

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



1989th
PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 18 November 1971,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 97:	
World Disarmament Conference (<i>continued</i>)	1

President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 97

World Disarmament Conference (*continued*)*

1. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): Twelve years have passed since the General Assembly, in its resolution 1378 (XIV) adopted on 20 November 1959, declared that the achievement of general and complete disarmament was the most important task facing the world and expressed the conviction that progress toward that goal would contribute to preventing a new and disastrous war and creating relations of trust and peaceful co-operation among States.

2. In retrospect, this declaration of the General Assembly can be seen as a portent of a new era in disarmament negotiations. It marked the beginning of an intensified and more imaginative search for ways and means by which the international community could come to grips with the complex problems of disarmament and arms control. The disarmament efforts of the past decade resulted in a number of limited yet significant collateral measures of arms control: the Antarctica Treaty,¹ the Moscow Treaty on the discontinuance of nuclear tests in three environments,² the outer space Treaty,³ the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco),⁴ the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*], the sea-bed Treaty,⁵ and, most recently, the draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction [*A/8457, annex A*], which is now before the General Assembly. Each of these treaties has its intrinsic value as a measure designed to limit the danger posed by nuclear and other weapons of mass

destruction. Each has helped to sustain the process of negotiation in this field of crucial importance for the maintenance of international peace and security. In this process, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, at Geneva is performing a most valuable service. The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), which after a summer session at Helsinki were resumed a few days ago at Vienna, form another negotiating body of crucial importance for the future of disarmament.

3. And yet the goal of general and complete disarmament seems as distant as ever. In spite of the progress made in arms control, the arms race has continued unabated. The production of armaments has grown steadily, and the weapons produced today are deadlier than ever. The burden of the cost which the arms race now places upon the peoples of the world is so immense that nations cannot hope to solve the pressing problems of underdevelopment and over-population so long as they continue to devote such a large proportion of human and material resources to the task of keeping up with each other in military capabilities. Only a new and determined effort made jointly by all nations can halt and reverse this trend, so that we may begin to move towards the goal of general and complete disarmament.

4. The opportunity to make such an effort may well exist now. The general political framework within which disarmament negotiations have to evolve is undergoing rapid and profound changes. There is hope of a normalization of relations between the leading Powers resulting in a reduction of tensions and a strengthening of a process of *détente*, a process at present most pronounced in Europe.

5. If this trend can be maintained and extended, it will create a more favourable atmosphere for a new disarmament effort. Now that the delegation of the People's Republic of China has taken its seat in the United Nations—and I should like to take this opportunity to extend to it a most warm welcome—the Finnish Government hopes that both China and France will find it possible to join in such an effort.

6. It is obvious that real and lasting progress in the field of disarmament, and particularly nuclear disarmament, can be achieved only through the participation of all the nuclear Powers. This also accords with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security which these Powers hold as permanent members of the Security Council, and it serves to underline the organic link between disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security, a link explicitly stated in Article 26 of the Charter, which assigns to the Security Council a major role in disarmament.

* Resumed from the 1987th meeting.

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 402 (1961), No. 5778.

² Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480 (1963), No. 6964).

³ Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (resolution 2222 (XXI), annex).

⁴ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634 (1968), No. 9068.

⁵ Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof (resolution 2660 (XXV), annex).

7. It may be worth recalling that Article 26 of the Charter states that:

“In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in Article 47, plans to be submitted to the Members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.”

Article 47 again says that the Military Staff Committee shall advise and assist the Security Council on, among other questions, “the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament”. It further states that “Any Member of the United Nations not permanently represented on the [Military Staff] Committee shall be invited by the Committee to be associated with it when the efficient discharge of the Committee's responsibilities requires the participation of that Member in its work”.

8. The Charter thus offers Member States a ready-made instrument for disarmament negotiations, an instrument flexible enough to be adapted to the requirements of changing circumstances. The fact that this instrument has not been used except in the very early years of the United Nations is no reason to forget about it altogether.

9. While recognizing the special responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security and thus for disarmament, we believe that progress towards the goal of general and complete disarmament can be achieved only through the co-operation of all nations. The time has come, therefore, for a review and a reassessment of the disarmament scene in its entirety. A natural forum for such a review would be a world disarmament conference, as proposed by the Government of the Soviet Union [see A/8491]. Such a conference—the first of its kind since the Second World War—would provide an opportunity for a general examination of all disarmament questions, for a reaffirmation of our commitment to the goal of general and complete disarmament and for charting the course and setting the priorities for future negotiations.

10. Naturally, such a conference can be productive only if all the States of the world, and, in particular, all the militarily important and powerful States, participate in it. The framework for such a conference and all the many questions relating to organizing it will have to be settled through consultations among all interested Governments. Finland, for its part, is ready to contribute as best it can to such consultations with a view to reaching general agreement on the question of convening a world disarmament conference.

11. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): Among the great causes whose success governs the progress of international society, that of disarmament is in the front rank. It quite rightly gives rise to the greatest hopes, but more than any other it also meets with doubt, scepticism and discouragement.

12. Without harbouring any illusions as to the extreme difficulties of the undertaking, the French Government is

nevertheless convinced that disarmament can make progress if the desired political and technological conditions can be met. In its opinion, the proposal for a world conference submitted by the Soviet delegation [see A/L.631 and Add.1] could provide an opportunity to explore, define and better elucidate these conditions, to set up appropriate organs to study and negotiate and, finally, to enter the realm of action. In their starkness the facts are alarming. Let us just mention the most striking ones.

13. First, since the end of the Second World War, arms stocks have been constantly on the increase. The report which the Secretary-General recently communicated to us on the consequences of the arms race [A/8469 and Add.1] shows that, even if we take into consideration price inflation, the cost of arms borne by the world has risen by one third during the past decade; world military expenditure is rising every year and currently stands at a figure of 1,100,000 million francs, or \$2,000 million.

14. Secondly, for the past four years this figure has been more or less steady, but the developments of technology applied to arms have, over the same period, greatly increased the possibilities of destruction, especially in the nuclear field. The qualitative aspect of the arms race is making the quantitative progression worse.

15. Thirdly, although the expenditure of the six greatest military Powers—which alone accounts for more than four fifths of the world's arms expenditures—remains steady, the amount of resources that the developing countries are devoting to their armed forces is growing all the time at an increased rate: in the past four years it has risen from 50,000 to 65,000 million francs, or from \$9,000 million to \$12,000 million. At the present time, it represents almost double the public aid that these countries receive.

16. Fourthly and lastly, we note—and this observation is no less distressing—that if only half of these non-productive expenses were applied to solving the world's great problems of development, health, education and the environment, new prospects would be opened up for the advancement of the community of man.

17. Everyone recognizes these facts. The question of disarmament has existed in all its gravity ever since the end of the First World War. However, while it has been growing worse, what have we been doing for a quarter of a century to attempt to stem the rising tide of armaments? What have we done to heed the appeal that the Secretary-General has been tirelessly issuing each year? The first 15 years of the United Nations were marked by praiseworthy efforts to draw up plans for general disarmament. In this hall there are witnesses of this period of time, and the presence of Mrs. Myrdal, who for so many years and with so much tenacity and competence has been trying to contribute to this work of peace, is eloquent proof of this.

18. However, this important work subsequently ceased to receive the same priority and the direction of our work has been altered to the point where a word in itself very clear, “disarmament”, has been replaced by the more ambiguous term “control” of arms. Talks have subsequently focused on measures termed “partial or collateral”, to the detriment of the quest for real disarmament. We have thus witnessed

the conclusion of a series of agreements whose main effect is to prevent non-nuclear States from acquiring arms that others allow themselves to keep or to develop. The first was a treaty on the partial banning of atomic explosions; it left the nuclear Powers the option of carrying out several hundred underground tests and also of perfecting a new generation of devices. As for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, it rigidly divides States into two categories and establishes discrimination without compensating for it, since renunciation by some does not win in return any real commitment from the others with regard to the future elimination of nuclear weapons.

19. The path which the international community has thus taken does not lead to disarmament. One must not be deceived by these agreements nor by the gratuitous declarations and promises without guarantees which are too often presented to set the minds of the world at rest. The figures I quoted earlier would suffice to prove this: disarmament remains to be achieved, although it is expressly mentioned in the Charter, which we have all signed, particularly in Articles 11 and 26.

20. Let us not confuse it either with negotiation, in which the two major nuclear Powers are trying to put the brake on an arms race which threatens to destroy the ever-precarious balance. We are following these efforts attentively and with sympathy, in so far as they can serve *détente* and dissipate mistrust. But the object of these talks is not to destroy existing arms and the balance of terror, whose stabilization is thus being sought, but is, on the contrary, keeping nuclear strength at a high level, ensuring for those who possess them a monopoly not only of these weapons but also of the political power which they bestow.

21. Without any doubt, this equilibrium tends to avert a nuclear confrontation. But in so far as this appears—very fortunately—to be quite remote, even the nuclear States are led to maintain and perfect conventional weapons whose cost is even greater than that of atomic weapons. Furthermore—and this fact only appears to be paradoxical—armed conflicts persist and are flaring up in certain regions of the world when conventional confrontations are not restrained by the threat of nuclear escalation, even though the nuclear Powers are, directly or otherwise, implicated in these conflicts. In actual fact, nuclear deterrence leaves the field free for conventional, localized wars. Although we have never underestimated the danger that an upset in the strategic equilibrium would entail, we have always declared that this equilibrium is not an end in itself. It must be only an invitation to real disarmament.

22. As for partial measures, we noted very early that these did not lead to disarmament. We thus refrained from adhering to agreements on them. Such was the case of the non-proliferation Treaty. It seemed wrong to us that the privilege of the nuclear Powers should thus be sanctioned without stipulating that they should also undertake a genuine commitment with regard to nuclear disarmament—a commitment which would have balanced the obligations endorsed by the other signatories of the Treaty.

23. However, France has never abandoned the idea of participating in efforts to limit the scope of the arms race. It stated its intention to abide by the principal obligations

of the non-proliferation Treaty. France signed the treaties prohibiting armaments from areas newly opened to human activity, whether in the Antarctic or outer space. France expressed its support of the proposal to have experts study the possibilities of supervising the elimination of bacteriological and chemical weapons. As depositary of the Geneva Protocol,⁶ France demanded respect for it. Its Government has just submitted a bill forbidding the manufacture and possession in France of biological arms and toxins—a bill which goes further than the incomplete draft convention drawn up in Geneva, which we shall shortly be discussing here [A/8457, annex A].

24. Finally, France does not intend to let any opportunity pass to reopen the discussion on disarmament. Events prompt us to seize this opportunity once again. China, a nuclear Power, now has a seat among us. And the presence of China is an invitation to us to discuss disarmament, because this problem, like many others, can neither have a satisfactory solution nor be of universal significance without that country's participation.

25. The President of the French Republic, speaking to Mr. Brezhnev, stated recently:

“We remain convinced that the great danger which threatens the world is the atomic danger, and that in one way or another, in one framework or another, it will be necessary for the countries possessing this weapon to talk together in the interest of all mankind.”

That is why, since we have always favoured a conference of all the nuclear Powers, we gave a positive reply to the proposal made by the Government of the USSR last spring.

26. I hope we will be understood. This attitude does not reflect any predilection for negotiation in a restricted and exclusive coterie. It is not based on any underestimation of the interest that non-nuclear States quite rightly have in problems linked to the existence of this weapon, and in the efforts to eliminate it. We believe, as they do, that if the most serious danger is the atomic danger, it is because, over and above its power to annihilate the universe, the nuclear weapon possesses infinitely harmful political consequences. It crystallizes hegemonies. It consolidates the political division of the world. It encourages the endless prolongation of local conflicts in which conventional weapons are used.

27. If, then, we are in favour of a meeting of the nuclear Powers on disarmament, it is first of all as the French Foreign Minister emphasized [1942nd meeting], out of concern for effectiveness. The Powers possessing nuclear weapons are those most competent to debate the very complex and technical aspects involved in the problem of nuclear disarmament. They are the first to be able to implement and execute effective disarmament measures.

28. We also believe that there is an advantage to be gained in not distracting future negotiators from the very object of their negotiation, which is to disarm themselves and not to

⁶ Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2138).

disarm others or to prevent others from arming themselves. It is no longer a matter of finding loop-holes or, indeed, of resorting to the device of partial or collateral proposals which, under the gloss of words, have been substituted for the disarmament undertaking itself for so long. Our objective, far from attempting to condone a monopoly, is the opposite, since it consists in obliging the nuclear Powers to meet, to come to an understanding and to set an example for disarmament.

29. We are perfectly well aware, therefore, that the undertaking of disarmament is not and cannot be the privilege of just a few. Its successful achievement requires the assistance of the entire international community. Indeed, if true nuclear disarmament were to come about, measures for conventional disarmament would have to be drawn up and put into effect by many States to offset the imbalance which nuclear disarmament might involve. Measures of international control will be necessary moreover in both areas, nuclear and conventional; and everyone will be required to accept them and participate in them because it will, of course, be necessary not only to verify what has been eliminated or destroyed, but also what remains. In any case, control can only be international and must give all States the guarantees which they have the right to demand for their security. These reasons in themselves would justify a collective examination of these problems.

30. However, even if a five-Power conference cannot be contemplated at the present time—and we would regret this—we have no preconceived ideas about disarmament so long as the matter is discussed seriously. Accordingly, the plan for a world conference can help to give a fresh start to the work on disarmament and, in particular, to provide the nuclear Powers with a framework within which to discuss together their common problems in the interests of everyone. It goes without saying that the projected conference must be in charge of its agenda and procedure. I can think of no better way of concluding than by quoting the words of Mr. Maurice Schumann himself, when he spoke before our National Assembly two weeks ago:

“The hopes which can be founded on the success of a world conference will still have no meaning unless the participation of all the nuclear Powers is ensured. For our part, it is with this conviction that we give our approval to the draft resolution for a world disarmament conference submitted by the Soviet Union.”

31. Mrs. MYRDAL (Sweden): When I take the floor today to speak on the subject of a world disarmament conference, it gives me particular satisfaction to do so in the knowledge that representatives of the People's Republic of China now participate in our deliberations. The Swedish Government and the Government of the People's Republic of China have maintained full diplomatic relations for over 20 years, and for over 20 years my Government has also voted here at the United Nations for the Government of the People's Republic of China to occupy the seat which we have maintained lawfully belongs to it and to China in this world Organization. My Government wishes to express through me a hope for collaboration with the Government of China within the framework of the United Nations, in order to make speedier progress and obtain a more secure peace in the world.

32. The item on our agenda entitled “World Disarmament Conference” is of supreme importance. The fact that it has been taken up directly in the plenary serves to underline the fundamental interest of the United Nations in keeping disarmament in the foreground of its active concern.

33. And yet, although the goal of disarmament is becoming ever more urgent as time goes on, we must face the fact that it has so far eluded us. In his opening statement last week [1978th meeting], the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics quoted figures from the Secretary-General's report on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security, prepared by a group of consultant experts [A/8469]. Those figures throw into clear light the growing discrepancy between our disarmament efforts and the steep increase in world armaments, between pious talks and harsh reality. In our search for ways to remedy this state of affairs, we must be prepared to study in a positive spirit any procedure which might hasten progress. The Swedish Government accordingly approaches with an open mind any proposal for a concert of nations to give new impetus to our disarmament negotiations.

34. We must all admit that so far they have not yielded impressive or even satisfactory results. As a representative of one of the countries participating in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which constitutes the most central machinery for disarmament negotiations on a global scale, I have particular reason to regret our inability during the last decade to reverse or even impede the arms race. However, I think it should be said in fairness that through the work at Geneva—apart from the limited results which have been achieved so far—the ground has been prepared for more far-reaching measures in both broad and specific areas of disarmament, if our nations will only muster the political will.

35. When searching for a forum where all can contribute to the debate on disarmament issues, we should not overlook the machinery within the United Nations, primarily its Disarmament Commission. In that body all efforts at negotiating disarmament could be examined, also those occurring outside the framework of the United Nations itself, through bilateral or regional arrangements.

36. However, an inherent weakness in the disarmament negotiation efforts undertaken hitherto both in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and in the Disarmament Commission has been that not all of the world's five nuclear-weapon States have been participants. Several speakers in this debate have underlined that more favourable conditions now exist for realistic and effective multilateral disarmament endeavours. This is the second argument in favour of deciding at this juncture on raising the disarmament issues in such a way that they command world-wide attention, the first argument being the need to speed up the work through some more forceful incitement. For the first time the five nuclear-weapon Powers are now represented in the General Assembly and its Security Council. They can now be expected to participate in the disarmament work, thus setting the scene for more earnest endeavours than has hitherto been the case.

37. I must declare that the participation of all important States is so crucial that for us it amounts to a *conditio sine*

qua non when judging the desirability of calling a large-scale conference on disarmament. A conference should not only be spectacular: in order to be meaningful, it must be assured of the participation of all important States.

38. We are inclined to agree, accordingly, that there is a strong case for a broad and thorough discussion of possible further disarmament measures, and also of how and under what forms future negotiations should proceed. My Government is of the view, however, that such a discussion, or conference, could most appropriately and advantageously take place within the framework of the United Nations. As also seems to be the position of the majority of Member States, we see no compelling reason to go outside the Organization set up for the specific purpose of "saving future generations from the scourge of war", especially at a moment when the most crucial shortcoming in the universality of the world organization has been removed. We also hope that the progress achieved regarding the German problems and other *détente* efforts in Europe will lead to the inclusion of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic in the ranks of United Nations Members by this time next year. And, if I have understood the Soviet Union's proposal correctly, it is at the twenty-seventh session that the decision should be taken as to the time and the agenda of the world disarmament conference or of a special session of the Disarmament Commission, which comprises the totality of the United Nations membership as it will then be.

39. The question of an appropriate agenda will also be important, of course. If possible it should cover both a programme for future disarmament measures and the questions of time-table and the necessary machinery for conducting continuing concrete negotiations. The McCloy-Zorin joint statement of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations⁷ is now 10 years old. In the spring of 1972 the United States outline of basic provisions of a treaty on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world⁸ and the Soviet Union draft treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control⁹ will also be 10 years old. It is certainly about time to review these bases and examine whether new points of departure are available.

40. In this context, I wish to remind my colleagues of last year's attempt to arrive at a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Such a programme was submitted to the General Assembly on 1 December 1970.¹⁰ It had its origin in the resolution adopted the year before, by which the 1970s were declared a Disarmament Decade [*resolution 2602 E (XXIV)*]. The Assembly, in resolution 2661 C (XXV), recommended that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament take this programme into account in its further work, but I regret to say it has not yet come to function as a set of guidelines. It seems to me that this

programme could now serve as a basis for discussions regarding the agenda and time-table of the proposed talks.

41. The representative of the Soviet Union has proposed that priority should be given to disarmament measures dealing with nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons, together with chemical and biological weapons, as weapons of mass destruction, are also given priority in the programme I mentioned. Furthermore, the programme indicates ways and means of attaining our ultimate goal, general and complete disarmament. I wish also to refer to its recommendation of regional disarmament conferences as parts of the whole negotiation structure. Obviously, the proposed world disarmament talks must include the question of what procedures and what form will be most efficient for future disarmament negotiations. In order to facilitate co-ordination and to ensure that the General Assembly will be kept informed on all matters pertaining to disarmament, as well as for the purpose of ensuring continuity, it seems necessary that any machinery to be set up for detailed negotiations on disarmament measures should report directly to the United Nations and not to a conference outside the world Organization.

42. In addition, I want to state our preference that such a body should be kept relatively small in size; both the number of delegations and the two-term spring and summer sessions of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament seem to be features worth preserving.

43. As for the preparatory planning of the conference, several valuable suggestions have already been made in the course of this debate. Time must be allotted for consultations with all States that are vitally interested in disarmament. The most attractive formula offered so far seems to me to be the one outlined by the representative of Egypt last Tuesday [*1985th meeting*], that is, that the Assembly request the Secretary-General to obtain the opinions of Member States on the modalities of the conference. He laid particular stress on consultations with the five permanent members of the Security Council. I should add, in borrowing another leaf from his book, that there would seem to be no harm, but on the contrary considerable merit, in consulting, in addition to Members of the United Nations, those States that are parties to important international disarmament treaties.

44. My statement today reflects the general position of my Government on this urgent and important matter of a world-wide examination of the disarmament issues. However, we are ready to go along with any of several avenues of procedure. I must repeat only that we want to be assured that all States of any significance in this context would agree to participate in open and free discussions between countries, both great and not so great, since the conference, if it is to be held, must be one that can lead to real progress towards stopping the arms race and decreasing armaments everywhere.

45. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): During the general debate at the commencement of this session [*1951st meeting*] the Tanzanian Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Elinewinga, expressed the views of my Government on the general question of disarmament. It will be recalled that in his statement, the idea of a world

⁷ Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 19, document A/4879.

⁸ Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for January 1961 to December 1962, document DC/203, annex 1, sect. F.

⁹ Ibid., sect. C.

¹⁰ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes, agenda items 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 93 and 94, document A/8191.

disarmament conference was welcomed. It is now my intention to discuss more particularly the proposal for such a conference as set out in the explanatory statement of the permanent representative of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Malik, at our 1978th meeting and in the draft resolution in documents A/L.631 and Add.1.

46. At the very outset, we must all agree that the question of disarmament is of overriding importance to the peoples and Governments of all countries. Since the middle of the present century, we have hardly had a period free from war, whether officially labeled as such or more euphemistically described. The African continent has not known full peace and security because of the irresistible temptation and designs of colonialism and imperialism. In the southern part of the continent, for example, the forces of racism and colonialism strive, by means condemned by the overwhelming opinion of the civilized world, to hold back the tide of liberation, and suppress by force the inherent rights and liberties of the African people, while in the northern part, vast areas of African territory remain under illegal occupation, thereby posing a constant threat to the stability and security of the region. Some Latin American States have suffered from outside intervention under one guise or another, while at least one of the countries of that region has for many years suffered, and is still suffering, from a unilateral economic blockade that is tantamount to a continuing aggression. As for the continent of Asia, the inhabitants of some areas have never known even a day's peace, but only a greater or lesser waging of war by imperialism and self-declared world policemen.

47. The continent of Europe, it is true, has been relatively free from major armed conflict in the past quarter of a century. However, the threat of war has hovered ominously over even that comparatively favoured area of the world. It is the hope and desire of all peoples everywhere that all wars will be ended and the threat of war dispelled by the Governments of all nations agreeing upon and implementing effective measures of disarmament.

48. The distinguished Secretary-General of our Organization, U Thant, has striven with most commendable dedication and sensitivity to increase the awareness on the part of responsible statesmen of the scale of the arms race and its significance to human life. In his valuable report on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security [A/8469], he notes that during the immediately preceding decade, that is to say from 1961 to 1970 inclusive, military expenditures for the world as a whole added up to an estimated total of \$1,870,000 million, at 1970 values. At the present annual level of about \$200,000 million, which is between 6 per cent and 6.5 per cent of the total world gross national product, military expenditures equal 2.5 times what all Governments spend on health, 1.5 times what they spend on education, and 30 times more than the total of all official economic aid granted by developed to developing countries, which now adds up to some \$7,000 million.

49. It was with a view to translating the hopes and dreams of mankind for world peace into reality that the Heads of State and Government of non-aligned countries gathered from all corners of the globe for their historic second

conference in Cairo in 1964. During their discussions, the eminent leaders unanimously agreed that the holding of a world disarmament conference would be one of the most important steps towards a reduction of world tensions and the building of international peace and security. Subsequently, this view was endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly at its twentieth session in 1965 [*resolution 2030 (XX)*].

50. Repeatedly since then the same idea has been endorsed by conferences and meetings of many distinguished statesmen and leaders of the world. Thus the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lusaka in September 1970, declared:

“The participating States feel that it may be useful to convene a World Disarmament Conference at an appropriate time open for participation to all States.”

51. Our own Organization, conscious of the universal desire for peace through disarmament, has worked unceasingly towards that end. To a limited extent there has been progress. Yet the gap between our goal and our efforts to date is still lamentably vast. As our delegation stated in the general debate,

“A common characteristic of these measures is that they nibble at the edges of the problem rather than going straight to the centre. Another characteristic is that the measures prohibit all States from pursuing courses of action which the major Powers no longer consider necessary in order to develop or maintain their military domination. Always these measures, when presented to the smaller nations for acceptance, are accompanied by promises from the major Powers to continue efforts to attain the more lasting and desired goal of general and complete disarmament.” [*1951st meeting, para. 109.*]

52. The General Assembly has shown its sensitivity to these partial and not quite satisfactory measures by adopting, for example, resolution 2289 (XXII), in which it urged all States “to examine . . . the question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and the draft convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . . and to undertake negotiations concerning the conclusion of an appropriate convention through the convening of an international conference, by the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, or directly between States”. The main concern of that resolution, it will be noted, was the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons—and, of course, those weapons are the ones whose effects are the most devastating and disastrous for mankind. Therefore it was natural and appropriate to give their prohibition the utmost priority in disarmament efforts.

53. Nevertheless, it might be well to ask whether perhaps the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and the General Assembly as a whole have not over-concentrated on the question of nuclear disarmament to the exclusion of disarmament in other more conventional weapons. After all, the series of aggressions committed against some countries since the end of the Second World War has

involved the exclusive use of conventional weapons. This does not in any way imply that less attention should be given to the all-important question of nuclear disarmament. Far from it. For we do not fail to bear in mind that even though aggression may be carried out exclusively by conventional weapons, the threat or fear of the use of nuclear weapons may be a potent factor in the respective considerations of the aggressor and its victim. All we are saying is that there is more to the question of general and complete disarmament than nuclear disarmament, crucial and overriding though that aspect of disarmament may be.

54. The blunt fact is that the world's major industrial Powers, including those which under the Charter of our Organization have a primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, so far prefer to place their trust and reliance not in any scheme of collective security and disarmament but in their own efforts and might. Hence, as pointed out in the Secretary-General's report to which I have already referred,

"Six countries out of 120 alone accounted for more than four fifths of the world total [*of military expenditure*] for the decade of the sixties. These countries— . . . which were involved to the limit of their resources in the Second World War—dominate, and indeed largely determine, the world trend." [*A/8469, para. 30.*]

55. Experts of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimate that the two greatest military Powers accounted for some 70 per cent of world military expenditure in 1968 and between them also accounted for over 80 per cent of world military expenditure between 1965 and 1968. There is no doubt that the greatest cause of those Powers' colossal military expenses has been the developing, testing and stockpiling of military weapons. Hence one super-Power alone reportedly devoted the sum of \$78.5 thousand million to military expenditure in 1970. Of that amount, approximately one third was spent in the futile attempt to overcome the heroic determination of the people of Viet-Nam to be free of alien domination.

56. From all that we have said so far, it is clear that we support in principle the proposal of the Soviet Union for the convening of a world disarmament conference. We also support without any qualifications the insistence of the representative of the Soviet Union in his statement [*1978th meeting*] that the participation in such a conference should be universal, comprising the whole family of nations.

57. With regard to the actual modalities of such a conference, that is to say, the venue, timing and *modus operandi*, we would require greater clarification of certain matters before we could give our considered opinion—in particular, the proposal that the conference should be convened "outside the framework of the United Nations" or that the world disarmament conference should become a permanent international forum, to be convened periodically—once every two or three years—to consider the state of affairs in the matter of the solution of disarmament problems. In our opinion, what is important is to have universal participation by all States, Members and non-Members of the United Nations, in such a conference. Whether the conference is to be held within or outside the framework of the United Nations will, therefore, depend upon the best means of achieving such universality.

58. What we are being asked to bring into being—if I understood the Soviet and Rwanda proposal correctly—is a permanent institution, which would discuss in general terms the draft treaties and other agreements that have already been worked out on various problems of disarmament in more restricted organs such as the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament; and then, when agreement on those problems is reached in principle in the world disarmament conference, the draft treaties or other agreements would be referred back to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

59. At the same time, it has been proposed that there would be "joint action" by the five nuclear Powers to try and arrive at an understanding on nuclear matters. Presumably any understanding or agreement between the five nuclear Powers would be brought for discussion to the world disarmament conference, which might approve it or refer it back for further elaboration or modification.

60. But what role, if any, would be left to the United Nations General Assembly in these matters? Would there be any need or profit in the Assembly interposing itself? It is the view of my delegation that we should be cautious here lest we establish a permanent or semi-permanent institution which could turn out to be either a rubber-stamp, a white elephant or a rival to the United Nations. We should also point out the danger inherent in creating a permanent or semi-permanent institution. That is the probable implication of not achieving the desired objective of world disarmament. For the permanency of an institution, as has already been explained by some delegations, could mean that we are required to live forever with the idea of a perpetual arms race.

61. While voicing the reservations of my delegation regarding the procedural aspects, I nevertheless do not consider them insurmountable obstacles to the implementation of the substance of the Soviet proposal, which, as I have already stated, we endorse.

62. Finally, may I say that my delegation has read with interest the statement on this proposal by the Council of Ministers of the German Democratic Republic which was transmitted by letter from the representative of the Soviet Union to the Secretary-General [*see A/8452*]. We look forward with great interest to hearing the contribution to the proposed world disarmament conference of the representatives of the German Democratic Republic and those other States whose voices are at present not heard in our General Assembly debates.

63. Mr. SHEVEL (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): Consistent with its peace-loving foreign policy and the programme of peace announced at the twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Government of the USSR has put before this session of the General Assembly the question of convening a world disarmament conference.

64. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR notes with satisfaction that the initiative of the Soviet Union has, at this session of the General Assembly, been welcomed by many delegations which have already registered their approval of the idea of convening such a conference.

65. It should be pointed out that the Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries, following their consultative meeting at the beginning of this session, clearly indicated in their joint communiqué that it would be desirable to convene a world disarmament conference with the participation of all the countries of the world. The support given to the new Soviet initiative reflects the sincere desire of peace-loving States to put an end to the headlong arms race and to participate directly in the consideration and solution of disarmament questions.

66. The Ukrainian delegation is convinced that the USSR proposal to convene a world disarmament conference is timely and that circumstances are ripe for holding this important international meeting.

67. It should be stressed above all that the imperative need to convene a world disarmament conference stems from the situation created by the ever-mounting arms race, which poses a danger to all the peoples of the world without exception. Many cogent facts confirming this may be found in the report of the United Nations Secretary-General on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security.

68. The report is quite correct in stressing that "The threat of ultimate disaster it [*the arms race*] has generated is by far the most dangerous single peril the world faces today—far more dangerous than poverty or disease, far more dangerous than either the population explosion or pollution—and it far outweighs whatever short-term advantage armaments may have achieved in providing peoples with a sense of national security." [*A/8469, para. 112*].

69. The representative of Tanzania, speaking before me, observed that this report, prepared by expert scientific authorities from many countries of the world, indicates that annual military expenditure is currently two and a half times greater than the expenditure of all Governments on public health, one and a half times greater than the expenditure on education, and 30 times greater than the total of all official economic aid granted by the developed countries to the developing countries. Those figures suffice, I believe, to show the heavy burden lying on peoples as a result of the arms race.

70. But we are not so ingenuous as to be unaware that there are forces in the world—the forces of imperialism and the monopolies—which are obstructing and resisting all initiatives for disarmament. It matters little who acts for them—the revanchists, the militarists, the aggressive military establishment or—as the late President Dwight Eisenhower called it, the military-industrial complex. The central point is always the same: they have made a business of the arms race and the sale of weapons, and they obtain astronomical profits and super-profits. They attempt to push the world back to the times of the "cold war", and if possible to plunge the peoples of the world into a hot war.

71. However, these forces can no longer exercise complete sway and arbitrarily impose their will either in their own countries or—even less—in the world at large. Peace-loving peoples, drawing a lesson from the past and the present, are uniting and intensifying the fight against imperialism and

militarism in all forms and guises, so as to prevent the outbreak of a third world war, a thermonuclear catastrophe which could bring an end to civilization and the culture of all mankind.

72. It is quite clear that peace on our planet cannot be stable and secure without the cessation of the arms race and the achievement of general and complete disarmament.

73. The proposal of the Soviet Government to convene a world disarmament conference is a constructive step directed towards achieving that extremely important objective.

74. As is well known, disarmament questions have been examined during the post-war period in the United Nations and in a great many international organizations. It should be noted that at the twentieth session of the General Assembly a resolution was adopted in support of the convening of a world disarmament conference; however, for various reasons it was not possible to implement that decision. The intention of the United Nations to convene a world disarmament conference was not realized then. And so there has not yet been a single meeting of all States to examine so important a problem as ending the arms race.

75. A world disarmament conference would represent a qualitatively new stage in dealing with this urgent problem, which affects the interests of absolutely all countries irrespective of their level of economic development, their military power or their geographical position.

76. In speaking of conditions conducive to holding a world disarmament conference, we should point out—and this has already been remarked upon by many delegates at this session of the General Assembly—that the prevailing trend in the world today is towards a relaxation of international tensions. The trend towards *détente* is particularly clear in Europe, where trust and mutual understanding between countries is growing. This is already having a salutary influence on the international situation as a whole; that influence will undoubtedly augment after the holding of an all-European conference on questions of collective security.

77. The consistent peace-loving foreign policy of the socialist countries and other peace-loving States is contributing greatly to the relaxation of tensions.

78. The States Members of the United Nations are acquainted with the many proposals of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries on key questions of building peace and international security and supporting the anti-imperialist national liberation struggle and disarmament, which have met with approval here in the Organization. They are also acquainted with the practical steps taken by the socialist States in that direction, as well as those for strengthening co-operation between countries and peoples on a bilateral or regional basis in keeping with the policy of peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems established by the great Lenin.

79. This peace-loving course followed by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union has found concrete expression in the programme of peace announced at the twenty-fourth

Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the practical measures which are being implemented for its realization.

80. It should be remembered that the peaceful course of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the socialist States is not derived from temporary, short-term considerations. It stems from the very nature, the very essence of the socialist system. How little this means to those who are against easing tensions, strengthening international security and achieving disarmament—the various proponents of the “cold war” and the so-called theoreticians of “local wars” and escalations, who frighten people with the “communist menace” and other inventions of the mind. And yet, any sensible man, any person in public life possessing a sense of realism, will long since have understood that the peoples of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, who made enormous sacrifices in the last world war and who are now building a new bright future, do not need war, do not need the arms race which swallows up enormous material and human resources, but need peace, security and disarmament. That is why we have so insistently called here in the United Nations for support for the Soviet proposal to convene a world disarmament conference and to plan the measures which would pave the way for such conference within the agreed time-limit, not later than 1972.

81. An important element favouring the successful holding of a world disarmament conference is the fact that in recent years it has been possible to take a number of important steps towards limiting the arms race. I refer to the conclusion of certain well-known agreements which have already been mentioned here. The current session of the General Assembly has before it the first practical disarmament agreement—the draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction [A/8457, annex A]. During the discussions on this subject, it became clear that the majority of countries were also resolved to prohibit and eliminate chemical weapons, and a converging of views on various aspects of this problem has been noted.

82. Thus we have practical proof that if States taking part in such discussions demonstrate goodwill and a readiness to act, agreement can be reached on the most complex problems. Formal agreements on partial measures, which play a limited positive role in restraining the arms race, obviously cannot solve the disarmament problem as a whole. However, experience gained in the course of negotiating such agreements will clearly contribute to the success of the world disarmament conference.

83. Another point of great practical significance is that the existing international agreements on partial measures include provisions which pave the way to further negotiations and to new instruments which will lead to action ranging from the prohibition of the most dangerous weapons of mass destruction and the cessation or limitation of the arms race right up to general and complete disarmament.

84. An understanding of the need to find ways of halting the arms race, and actual participation in the world disarmament conference, will clearly assist participants in the conference in their attempts to resolve the international

problems of a political, economic, ideological or other nature which divide countries and exacerbate relations between them. Without making concessions of principle, it is possible and necessary—in the cause of strengthening international peace and security and also in the realization that peace is indivisible—to find common ground between States in order to mobilize for the successful holding of a world disarmament conference.

85. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic also shares the view that a major condition for the success of the conference on disarmament is its universality, i.e. participation in it by all States without exception, whether or not they belong to the United Nations or other international organizations. The ever-intensifying arms race and the constant threat it poses to the security of all peoples gives all States without exception the right to participate in the discussion of the disarmament problem and to contribute to its solution.

86. The cause of disarmament demands that all States should be invited to participate in the world disarmament conference, including States which are Members of the United Nations and those which for various reasons are not.

87. How, for instance, would it be possible to debar from participation in such a conference the German Democratic Republic—the first workers' and peasants' socialist State on German soil, and the most important such State in central Europe? Indeed, the German Democratic Republic, in which 18 million people live and work, and which possesses a scientifically and technologically advanced economy, has been recognized both *de jure* and *de facto* by many States of the world.

88. How many years are we to wait for an end to the discrimination in the United Nations against a number of States, discrimination practised with the aid and active participation of the United States, the United Kingdom and certain other Western countries?

89. An important step has been taken at the current session of the General Assembly to achieve genuine universality in the Organization: after more than 20 years of continuing procrastination the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China have been restored in the United Nations. In welcoming the representatives of the Chinese people here in this hall, my delegation expresses the hope that their participation in the United Nations will serve to activate the work of the Organization in solving its main tasks—the strengthening of peace and international security, halting of the arms race, particularly with respect to nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, elimination of military conflicts and hotbeds of aggression, and work towards disarmament until the achievement of general and complete disarmament. This goal would also be brought closer by the admission into the United Nations of the German Democratic Republic and a number of other States.

90. Unfortunately, because of certain Western Powers the United Nations is still not a genuinely universal Organization.

91. I would like to say a few words about the agenda of the future conference. In our opinion, support should be

given to those delegations which have suggested that the conference should consider the entire range of disarmament problems, covering both nuclear and conventional weapons. Since it is the nuclear arms race which evokes the greatest anxiety among peoples, primary attention could, if it were the wish of the majority of participants in the conference, be given to the questions of prohibiting and eliminating nuclear weapons. The solution of this problem would represent a substantial contribution to the strengthening of universal peace and security.

92. In addition, the conference could also examine both the problem of general and complete disarmament, which is a crucial issue of the modern age, and separate partial measures to relax international tension and limit the arms race. Among these questions primary attention should be given to the prohibition of chemical weapons, the banning of nuclear weapon tests, the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world, the reduction of State military expenditure and several other questions.

93. The USSR delegation has submitted for consideration by the General Assembly a draft resolution on the world disarmament conference [*A/L.631 and Add.1*]. It should be emphasized that the resolution contains no prior conditions for the convening of the conference. It outlines the organizational measures which are necessary at the first stage of preparation for the conference, and particularly the holding of bilateral and multilateral consultations. In our opinion it is quite clear that now, at this session of the General Assembly, it is essential to agree on the principle of convening a conference. As for such problems as the location, time, agenda and other matters involved in the preparation and holding of the conference, they should be agreed upon during the proposed consultations.

94. Among the many problems that need to be settled before the conference is convened, the date and the agenda are particularly important. They should be settled not later than 1972, as provided for in the Soviet draft resolution.

95. The Ukrainian delegation urges all States to support the USSR draft resolution, so that practical work to implement the idea of convening a world disarmament conference can begin in the very near future.

96. The process of perfecting the stockpiling weapons of destruction cannot go on for ever. The peoples of the world cannot live under the perpetual threat of an atomic world war. Given goodwill on the part of all States, a world disarmament conference can point the way out of the present dangerous situation, and we are sure that in defining their positions with regard to the proposed draft resolution delegations will demonstrate statesmanship and a sense of responsibility for the present and the future of mankind.

97. Mr. THAYEB (Indonesia): With the horrors of the Second World War still fresh in their memories, the founders of the United Nations gave expression to their resolute will to preserve future generations from the scourge of war by providing in Articles 11, 26 and 47 of the Charter for the active participation of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Military Staff Committee in the search for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments and disarmament.

98. For a good many years, the problem of establishing adequate machinery bedevilled the United Nations. By its very first resolution in 1946, the General Assembly established the Atomic Energy Commission, testifying to its preoccupation with the tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The following year, to complement the work of the Atomic Energy Commission, a Commission for Conventional Armaments was established. In 1952, in a further step of reorganization, the Assembly dissolved both those Commissions, and merged their functions in a single organ designated as the Disarmament Commission. Dissatisfaction with the membership of the Disarmament Commission prompted the expansion of its membership in 1958 to encompass all Member States. In 1959, on the initiative of the Conference of Foreign Ministers of France, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States, a Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee came into being, which met for the first time in 1960. Following the failure of the ten-nation Committee in 1961, the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee was set up three months later, based on the joint principles of the USA and the USSR of 20 September 1961. This Committee met for the first time in Geneva in 1962, and was subsequently enlarged to become the present Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

99. These organizational manoeuvres and shufflings were symptomatic of the inability of nations, especially the great military Powers, to put aside their mutual suspicions and competing approaches to disarmament, which obstructed any progress. The disarmament negotiations in the period from 1945 to 1962 failed because of the incipient hostilities of the cold war and the general political atmosphere of the time which, in the 1960s, was epitomized by the conflicting positions over Chinese representation in the United Nations.

100. Despite this period of contention and organizational disarray, the Powers managed to bring to completion a number of disarmament agreements. The first major breakthrough came in 1963 with the partial test ban Treaty, which was followed by the outer space treaties, then the non-proliferation Treaty of 1968, and this year's Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof. Such measures, although extremely important and progressive in character, did not meet the original high expectations of the great military Powers themselves in the years immediately following the war. Neither did they completely fulfil the desires of the non-aligned nations expressed and reiterated at the Asian-African Conference at Bandung in 1955, and at the Conferences of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo in 1964, and recently at Lusaka in 1970. At Cairo, the participating nations went on record as favouring the convening of a world disarmament conference under the aegis of the United Nations.

101. Recognizing the lack of fundamental progress towards controlling the practice of stockpiling and perfecting armaments, the Indonesian delegation put forward in the First Committee at the twenty-fifth session [*1759th meeting*] its suggestion to reactivate the Disarmament Commission or to convene a world disarmament conference. The constellation of political circumstances seems to render the chances of success greater now than ever before. We

therefore regard the present Soviet proposal as having been born under a favourable sign. There is indeed a pressing need for such a conference. My delegation is most grateful to the Soviet Union for its timely initiative.

102. In Europe, *détente* has succeeded the tense confrontation between East and West. The successful negotiations which led to the agreements between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union as well as between the Federal Republic of Germany with Poland, and the Quadripartite Agreement on Berlin,¹¹ have created conditions under which the call for a general conference on European security and co-operation may meet a receptive response. Only last week it was reported that the Soviet Union and the United States had resumed the sixth round of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks at Vienna, and these careful negotiations hold out the promise of substantial agreement in the near future. During the general debate, a large number of States, placing aside the uncompromising attitudes of the past, emphasized the theme of universality, urging us to work for a universality of peace as well as hope in this era of interdependence. Furthermore, the momentous participation of the People's Republic of China in our work here renders possible the most universal negotiations ever conducted within the United Nations system. All these developments augur well for the success of a world disarmament conference.

103. The world's peoples anxiously await this conference in their fervent desire to strengthen conditions of security. In order not to disappoint these expectations or dash these hopes on the rock of failure, meticulous preparations must be taken so that there will be prearranged agreement as to matters of procedure and substance.

104. In similar cases in the past, a special *ad hoc* preparatory committee has made preliminary arrangements, or alternatively, an existing organ has been assigned to this work, for example the sea-bed Committee in the case of the conference on the law of the sea. The Indonesian delegation is inclined to agree with the suggestion of the representative of Egypt [1985th meeting] that preparations should be centred within the United Nations. But we are also mindful of the fact that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament already exists and is functioning, and that in the overriding interest of expedition we could therefore countenance the situation in which the Committee could begin preparations with the least delay. In such a case the possibility of enlarging the membership of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament may well be considered so as to reflect more fully the political reality and regional representation in the Assembly.

105. The non-aligned nations have in general always favoured enhancing the functions of the United Nations, especially in the field of international security and peace-keeping. Thus, my delegation believes that the conference should meet under the patronage of the United Nations. Now that the full participation of the People's Republic of China has been obtained, all the nuclear Powers and most of the world's military Powers exercise membership in the United Nations. Non-membership in the United Nations would not constitute an insuperable impediment to a

universal conference under United Nations auspices. Non-Member States can be invited to participate on the basis of the principle of universality, as many delegates have stated from this rostrum. The Cairo Conference of 1964 envisioned the world disarmament conference within the context of the United Nations. We continue to believe that the United Nations provides the most hospitable setting for so auspicious a conference.

106. As Ambassador Malik of the Soviet Union rightly surmised, the world disarmament conference would undoubtedly need to become "a permanent international forum functioning over a period of time" [1978th meeting, para. 37]. Especially in the light of this judgement, it is important that a permanent institutional link should be forged between this disarmament conference and the United Nations. There has been broad agreement in past years that the control organ to review progress and supervise any disarmament treaty should come under the aegis of the Security Council. In resolution 1722 (XVI), the General Assembly recommended that disarmament should be carried out under "effective international control". To the Indonesian delegation, this can only mean within the United Nations.

107. As for the matters of substance to be discussed, the resolutions of past General Assemblies and the opinions expressed in the First Committee represent a sampling of world opinion on disarmament matters and ought to enlighten the participants as to the direction their efforts can follow. While no one can disagree with the representative of Poland that nuclear disarmament is of the utmost priority, my delegation would like to advocate that a prominent and urgent place in our scheme of work be accorded to the matter of conventional weapons. The frenzied accumulation of armaments costs the developing countries financial resources which they can ill afford, and sometimes results in the mortgaging of their most precious possession of political independence for the purchase of arms from outside sources.

108. Beside non-armament measures, high priority should also be given to actual disarmament measures such as the reduction of armed forces, the destruction of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and the limitation of strategic arms.

109. In the years immediately following the end of the Second World War, the urgency with which statesmen viewed disarmament was based on their preoccupation with the horrible sufferings actually inflicted by the use of modern weaponry, especially the nuclear bomb. Today a new consideration compels us even more urgently to apply ourselves with renewed vigour to ending the arms race. The staggering figure of \$200 thousand million spent by the world's nations on arms last year—fully the equivalent of a total year's income of all the developing countries—reflects the absurdity of this situation. Major Powers which fail to contribute the full share suggested for them by the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade [resolution 2626 (XXV)] revel in the luxury of extravagant defence budgets.

110. It is the essence of the psychology motivating the arms race that military expenditures spiral ever upwards.

¹¹ Signed at Berlin on 3 September 1971.

Meanwhile the allocations for development assistance plummet downwards, even below the already grossly insufficient level. These two trends are not unrelated. With the clearer awareness that now exists of this link between disarmament and development, a world disarmament conference could attempt to synchronize a time-table for disarmament with the realization of the goals of the International Development Strategy. The fact that the First Disarmament Decade was made to coincide with the Second Development Decade will provide a testing-ground where the governments of all nations have the opportunity to demonstrate whether a new approach to disarmament can be inaugu-

rated, or whether they will back-slide into the sterile positions of the past.

111. We have been beset by indecision and hesitation for a time. We have been in danger of losing our direction and our momentum in the pursuit of general and complete disarmament. If we were to lose this direction, we would, in a profound sense, be lost indeed. The world disarmament conference can be a sign-post, marking a new direction and a new orientation which we cannot afford to ignore.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.