal affairs of States, rejection of the principle of using force or threatening to use it against the sovereignty of any State, its regional security or its independence, and recognition of the full and permanent sovereignty of each State over its natural resources and all its economic activities.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

I shall conclude my statement by reiterating the words of His Holiness Pope John Paul II in the General Assembly when he said:

"The United Nations has proclaimed 1979 the Year of the Child.

In this perspective we must ask ourselves whether there will continue to accumulate over the heads of this new generation of children the threat of common extermination for which the means are in the hands of the modern States, especially the major world Powers. Are the children to receive the arms race from us as a necessary inheritance? How are we to explain this unbridled race?" (A/34/PV.17, p. 32)

Mr. KANE (Senegal) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, in response to your appeal I shall refrain from congratulating you in the customary manner. However, my delegation must express its satisfaction at seeing you, the representative of a small country, guiding the work of this Committee, which was thought to be the preserve of the great military Powers. We should like to interpret this as a sign of the willingness of these great Powers to take account of the views of small countries like ours in disarmament matters and also have them participate in the taking of decisions and in negotiations on armaments.

My country, Senegal, has always attached the highest importance to questions of disarmament and international security. A small country faced with the pressing task of economic development Senegal needs a peaceful international climate in which it can maintain its political independence and national sovereignty and concentrate its efforts on improving the standard of living of its people. Hence my country believes that the two greatest threats to the advent of a peaceful world are the race for nuclear and conventional weapons and the economic injustice afflicting the majority of the world's peoples.. These two dangers are linked in many respects, a fact which has been recognized by the United Nations General Assembly in many resolutions, in particular resolution S-10/2.

(Mr. Kane, Senegal)

In order to cope with these two dangers, Senegal has from the first days of its independence striven to work, thanks to its adherence to the philosophy of dialogue, towards the establishment of trust and good-neighbourliness with all neighbouring States, on the one hand, and the elimination of the risk of a world war and the establishment of a more equitable new economic and cultural order, on the other. For we believe that this is the only way to help bring about an international order guaranteeing the independence of all States and their free development in keeping with the values of their civilizations and their political and economic choices.

The special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament had aroused much hope, particularly with regard to a slackening of the arms race. However, given the current realities in international life, this optimism has to be revised somewhat. Indeed, one notices that press reports do not speak of disarmament measures but, rather, of the activities of the great Powers in deploying new weapons, such as, for example, the neutron bomb, modernizing old weapons and engaging in a great deal of publicity on various peace proposals. These facts are unmistakable signs that the arms race is continuing and that there exists a climate of distrust hindering disarmament negotiations.

The military competition in which the great Powers are engaged, particularly the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact, is today the most serious threat to the survival of mankind. For the sake of the imperative needs of national security, increasingly sophisticated weapons at ever more exorbitant cost are being accumulated. To what purpose? We are told that these weapons are not meant to be used but solely to deter. However, what nevertheless emerges from this practice is that these weapons do not prevent the manufacture of other even more deadly weapons.

In any case, how can one be sure that these weapons will never actually be used when today the joint efforts of the major States and researchers are designed to determine the most favourable conditions for their use? Through having to consider the use of these weapons, will they not eventually become accustomed to the possibility of their actual use and lose sight of the horror of a nuclear holocaust?

(Mr. Kane, Senegal)

The nuclear danger is not limited to the constant manufacture of nuclear weapons but is also present in aggressive policies tending to aggravate international tensions and speed up the arms race. Indeed, my delegation is one of those which are greatly disturbed at the establishment of interventionist forces to deprive certain peoples of the enjoyment of their natural resources or their political independence. It views with the same concern the deployment of fleets of warships in the seas of the world, armed intervention, through mercenaries or commandos, in the affairs of other continents in order to impose an ideology alien to them and, lastly, recourse to flagrant armed aggression against weaker countries.

This return to a kind of law of the jungle in international relations is a reflection of the rivalries of the great Powers for world hegemony. The risks inherent in it continue to be the aggravation of international conflicts, the spreading of the violation of human rights and the entry of small countries into the arms race in order to protect their national sovereignty and political independence.

It is to be hoped that the example set by Canada will be followed by all nuclear-weapon countries or those which share the secret of the manufacture of nuclear bombs either by voluntarily refraining from their manufacture or by refusing to sell to all those which might be tempted to possess the nuclear weapon the necessary expertise or material, such as the CANDU reactor, which could, as has happened in the past, be diverted to non-peaceful uses.

In this connexion my delegation was particularly struck by an article published this morning in The New York Times, which most members have read, which speaks of the less rigid conditions being imposed by the United States on the sale of technology that might lead to the manufacture of nuclear bombs. One of the paragraphs of this article reads as follows:

(spoke in English)

"Instead of its total opposition to the reprocessing of fuel or the development of breeder reactors, which run on plutonium, the report says, the United States is now trying to win international acceptance 'of the position that access to weapons-grade materials is appropriate for industrialized countries but not for developing ones'".

(The New York Times, 25 October 1979)

(Mr. Kane, Senegal)(continued in French)

This is particularly serious and a matter for concern for the developing countries because, if that article is true, it would represent a new and even graver type of discrimination because it jeopardizes the very survival of mankind.

With regard to disarmament negotiations, my delegation must say that it is not very satisfied at the results. However, we welcome the conclusion of the SALT II agreements by the United States and the Soviet Union. We hope that these agreements will be duly ratified and that they will prepare the ground for the conclusion of new agreements involving substantial cut-backs in nuclear weapons. We also view as a positive development the fact that the Soviet Union and the United States were able to submit to the Committee on Disarmament a treaty prohibiting the development, manufacture and stockpiling as well as the use of radiological weapons.

(Mr. Kane, Senegal)

However, we must again state our disappointment at the fact that the trilateral negotiations between the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty have so far given no concrete results.

Our anxiety derives also from an article published recently in which it is stated that according to an Agence France-Presse dispatch of 24 October, "on Wednesday the Soviet Union carried out an underground nuclear explosion in the Caspian Sea region". This is of great concern also to most countries that had hoped that we were moving towards the complete banning of all nuclear tests.

In this respect, we support the position of the Group of 21 of the Committee on Disarmament, which insists that negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty "should be initiated at the beginning of the next session of the Committee on Disarmament as the highest priority item". (CD/50, p. 2)

My delegation would also express its concern at the slow pace of negotiations on chemical weapons. We associate ourselves with other delegations in calling on the two super-Powers to conclude their bilateral negotiations as soon as possible and to present a draft treaty on the prohibition of chemical weapons to the Committee on Disarmament.

In this context, we welcomed the offer by the Federal Republic of Germany, in document A/34/56, to be host to an expert meeting on the verification of a ban on the manufacture of chemical weapons that would, at the same time, not jeopardize the interests of industry and research in general.

Turning now to the African continent, our Continent, I should like to convey to the Committee the deep concern of my delegation at the attempts of the racist régime of Pretoria to acquire nuclear weapons. If it were able to do so that would doubtless jeopardize the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in Africa and would be a stimulus to the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world. Furthermore, it would pose the problem of guarantees to be granted to the numerous African States which have signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty in the face of the nuclear blackmail which the racists in Pretoria would without any doubt bring to bear.

(Mr. Kane, Senegal)

Senegal hopes that the implications of the policy of the South African Government in the nuclear sphere have not been lost on the non-African members of the international community, and particularly on those that have permanent seats on the Security Council. That Council should, in keeping with its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security, continue to keep a close watch on the evolution of the situation in South Africa and be ready to take whatever measures are necessary.

My delegation has also noted the statements made by certain Western countries to the effect that they did not maintain any co-operation with South Africa which would enable that country to equip itself with nuclear weapons. However, we feel that we could be reassured only if South Africa signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and opened its nuclear installations to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency. So far it has refused to take such a step.

The Pretoria racist régime has not confined itself to attempts to introduce nuclear weapons on the African continent. It is also engaging in repeated acts of armed aggression against neighbouring African States, and, only recently, against Zambia. It is carrying on a colonial war in Namibia despite the condemnation repeatedly voiced by the international community. Moreover, it is continuing to arm itself to the teeth, thus helping to speed up the arms race in southern Africa.

The question of guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States is, in the opinion of my delegation, of highest importance. As we have just said, the designs of the South African régime, as well as rumblings from other parts of the world, and particularly from the Middle East, are a serious source of concern for my country. Moreover, as a signatory

(Mr. Kane, Senegal)

to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, Senegal, like many other countries, has renounced a sovereign right - and has done so in a most formal manner. We are therefore quite sure that, for reasons of equity, the nuclear powers should, for their part, undertake through a treaty never to use nuclear weapons against States signatories to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty or against States not possessing such weapons on their territory. The Powers should also undertake to guarantee the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, which are victims of the nuclear blackmail of the racist régimes.

My delegation, however, feels that the ideal solution to the question lies in the total prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and in their total destruction.

The question of the link between disarmament and development is of prime importance to Senegal. The President of the Republic of Senegal made this the focal point of his statement at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Subsequently, in keeping with the recommendations of the General Assembly on the dissemination of information on the arms race and disarmament, my country was host, from 8 to 10 February 1979, to a symposium on the relationship between disarmament and development. This symposium, perhaps the first of its kind ever held on African soil, brought together representatives from market-economy countries, planned economy countries and developing countries. On concluding their work, the participants published a final communiqué, which, inter alia, says the following:

"At the present time, all developing countries have to wage a second war for independence. This independence assumes the establishment of a New International Economic Order. This Order can be viable only if linked to a new world cultural order.

"To achieve these purposes, all developing countries insist on real disarmament at the world-wide level. This would open up colossal possibilities. Even a one perccent reduction of military budgets of the developed countries would make it possible to attain all the objectives set by the World Food Conference in the sphere of agriculture. A five per cent reduction of military budgets would have made it possible to attain all the objectives of the Second Development Decade. Lastly, a 10 per cent reduction would make it possible to increase by one-third the amount of investment in the developing countries, thus opening to those countries the path to true development."

The symposium was another opportunity for the developing countries to deplore the squandering of resources which the arms race entails and its inccmpatibility with the establishment of a New International Economic Order.

(Mr. Kane, Senegal)

At present arms expenditures exceed \$400 billion, while hunger, illiteracy and poverty continue to be the fate of two thirds of mankind. A billion people throughout the world lack water, and many die each year as a result.

The tragic situation in which mankind finds itself does not always give rise to adequate responses. For example, according to a recent report of the Arms Control Association on military and social expenditures in 1978, military expenditures in the world cost \$92 per inhabitant, whereas humanitarian programmes of the United Nations cost only 57 cents per inhabitant. The report goes on to point out that world arms expenditures have risen faster than the rate of inflation which, as we all know, is quite a rapid rate.

This squandering of resources is all the more scandalous in that it has been demonstrated that the current level of armaments is more than enough to assure the security of the principal protagonists in the arms race. For example, in 1974 one of the super-Powers had a stockpile of nuclear weapons that was capable of destroying the entire population of the world twelve times over. The excellent film "Boom" that was shown yesterday led to an almost apocalyptic conclusion -- one which none of us would ever like to see occur on this earth of ours.

We are now in the year 1979. We must therefore assume that that capacity for the destruction of mankind has risen in the meantime. This brief example shows, if there is need for proof, that the resources swallowed up each year in arms expenditures are hardly compatible with the legitimate security needs of the super-Powers. Is it necessary, in order to defend one's country, to have the capacity to annihilate the whole of mankind?

Insufficient emphasis has been laid on the fact that the arms race has a harmful effect in the developing countries, since the armament industry of the developed countries is seeking always and by every means to export its products to hotbeds of tension where they have an ideal testing ground.

Have not the MIGs, the SAM rockets, the Mirages, the F5s and tanks of the most varied types found a proving ground in the conflicts in the Middle East and in Indo-China? And what harm this arming of the smaller countries has done to them in terms of their external indebtedness and human resources diverted from productive tasks. The arms race, because of the squandering of resources inherent

(Mr. Kane, Senegal)

in it, is incompatible with the much-needed establishment of the kind of order which everyone prays for - a more equitable international economic order. It is a race that encourages power politics, the rejection of genuine negotiations and the plundering of the resources of the weakest States. In brief, it does not create a climate conducive to a successful outcome of the North-South negotiations and the redistribution of resources within and among nations.

The Dakar symposium on the relationship between disarmament and development dwelt, as we have said, on the question of the reduction of military budgets. The Head of State of Senegal, for his part, in his address to the special session of the General Assembly on 5 June 1978 proposed the establishment of a 5 per cent levy on military budgets, the proceeds from which would be paid into a United Nations fund for development aid.

This could be added to the fund which was proposed by President Castro, on behalf of the non-aligned countries, only a few days ago, providing machinery that would make it possible to ensure an additional contribution to it of \$300 billion over a period of 10 years. That is one means of adding to this fund designed to improve the lot of mankind.

It has to be noted with regret, however, that the great Powers - even those that make proposals on military budgets - have continued to increase their military expenditure at a rate of between 3 and 5 per cent per annum. Such an attitude is not encouraging.

Nevertheless, the United Nations has studied all the technical aspects of the question. A standardized instrument for publication has even been proposed - an instrument which should be improved, but which certainly would be useful.

We hope that the great Powers will be able to overcome their differences and will show their good will by freezing their military expenditures at their present current level. They could also reach agreement on reductions in military budgets in absolute terms as a first step towards systematic reductions.

(Mr. Kane, Senegal)

Member States of the United Nations have acknowledged, in paragraph 35 of resolution S-10/2, that

"There is also a close relationship between disarmament and development. Progress in the former would help greatly in the realization of the latter. Therefore resources released as a result of the implementation of disarmament measures should be devoted to the economic and social development of all nations and contribute to the bridging of the economic gap between developed and developing countries".

The United Nations has begun an attempt to define the concrete modalities of this link by setting up a group of experts to study the link between disarmament and development. My country, which is represented in the group, will make its full contribution. We hope that the work of the group will shed light on the mechanisms for the reconversion and the transfer of resources released by disarmament.

I should not like to conclude without touching on the problem of verification of disarmament agreements. We are pleased that the Secretary-General has set up the group of experts to study the technical, legal and financial implications of the creation of an international satellite monitoring agency.

My delegation, which had made a proposal on this matter, was very encouraged by the preliminary conclusions of the group of experts, which

"recognized the useful contribution which satellite monitoring could make to the verification of certain parts or certain types of agreements on the limitation of armaments and on disarmament".

Similarly, the group felt that the setting up in stages of an international satellite monitoring agency was technically feasible and that it would make it possible to limit and monitor the financial commitments requested of the international community.

What could be more optimistic? In the opinion of my delegation, this report would make it possible to press on with the work which has been under way. Therefore, we feel that the group of experts should do its utmost to present us with its final report before the second special session on disarmament, which is scheduled for 1982.

Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): Every year the General Assembly decides to carry forward certain items to the agenda of the following session. This is true today of the majority of the items now before us for consideration in the First Committee, although new items have been added which were dictated by world conditions and developments. We are glad that delegations have the opportunity to express their views and their attitudes on the various disarmament items at the time and in the way they consider appropriate in the framework of a general debate. My delegation will take advantage of this possibility today to make a comprehensive statement on certain items, and particularly on those regarding the implementation of the resolutions of the tenth special session and some past resolutions, reserving its right to make later on a complementary statement on certain other items.

One year, and therefore, one session of the General Assembly separates us from the tenth special session devoted to disarmament. My delegation, like other delegations had the opportunity in the course of the thirty-third session to express its views about that special session, which we think marked the most impressive collective effort made by the international community in its attempt to spare mankind the woes of a world war which, if it were to occur, would be terminal and destructive.

(Mr. Glaiel, Syrian Arab Republic)

My delegation expressed its satisfaction with the results of that special session, and the hope that its resolutions would be implemented in due course.

Today, more than ever before we may say that the special session did bear some fruits which, though not yet mature, promise a satisfactory harvest should the climate be appropriate.

The first thing I should like to mention is the work of the Committee on Disarmament, the new enlarged negotiating organ which held two long sessions in Geneva and produced in six months more than its predecessor managed to produce in long years of work. The meeting of the Committee in its present form at the time set for it by the Final Document, the rotating chairmanship, the access provided for all nuclear States to take part in its work, the effective participation of France, the establishment of its rules of procedure and of the priorities to be followed in its negotiations are all sources of optimism to my delegation, which hopes that the Committee will not now rest on these modest laurels and concern itself with secondary details while leaving important issues aside.

We hope, too, that the Committee will be brought into and will be able to play an efficient role in the negotiations - at present limited to three nuclear Powers - that are now going on on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban, and in the efforts being made to halt the nuclear arms race, in accordance with the documents submitted by the Group of 21.

We are gratified by the fact that priority was assigned to the question of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and also by the setting up of a special Working Group under the chairmanship of the representative of Egypt. This Group has carried out its task most effectively, having drawn up general guidelines and outlined the main components that must be included in international arrangements that would guarantee the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. My country shares the hope of all other non-nuclear-weapon States of obtaining effective guarantees of the non-use of nuclear weapons against them by major nuclear Powers and any other State or authority possessing such arms, especially adventurist and irresponsible régimes. Negative guarantees must above all

(Mr. Glaiel, Syrian Arab Republic)

be given to the non-nuclear States which have become parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and others that have refused to manufacture or possess nuclear weapons. Such a measure may constitute an incentive to other States to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to refrain from acquiring nuclear weapons. However, we remain firmly convinced that the best guarantee and protection is permanent general and complete disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, which the nuclear Powers should carry out. Those States have already stated that under certain circumstances they would refrain from using nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. But there is one question that arises in our minds which calls for an immediate answer, and that is, how can the security and safety of non-nuclear States be guaranteed against the use of nuclear weapons by other States or régimes not at present considered as nuclear although they do possess nuclear weapons?

In the course of the two sessions held by the Committee on Disarmament this year, numerous documents, working papers and drafts were submitted to it. Among these, the most prominent was the joint United States-Soviet Union document (CD/28) containing the text of the Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, with the Protocol annexed thereto and a joint statement about the pursuing of negotiations, and the statement about the subjects submitted to the Committee.

We trust that the Treaty will be ratified by the authorities concerned and implemented, so that further rounds of negotiation may follow which we hope will be more comprehensive so as to take into account the differing views and trends. It is high time for the international community to deal with disarmament and the dialogue concerning it in an international conference held to that end, so as to allow developing and smaller countries to play a more active role in these discussions and to ensure implementation of the principle of universal participation.

With regard to confidence-building measures among States a distinction has to be made between measures based on mutual respect and other measures designed to perpetuate occupation, aggression, racial discrimination and apartheid. My delegation wonders very often what sort of measures could

(Mr. Glaiel, Syrian Arab Republic)

exist between the aggressor and the aggrieved, between the criminal and his victim. The first step that needs to be taken towards establishing confidence-building measures is for certain countries and régimes to give up their policies and practices which limit the efforts of the international community directed towards détente, the settlement of disputes, disarmament and a better life. We look forward to the year 1980 and hope that it will be marked by the conclusion of the necessary treaties on radiological and chemical weapons, now that the preliminary attitudes of States have been made known at the meetings of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, which still has to examine the many suggestions submitted.

As we review the extent of the implementation of the recommendations of the special session devoted to disarmament and some of the resolutions of the thirty-third session, we cannot but express our thanks to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for his reports on the different aspects of the activities concerning disarmament, which were presented without delay and reflect his special interest in the subject.

(Mr. Glaiel, Syria)

The groups of experts for the study of the different aspects of disarmament started their work without delay and submitted some of the required studies.

As shown by the special session, by the many previous resolutions, and by the general debate that has just concluded in the General Assembly, the most important aspect of disarmament and the greatest benefit to be derived from it is the channelling of part of the savings resulting from the reduction of military budgets, into the economic and social development of poorer countries with limited resources. We trust that the wealthy countries that have big military budgets will attach great importance to the study on the relationship between economic and social development. This would be in keeping with the spirit of paragraph 94 of the Final Document, which provides for the "necessity to release real resources now being used for military purposes, economic and social development in the world, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries". Moreover, it would give practical effect to General Assembly resolution 71/33 dated 14 December 1978.

The Non-Aligned group did not miss this aspect at their summit conference held recently in Havana; the Political Declaration adopted at that Conference contains the following statement:

"The Conference noted that the arms race is incompatible with and contrary to the efforts directed to the establishment of the New International Economic Order. It underscored again that increasing material and human potentials were being wasted through investment in armaments, which considerably diminishes the availability of resources indispensable for development. The Conference again urged the immediate reduction of expenditures for armaments, especially by the nuclear-weapon States and their allies, and called for concrete measures of disarmament the implementation of which would progressively enable a significant portion of the resources so diverted to be used for social and economic needs, particularly those of developing countries."

(Mr. Glaiel, Syria)

President Fidel Castro expressed this view to the General Assembly with masterly eloquence that I could not hope to emulate here, and I need therefore not repeat what he said. The Secretary-General's reports also inform us of the activities of other authorities and organs entrusted with different tasks in the field of disarmament. The United Nations Centre for Disarmament, represented by its Assistant Secretary-General has exerted valuable efforts with a view to preparing studies, establishing contacts and submitting information about disarmament and disseminating such information. The programme of scientific scholarships in disarmament in disarmament was created in accordance with paragraph 108 of the Final Document and in implementation of resolution 33/71 K of 14 December 1978. My delegation is pleased that one of our diplomats received one of these scholarships. This will help us to gain technical experience in this field.

My delegation limited itself to speaking about disarmament in general, the achievements of the past years, the expectations of the world and what it still expects from the great Powers which have a special responsibility in this matter.

My delegation has decided to speak later on other issues related to disarmament in view of their great relevance to my country, to the suffering Middle East area and to international peace and security.

Mr. IMAM (Kuwait): The decision of the tenth special session to re-organize the Committee on Disarmament had given rise to great hopes that under its new mandate and method of work, the Committee would be able to achieve more rapid progress on the disarmament issues that it unsuccessfully grappled with in the past. However, casting even a cursory glance at the report of the Committee would show that this has not been the case.

The Committee has not reported any significant progress on the question of a nuclear test ban which had been given the highest priority. In the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the United States and the Soviet Union had committed themselves to a comprehensive test ban. Studies on seismic detection clearly show that it is now impossible to verify underground tests.

(Mr. Imam, Kuwait)

Failure to prohibit underground tests would corroborate the widely held belief that the partial test ban treaty was merely an environmental measure which, in the advanced state of technology enjoyed by the two super-Powers, made it possible for them to continue nuclear testing underground without in any significant manner reducing their nuclear potential. Nuclear weapon testing has played a crucial role in the continued development and refining of nuclear weapons.

The report of the Committee on Disarmament does not report tangible progress on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States that they will not be subject to the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Unilateral declarations by some of the nuclear Powers, which vary in terms and scope, do not provide the necessary assurances. The Security Council, whose permanent Members are all veteran nuclear Powers, is incapacitated by the veto system from offering such safeguards or guaranteeing their implementation. An international convention imposing binding obligations on the nuclear Powers may contribute to providing some assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States that they will not be subject to the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

On the question of chemical weapons, we have nothing more than a promise that the matter will be discussed next year. The biological weapons convention has been seriously undermined by the failure of the major military Powers, after years and years of negotiations, to reach any agreement banning the production and use of chemical weapons. It should be noted, however, that even if an agreement is reached on the destruction of chemical-weapon, stockpiles, many military Powers already possess such large stockpiles of chemical weapons that it will take many years to destroy them. This interval is likely to constitute a period of uncertainty and insecurity before and during the projected convention.

An encouraging sign may be the submission by the Soviet Union and the United States of an agreed joint proposal on the major elements of a treaty prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons.

(Mr. Imam, Kuwait)

It is necessary to ban new weapons of mass destruction at the most elementary stage before they have been tried and tested, especially before the military-industrial complex acquires a vested interest in their mass production and stockpiling.

Research and development for military applications is significant not only for what it has produced but also for the continuing momentum it gives to the arms race generally. In the super-Power competition, each side considers it essential to develop and produce whatever is technologically possible, on the grounds that the other side may do so. Research and development is the instrument through which the arms race between the two super-Powers ensures a never-ending escalation of armament levels.

One should not judge the Committee on Disarmament too harshly because serious disarmament negotiations are still conducted in the form of a dialogue between the two super-Powers. In all major respects, arms control has essentially failed. Three decades of United States-Soviet negotiations to limit the arms competition have done little more than to codify the arms race.

Some claim that there is a close link between détente and arms control. It is pertinent to note that it took nearly twice as long to negotiate SALT II than the agreements preceding it. The Vienna talks on mutual and balanced force reductions in Central Europe as well as the recent Soviet-American attempt to regulate naval forces in the Indian Ocean have yet to produce results.

(Mr. Imam, Kuwait)

Most arms control agreements were intended as cost-saving measures rather than as serious efforts to strengthen international security.

In a study entitled "World Military and Social Expenditures 1979", Mrs. Ruth Leger Sivard, the former chief of the economics division of the United States Control and Disarmament Agency, has this to say:

"The most buoyant section of the world economy is the arms business. Annual sales of military equipment, for both nuclear and conventional war, now amount to \$120 billion a year. Arms sales are larger than the national incomes of all but ten nations in the world.

"Military expenditures rose to an estimated \$425 billion in 1978, exceeding the rate of price inflation for the seventh year in a row. In actual outlays, world spending has quadrupled since 1960. Estimated in constant prices, the world military budget is about 70 per cent higher than it was in 1960.

"Governments spend more for space research than for health research, four times more for research on weapons than on energy.

"Military expenditures of developed nations rose by \$200 billion between 1960 and 1977, their foreign economic assistance by \$10 billion. In 1977 their military expenditures were 20 times larger than their development assistance."

On the link between disarmament and development, Mrs. Sivard has something weighty to say:

"Military spending often attracts political support on purely economic grounds. It is claimed to be a boon to the economy, a means of nation-building, stimulating investment, upgrading skills, adding jobs."

Mrs. Sivard rejects this contention, saying that:

"No analytical studies, however, have yet established a positive link between military expenditures and economic development in the broad sense. There is, in fact, a growing body of evidence pointing to retarding effects through inflation, diversion of investment, use of scarce materials, misuse of human capital."

(Mr. Imam, Kuwait)

The littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean held their first meeting last July. Our main object should be the formulation of a draft treaty to transform the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. We should like the littoral and hinterland States to be parties to the treaty and the major maritime users of the Ocean to be convinced of the necessity of respecting the provisions of the treaty by ratifying a separate protocol. Naturally, the goodwill and co-operation of the maritime users of the Indian Ocean will be crucial.

The rivalry among the military Powers in the Indian Ocean has not yet abated. A new ominous manifestation of that rivalry was the attempt to prevent the States concerned from freely disposing of their wealth and natural resources. The need for raw materials is becoming so great that interference may take the form of attempts to impose constraints on the freedom of the developing countries to dispose of their natural resources on remunerative terms and to use the proceeds to accelerate the economic and social development of their peoples. My Government firmly believes in the inalienable right of all the littoral and hinterland States to dispose freely of their natural wealth and resources, without any threat or pressure which is designed to shackle their freedom or to disrupt their self-sustained growth.

My delegation reserves the right to speak on other items at a later date.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.