



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 20TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MULLOY (Ireland)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

- General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Chua (Singapore)
Mr. Germa (Togo)
Mr. Eilan (Israel)
Mr. Mkwizu (United Republic of Tanzania)
Mr. Wu Zhen (China)
Mr. Moini (Iran)
Mr. Zaimi (Morocco)

PROGRAMME OF WORK

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/35/PV.20
30 October 1980

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

Mr. CHUA (Singapore): As this is the first time I have taken the floor, kindly allow me to congratulate the Chairman on his unanimous election to the high office of Chairman of the First Committee. I am confident that under his wise guidance and able leadership, we will be able to make good progress in our collective effort to make the world a safer place to live in. May I also extend my congratulations and best wishes to the other elected officers of the Committee.

Since the first two atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the world has entered a completely new era. With the advent of the nuclear age, mankind has created the ultimate weapon capable of destroying its very existence. The holocaust of nuclear war has been forcefully and vividly drawn to our attention by the representative of Mexico, Ambassador Garcia Robles, in his statement. A United Nations expert study has reported that the combined explosive power of the existing 40,000 nuclear weapons is already 1 million times that of the first-generation fission bomb that destroyed Hiroshima. We have also been told that there is enough destructive power in the nuclear arsenals to kill every man, woman and child in this world 10 times over. As if this were not enough, the super-Powers are continuing to increase their power of annihilation qualitatively and quantitatively.

The founding fathers of the United Nations set up this world body in the hope that mankind, having experienced the scourge of two world wars this century would eschew the path of force and resolve any bilateral and multilateral problems peacefully through the United Nations. They had hoped that the principles of international conduct as enshrined in the United Nations Charter would guide nations to live in harmony with one another. The 154 sovereign nations, representing the world's population, have pledged to honour and uphold the high ideals of this Organization.

(Mr. Chua, Singapore)

If each and every nation had adhered faithfully to the principles of the United Nations Charter, we would not be confronted with the present-day tense international environment, the spiralling arms race, the horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons, local wars and mutual distrust.

Why are we in this sorry state of affairs? How did we get ourselves into such a mess? Is it because we have not tried hard enough?

During this debate, we have heard representatives hurling charges and counter-charges as to who has been responsible for the lack of progress in disarmament efforts and it is clear that this forum is not going to get any consensus view on what has gone wrong. Notwithstanding this, permit me to air my delegation's view and to add yet another perspective to this very complex subject. As a non-partisan, non-aligned, small nation, which has no vested interest in any particular power bloc, we can afford to speak our mind more freely than others.

Over the three weeks of general debate, speakers before me have ably dwelt on various aspects of the 20 disarmament items put before this Committee. The general feeling is that while some progress has been made in confidence-building measures, there seems to be genuine disappointment at our failure to curb the nuclear arms race and the conventional arms race, and to prevent nuclear proliferation.

The most common reason cited for this poor performance is the lack of political will. Notwithstanding the dismal results achieved after decades of hard work and countless studies and resolutions, there seems to be unanimous agreement that the First Committee and the disarmament bodies must continue to plod on and hope for a major breakthrough in arms control and disarmament measures. The alternative of giving up in frustration is unthinkable because the very survival of the human race is at stake. The Singapore delegation fully shares these conclusions and joins others in appealing to the major Powers, particularly the nuclear-weapon States, to make greater efforts in arms control and disarmament.

(Mr. Chua, Singapore)

Détente and disarmament are two sides of the same coin. The two subjects are inseparable because disarmament efforts will be seriously undermined when there are tensions and conflicts. This is the conventional wisdom. But is this so? If we look back at the last 20 years of détente, we must be genuinely disappointed to note that, far from making progress in the general direction of arms control and disarmament, we seem to be heading down the dizzying and uncontrolled path of a never-ending arms race.

Some facts and figures will illustrate this. Global military expenditure has almost quadrupled in real terms from \$130 billion in 1950 to \$500 billion in 1980. In the conventional arms race, which has been increasing at the yearly rate of 25 per cent in the past five years, the military build-up has increased eight-fold compared to the 1950s. It is of particular concern to note that third-world military spending has been increasing much faster than the gross national product in the last 20 years, the former by about 4.5 times, while the latter has increased by about three times.

(Mr. Chua, Singapore)

It is also pertinent to note that during this period of détente one major Power has caught up with the other super-Power in the strategic nuclear race. I can understand and sympathize with this super-Power's wanting to achieve rough nuclear parity so as not to live in perpetual fear of being cowed and dominated by another super-Power. The international community had hoped that, having fulfilled its long-cherished dream, it would use its new-found strength to contribute to world peace and harmony. Instead, we have been disappointed.

We have been disappointed because this super-Power has in recent years caused, directly and indirectly, two major upheavals on the international scene, thus aggravating the already tense international situation. In 1978, it provided the necessary military and economic support to enable its ally to invade Kampuchea. In 1979 it used its own military force to intervene in Afghanistan. In the one instance it sought to justify its action by claiming that the armed intervention was justifiable because the Government which was overthrown had requested military help in accordance with an existing treaty arrangement. In the other instance, it was said that the intervention was requested in accordance with a treaty concluded two months after the invasion.

The international community has decisively rejected the justifications offered for these interventions. The overwhelming vote in support of the resolution initiated by the member countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) on the situation in Kampuchea is the best indication that the world has not been deceived.

I submit that the spirit of détente has been grossly violated, and this is the real obstacle to disarmament efforts. As I have said earlier, détente and disarmament are inseparable. Détente cannot be selectively applied in the disarmament field and ignored in other respects. By violating the United Nations Charter and carrying out armed aggression, the party or parties concerned carry the full burden of seriously undermining the developing environment of mutual trust and confidence, without which no progress in arms control and disarmament is possible.

(Mr. Chua, Singapore)

A super-Power and its allies have in this forum consistently expressed concern that détente is on the verge of breakdown. They have accused the other super-Power of engineering an anti-détente mood so that it could revert to a policy of strength. To demonstrate their peace-loving nature, they have proposed certain specific measures to reduce the danger of war. While this proposal sounds reasonable, we must question the sincerity of its proponent. If the super-Power concerned is sincere in its desire to control the arms race, the first thing it should do is to withdraw its armed forces from Afghanistan and persuade its ally to do likewise in Kampuchea. Only by demonstrating that it has no desire to expand its empire and dominate others can the process of détente be resuscitated. Détente is a total process and cannot be exploited selectively. Détente cannot exist while one of the super-Powers and its allies are embarked on military adventures abroad.

As long as that super-Power and its allies continue to occupy the territories of other States, as long as they continue to seek domination over others, we are compelled to conclude that their proposals to reduce the danger of war and other such proposals are manufactured for the purpose of deceiving world public opinion. One should judge them by their deeds, not by their words.

Let me conclude by emphasizing that without an atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence there can be no significant progress in arms control and disarmament. During the decade of the 1970s, the cold war between East and West subsided and the process of détente enjoyed a good beginning. In the last two years, however, one super-Power and its allies have dealt two fatal blows to the process of détente and have thereby added a new impetus to the arms race. If we are to return to the status quo ante, if détente is to be given a second spring, that super-Power and its allies must pull out their armed forces from Afghanistan and Kampuchea and demonstrate - by their deeds not by their words - their willingness to live by the principles of the United Nations Charter and by the laws of nations. The burden is therefore upon them.

Mr. GERMA (Togo)(interpretation from French): In speaking here for the first time, I should like first of all to extend to the Chairman, the congratulations of the delegation of Togo on his unanimous election to head this Committee. We are convinced that his wisdom and great skill are an earnest of the fruitful conclusion of our work. We also add our congratulations to the other officers of the Committee.

The importance of the problem of disarmament requires no further proof, since it is a vital question of the survival of all of us human beings on earth.

Indeed, it is a secret to no one that nuclear war would spell the inevitable destruction of all mankind. Were such a war to break out, it would not last for long - perhaps a few days at the most. But in those few days we would see the destruction not only of what men throughout the centuries have built with their courage, their perseverance and their faith, but also of man himself and all other forms of life.

Following the Second World War, with the atrocities of a time of barbarism and destruction unprecedented in history still fresh in their minds, men of goodwill created our Organization in the noble hope of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war. But that goal has still not been attained, for since the founding of the United Nations, war has never entirely disappeared from the surface of our planet. Yet none can deny the fact that a generalised conflict has thus far been spared us. However, local conflicts have multiplied, in Asia, in the Near East, in Africa and in Latin America.

Since the end of the Second World War, the world has also witnessed a headlong competition for the possession and development of both nuclear and conventional weapons. Astronomical sums are devoted to their manufacture and constant improvement. One hundred million dollars are daily invested in supplying nuclear arsenals. It is estimated that six countries are now capable of producing nuclear weapons, but that 18 others have such weapons stockpiled in their territories or possess missile launching bases.

(Mr. Germa, Togo)

Since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the great Powers have gone from the atom bomb to the hydrogen bomb and then to the neutron bomb. The destructive capability of these fearsome weapons has also increased, from a kiloton, or 1,000 tons, of TNT to a megaton, or 1 million tons of TNT. In the conventional field, new weapons have also been manufactured, in particular chemical, bacteriological and radiological weapons that are also weapons of mass destruction.

Thus, an infinitesimal portion of mankind is today capable of destroying all of mankind several times over in a few minutes.

(Mr. Germa, Togo)

May we venture to suggest what lies at the root of this arms race, whether it be nuclear or conventional.

First, if all these weapons are manufactured and constantly improved it is because of those who preach the various theories of deterrence in order to prevent the unleashing of a generalized conflict by establishing a healthy balance among the forces of destruction. Whatever credit one can give to such theories it does not seem to us that they should be regarded as a definitive means of ensuring peace among nations. They should be left behind as soon as possible if mankind really wishes to free itself from the scourge of war. The old Roman principle according to which he who wants peace should prepare for war was able for a time to provide relative calm, but sooner or later it leads to war. That war in the past was limited because the Romans and the peoples of that time made use of weapons that today are regarded as rudimentary. Present-day weapons tend more and more to have a world-wide impact and the nuclear bomb is powerful enough to wipe out the whole of mankind. We feel therefore that it cannot serve as a means of deterrence when we consider the consequences of its possible utilization, a possibility that can never be disregarded as long as that weapon exists somewhere on earth.

The community of nations should have no illusions while the age-old struggle between the sword and the shield continues, the sword always trying to get by the shield and the shield always trying to hold off the sword. That is why the manufacture of missiles leads to the manufacture of anti-missiles and then to anti-anti-missiles and we loop the loop with the development of anti-anti-missile missiles.

Secondly, the arms race flows from the will for domination and supremacy that seems to motivate the great Powers today. The problem would be relatively easier to resolve without that will for hegemony and leadership.

Thirdly, the relentless antagonism of the great Powers based on their ideologies still seems impossible to resolve at the present time. There remains only the solution of the peaceful coexistence of the two ideologies which today determine the division of our world into two blocs.

(Mr. Germa, Togo)

Fourthly, mistrust seems in the final analysis to be the strongest bastion that the whole of mankind will have to tear down in order to ensure effective disarmament, because despite all the reasons that we have just cited namely, theories of deterrence, will for domination and antagonism, it seems that the consensus today is in favour of general disarmament but mistrust constitutes the main obstacle to true disarmament. Each side wonders whether the other truly wishes to disarm. That attitude of fear is nothing new and has always characterized relations among human beings individually or at the level of nations. Perhaps it is time to change that now that mankind is threatened with total destruction by the nuclear bomb.

In the opinion of the Togolese delegation international peace and security cannot be achieved by means of a frenzied arms race and the precarious balance of terror. International peace and security cannot truly be established except as a result of general and complete disarmament and scrupulous respect for the legal and moral principles contained in the Charter of our Organization, especially the non use of force in international relations, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, and respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States. In that connexion, the present armed conflicts are not conducive to preserving world peace.

World peace and security will also result from an increase in nuclear-weapon-free zones. Pursuant to that line of reasoning the Togolese delegation attaches particular importance to the non-nuclearization of Africa and the need to prevent the racist régime of South Africa from acquiring nuclear weapons. My delegation makes a pressing appeal to the Western Powers that collaborate with South Africa in the nuclear field to put an end to that collaboration. The Togolese delegation also supports the denuclearization of Latin America, Asia and the Middle East. Indeed the partial denuclearization of certain regions of the globe and the establishment of zones of peace must not be considered as an end but only as one step in general and complete disarmament. That is why the Togolese delegation welcomes the very important turning point represented by the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Germa, Togo)

At that session that was convened on the initiative of the Movement of the Non-Aligned Countries including Togo, the international community became aware that disarmament is a vital problem for the whole of mankind and cannot be left in the hands of a few countries, however powerful they are. Positive measures were then taken to democratize the composition of the Committee on Disarmament and the conduct of that Committee's meetings. While being satisfied with that change, Togo maintains its total support for the negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms. Togo welcomes the conclusion of the SALT-II agreements. It hopes that those agreements will soon be ratified and then followed by a SALT-III agreement.

Togo gave its support to General Assembly resolution 34/75 that calls for the declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. We hope that that Decade will enable us to make notable progress towards our objective. In the view of the Togolese delegation the following measures are necessary in order to achieve general and complete disarmament.

In the nuclear field they are, in chronological order: the prohibition of the manufacture of new nuclear weapons and the prohibition of all nuclear tests; the limitation of nuclear weapons to their present level; the reduction of present stocks under mutual and international control; the total destruction of all nuclear weapons, also under mutual and international control.

In the conventional field they are: the immediate reduction of military budgets; a considerable and balanced reduction in conventional forces and weapons.

All this cannot be done without real political will on the part of the States concerned, first and foremost the great Powers, whose responsibility for the existence of these weapons is overwhelming. The laudable technical work that has been done on all sides by experts would be useless if it only served to provide a cold appreciation of the present situation as far as the arms race is concerned.

The problem of disarmament is a problem of human beings. Let them but get over their divergences and attach importance to what unites them and peace will be won.

(Mr. Germa, Togo)

We must honestly examine our consciences and ask ourselves the question of whether it is truly within human nature to allow children to die for lack of care and food when considerable resources are squandered in the arms race. Each year \$450 billion are devoted to armaments when merely \$20 billion are invested in the developing countries each year. More than half a million researchers and scientists are working in military laboratories, applying their genius to finding a weapon that will more radically still destroy the human race. A tiny part of those colossal resources devoted to armaments would be enough to save those who are suffering from the famine, disease and poverty that still afflict a great part of mankind. Mankind's resources must obey the principle of communicating vessels, so that the empty vessel will be filled by the overflowing one. The arms race is directly harmful to development. The world's resources are limited and since the production of armaments cannot continue by any other means, it will do so to the detriment of our daily life. We should not look any further to find one of the most important causes of the present world crisis.

Let the feverish concern about arms be done away with and let the resources thus won be devoted to the improvement of living conditions on earth. To do away with that concern the community of nations should earnestly desire to continue to build in the minds of men the foundation of what will make them more balanced and freer from fear. That task has been undertaken by the United Nations since its creation and it should constantly receive the support of States.

Togo, with the encouragement of its President, General Gnassingbe Eyadema, a man of peace and of dialogue, is ready to give its support and contribution to all that might serve to the establishment of trust among peoples, an indispensable element for real co-operation. That is why, adopting the conviction of its Head of State according to which the education of youth is an indispensable element for all harmonious development, the Togolese delegation, as it did at the previous session, has become a sponsor of the draft resolution concerning the creation of a University for Peace submitted by Costa Rica. We are convinced that nuclear and conventional disarmament cannot be achieved unless disarmament takes place in the minds of men.

The Togolese delegation thus makes an urgent appeal to all for the halting of the arms race and the establishment of a climate of trust in international relations propitious to a successful outcome of the disarmament negotiations currently under way, for the peace and prosperity of all.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): As this is my delegation's first substantive statement, I should like to associate myself with the good wishes extended to Mr. Naik and other officers of the Committee by other delegations in this debate.

In discussions on a wide range of items on disarmament such as those conducted in this Committee year in and year out my delegation has in the past chosen to address itself in its annual statements to one specific aspect of the problem, such as the role of science or the impact of petrodollars in the spiral of production, transfer and use of conventional weapons. This year we should like to turn our attention to the link between disarmament and security arrangements.

We are aware that a study on the relationship between disarmament and international security is being prepared by a group of experts. The submission of their report, however, has again been postponed and in its absence we permit ourselves to say a few words on the subject.

Disarmament or arms control has been the subject of multilateral discussions since the end of the First World War and has undergone several conceptual changes. In this respect, it is interesting to note the difference between the Articles of the Covenant of the League of Nations devoted to disarmament and the relevant provisions of the Charter. To start with, the Covenant saw in arms control a duty which each Member State undertook to perform on joining the League. There is no such stipulation in the Charter of the United Nations. Furthermore, the Covenant devoted the whole of Article 8 to disarmament. Its wording is worth recalling:

"1. The Members of the League recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.

"2. The Council, taking account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each State, shall formulate plans for such reduction for the consideration and action of the several Governments.

"3. Such plans shall be subject to reconsideration at least every ten years.

"4. After these plans shall have been adopted by the several Governments, the limits of armaments therein fixed shall not be exceeded without the concurrence of the Council.

(Mr. Bilan, Israel)

"5. The Members of the League agree that the manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objections. The Council shall advise how the evil effects attendant upon such manufacture can be prevented, due regard being had to the necessities of those Members of the League which are not able to manufacture the munitions and implements of war necessary for their safety.

"6. The Members of the League undertake to interchange full and frank information as to the scale of their armaments, their military, naval and air programmes and the condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to war-like purposes."

The Charter's reference to disarmament, compared to that of the Covenant, is somewhat less homogeneous and less imperative.

The difference between the attitudes of the Covenant and the Charter on the subject of disarmament is a reflection of two very different views prevalent in Europe after the end of the two world wars. After 1918 it was widely believed that the First World War was to a large extent the result of an arms race, notably between Germany and Great Britain, in the field of naval armament. After 1945, on the other hand, the causes of the outbreak of the Second World War were ascribed to the lack of military preparedness on the part of the Allies and the USSR which is supposed to have goaded Hitler, with his unbridled ambitions, into risking a military solution. In other words, after the Second World War the drafters of the Charter tacitly assumed the inevitability of the existence of armaments among Member States but saw in the balance of power a prerequisite for the introduction of arms control and, finally, disarmament.

This is not the place to enter into a comparative analysis of the two schools of thought about the role of armament as a cause of war. Suffice it to say that they were formed on the basis of a purely European experience in the first half of this century. The problem of the armaments race and its link with security in the 1970s and 1980s is not confined to Europe but is global and entails novel elements which did not exist in the past.

As stated before in previous debates in this Committee and in such publications as those of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), 135 wars have been waged the world over since 1945. From the commencement of the tenth special session, on disarmament, in 1979 until the present session,

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

four wars have been and are still being waged with varying degrees of intensity in Africa, the Middle East and South-East Asia. Each of these conflicts involves the super-Powers directly or indirectly and is of political and economic consequence not only to States adjacent to the area of conflict but to countries of other regions as well.

Before continuing, I should like to make it unmistakably clear that the remarks that are going to follow address themselves to the situation in the world as such and that they have no particular application to Israel. My country, in terms of industrial development, does not fit easily into any of the established categories. It is in some fields still a developing country and yet it is highly developed in others; though it imports arms, it is capable of producing locally much of its weaponry and spare parts for imported equipment.

This cannot be said of most countries which have been involved in military conflicts for the last 30 years. This is where we are facing a novel aspect in the proliferation of conventional weapons and the proliferation of wars. To understand fully the character of some modern conflicts one may have to compare them to those of the past.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

Both world wars were waged between opponents which by and large were themselves the producers of armaments, were highly developed industrially and possessed both the industrial and the logistical infrastructure to provide their armies at a rapid rate with regular replacements for losses suffered in combat. In addition, the armies of the two opposing sides in the two world wars also possessed the capacity to integrate new systems of weapons with great speed in the conduct of warfare.

In the case of so many of the wars that have erupted since 1945, both parties have found themselves, or sometimes one of the sides to a conflict has found itself, completely dependent on aid from exporting countries not only for the main instruments of war but also for spare parts. The growing sophistication of conventional weapons demands a highly developed technological infrastructure for their constant maintenance.

I should like to quote from an article by Mary Kalder entitled "Arms and Dependence":

"The increased vulnerability of all weapon platforms - ships, tanks, aircraft - calls into question the utility of equipment which is difficult to hide and expensive to replace. In addition, modern equipment entails considerable logistical problems.

A squadron of F-4 Phantoms, for example, requires an inventory of 70,000 spare parts to be kept operational under wartime conditions." Almost the same considerations apply, no doubt, to the maintenance of a MIG-21 or 23.

It can therefore be said that hand in hand with the growing sophistication of conventional weapons goes their transfer to an ever increasing number of recipient countries which are not always in a position to provide for their adequate deployment or use in case of war without continued aid from supplier countries. The proliferation of sophisticated weapons all over the globe serves, therefore, to create an illusion of military power, which itself endangers world peace. This illusion prompts States parties to a regional conflict to opt for military solutions instead of seeking pacific means of negotiations and settlement.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

My delegation is not really surprised that for the second year the group of experts established by the resolution of the General Assembly at its thirty-second session to undertake a study on the interrelationship between disarmament and international security has asked for additional time for the submission of its report. Its task is well-nigh impossible.

It was not clear what the group of experts was expected to determine. Surely the very existence of the link between security and disarmament is too evident to demand further inquiry. As to the nature of the link - that is to say, whether armament causes insecurity or insecurity causes armament - both propositions are equally true or untrue depending on the specific case under study. The application of artificial academic paradigms to a bewildering variety of situations will not advance the cause of disarmament or peace. In the light of the recognized constraints of United Nations politics, one can only commiserate with the experts, who have to find answers to questions too general in character to allow of an honest answer.

A more realistic approach is obviously needed and perhaps has been found in the framework of a regional approach to arms control. This approach is more promising, since most military conflicts are of a regional nature. To quote the representative of Finland in this debate:

"In arms control, the significance of a regional approach is rapidly increasing. Disarmament is, of course, of global interest. Yet in many cases politico-geographical conditions call for a regional approach. The global approach can be usefully supplemented with unrelenting and systematic efforts at the level of different regions and subregions. There is scope for independent action in each region. Lack of progress at the global level should not impede but, on the contrary, encourage this approach." (A/C.1/35/PV.10, pp. 12 and 13)

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

Thus, the study on all aspects of regional disarmament contained in document A/35/416 is a timely effort to deal with a problem of great complexity. Though the study itself is thoughtfully prepared and presented with great expertise, it is perhaps regrettable that so little space is devoted to the regional aspect of the control of conventional weapons. The reason for this is painfully obvious: there is little to report except for some promising developments in Latin America.

Both in the field of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and in the control of conventional weapons Latin America has set an example for the world to follow. One can only welcome the Declaration of Ayacucho, Peru, of 9 December 1974, its reaffirmation in 1978 and the meeting in Mexico City of August 1978, where the representatives from 20 Latin American countries discussed the establishment of a regional consultation mechanism relating to disarmament matters in the field of conventional weapons.

The time has come for us to admit that there exists no wonder drug to cure the ills of the arms race. The experience of the recent past clearly points in the direction of the establishment of confidence-building measures within the context of regional agreements. A pre-condition of the attainment of the reduction of tensions and of arms control within this framework is, of course, the existence of the political will on the part of the opposing sides in a dispute to come to terms with each other.

Two agreements, very different in character and in origin, the Camp David agreement and the military provisions of the Helsinki agreement, may perhaps serve as a guide for the future. Both the agreements between Israel and Egypt, which led up to the signing of the peace treaty, and the Helsinki accords contain clauses providing for the reduction of tension through military confidence-building measures. The other feature that these two agreements have in common and that should be of particular interest to this Committee is that both were reached outside the framework of the United Nations.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

At the beginning of my statement I spoke of States that suffer from an illusion of power as a result of the proliferation of sophisticated weapons and regretted that some Member States do not choose the way of pacific settlement of their disputes. The United Nations is largely to be blamed for being unable to provide parties to a dispute with the necessary machinery for negotiations, arbitration and conciliation. Had this Committee devoted its time to establishing the tools for peace rather than engaging in abstract discussion, it could at least have reduced the number of conflicts that have erupted in the past.

The Permanent Representative of Israel, in his communication to the Secretary-General of 16 April 1979, in expressing Israel's views on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, made the following proposals:

"With a view to promoting progress wherever possible on local and regional levels, it is suggested that the United Nations establish regional disarmament commissions, composed of all Member States in the region, the task of which would be to review ideas and proposals for intergovernmental regional agreements on arms reduction and control. These commissions should address themselves, inter alia, to finding appropriate solutions to two specific problems related to a 'comprehensive programme of for disarmament':

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

"(a) To create by common agreement of all Member States of the region the necessary modalities for the limitation of military budgets in conformity with resolution 33/67.

"(b) To implement within a regional basis the terms of the decisions adopted by the General Assembly during its tenth special session in paragraph 93 of the Final Document with reference to confidence-building measures." (A/CN.10/1, p. 28)

The group of experts and the Secretariat staff who were responsible for compiling the "Study on all aspects of regional disarmament" are to be congratulated for posing the problem in its proper context. If this Committee were to agree to the establishment of regional disarmament commissions, as suggested by the Permanent Representative of Israel, we would at least give Member States a viable alternative to hostilities, and give practical substance to Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. MKWIZU (United Republic of Tanzania): This Committee is meeting at a time when the United Nations aim of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war is overshadowed by the ugly reality that mankind could be wiped out at any time in a holocaust unleashed through accidental or calculated ignition of the nuclear arsenals accumulated by the super-Powers in the name of security. We are meeting at a time when the goal of general and complete disarmament is effectively mocked by the achievement of general and complete saturation of armaments. That is the ironic reality facing the United Nations after 35 years in search of world peace and security.

We owe our children an explanation for this tragic contradiction. They will never forgive us if the only thing we can hand over to them after our achievements in science and technology is assured extinction. But our children are entitled to live in peace and prosperity. They should certainly not be doomed to perish with us just because we are reckless enough to accept the bizarre notion that security can be achieved by sitting on the equivalent of 13 billion tons of TNT in nuclear explosives.

(Mr. Mkwizu, United Republic
of Tanzania)

In this sombre state of affairs, it is imperative that the international community act quickly to defuse the situation by upholding the purposes and principles of the United Nations, by implementing the decisions and recommendations of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, by resolutely undertaking negotiations leading to the conclusion of internationally binding agreements on disarmament in accordance with the priorities set forth by the Disarmament Commission and the Committee on Disarmament, by ensuring that the Second Disarmament Decade of the 1980s sees measurable progress towards the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control and by ensuring that the resources saved from the wasteful arms race are reallocated to the economic and social development of peoples - particularly in the developing countries.

Much has been said about disarmament and the special responsibility in this regard of the super-Powers and other States with large arsenals, about the linkage between disarmament and international security, about disarmament as an essential step in the establishment of a New International Economic Order, about the need, therefore, to synchronize and co-ordinate the programmes of the Second Disarmament Decade with those relating to the third development decade, and about the lack of political will to take the necessary steps to achieve previously agreed aims and objectives. It is therefore not the intention of my delegation to add unduly to the volume of literature on these matters.

However, in view of the serious threat that nuclear arms pose to the survival of mankind, the delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania views with deep concern the slow pace of the tripartite negotiations between the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The conclusion of such a treaty is a necessary step towards halting the nuclear arms race and would reduce the risk to our planet of further pollution from radioactive debris. To that end, it is our view that all nuclear-weapon States should participate in the negotiations. And since nuclear weapons pose a threat to all nations and peoples, it seems appropriate that the entire international community should be involved in this exercise through its multilateral negotiating forum - the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Mkwizu, United Republic
of Tanzania)

It was therefore with disappointment that my delegation learned that some countries have found it difficult to facilitate the establishment of ad hoc working groups on nuclear disarmament and the negotiations on a comprehensive test ban.

At the same time, my delegation hopes that the early ratification of SALT II will contribute significantly to the relaxation of tension between the two leading nuclear-weapon States, provide a basis for continued negotiation and dialogue on the prospects of SALT III and have a positive impact on the global problems of disarmament, particularly in relation to the comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The problem of arms race embraces the topical question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Second Review Conference On the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) wound up its deliberations recently. But the fact that the Conference failed to agree by consensus on the final document, containing an appraisal of the implementation of the Treaty, reflects the extent of the divergencies of views between the nuclear and the non-nuclear-weapon States. The lack of unanimity in appraising the implementation of the Treaty represented in no small measure the non-endorsement by the non-nuclear-weapon States of the notion that the non-nuclear-weapon States can forgo their option of development of nuclear weapons without viable alternatives in regard to the preservation of their security or without guarantees that they will at least have unimpeded access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Further, it casts doubt on whether the nuclear-weapon States, which were the architects of the Treaty, can continue to enjoy the confidence of the international community regarding disarmament matters unless they genuinely undertake to commit themselves to the policy of non-proliferation. Most importantly, it demonstrated that inherently discriminatory treaties can in no way be viable instruments for combating the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Mkwizu, United Republic of
Tanzania)

A direct consequence of the policy of proliferation of nuclear-weapon technology pursued by some Western countries has been the frustration of the regional aspects of disarmament, including the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace. Of particular concern have been the disturbing reports concerning the acquisition of nuclear weapons by the racist and apartheid régime of South Africa. The events of 22 September last year climaxed a sustained clandestine collaboration in the field of nuclear-weapon technology between that régime and some Western countries. Though it is said that there is no corroborative evidence to ascertain the detonation of a low-yield nuclear device by South Africa, the fact that there is equally no concrete scientific evidence to dismiss such a possibility, as shown in the report to the Secretary-General on the denuclearization of Africa, is a matter of concern to my country and to Africa as a whole.

Collaboration with that apartheid régime in the nuclear field not only constitutes a threat to international peace and security but also amounts to a flagrant violation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa adopted by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and repeatedly endorsed and supported by the United Nations. Such collaboration will remain a standing indictment of those who continue to see logic in sustaining that apartheid régime's total defiance of international opinion. As we stated last year in our intervention before this Committee, we shall continue to hold those Western countries and Israel responsible for that treacherous development.

My delegation supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace. The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America through the Treaty of Tlatelolco stands as an inspiring example to other regions. The recognition of the inherent uniqueness of a region, including the security prerogatives of States of that region, can contribute significantly to the establishment of a viable zone of peace. Yet, while it is desirable that the States of a given region undertake such a commitment, it would be pertinent to take into account the role of extra-zonal nuclear Powers since such zones are conceived in a non-nuclear environment.

(Mr. Mkwizu, United Republic of Tanzania)

The Indian Ocean, of which the United Republic of Tanzania is a littoral State, has been on the agenda of the United Nations for almost a decade now. However, in complete violation of General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) on the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, some Members of this Organization which are nuclear-weapon States have greatly stepped up their military presence in the Indian Ocean, using their differences elsewhere as a pretext. My delegation reiterates Tanzania's objection to the tendency on the part of the nuclear-weapon States concerned to extend their differences and military rivalry into the Indian Ocean region.

My delegation is concerned that recent events have further compounded the problems pertaining to that area and put the prospect of implementing the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace in further jeopardy. We regret that the USA-USSR bilateral talks on their military presence in the Indian Ocean remain suspended.

We are more concerned, however, that concerted efforts are being deployed to frustrate the decision of the meeting of the littoral and hinterland States which took place in July 1979 to hold a conference on the Indian Ocean in Sri Lanka next year. By invoking unrelated situations and seeking pretexts in existing international problems, some nuclear-weapon States are engaging in a calculated scheme to perpetuate their presence in the area and to frustrate the efforts of littoral and hinterland States to implement General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI). For if one were to argue that all efforts to find solutions to some problems should be halted until outstanding problems are solved, it would mean rendering this Organization meaningless.

In that regard, my delegation also takes this opportunity to welcome the initiative of the President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar on the convening at Antananarivo, late in 1981 or early in 1982, of a summit conference of all countries concerned with peace and security in the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Mkwizu, United Republic of Tanzania)

Our support for the establishment of zones of peace in South Asia, the Middle East and elsewhere is also guided by our conviction that such steps would strengthen regional security and contribute to comprehensive efforts to achieve disarmament. My delegation will continue to support the initiatives of the countries concerned in such an endeavour.

Non-nuclear-weapon States are entitled to security guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against them. To that end, the extension of such assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States would not only offer a disincentive to the acquisition of nuclear weapons but also demonstrate the commitment of the nuclear-weapon States to matters pertaining to international peace and security. My delegation has noted the declarations of the nuclear-weapon States in that regard. We appreciate the difficulties facing the Committee on Disarmament in working out a compromise formula. While such a compromise may eventually emerge, my delegation feels that an internationally legally binding instrument in the form of a treaty would be most welcome. My Government hopes to be able in the future to express its position on the contents of the proposed instrument.

The United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects concluded three weeks ago with a measure of success. The adoption of the general convention and three protocols on land mines, some incendiary weapons and non-detectable fragments was one of the positive developments of the year.

(Mr. Mkwizu, United Republic of Tanzania)

The Committee on Disarmament deserves credit for this breakthrough. Although these achievements do not cover all the aspects of conventional weapons, they nevertheless represent a significant step in the expansion of international humanitarian law applicable in armed conflict, and provide a basis upon which further negotiations on other aspects of such prohibitions can be conducted.

Further, it is with optimism that we welcome the participation of all the nuclear-weapon States in the work of the Committee on Disarmament. We feel that the modifications made within the Committee - its expansion and the participation of the five nuclear-weapon States, as well as the establishment of ad hoc working groups - should facilitate the work of the Committee.

Since this is the first time my delegation is speaking in the Committee this session, we wish to extend our hearty congratulations to the Chairman and officers on their election to preside over the deliberations of this Committee. There is no doubt that a man of Ambassador Naik's distinguished diplomatic record and negotiating acumen will guide our work to a successful conclusion. I pledge the fullest support of my delegation in this regard.

Mr. WU Zhen (China)(interpretation from Chinese): The very first chapter of the United Nations Charter already clearly stipulates that one of the purposes of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security and that all Member States should refrain in their international relations from the violation of the territorial integrity or political independence of any Member State. However, for some time, the Soviet hegemonists have been flagrantly trampling under foot the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, ignoring the norms of international relations and grossly violating the territorial integrity and political independence of other States. It relies upon its military strength to carry out a militaristic policy and the power politics of the strong preying on the weak. It openly propogates the idea that aggression is justified and has launched a most threatening offensive strategy on a global scale. It carried out armed aggression against and the occupation of Afghanistan and supported Viet Nam's armed aggression against and occupation of Democratic Kampuchea. These acts

have not only increased the danger of a world war, but are imposing upon the peoples of Afghanistan and Democratic Kampuchea the disaster and misery of war, which has brought incalculable loss and destruction of lives and property and made untold numbers of innocent people displaced persons. Further, the situation is all the more serious in that its aggression in Afghanistan and its support for Vietnamese aggression against Democratic Kampuchea are only two very important integral parts of its global strategy. It is attempting to use Afghanistan and Kampuchea as bridgeheads to step up the implementation of its strategy of a southward drive; it is stretching out its tentacles towards the Persian Gulf region, the vast Indian Ocean and the whole of South-East Asia, and it seeks to control the Straits of Malacca in order to merge them into one of its strategies for the two oceans. If its wild ambitions are realized, it will be self-evident what serious consequences that would bring for peace and security in the whole world.

While making every effort to carry out aggression and expansion, the Soviet Union has proposed at this session of the General Assembly an agenda item, so-called "Certain urgent measures for reducing the danger of war." It is not difficult for people to judge from the Soviet Union's practical actions how much real value this proposal has. As was pointed out by the head of our delegation, Vice-Premier Huang Hua, in his statement to the General Assembly, it has long been the established practice of the hegemonists to pursue aggression and expansion while trumpeting the slogan of "détente". Especially after each massive act of aggression, it always tries to strike a pose of defending peace and to launch a big "détente" offensive. For instance, not long after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, it proposed in 1969 that the United Nations General Assembly discuss the so-called question of "The strengthening of international security". Today, after it has occupied Afghanistan and also occupied Democratic Kampuchea through its agents, in an attempt to divert the attention of the people of the world and divide the forces of anti-aggression it has again resorted to its old trick of clamouring for "détente".

In its meticulously concocted draft resolution, no matter how it repeatedly asserts that "war would bring untold misery and sufferings to peoples" and that there

is a "need to take urgent measures for reducing the danger of war and strengthening international security", the fact remains that it is none other than the Soviet Union and the Vietnamese aggressors who have inflicted the catastrophe of war on the innocent Afghan and Kampuchean peoples, and that peace and security in southern Asia and Indo-China have been breached and violated by the flames of war and aggression started by none other than the Soviet Union and several hundred thousand Vietnamese troops. The wars of aggression carried out by the Soviet Union and Viet Nam against Afghanistan and Kampuchea pose the most real and serious threat to world peace and security. This cannot be concealed by any kind of clever oratory. If the Soviet Union is at all sincere about "reducing the danger of war", it should immediately implement the relevant resolution of the General Assembly and totally withdraw the aggressor troops from Afghanistan and Kampuchea. No urgent measure for reducing the danger of war could be more urgent than this one. One practical action is far superior to a dozen proposals. If the Soviet Union says one thing and does another and tries to continue to mouth clichés of sham détente and sham disarmament to confuse the public and cover up its aggressive actions, this could only further expose its hypocritical features and lead to exposure and opposition by peace-loving countries and people throughout the world.

Since the Soviet proposal evades the substance of the issue and only contains empty rhetoric about reducing the danger of war without any reference to the withdrawal of aggressor troops from Afghanistan and Kampuchea, the Chinese delegation will not participate in the vote on this draft resolution and will have nothing to do with it.

The Soviet representative, in several statements, engaged in utterly groundless slander and vilification against China. Several of his colleagues have adopted the same tone and followed his lead in levelling attacks against China. These slanders and attacks are absurd in the extreme. For example, they resorted to fabricating a myth and by means of innuendo accused China of waging an "undeclared war" on Afghanistan, as if to say that it was not the hundred thousand Soviet troops which launched the armed invasion and military occupation of Afghanistan, but rather China, which has never sent one single soldier to Afghanistan.

(Mr. Wu Zhen, China)

These foolish attempts at lies and sophistry only serve to show the aggressor's difficult predicament, in which the more he tries to hide the more he is exposed. Who can be expected to believe them? While slanderously accusing China of opposing disarmament and sabotaging détente, they eagerly style themselves the standard-bearers of disarmament, constantly recalling the so-called draft resolutions on disarmament put together by the Soviet Union as if they were enumerating family heirlooms. We need not go too far back; in the last 10 years, the Soviet Union has certainly put forward over 10 draft resolutions. But we only wish to address a question to the Soviet representatives: "After you came up with such a host of draft resolutions, have you in fact reduced your armaments by even a single bullet or your armed forces by a single soldier?" Not only have they not done so, but quite the contrary, during this period, the Soviet Union has carried out arms expansion and war preparations at an alarming pace, its strategic weapons have increased manyfold, its tanks, aircraft and artillery have increased by the thousands and tens of thousands, its warships have increased in tonnage by as much as a million tons, and its combat troops by a million. How can these harsh realities be concealed by deceptive propaganda? Since your deeds are so far removed from your words, is it not entirely appropriate for us to have termed these so-called disarmament proposals of yours sham disarmament? The Soviet Union and its followers have attacked and vilified China precisely because we have revealed the Soviet Union's true features of sham détente, sham disarmament. Not only is the Soviet Union peddling counterfeit goods, but is full of bombast and smugness in doing so. Does this not fully demonstrate that the Soviet representative's bragging and lies constitute moral destruction?

(Mr. Wu Zhen, China)

As for China's attitude on disarmament, we have stated on many occasions that we favour genuine disarmament, support all reasonable proposals and have made our own efforts and contributions in this regard. We had put forward our concrete proposals and views at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, at the first session of the Disarmament Commission and at the Committee on Disarmament. The Soviet representative has branded us "the opponents of disarmament" only because our proposals and view were not to the Soviet Union's liking. By equating our opposition to Soviet sham disarmament with opposition to disarmament, the Soviet representative has revealed his ulterior motive in the difference of one word. This is something which had to be exposed.

Mr. MOINI (Iran): Allow me at the outset to congratulate Ambassador Naik on behalf of my delegation on his election to the chairmanship of our Committee. I am certain that his effective and experienced leadership will produce positive results for our work in this session.

We have listened very attentively to the illuminating deliberations of our Committee on the different aspects of disarmament. Because of the unfortunate circumstances through which our region of the world is passing, it is the intention of my delegation to express its views on a specific aspect of disarmament which is most relevant to the present situation of our country, namely, the control of the supply to adventurist régimes in the developing world of certain conventional weapons that have devastating effects.

In our view the present pattern of relations among States in the international community is based mostly upon certain notions that not only do not lead the world towards permanent peace and security, but instead have resulted in leading the world to conflict, aggression and war. In other words, interaction between States is not regulated by the basic principles of the Charter, namely, non-use of force in international relations, non-acceptability of the acquisition of territory by the use of force and non-intervention and non-interference in the affairs of States.

(Mr. Moini, Iran)

But, in fact, it is the notion of power and the acquisition of more power that dominate the minds of decision-makers around the world and especially among those who have dreams of personal glory and grandeur. This attitude towards international relations is characteristic of the super-Powers and other big Powers. It has also been imposed on the developing world in general through the encouragement of certain hegemonistic régimes in different regions of the world to acquire alarming quantities of arms and to follow policies of domination and aggression, thus leading to regional tension and arms races.

The experience of Viet Nam demonstrated that the time for direct super-Power involvement in implementing imperialistic policies in the developing world had finally passed. Therefore, the super-Powers began to look for regional leaders who would be ready to enter into bargains with the forces of imperialism, receiving arms and support for the sake of implementing their own dreams of glory in return for committing themselves and the resources of their peoples to safeguard the interests of the big Powers in those regions.

In the Persian Gulf region such a policy was followed by United States imperialism, which used the deposed Shah as a counterpart. But, with the fall of the oppressive régime of the Shah, imperialism found itself in an immediate dilemma. Not only had a powerful and loyal servant vanished from the region, but a popular movement had taken its place with the primary goal of struggling to free that region from super-Power influence. As a result, the objectives of international imperialism in the Persian Gulf acquired two distinct dimensions: first, to find a replacement for the Shah, and second to destroy the anti-imperialistic revolution in Iran.

(Mr. Moini, Iran)

The forces of imperialism were fortunate. They found an oppressive and ambitious régime in that area which was not only more than ready to replace the Shah, but also ready to attempt to destroy the Islamic revolution of Iran by using the most barbaric and inhumane methods while justifying its savagery with the most baseless and ridiculous pretexts.

The barbaric war of aggression against Iran in which the aggressor has concentrated his attacks on civilian and populated centres, even using medium-range surface-to-surface missiles against defenceless people at night, is a vivid example of the consequences of supplying a power-hungry and expansionist régime with vast quantities of sophisticated weapons. The question arises as to the extent of the responsibility of the suppliers of armaments for the lives and property lost because of the misuse of those arms by a third party. For example, when a weapon of mass destruction is used by a barbaric régime against population centres of Iran, to what extent is the supplier of that weapon responsible for controlling its irrational and inhumane deployment?

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Iraq, who has asked to speak on a point of order.

Mr. AWANIS (Iraq)(interpretation from Arabic): I must apologise for interrupting to raise a point of order, but I am obliged to do so because the representative of Iran has departed from the question before the Committee, namely, the general debate on the broad range of items before it. The dispute between Iraq and Iran has no place in our discussions here, and I am sure Sir, you will agree with me that the most appropriate body in which to deal with that is the Security Council, not the First Committee. Therefore I urge you to ask the representative of Iran to limit himself to the question before the First Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I have taken note of the statement of the representative of Iraq, and I take this opportunity to remind the representative of Iran that we are engaged here in the general debate on the disarmament items. Accordingly, I ask him to confine his remarks to the subject under discussion.

Mr. MOINI (Iran): The savagery of the methods used in the present war of aggression against Iran is an experience that the whole community of nations should seriously consider. The dimensions of the misery that our civilian population is going through at this very moment are due to nothing but the supply of arms to an oppressive and expansionist régime.

In listening to the general statements made so far in this Committee we have noted that there is a strong conviction, shared by all, that disarmament is essential to the establishment of international peace and security. In dealing with the problem of disarmament we are in the main fighting the smoke rather than the fire that causes it. We believe that no effective solution to the question of disarmament can be found unless relations among the countries of the world are

(Mr. Moini, Iran)

based upon co-operation and mutual trust instead of on the rivalry and power politics that dominate international relations today. We are looking forward to the day when the world will no longer contain power-hungry leaders endangering the security and peace of mankind for the sake of gaining personal glory. We also look forward to the day when the producers of arms stop considering the production and sales of armaments as a profitable business and a convenient tool for maintaining economic growth.

Mr. ZAIMI (Morocco)(interpretation from French): The delegation of Morocco would like first of all to express its pleasure at seeing Mr. Naik preside over the work of the First Committee this year. His wisdom, experience and calmness give us grounds for hoping that our deliberations on problems as important and complex as those of disarmament and the safeguarding of international security may at last be set upon the right path towards satisfactory solutions. Our optimism is all the more justified in that the other officers of the Committee are also distinguished and competent experts. My delegation would like to assure you all of its full and entire co-operation.

Indeed, we shall need all the goodwill and experience we can muster in order successfully to conclude our consideration of the crucial issues that so urgently confront mankind and determine its fate, particularly since this year the First Committee is taking up the question of disarmament in an extremely alarming and explosive international atmosphere.

(Mr. Zaimi, Morocco)

Unfortunately we stand by powerless while the evil practice of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States continues. Certain Powers allow themselves to intervene in order to influence the normal flow of the policies of other States, resorting to the boldest methods, including the use of armed troops. That dangerous practice helps to increase the numbers of focal points of tension throughout the world and to delay the time-limits for reducing armaments, while giving rise to and strengthening distrust among members of the international community. This adventurous behaviour, that is unfortunately not the monopoly of the great Powers, points to a hegemonistic tendency with extremely serious consequences for international peace and security.

The tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, first of all simply because it was held then because of the objectives and priorities that it set and finally because of the noteworthy improvement it introduced in the structure of the deliberative and negotiating bodies, gave rise to tremendous hopes, all the more so as its decisions were supported unanimously.

Devoting a special session of the United Nations General Assembly to disarmament problems was in itself an encouraging sign, demonstrating increased awareness of the gravity of the stagnation surrounding the efforts made to avoid the dangers inherent in the stockpiling of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction and to arrive at general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

Furthermore, the reaffirmation and confirmation of the priority goals and objectives of disarmament negotiations was welcomed by mankind as a whole, insofar as unanimity on such objectives and priorities should lead us to quick and positive conclusions.

The restructuring of the deliberative and negotiating bodies finally corrected an abnormal and unbalanced situation that had added to the difficulties that negotiations always face. We wish to express here our full satisfaction at the active participation of all the nuclear Powers in the disarmament negotiations.

(Mr. Zaimi, Morocco)

We had every grounds for expecting that, as a result of such positive developments, there would be tangible progress in some areas of the disarmament negotiations. I must, unfortunately, point out that such progress is taking a long time. The arms race, particularly the continuing sophistication of nuclear weapons, continues faster than ever and shows no sign of slowing down. The deterioration in the international situation has also aggravated that state of affairs. One noteworthy result was the freezing of the implementation of the second treaty on the limitation of strategic arms (SALT II). That absence of progress makes all sorts of development possible and gives rise to real dangers for the security of all States, large and small.

In Geneva, the Committee on Disarmament, whose structure and operations have been made more balanced and more democratic, is making commendable efforts to overcome this inertia. Those efforts have certainly produced some results of a procedural character, notably the creation of working groups to deal with various aspects of disarmament. On the other hand, we unfortunately find that no tangible progress has been made on matters of substance in any area at all. Whether it is a question of the nuclear arms race or the halting of nuclear weapon tests, chemical weapons or other weapons of mass destruction, or of guarantees for non-nuclear States against the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons against those States, it is utterly depressing to note the lack of progress concerning the scope or the field of application, the definition, the criteria to be approved, verification methods or even sometimes the legal form of the final instrument.

What that really comes down to is a lack of real political will that would have led us towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control. This lack of political will in turn points to the absence of mutual confidence and prevents agreement even on the criteria and practical measures that would help us to strengthen mutual confidence. That same difficulty is at the root of the dizzy upward spiral of military expenditures that now amounts to \$500 billion.

This explains, without justifying it, the fact that no progress has been made in reducing military expenditures. One can recall the frequent attempts by the United Nations General Assembly to take a clear decision on reducing the military expenditures of the major military Powers by at least 10 per cent. However, that target is one that is difficult to reach; there are always obstacles that we feel are not insurmountable if there is genuine goodwill by all parties concerned, and an atmosphere of mutual trust.

(Mr. Zaimi, Morocco)

It is time to bring this state of stagnation to an end. The dialogue that has been initiated in this Committee and in the other deliberative and negotiating bodies must be given new impetus and must break out of its current inertia, particularly since all the nuclear Powers are participating fully in the work of the Committee on Disarmament and in the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission.

Those nuclear States and the major Powers in general owe it to themselves really to demonstrate more political will so that the commendable efforts of the Committee on Disarmament can be crowned with success, in the interest of peace and in order to avoid a total destruction of civilization, if not of the human race. It is essential to make sure that the sense of horror and insecurity that now grips people throughout the world is not the first symptom of such destruction.

The small and medium sized Powers, when faced with such an international situation in which there is no respect for the rules of international law and the elementary principles governing inter-State relations, find themselves faced with an agonizing dilemma. After all, what does disarmament mean for a State whose sovereignty, territorial integrity and way of life that it has freely chosen for itself are threatened by certain hegemonistic appetites? The current tendency of certain super-Powers to create zones of influence help to make some less powerful States the instruments of destabilization serving the designs of those super-Powers. What other choice then do the victims of such a practice have than to resort to costly armaments that place a heavy burden on their economies and undermine any attempt at development.

In this hopefully fruitful and positive dialogue on disarmament and the state of peace and security in the world, the small and medium-sized Powers have a definite interest. Their security and very survival is at stake, and so are their development and prosperity. The huge expenditures on destruction and the ever more terrifying sophistication of nuclear devices that we hope will never be used should have been used at least partly, to create a more prosperous, just and happy world, and the developing countries would have been the first to have benefited.

(Mr. Zaimi, Morocco)

That explains why countries such as my own attach paramount importance to the complex issue of disarmament and its corollary, the restoration of relations among States on the basis of equality and respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and free choice of the way of life of each State, within a framework of understanding, co-operation, friendship and good-neighbourliness.

(Mr. Zaimi, Morocco)

Meanwhile, until we have general and complete disarmament, the complete destruction of all nuclear-weapon stocks and an absolute halt to all nuclear-weapon tests, we continue to believe that the creation, safeguarding and strengthening of zones of peace and denuclearized zones are immediate goals which deserve all the efforts that are accorded to them.

Also, we believe that real and explicit guarantees should be given to the non-nuclear countries by the nuclear Powers against any use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against their territory.

In this respect, my delegation has taken due note of the draft resolution introduced by the Soviet delegation. The ideas contained in that draft resolution are now being thoroughly studied by my delegation. As far as concerns guarantees to non-nuclear countries, I should merely like to state here that only a commitment, in good and due form, such as a convention that would be binding under international law, could effectively guarantee non-nuclear States against the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons against their respective territories.

Morocco, in its capacity as a member of the Committee on Disarmament, is making its modest contribution to the search for adequate solutions of the problems that prevent us from actually attaining disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament. We have no other choice but to continue exploring all the ways and means that could make such an achievement possible. We can never say often enough that the First Committee must seriously tackle the problem of the impasse reached in the negotiations on the various aspects of disarmament. This Committee gives the Powers concerned an opportunity to define more clearly their respective positions on the question of how they envisage breaking out of that impasse in order to move forward towards general and complete disarmament.

We would hope that the Second Disarmament Decade, which begins next year, will see us attain that objective. The safeguarding of future generations depends on it to a large extent.

The CHAIRMAN: There are no further speakers for this afternoon.

The representative of Iraq wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on him.

Mr. AWANIS (Iraq)(interpretation from Arabic): Today, the representative of the Zionist entity and the representative of Iran have both made statements. My delegation wishes to reserve its exercise of the right of reply until tomorrow evening.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: Before we conclude our business today, I would inform the Committee that the Bureau has been considering how the First Committee might continue to discharge its responsibilities within the framework of the programme of work which it adopted at the beginning of this session.

It will be recalled that we decided to conclude the general debate on disarmament items on Friday, 31 October. The Committee is also aware that some meetings had to be cancelled early in this session for lack of speakers. Moreover, some members could not keep to their positions in the list of speakers because of other commitments. A number of representatives requested to be inscribed before the deadline agreed upon by the Committee for closing the list of speakers, but unfortunately all positions had already been taken. Consequently, the Bureau recommends that the Committee devote its four meetings scheduled for 3 and 4 November to hearing statements made as part of the general debate, without prejudice to the right of any member to speak on draft resolutions submitted to the Committee, as decided in our programme of work.

At the same time, the Bureau appeals to all members inscribed to speak tomorrow and on Friday to keep to their positions in the list, since otherwise we run the risk of being unable to accommodate them on Monday or Tuesday next.

In this connexion, the Bureau believes that no further extensions should be agreed upon beyond Tuesday, 4 November. Otherwise, the Committee may not be able to complete its work within the deadline set by the General Assembly.

(The Chairman)

I would hope that the arrangement to which I have referred, to allow additional representatives to speak in the general debate on Monday and Tuesday next, will find ready acceptance within the Committee.

If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.