UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.2013
8 November 1974

ENGLISH

Twenty-ninth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND AND THIRTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 8 November 1974, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. NEUGEBAUER (Vice-Chairman) (German Democratic Republic)

Rapporteur: Mr. COSTA LOBO (Portugal)

- Reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries /24/ (continued)
  - (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Distribution of the Funds Released as a Result of the Reduction of Military Budgets;
  - (b) Report of the Secretary-General
- Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use: report of the Secretary-General /27/ (continued)
- Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /28/ (continued)

/...

- Urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /29/ (continued)
- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3079 (XXVIII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General /30/ (continued)
- Implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean /31/ (continued)
- World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference /34/ (continued)
- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2286 (XXII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) /100/ (continued)
- Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone intthe region of the Middle East /101/ (continued)
- Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health /103/ (continued)
- Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia /107/ (continued)

AGENDA ITEMS 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 100, 101, 103 and 107 (continued)

REDUCTION OF THE MILITARY BUDGETS OF STATES PERMANENT MEMBERS OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL BY 10 PER CENT AND UTILIZATION OF PART OF THE FUNDS THUS SAVED TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (A/9565, A/9713, A/9770, A/9800)

(a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE FUNDS RELEASED AS A RESULT OF THE REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS;

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

NAPALM AND OTHER INCENDIARY WEAPONS AND ALL ASPECTS OF THEIR POSSIBLE USE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/9726)

CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (A/9708)

URGENT NEED FOR CESSATION OF NUCLEAR AND THERMONUCLEAR TESTS AND CONCLUSION OF A TREATY DESIGNED TO ACHIEVE A COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (A/9593, A/9650, A/9698, A/9708)

IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 3079 (XXVIII) CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL II OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLATELOLCO): REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/9718, A/9797)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A ZONE OF PEACE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN (A/9585, A/9629)

WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (A/9590, A/9628, A/9636)

GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (A/9698, A/9708)

IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 2286 (XXII) CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL I OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLATELOLCO) (A/9692)

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN THE REGION OF THE MIDDLE EAST (A/9693 and Add.1-3)

PROHIBITION OF ACTION TO INFLUENCE THE ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE FOR MILITARY AND OTHER PURPOSES INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, HUMAN WELL-BEING AND HEALTH (A/9702 and Corr.1; A/C.1/L.675)

DECLARATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH ASIA (A/9706)

Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): I should like to join the numerous speakers who have preceded me, in welcoming the fact that the principles of peaceful coexistence of States with differing social systems are being implemented more and more in everyday life. The debate in the plenary meetings of the current session of the General Assembly as well as in this Committee has shown that practically every delegation -- with the exception of one -- has analysed the situation in a similar manner in stating that a process of détente is taking place in the world which is favourable for maintaining peace and international security, favourable for the life of mankind and of all the peoples. We have heard from practically all the delegations that made their statements here -- again with only one exception -- that détente in the political field has to be supplemented by détente in the military sphere. Practically every delegation -- with the exception we have mentioned -- has appealed for an increase in the efforts in disarmament negotiations. All positive proposals in this regard have been welcomed, including the new Soviet initiative which does not relate to any imaginary melting of glaciers as someone is trying to convince us here, but concerns on the contrary one of the fields that is vital in its importance for the future of mankind. We have already had after all an opportunity to comment on this question in detail. Who is then speaking the truth? Is it the delegation of a certain Power which does its best to convince us that all things are different from what the overwhelming majority of the others regards them to be?

The future fate of the whole of mankind depends on the solving of disarmament questions, as well as on the political and economic conditions under which it will live. That is why the representatives of many countries rightly ask that all States, and particularly the nuclear Powers bearing the main responsibility for maintaining world peace and international security, participate in the talks on disarmament and in its solution. The questions of disarmament pertain not

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

only to the maintenance of the security of every individual country but also to other important fields and therefore all whom they concern should participate in seeking solutions to these questions. Some speakers have called disarmament the problem of problems. The continuing arms race financial and irreplaceable human resources from the non-military sphere and all the negative consequences inherent in this process are a convincing proof of what we have said above.

It has become an established practice for the most important problems of world significance and scope to become items on the agenda of world bodies and conferences, where the representatives of all countries have an opportunity to speak on these questions and to contribute to their solution. Lately, problems pertaining to the law of the sea, the world's population, the living environment and others have been dealt with this way. It is regrettable that among the few questions that have not yet been under discussion in a world body in a special conference is the complex of questions pertaining to disarmament, although their importance has been recognized practically by all States in the course of a few past decades.

That is why in 1971 we supported the proposal of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to convene a world disarmament conference and voted in favour of the adoption of resolution 2833 (XXVI) in which the General Assembly expressed its conviction that it was most desirable to take immediate steps to consider carefully the convening of a world disarmament conference and in which it recommended certain further concrete measures. A year later, we supported the adoption of resolution 2930 (XXVII) setting up a special committee to examine all the views and suggestions expressed by Governments on the convening of such a conference. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, being a member of the Special Committee, has always favoured such a course of preparations for the conference as would permit its convening as soon as possible. The deliberations of the Special Committee, which was enlarged at the preceding twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly in accordance with resolution 3183 (XXVIII), were more favourable and we should like to express our particular appreciation of this fact. Under the excellent chairmanship of Ambassador Hoveyda, the Committee

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

has held a number of businesslike sessions and has successfully fulfilled the mandate entrusted to it by the above-mentioned resolution. The Committee prepared its report, contained in document A/9628, and this has become a basis for our deliberations on the questions pertaining to the preparations for and the convening of a world disarmament conference. We view as a positive side of the Committee's work this year the fact that two more Powers have started a relatively active co-operation with this body. Regrettably, certain Powers which are not in favour of the idea of convening a world disarmament conference still stand aside.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

The Power which comes out most strongly of all against the convening of the world disarmament conference, the People's Republic of China, does not participate in any of the disarmament talks and obviously intends to boycott them in the immediate future also. However, we should not remain idle but, on the contrary, we should continue our efforts to succeed with the idea of the world disarmament conference despite all this.

The results achieved in the work of the Special Committee show that numerous questions pertaining to the preparations for and the convening of the world disarmament conference have been singled out and that some of them have been solved in preliminary way. They include, for example, the question of participation in conference, which has in the past caused certain difficulties. Furthermore, there are the questions of the preliminary draft agenda of the conference, its relationship with the United Nations, its adequate preparation and so on.

The work of the Ad Hoc Committee should not be considered as concluded with the submission of its report. On the contrary, the Committee has won the confidence of States and created the groundwork for future activities by gaining valuable experience and by establishing contacts with three of the nuclear Powers. The Czechoslovak delegation is of the opinion that it would be useful if the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee were to be enlarged to enable it to begin specific preparations for the convening of the conference. Sooner or later it will certainly be necessary to entrust some organ with the preparations for the conference. The Ad Hoc Committee, composed of representatives of all geographical groups, could properly be regarded as the body that should be given the task of preparing the world disarmament conference.

An important role in the field of disarmament talks is played by the Geneva Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which has submitted its report on this year's activities in document A/9708. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is a member of that main body where multilateral disarmament talks are held and I should therefore like to make a few brief comments on the Conference's activities.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

As may be seen from the report, the conference has discussed a whole series of disarmament issues, starting with partial measures and ending with the complex of questions pertaining to general and complete disarmament. The work done by the Conference this year may be evaluated, on the whole, as positive, in spite of the fact that no agreement has been worked out that would finally settle some of the specific questions of disarmament. It is well known that the Conference has not succeeded in bringing to a successful conclusion its deliberations on the banning of chemical weapons. The Conference has held several technical meetings with the participation of experts, including a representative of my country. Those deliberations of experts have assisted in singling out certain problems which still stand in the way of solving the question of banning chemical weapons as a whole, and at the same time they have helped to make more precise the positions taken by the individual governments of countries, which will be decisive for the adoption of a specific agreement in the near future, and for the scope of such a measure.

The deliberations have proved that the majority of States, members of the Conference are of the opinion that a relevant agreement should be worked out as soon as possible and that it should involve from the very beginning the banning of the production, development and stockpiling of as large a number as possible of chemical substances that could be used for military purposes, as well as the destruction or transfer to peaceful uses of all banned chemical substances. The trend prevailing in the Committee has been to deal with the complex of questions relating to the banning of chemical weapons gradually, as was proposed in a draft convention submitted by Japan in April this year. Although we made certain critical comments on the Japanese proposal in the Geneva Conference --- comments which still remain valid -- we have on the whole welcomed the proposal as a realistic effort in seeking possible ways of solving this important complex of questions.

Because of the possibility of a joint initiative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the question of banning the most dangerous kinds of means of chemical warfare, announced in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, real hopes have been raised for a successful continuation of the Conference's deliberations on this issue.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

In our opinion, the Political Committee should recommend the adoption of a resolution requesting the Committee on Disarmament to continue its deliberations on the banning of chemical weapons as a question of special priority, and to submit a report on its activities to the thirtieth session of the General Assembly.

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has focused particular attention also on the problems relating to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, which, as is evidenced by the deliberations of the First Committee is becoming ever more urgent, due to the increased possibility that a number of States may be able to produce their own nuclear weapons. Further progress in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy is taking place in the world, which is a logical and useful process and one that may greatly assist the needs of States, particularly developing States. On the other hand, this favourable process is logically accompanied by certain unfavourable factors, and if those factors are not properly regulated, and regulated in time, they might aggravate the situation prevailing hitherto in the field of disarmament and increase the number of countries possessing nuclear weapons. The necessity has therefore arisen, at the present time perhaps more than ever before, to prevent such a further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

One of the realistic ways of achieving that aim would be to strengthen the régime of non proliferation of nuclear weapons and to secure the universality of the non-proliferation Treaty, to which up to now more than 80 States have acceded. Although that number represents the majority of States in the world, it does not include many States, that are important from the military and economic points of view, and thus which have at their disposal every economic, technical and scientific potential for producing their own nuclear weapons.

The evaluation of the five years' existence of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons will be carried out by the conference of participants to the Treaty which is scheduled to be held in May 1975 in Geneva. The preparation of the conference will be carried out, in accordance with the relevant resolution adopted at the twenty-eight session of the General Assembly, by the Preparatory Committee, which held two meetings this year. The results achieved in the Committee's work indicate that the conference will be well prepared in

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

every aspect and that it will be able to fulfil its main task, of further strengthening the régime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the Treaty itself.

This year's deliberations of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament have dealt also with the question of enlarging the membership of that body. As may be seen from the report, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Iran, Peru and Zaire have been admitted as new members. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic supported the admission of those countries, being convinced that their participation in the work of the Conference would contribute to making its work even more active and energetic. The activities of those new members during this year's session of the General Assembly indicate that they will spare no effort within the framework of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva towards reaching a solution on further important disarmament issues. The enlargement of the Committee by five additional members bears witness to the fact that the Committee is regarded as an important organ for the holding of multilateral talks on disarmament and that its work and the results it has achieved are viewed by the world in a favourable light.

However, a very detrimental approach on the part of certain Governments has made impossible the normal functioning of the Special Committee established in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3093 A (XXVIII) on the question of the proposal to reduce the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and to utilize part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries. As may be seen from the letter sent by the President of the twenty-eight session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Ambassador Benites, to the Secretary-General (A/9565), the group of Western European States has not appointed a representative to that Committee, thus paralysing its activities.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

At the same time, that is a question which was pertinently discussed in the plenary General Assembly last year, and the relevant resolution on the question was adopted by an overwhelming majority of votes.

In accordance with part B of that resolution, a group of experts was established, and it considered this complex of qeustions from every angle and assisted in the preparation of the Secretary-General's report (A/9770) entitled "Reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries", which includes additional States with large economic and military potentials.

The report gives a high assessment of the significance of the Soviet proposal and implicity calls for the implementation of resolution 3093 A (XXVIII), adopted on the basis of the Soviet proposal. The report touches also on the so-called technical problems, but those relate to treaties officially concluded among States and therefore are not connected with the reduction of military budgets under the Soviet resolution, which, as a matter of fact, calls for a voluntary unilateral decision to be made by every country. The report underlines also the significance of the reduction of military expenditures for economic progress, thereby showing the significance of all disarmament measures for international security and for economic and social progress. The report states, as a concrete example, that if six of the largest Powers of the world reduced their military budgets by 10 per cent and provided 10 per cent of the means thus saved for economic assistance to the developing countries, a sum of $2,000 million would be saved which might serve to finance important economic projects in a number of States that are in particular need of such assistance.

Questions pertaining to disarmament have annually occupied one of the most important places in the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly. That is a logical phenomenon, since the particular place of these questions in the complex of measures designed to preserve world peace and maintain international security is determined by the fact that the solution of these questions would eliminate or at least narrow the material and technological

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

basis from which wars originate and are waged, irrespective of their kind or scope. Mankind regards disarmament as the most effective way to guarantee peace, as the most effective means to eradicate militarism and get rid of the heavy burden represented by enormous military expenses. Our deliberations should therefore result in the adoption of such measures as would provide these prerequisites for conducting fruitful talks on disarmament issues next year also, in every organ that has dealt with the problems of disarmament from one angle or another.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): If the balance of terror, as it is called, has so far enabled the world to avoid the catastrophe of a horrible nuclear war and if the trend towards international détente has given the international community some hope for a future based on security and peace, neither has in fact been able truly to protect mankind from the impact of the armaments race. That race affects the economic, social, political and human conditions in all countries of the world, whether advanced or developing. The economic and political crises we are witnessing in the world today are nothing but reflections, direct or indirect, of the armaments race and the escalation of aggression.

No one can doubt that what is called the balance of terror, based on huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons and advanced conventional weapons, cannot give the world any real guarantee against the eruption of a nuclear war that would annihilate mankind and destroy the human environment.

What is of great concern in connexion with the fate of mankind is not only the ever increasing stockpiling of nuclear weapons on the territory of the nuclear States themselves, but the increase in the stockpiling of such weapons on imperialist military bases scattered through various parts of the world; that constitutes a grave threat to world peace and security.

There is no doubt that a mistake or a miscalculation could bring the world to the catastrophe of a horrible nuclear war, which would put an end to human existence and destroy human civilization. Man's experience during a long history of bitter wars has proved that such mistakes or miscalculations

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

are not impossible; rather, they can happen at any time in a world where tension has increased as a result of the escalation of aggression and disregard for the legitimate right of peoples to their homeland, and particularly the right to self-determination.

In this connexion I should like to remind members of one of the decisive moments lived through by mankind in modern history, when the whole world was brought to the brink of a horrible nuclear war. I am referring to what happened late last year when the United States of America placed its military forces in all parts of the world in a state of alert, when all its ground, air and naval forces, nuclear or conventional, were put in a state of preparedness for a world war if the situation made that necessary. The United States did that not to defend its national security -- certainly no one was threatening its security -- but to defend the racist, expansionist Israeli régime in occupied Palestine and encourage it to continue its aggressive policy and strengthen its grip on the occupied Arab lands, and also to help it achieve its expansionist programmes by force and continue the genocidal policy it has launched against the militant Arab Palestinian people.

That clearly shows that in the eyes of imperialism the armaments race must be continued in order to ensure imperialism's military supremacy, not to establish a balance of terror with the other military Powers in the world but to ensure the continuation of imperialism's domination of the world and the maintenance of its resources, to protect its interests and the interests of the aggressive, expansionist, imperialist, racist régimes it has established in Asia, Africa, the Middle East and other parts of the world as bases for action against the liberation movements of peoples and as centres to safeguard its interests.

The so-called balance of terror, alleged to justify the armaments race, is actually a lie and a distortion of history and logic.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

This is so because such a balance, even if it has prevented a military clash between the big Powers, has not by any means spared the world from local wars, which are no less serious than the events that humanity witnessed during the two world wars.

The conclusion that we reach as a result of all this is that the armaments race is not the path to the realization of world security, but rather is the path towards war and destruction. The wars in Viet-Nam, in the Middle East and in Africa have proved the fallacy of the imperialist concept based on force and the armaments race, because in spite of the vast quantities and sophistication of the armaments of the United States, the Israelis, the imperialists and the racists, they were unable to crush the will of the Viet-Namese people, or of the people of Palestine, or of other Arab and African peoples. On the contrary, those peoples were able to destroy the imperialist myth of force based on aggression and terrorism.

One of the contradictions on the international scene today is the lack of a link between disarmament and international peace and security, a fact which has rendered all the discussions and negotiations on disarmament fruitless and has led them into a vicious circle. We ask ourselves what is the value of those discussions and negotiations if they do not take into account the emancipation of humanity from fear and terror and the restoration of the legitimate rights of persecuted peoples to their homeland, as well as the elimination of aggression and all its consequences, the liquidation of all forms of foreign military intervention, and the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and barbaric conventional weapons, such as napalm and other incendiary weapons, as well as chemical and biological weapons, and the destruction of their stockpiles, the banning of all nuclear tests conducted for military purposes and the subjection of all nuclear tests for peaceful purposes to international control.

Mankind cannot overlook the bitter facts which prevail in the world today, where international tension is gathering momentum as a result of the armaments race and the escalation of aggressive wars in many parts of the world, at a time when discussions and negotiations on disarmament are taking place in an academic atmosphere remote from reality, or within the framework of the narrow selfish interests of certain countries.

(Mr. Al Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

Despite the conclusion of agreements and treaties on a partial nuclear test ban and the non proliferation of nuclear weapons, a number of countries are still disregarding those treaties, and the growing proliferation of nuclear arms and tests in various parts of the world is causing grave concern among us. The question of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones deserves our careful study, if its objective is to bring about the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and tests and thus to protect humanity from the consequences of armaments.

The Syrian Arab Republic, which joins the efforts of all peace-loving countries to establish the complete and comprehensive prohibition of nuclear arms in the world, welcomed the partial nuclear test ban Treaty and the non-proliferation Treaty, and hastened to sign and ratify them. We believed that although those two treaties fell short of the expectations of all peoples, they still constituted a satisfactory beginning and made a constructive contribution to the development of international co-operation designed to achieve the comprehensive and complete banning of nuclear tests and of the production and acquisition of nuclear weapons. Therefore, we believe that the signing and ratification of those two treaties is indispensable in working for the establishment of such nuclear-weapon-free zones.

The growing technological progress in the development of conventional weapons and the continued supply of those weapons to the aggressive, expansionist, imperialist and racist régimes to help them carry out their expansionist designs to conquer peoples of the world and prevent them from enjoying their right to self determination is something which is not less dangerous than the development of nuclear weapons and their proliferation and acquisition by many countries of the world. This fact calls for decisive, serious and speedy action to limit the development of such weapons, and prohibit their use or the threat of their use in the furtherance of aims that are incompatible with the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law. We must also prohibit the use of such barbaric types of weapons as napalm and other incendiary weapons.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

It is indeed deplorable that the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts has not been able to achieve positive steps towards the prohibition of such arms. During the past year the world has witnessed a dangerous escalation in the use of napalm and other barbaric weapons in the aggressive wars launched by imperialism and its colonialist settler and racist régimes in the world against the militant peoples and movements of national liberation. Every day news agencies carry reports about the continued use of napalm by the Israeli racist settler régime and of its repeated terrorist attacks on the camps of Palestinian refugees in Lebanon. It is evident that that régime would not have dared to use such barbaric weapons indiscriminately against military and civilian personnel alike to carry out its expansionist terrorist plans in the region had it not been for the leniency of the international community in not prohibiting the use of those weapons, and had it not been for the assistance and encouragement that Israel has received, in particular from the United States. The United States is supplying that régime with such awesome weapons. The barbaric effects of those weapons on the environment and on man can still be witnessed in the Palestinian refugee camps and in my country -- the results of the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons and time-bombs by the Israeli forces in the wars of 1967 and 1973 and the repeated terrorist attacks on the Palestinian refugee camps. All this makes it imperative for the international community to give a high priority to the question of adopting suitable international rules to prohibit the manufacture, use and stockpiling of those weapons.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

The Soviet proposal last year to reduce the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and use part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries is fully in keeping with the objective that the international community aspires to achieve, namely the transfer of expenditure on armaments and on the production of means of murder and destruction to constructive uses in order to save millions of human beings from the catastrophes of famine, disease and poverty. A simple comparison between the enormous funds spent by the big Powers on their armament budgets and the funds which could be saved as a result of a reduction of those military budgets by 10 per cent shows just how bright world prospects could be if this reduction were effected in the interests of developing countries and programmes of peace.

No one can ignore the facts of imperialist policy that reveals itself in an encouragement of the spirit of malice and murder in most parts of the world and in the priority accorded this activity over the promotion of peace and the provision of a dignified life for all mankind. It is sufficient in this connexion to recall what the Israeli racist settler régime obtained in the course of a few days only during the war of last October by way of military assistance from the United States of America: this included the most up-to-date and barbaric weapons, such as Phantom aircraft, napalm, and so on, that would help it to concentrate its aggression and increase its ability to murder, destroy and terrorize the region. The value of that assistance was estimated to be $2,500 million. This must be compared with what is needed by more than 30 developing countries in the form of aid for an entire year to save them from difficult economic circumstances and enable them to maintain the level of their basic imports of food-crop fertilizers, which has been estimated at $3,50 million. If we make this comparison we realize the crisis of conscience faced by imperialism and the different aspects of the sorry atmosphere in which our discussions are taking place today.

We hope that the obstacles which prevent the achievement of the objectives of General Assembly resolution 3093 (XXVIII) will be overcome and that the international community will work in unanimity for the realization of the new, humane objectives embodied in the proposal for the reduction by 10 per cent of the military budgets of the big Powers.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

A new item entitled "Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health" has been added to the agenda of the present session on the initiative of the Soviet Union. This deserves our careful consideration and the delegation of my country, which has welcomed this proposal from the beginning and joined in sponsoring the draft resolution on this question (A/C.1/L.675), is pleased to note that this proposal is meeting with wide support from the majority of the delegations which have participated in the discussion so far. This wide support and the excellent presentation of the draft resolution by the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Malik, makes it unnecessary for me to repeat the arguments put forward by others or to reaffirm the importance of this draft resolution.

The continuous deterioration of the international situation caused by the nuclear and conventional arms race and the challenge to the human race represented by the use of napalm and other incendiary and barbaric weapons by certain countries and régimes, together with the increased danger facing mankind as a result of the proliferation of nuclear tests and the acquisition of nuclear weapons, emphasizes the need to convene a world disarmament conference as soon as possible. The convening of such a conference is not impossible if there is sufficient good will and good faith and if we really want our discussions to break out of a vicious circle. We are convinced, as are others, that adequate preparations for that conference must be made in order to ensure its success, but we believe that those preparations should not be used as an excuse to waste time and prevent the convening of the conference. The holding of the conference and the participation in it of all countries are the only means of pursuing a positive course towards the realization of the desire of mankind for general and complete disarmament and the building of an international society free from terror and the balance of terror.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): It is a particular pleasure for me to address to Mr. Ortiz de Rozas the congratulations of the delegation of Tunisia. His high moral and intellectual qualities, his diplomatic skill and his experience in dealing with international problems give us the assurance that in our debates we shall together arrive at encouraging conclusions. We also congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and the other officers of the Committee, in particular our Rapporteur, Mr. Antonio da Costa Lobo, whose presence in that post is a symbol of the changing times.

Some days ago I spoke in the Fourth Committee and pointed out the importance of the presence of the representative of Guinea-Bissau as Rapporteur of that Committee, a presence which is a symbol of the progress achieved by our Organization in the field of decolonization. Those forces newly born from the struggle for liberation are added to the forces of progress which emerged after the Second World War, and it is their task to work relentlessly "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind", as is rightly stated in the Preamble to the Charter, and, in order to attain the noble objectives of that Charter, peace is the essential condition which will make possible the enjoyment of political, economic and social rights, an enjoyment that is hampered, if not seriously jeopardized, by unbridled arming.

(Mr. Driss, Tunisia)

A mere reading of the list of items now on our agenda shows to what extent the disarmament problem constitutes one of the major concerns of the international community. For many years already, our Committee has been meeting every session to consider one of the most complex and serious questions of our time. The question of disarmament, because of its political, economic, legal and social implications, is difficult to solve. It is also a field wherein the international community must act speedily, because any delay in arriving at an agreement promotes the rapid increase of military arsenals and thereby complicates our task.

The Tunisian delegation, in speaking at an advanced stage of our debate, will limit itself to stating its views on some of the items on our agenda.

Preceding speakers have sufficiently emphasized the dangers of the arms race which we are witnessing. The astonishing growth of military arsenals of all kinds constitutes a permanent threat to international peace and security, which are indispensable conditions for the founding of an era of development and prosperity.

On this occasion I should like to add my voice to those of other speakers who have emphasized the important role of the United Nations in seeking a solution to the disarmament problem. The United Nations, particularly for the smaller countries, is the ideal framework for the preparation and adoption of universal measures in the disarmament field. Disarmament is a problem which is of concern to all the people of the world without distinction, because, while all countries do not participate in the manufacture of these weapons, it is now obvious that in case of war they would all fall victim to them. Thus, it is our duty to make use of very possibility open to us to arrive at a satisfactory solution to this grave problem. All means likely to bring us closer to our goal should be explored with the utmost seriousness and objectivity.

It is in this context that we again support the idea of convening a world disarmament conference. We consider that this proposal, made by the Soviet Union three years ago and echoing the concern of the non-aligned countries since the Belgrade Conference of 1961, constitutes a positive suggestion which deserves particular attention from the international community. My delegation

(Mr. Driss, Tunisia)

is aware of the difficulties which are impeding the convening of such a conference. These obstacles are essentially political. May I in this connexion be allowed to emphasize the important role of the Ad Hoc Committee and, in particular, of its Chairman, my friend Ambassador Hoveyda, in seeking a solution to the various problems raised with regard to the convening of such a conference.

Tunisia, a member of the Ad Hoc Committee, has taken note with interest of the constructive attitude adopted in varying degrees by the nuclear-weapon States. The active participation of the Soviet Union, France and the United Kingdom has largely facilitated the task of the Committee. The maintenance of contact with the delegations of China and the United States of America leads us to hope that favourable progress will be made in the preliminary consultations for the convening of the world disarmament conference. We belive that, more than ever, it is necessary to continue consultations, so as to persuade all the nuclear Powers to participate in the preparatory work for the convening of this conference, the success of which will in the first place depend on the attitude of those who possess nuclear weapons. The convening of this conference constitutes for the countries of the third world an element of hope in the struggle which we are waging against the horrifying increase in armaments.

Indeed, the developing countries consider that the arms race in general, and the nuclear arms race in particular, has become a technological race which could continue indefinitely, unless it is stopped by appropriate political action.

Despite the repeated promises and solemn declarations of the nuclear Powers, they have so far given but few concrete proofs of their political will to adopt effective disarmament measures.

It goes without saying that this situation creates the greatest anxiety for the non-nuclear States, which are thus placed in permament insecurity because there is no international provision assuring them that they will not one day be the victims of a nuclear attack or of the threat of the use of such weapons by a neighbouring or distant State possessing these terrible instruments of mass destruction.

However, we are bound to note with satisfaction the statements made by President Giscard d'Estaing in his press conference of 24 October 1974 and by the French Senator, Mr. Taittinger, in the course of our debate, according to which French nuclear weapons would be used only for purposes of legitimate

(Mr. Driss, Tunisia)

self-defence. Such declarations constitute the minimum commitment which the nuclear Powers should publicly undertake, so as to create an atmosphere of reciprocal confidence among themselves and circumscribe the threat which haunts all our countries.

Consultations should be undertaken to draft an appeal and, in due course, a draft declaration with such an aim.

The non-nuclear States have always shown a particular interest in initiatives taken with the intention of removing from the field of application of nuclear weapons a group of countries or entire regions, by the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. As we all well know, the question of denuclearized zones is not new; it was discussed for the first time in 1950 and since that time many proposals have been put forward for the creation of such zones in various parts of the world. Thus, international agreements have already been concluded regarding the Latin American continent and the Antarctic region. Similarly, in 1965 the General Assembly, endorsing the declaration on the denuclearization of Africa published by the Heads of State and Government of the African States, adopted a resolution calling on all States to respect the African continent as a denuclearized zone. Furthermore, in 1971, the General Assembly adopted a declaration making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

It is noteworthy that the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly includes four or five items dealing with the establishment of such zones. My delegation is pleased with the Finnish proposal for the speedy initiation of a complete study of the question and concept of denuclearized zones. We hope that this work will provide us with specific information regarding the attainment of such a goal.

In the meantime, we must deal with the other diverse and constructive proposals which have been submitted to us for consideration this year. The number and the quality of these initiatives not only bear witness to a deep desire for peace and security but are also the result of the concern which all Governments feel because of the persistence of tension throughout the world.

Last year the delegation of Tunisia emphasized the explosive situation prevailing in the Middle East. Besides the alarming declarations which emanate fro this region regarding the imminence of a new war, the warning expressed by the illustrious American Senator, Mr. Fulbright, in a recent press conference on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of Winston Churchill's birth, should urge

(Mr. Driss, Tunisia)

us to take seriously the risk of a conflict fraught with grave consequences for international peace. The unprecedented stockpiling of military materiel in that region constitutes one of the most serious threats to peace at present. It is our duty to make every effort to put an end to this dangerous military escalation by the just solution of problems and the adoption of preventive measures.

My delegation welcomes with great interest the initiative taken by Egypt and Iran regarding the inclusion in the agenda of an item entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

(Mr. Driss, Tunisia)

We consider that the establishment of such a zone will be a positive contribution, not only to peace in the region but also for the security of mankind as a whole.

Tunisia unreservedly supports the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. We listened with interest to the important statement made in this Committee by Her Imperial Highness, Princess Pahlavi, who did not fail to emphasize some of the practical difficulties involved in that proposal. Tunisia considers that the establishment of this zone requires a coherent framework which will take into account geographical and political imperatives. In that connexion, we wonder whether the Mediterranean should not be included within the limits of this zone. In any case, we consider that extending this zone to the Mediterranean could but consolidate the advantages of the Egypto-Iranian initiative. It would, furthermore, make it possible to put an end to the military escalation in the Mediterranean and would facilitate the establishment of an era of co-operation and peace among the countries of the region that love peace and justice. We believe that this task should be inspired by the conclusive experience of the Latin American States which, by sustained efforts, managed to set up a system which guarantees the total absence of nuclear weapons in their region. The positive results which the Latin American countries have achieved are encouraging. On this occasion we wish to express to them our best wishes for success in this noble task.

It is the principle of Tunisia to support every initiative intended to promote peace and security throughout the world. It is in this context that we likewise support the Pakistani proposal to establish a nuclear-free zone in South Asia. I am sure that this initiative will constitute the indispensable complement to the Egypto-Iranian proposal.

We are pleased to take note, too, of the reiterated statements of India regarding the peaceful uses of its atomic energy.

Concurrently with the establishment of zones of peace and security which are free from nuclear weapons, the international community should redouble its efforts to prohibit the manufacture and use of chemical and bacteriological weapons. We hope that in the near future the international community will be able to conclude an international convention prohibiting chemical and bacteriological

(Mr. Driss, Tunisia)

weapons. We must urgently prohibit not only the use but above all the manufacture of such weapons which endanger the very existence of human life.

My delegation notes with horror the rapid development in the world of all kinds of sophisticated and deadly weapons. At the request of the Soviet Union, a new question has been included in the agenda, namely, the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes, incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health.

It seems to me that that proposal deserves to be considered. The incalculable threats to mankind and its environment because of the discovery and improvement of these new techniques, requires that we be continually vigilant. A thorough study of this new Soviet proposal is necessary, particularly at a time when we are endeavouring to protect man and his environment. The world has known, and is still experiencing, sufficient natural catastrophes for the international community not to remain indifferent at the deliberate use of the climate and natural phenomena for military purposes.

It is painful to note that, at a time when all energy should be mobilized to combat underdevelopment throughout the world, certain countries continue to invest considerable sums for the improvement and manufacture of devastating weapons. Would it not be more logical to devote that capital and the recent technological discoveries to the improvement of the human condition?

In condemning nuclear tests we must think not only of the elimination of the danger which threatens our planet, but also consider that this source of energy would be more profitable were it to be used solely for peaceful and creative purposes. The purpose of our action must be the economic development of man and human progress. Nuclear energy used for peaceful purposes could be an invaluable support in accomplishing that task. We are convinced of the usefulness of nuclear energy as an instrument for development and progress. Our opposition to nuclear testing is not addressed to the source of energy but is directed against its use for military purposes.

(Mr. Driss, Tunisia)

We wish to quote the following paragraph from the introduction to the report of the Secretary-General to the Assembly at this session:

"The hope has been widely expressed that the gradual improvement of the international situation would lead to more decisive progress also in the field of disarmament. It is certainly true that the last few years have seen a proliferation in the number of bodies dealing with disarmament, both inside and outside the United Nations. But the increased activity has not led to the kind of effective action that is so urgently needed." (A/9601/Add.1, p. 15)

The conclusion on which Mr. Kurt Waldheim invites us to meditate has been confirmed once again by our debate. An impressive number of proposals have been submitted to our Committee this year. That is proof of the profound concern of Governments regarding military stock-piling. All speakers who have preceded me have without exception spoken of the growing threat which endangers the international community.

However, there are profound divergences when it comes to prescribing a remedy. It seems to us then that the difficulty resides in the choice of the method to be followed to resolve this grave problem. From our debate, it is clear that there is almost unanimous agreement in regard to the following ideas.

First, the arms race continues to absorb immense resources and efforts at the expense of the economic, social and cultural development of peoples. Secondly, this situation is a result of the continuing tension which prevails in international relations as a consequence of the persistence of conflicts in the Middle East, Asia, Africa and elsewhere. Thirdly, any effective action in the field of disarmament requires the active participation of all States, particularly those possessing nuclear weapons. Fourthly, until a global solution is reached it is urgent to implement whatever proposals are made, even if they appear to be insufficient or partial. It is indispensable to move forward. The establishment of denuclearized zones or the prohibition of certain types of weapon might enable us not to remain in a dangerous immobility.

(Mr. Driss, Tunisia)

The problem of disarmament, as the debate this year once again proves, requires a common will without which no serious achievement can be contemplated. It seems that we are all in agreement on the objectives to be reached, but there are divergences in the course to be followed. We believe that the adoption of an effective and realistic method depends on political agreement which is at present lacking, particularly among the nuclear Powers. The absence of political agreement among the nuclear States is a major obstacle to the convening of a world disarmament conference. We believe that the international community should at present direct its efforts to achieving a meeting of minds among the nuclear Powers. And finally, success depends largely on our ability to prepare a common political platform which would be the basis of our future work.

The CHAIRMAN: It will be great pleasure for me to convey the kind remarks made by Ambassador Driss to Ambassador Ortiz de Rozas.

Mr. RAHARIJAONA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): This is the second time I have spoken in this Committee and I cannot refrain from expressing to the Chairman of the Committee, yourself and your fellow officers the sincere and very warm tribute of the delegation of Madagascar because of the authority, competence and effectiveness with which you have been conducting our proceedings.

On the eve of the closing of the general debate on the 12 agenda items submitted to our Committee under the general title of "Disarmament" the delegation of Madagascar does not wish to give way to concern or even to anxiety mixed with indignation or to discouragement.

(Mr. Rahari.jaona, Madagascar)

Are we once again going to confine ourselves to a reiteration of energetic recommendations, when we well know nothing very concrete will ever be done about them? Are we, in ingenuous enthusiasm, going to adopt resolutions that will simply swell the files of moral decisions that are entirely unenforceable and to which we can unfortunately only apply the lapidary phrase used by Cardinal de Retz concerning non-applied juridical rules: "Unenforceable laws fall into disrepute."

Are we once again going to put on our blinkers in the presence of facts so obvious that we need no expert report to corroborate them? And are we merely going to devote ourselves assiduously to the study of the future hypothetical dangers that will provide more than one committee with inexhaustible material for endless discussions?

Certainly, however scant they may be in this vital area, grounds for satisfaction should not be overlooked. My delegation sets a very high value on the proper functioning of international institutions and the strengthening of international security -- too high a value to refrain from mentioning certain facts which may give rise to some hope.

Thus, among other things, the Madagascar delegation has noted with particular interest the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, which was presided over with such distinction and competence by Ambassador Hoveyda. We pay a particular tribute to the authors of that report, which we very much hope will constitute a decisive stage on the way towards the rapid convening of a world conference, which has been recommended by the non-aligned countries since 1961.

The Madagascar delegation has also noted with satisfaction the resumption of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks in Geneva, and has noted with interest the texts of the international agreements between the United States and the USSR, arrived at between 27 June and 3 July 1974, on limitations on the underground testing of nuclear arms, the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems, and the use of the most effective measures to eliminate the dangers presented by the use of techniques of influencing the environment for military purposes.

(Mr. Raharijaona, Madagascar)

The Malagasy delegation also considers interesting the initiative taken to bring about a prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health. We reserve our right to go into that question at a later stage.

Generally speaking, the international community can take some satisfaction in the progress achieved in recent years in the area of peaceful coexistence and détente, in the measures designed to limit or prevent the use of certain weapons, in particular bacteriological weapons, and in treaties such as, in particular, that prohibiting the emplacement of arms of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

If those facts can to any extent give us hope, they do nothing whatsoever to relieve the concern of the Malagasy delegation -- concern, even anxiety, shared, I am convinced, by the entire international community, and particularly by the poorest countries. How can we suppress our concern when we see the vast and still growing gap between the wishes of our countries and the resolutions of our Assembly, on the one hand, and the actual state of affairs in the field of disarmament, on the other?

The main danger we now face is that posed by nuclear arms. On 5 October 1972, addressing the General Assembly, Commander Didier Ratsiraka, the Madagascar Minister for Foreign Affairs, stated:

"... while we note with satisfaction the Moscow Agreement of May 1972 on the limitation of strategic weapons, it still is a fact that the limitation on the installation of anti-ballistic missiles and the establihsment of a numerical ceiling for offensive missiles should have been accompanied by a concomitant limitation on the qualitative increase in the nuclear arsenals of the super-Powers.

"In other words, we whole-heartedly insist upon ... the urgent need for general and complete disarmament. We also advocate the holding of a world conference on disarmament the main objective of which would be the destruction of all nuclear weapons and all weapons of mass annihilation." (2055th meeting, pp. 36-41)

(Mr. Rahari.jaona, Madagascar)

On 3 October 1973, he again expressed his concern by stating:

"We are ... gratified that a bipartite agreement has been reached between the Soviet Union and the United States on the prevention of nuclear war. But here again we cannot give way to unqualified jubiliation. That agreement does not in particular solve, in a global way and with respect for the sovereignty and equality of all States, large, medium-sized or small, the problem of the diversification of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction or their stockpiling, nor does it solve the problem of nuclear testing. In this connexion, we expect the SALT negotiations to produce more positive results; otherwise security may well turn out to be an illusion." (2139th meeting, p. 59-60)

He added:

"Since disarmament is something that concerns us all, not only the super-Powers and the military blocs, we are more than ever convinced of the need to create conditions that will be propitious for the achievement of complete and immediate disarmament." (Ibid.)

And it was at its last regular session, in 1973, that the General Assembly in resolution 3078 (XXVIII), condemned nuclear-weapons testing and, in resolution 3184 (XXVIII), once again appealed for general and complete disarmament. Since then, not only has progress been disappointing but the danger itself has grown. How can we suppress our anxiety when we learn of the composition of the nuclear-arms arsenal of one of the super-Powers; when we learn that one of the super-Powers has increased the number of its land-based ballistic missiles, while the other has considerably improved the quality of its armaments by developing multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles; when we see that the military budgets of the two super-Powers have been growing from year to year to an extent clearly out of proportion with rising prices or the needs of national security, and when we see the quantitati increase in arms being accompanied by, if one may so put it, a qualitative improvement in armaments?

We cannot help being struck by the alarming descriptions of highly qualified authorities of the effects of a nuclear conflagration, descriptions which seem to derive straight from the Apocalypse. We cannot help being struc

(Mr. Raharijaona, Madagascar)

the cloistered, serene but often wholly unrealistic atmosphere which prevails in our disarmament discussions while the facts themselves contrive to make our task ever more difficult.

But this is a task our Organization must carry through to its final conclusion: general and complete disarmament. In that context, the Malagasy delegation repeats its support for proposals for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East and proclamation of a denuclearized zone in South Asia. We shall support any effort to make effective the denuclearization of Africa. Would draw to the attention of the international community resolutions 3079 (XXVIII) and 2286 (XXII) concerning the signing, ratification of the Additional Protocols to the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

(Mr. Raharijaona, Madagascar)

This Treaty provides inter alia for formal commitment on the part of the States parties not to acquire and not to manufacture nuclear arms, and for the possibility of carrying out explosions of nuclear devices for peaceful purposes -- measures which are likely to commend themselves to nations which are concerned to create "peace zones" within their respective regions.

The Madagascar delegation has always placed a very high value on the permanent, close and logical link which should exist between the strengthening of international security, disarmament, the liberation of territories under domination, economic development and the establishment of a new economic order in the sense of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its sixth special session.

It is within this context that we have studied with interest the report of the Secretary-General submitted at the twenty-eighth session on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and military expenditures and the report of the Group of Consultants submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/9770.

But we must once more express our concern when we see that here, too, hopes are scanty if not non-existent, and that the Special Committee created to distribute the funds released has not held any meetings, nor does it seem likely that it is going to be able to in the future, we are to believe the report submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/9800.

This failure among so many others comes at a very bad time, at the very time when the international community has to face up to a particularly serious economic situation, of which the poorest will again be the main victims.

Is there no other encouragement or other consolation to give to the countries which are calling in a spirit of economic justice for the establishment of a new economic order than this modest phrase which find in resolution 3075 (XXVIII) of the General Assembly:

(Mr. Raharijaona, Madagascar)

"Considers that the constant awareness and the continuing review of the effects of the arms race and of military expenditures, especially in the nuclear field, could facilitate future negotiations on disarmament;" (General Assembly resolution 3075.(XXVIII), para. 3)

We refuse to believe that the international community can long content itself with such euphemisms, and we are convinced that it will provide a courageous and just answer which the developing countries are looking for.

Now, and to keep to essential matters, how can we fail to express our disappointment, how can we suppress our anxiety when we see how little progress has been achieved within the framework of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

One of the questions of the greatest interest to the Madagascar delegation is that of the application of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

Speaking in the Assembly on 3 October 1973, the Foreign Minister of Madagascar raised this fundamental problem for the first time, in these terms:

"The creation of zones of peace similar to that which is planned for the Indian Ocean would undoubtedly be one of the instruments which we could use to achieve our goals of disarmament, peace and security. Actually, in the case of the Indian Ocean, the creation of a zone of peace would make it possible for the countries concerned to get together in order to establish co-operation based on genuine mutual trust.

"Outlawing the present race -- which in fact draws heavily on the theory of spheres of influence -- would make it possible for the utilization of the material resources of the countries in that area for purely peaceful purposes. It would make possible the guarantee of independence and the genuine sovereignty of those countries without risking direct or indirect interference." (A/PV.2139, p. 61)

(Mr. Raharijaona, Madagascar)

That statement still remains the underlying foundation of the unvarying attitude of my country to the question of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

My delegation would like to take the opportunity to pay tribute to the hard work done by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. We have noted with interest the information gathered under the Committee's directives. Although we were somewhat surprised by the nature of the sources of information used, we recognize that the subject is not an easy one to comprehend, and that in any c the information gathered in this way will help to strengthen its conviction that the Indian Ocean continues to be the chosen arena for the rivalry of the great Powers.

It is incidentally with this in mind that my Government published a communiqué which was issued following the announcement of the United States-United Kingdom project to expand port and air installations on the island of Diego-Garcia. That communiqué was distributed as a document of our Assembly in document A/9585. I will remind the Committee of its concluding words:

"The Government of the Malagasy Republic:

"Reaffirms its most vehement opposition to any policy of 'zone of influence' and hegemony and also to any construction of military bases outside national territory.

"Appeals to all the forces of peace and progress throughout the world, particularly to the non-aligned countries and to the members of the OAU, to bring pressure to bear on the United States of America and the United Kingdom so that they abandon their project.

"Requests all the great Powers and the 'super-Powers' to do everything they can to strengthen peace and security in the zone of the Indian Ocean - which has so far escaped military conflict -- particularly at a time when active efforts are being made to restore peace and tranquillity in the neighbouring area of the Middle East." (A/9585, Annex, p. 2)

(Mr. Raharijaona, Madagascar)

Confirming the terms of this communiqué, our Head of State, General Gabriel Ramanantsoa stated at the second summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity in Mogadiscio:

"Some great Powers are trying to disturb the tranquillity of the ocean which surrounds us contrary to the decision of the United Nations making a zone of peace out of this ocean. In injecting their quarrels between the rich nations, they are trying to force us against our will to defend a cause which is not our own."

Our geographical position and the value we place on our security have prompted us to make our contribution to this work here, without prejudice, however, to the debates and discussions which will be taking place in specialized bodies or committees.

My delegation feels that we have now arrived at the stage of discussing modes of action, and we suggest four guiding principles for future action in the area of the Indian Ocean:

First, the problems of the Indian Ocean must not be brought up and studied piecemeal. They should be approached in a global fashion. But with regard to disarmament, priority should be given to measures to ensure security and maintain peace, without losing sight of the development needs of the countries concerned.

Secondly, initial efforts should concentrate on concerted action on the part of the countries concerned -- the coastal and the hinterland nations -- which bear the primary responsibility, with a view to creating an atmosphere of genuine and mutual confidence.

(Mr. Raharijaona, Madagascar)

Thirdly, it is necessary to work on the clarification of certain definitio for example, the definition of a denuclearized zone, a land-locked country, and on -- and also on the geographical delimitation of the region concerned.

Fourthly, henceforth any activity for military purposes which is liable to jeopardize peace and security in the area should be prohibited.

The delegation of Madagascar is in any case convinced that the creation of peace zones can constitute an effective means of strengthening international security and cannot possibly be, as some people have said here, a limited and partial measure contrary to the international practice of the law of the sea or a discriminatory one.

Obviously it is not possible to cover in a single statement all the importa items before us. However, I should not like to pass over in silence the propose designed to achieve prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health. That proposal will receive the support of our delegation. I shall leave it to those who are better qualifi than I am to comment on the draft convention before us and particularly to analy its scientific and technical aspects.

I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the danger which may exist for the developing countries which are anxious to protect their natural resources and to mobilize them exclusively for the well-being of their own people and of mankind, the danger of the possible development of meteorologi geophysical or other scientific procedures which could damage, modify, divert or annihilate portions of those natural resources, whether they be on land or in the sea. The same danger, incidentally, may threaten the resources recently defined in a General Assembly resolution as constituting part of the common heritage of mankind. That is why the Madagascar delegation believes that we should condemn or prohibit not only all actions for military purposes but also any economic aggression the effect of which might be a reduction of the economi potential of a nation.

(Mr. Raharijaona, Madagascar)

The delegation of Madagascar has not attempted to conceal its concern, anxiety and scepticism regarding the continuing efforts, stubborn but futile, of the international community to banish from our universe military rivalries, terror and the perpetual threat of a conflagration which might very well be the last, but we should like in conclusion to reaffirm our great confidence in international institutions. We are perfectly well aware, as indeed many delegations have reminded us here, that the essential elements of a real solution for the problems of general and complete disarmament are to be found in the will of the super-Powers to respect the wishes of the vast majority of mankind and to seek security, peace and economic justice.

However, we cannot concede that those who have neither the means nor the desire to devote themselves to an arms race should be excluded from the international debate on disarmament. We therefore endorse the reaffirmation in General Assembly resolution 3185 (XXVIII) that

> "... all States have the right to participate on a basis of equality in the settlement of major international problems in accordance with the principles of the Charter so that peace and security will be based on effective respect for the sovereignty and independence of each State and the inalienable right of each people to determine its own destiny freely and without outside interference, coercion or pressure".

We shall continue to seek, alongside the countries of the third world, particularly the African States and countries of the non-aligned group, any solution which could make our common work significant and genuinely effective.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Madagascar for the kind words he addressed to the officers of the Committee.

Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia): Since the end of the Second World War there have been continuous rounds of negotiations for ending the arms race. Hundreds of meetings have been held, at which millions of words have been uttered. There have been negotiations on disarmament and arms limitation in Geneva, in Helsinki, in Vienna, there have been discussions in this Assembly

(Mr. Anwar Sani, Indonesia)

and elsewhere. Efforts are being made for the convening of a world disarmamen conference and the membership of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmamen has been enlarged.

All those diplomatic labours have indeed not been without positive achiev They have resulted in such arms limitation agreements as the 1959 Antarctic Treaty, the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty, the 1967 outer space Treaty, the 196 non-proliferation Treaty, the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of Biological Weapons, and other agreements. I would be the last to say that those achievemer were not important. However, they are not really disarmament treaties. And, whatever their virtues may be, it is a fact that they have failed to prevent a very high increase in the stockpiling of armaments. While we are talking about disarmament, arms expenditure is doubling every 15 years. Nuclear testing has been stepped up since the 1963 test-ban Treaty. While the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks have been taking place, the number of delivera American and Soviet warheads has increased dramatically and the systems of delivery have become increasingly sophisticated. In short, the results of the efforts to control the arms race, including the much heralded Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, have in reality been illusory as far as their effect on real disarmament is concerned.

It has become more and more difficult to escape the impression that discussions on disarmament in this Committee, and for that matter in any other forum, may perhaps be just an exercise in futility. In this Organization, we have, year after year, gone through the ritual of making statement after statement repeating more or less the same arguments, followed by the adoption of resolution after resolution, and the only result has been the increasing intensification of the arms race, not only quantitatively but also qualitatively as to the destructive capacity of weapons.

There are certainly well-founded reasons for blaming the big nuclear Powers for the failure so far to achieve real disarmament, since those Powers have continued not only to pile up more arms, nuclear as well as conventional, but also to improve on the deadliness of the weapons they already possess. However, we would be less than candid if we failed to point out that many medium-sized and small nations have also, each for its own reasons, found it necessary to increase their armaments as soon as they have had the means or the opportunity to do so.

(Mr. Anwar Sani, Indonesia)

As I stated earlier, efforts towards disarmament and arms limitation undertaken since the Second World War have not been without results, though not so much in the sense that the world has indeed started to disarm or that we have really succeeded in limiting arms. The big Powers are apparently aiming more at achieving parity than at disarmament. The main results of disarmament efforts are perhaps to be found in the fact that to a certain extent they have been instrumental in preventing the outbreak of armed conflicts between the big Powers and have helped to create a certain atmosphere of détente. Though physical conflicts between the big Powers have been avoided, apparently nothing much can be done to prevent the outbreak of armed confrontations between the smaller nations, as if making those smaller nations the testing grounds for new types of weapons.

All those factors have led my delegation to wonder whether the continuing discussions on disarmament in this Committee can realistically be expected ever to achieve their aims, since apparently every country which is in a position or has the opportunity to do so continues to increase its armaments. That leads my delegation to wonder whether our proceedings are merely intended to give an opportunity for us to air our feelings of impotence and frustration, without our being convinced of their practical usefulness towards real disarmament. We continue to express our concern about the increasing arms race and we continue to talk about disarmament, while in fact we should like to arm ourselves as soon as we have the means or the opportunity to do so.

(Mr. Anwar Sani, Indonesia)

My remarks may have a pessimistic ring, but I should like to assure the Committee that Indonesia is genuinely interested in the continuation of serious efforts towards achieving concrete disarmament, both in the sphere of nuclear weapons and in that of conventional arms. My delegation believes that in order to proceed in a more fruitful manner we should not fail to recognize our failure so far to achieve real disarmament. We should, furthermore, devote our efforts to analysing our failures and formulating concrete measures to overcome them. Perhaps the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, now that its membership has again been enlarged, will be able to play more effectively the role that has been assigned to it.

It is in that spirit that Indonesia expresses its continued support for further efforts to achieve disarmament, efforts that we hope will lead towards greater security for nations, big and small towards the elimination of wars, big and small, and towards arresting the continued increase of the manufacture and sale of weapons that have so gravely prejudiced the security of the world.

Indonesia, like any other developing country, cannot but be in favour of genuine disarmament. We need the means and resources at our disposal for development purposes, in order to bring about material and spiritual well-being for the people in the implementation of the principle of social justice, which has been one of the promises of independence.

Allow me now to make some remarks on the question of the world disarmament conference. My delegation's deep appreciation goes to my colleague and good friend Ambassador Hoveyda of Iran, who has presided in such an excellent manner over the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference. His task has been far from easy, but because of his great diplomatic skill and persistent efforts the Ad Hoc Committee has been able to achieve some progress in its latest meetings. From a non-committee it has become a committee. Two more nuclear Powers, namely the United Kingdom and France, have participated in the work of the Committee, in addition to the Soviet Union, which has taken part since the Committee's inception. The other nuclear Powers, China and the United States, maintain contacts with the Committee through its Chairman. Also, the fact that the Committee has succeeded in preparing its report is in itself an indication that some progress has been made.

(Mr. Anwar Sani, Indonesia)

My delegation has on earlier occasions already expressed its support for the idea of convening a world disarmament conference. I had the opportunity to elaborate on my delegation's views before this Committee during the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. Those views remain valid. It is the opinion of my delegation that we should not act with undue haste but should convene a world disarmament conference only after we are reasonably assured, on the basis of careful preparatory work, of its chances of success. At the same time, we strongly believe that we should continue to make serious efforts to achieve concrete progress in this admittedly difficult preparatory work. We believe, furthermore, that if the conference is to produce constructive results, the participation of all nuclear Powers is an absolute necessity. What is even more important is the readiness of those Powers not only to participate but to do so in good faith. It is generally recognized that the main cause of lack of progress in disarmament has been the lack of any genuine effort on the part of the big Powers. One of the basic requirements for achieving meaningful progress in disarmament is the existence of a genuine political will among the nuclear Powers. They should agree on the measures necessary to abolish all weapons of mass destruction, as a first step towards general disarmament. It has been said that once the political will exists, the forum for negotiation is irrelevant. The absence of such political will, however, would make the efforts of this Committee irrelevant.

May I now comment on the draft resolution aiming at the reduction by 10 per cent of the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council and the utilization of part of the funds saved to assist developing countries. My delegation continues to support the idea. At the same time, we maintain our scepticism, which we expressed in last year's debate, with regard to the practicability of the idea so long as its implementation is made conditional on the agreement of all the permanent members and none of them is prepared to give the good example without waiting for the others to do so.

Another item which is of great concern to my delegation is the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. My delegation notes with satisfaction that some progress has been made by the Ad Hoc Committee not only in preparing its report but also, and particularly, in adopting by

(Mr. Anwar Sani, Indonesia)

consensus the draft resolution that has been submitted to this Committee. Such progress has been made possible by the able guidance of the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, Ambassador Amerasinghe, and the co-operation and understanding of its members.

The progress achieved so far on the question of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace has not, I regret to state, been as rapid as we might have wished. For example, the consultations between the littoral and hinterland States and the extra-regional Powers envisaged in operative paragraph 3 of teh Declaration in resolution 2832 (XXVI), proclaimed three years ago, have yet to take place. Moreover, as the statement of the experts indicates in document A/AC.159/1/Rev.1, during the past few years there has been a substantial increase in great-Power naval activity in the Indian Ocean. That activity is inconsistent with the Declaration, which calls upon the great Powers to halt "the further escalation and expansion of their military presence in the Indian Ocean" (resolution 2832 (XXVI), para. 2 (a)). Should that escalation continue, it will inevitably place the entire concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace in serious jeopardy. What is needed now is an understanding between the littoral and hinterland States and the extra-regional Powers to avoid another upward spiral of big Power naval rivalry in the Indian Ocean.

It is from that viewpoint that Indonisia fully endorses the recommendations contained in the Ad Hoc Committee's report (A/9629) and the draft resolution adopted unanimously by the members of that Committee. Of particular importance in this respect is paragraph 4 of the recommendations contained in the report and operative paragraph 4 of the accompanying draft resolution, which, in pursuance of the Declaration, requests the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean to enter as soon as possible into consultations with a view to convening a conference on the Indian Ocean.

The primary objective of such consultations among the coastal and hinterland States would be to endeavour to define broad areas of agreement among them, and to formulate a common viewpoint, shared by all, on the implementation of the Declaration. That common viewpoint would become the basis for consultations and negotiations with the big Powers and the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Anwar Sani, Indonesia)

I have to admit in all sincerity that the formulation of such a common viewpoint among the littoral and hinterland States will not be an easy task. Nor will it be easy to bring to a successful conclusion the consultations and negotiations with the big Powers and the major maritime users. However, if we are all earnest enough in our desire to put into effect the principles enunciated in the Declaration, we shall ultimately be able to reconcile our differences and to establish an acceptable basis for common action. But we must make a concrete start.

(Mr. Anwar Sani, Indonesia)

Another question of considerable importance is the issue concerning the creation of nuclear-free zones. It is encouraging to note that at the present session of the General Assembly we are discussing, in addition to the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in Latin America, the concept of establishing similar zones in the region of the Middle East and South Asia. My delegation welcomes the initiatives taken by the delegations of Egypt, Iran and Pakistan.

As has been indicated in the past, my delegation has consistently supported the concept of the creation of such nuclear-free zones. It is the opinion of my delegation that the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world will make an important contribution to the limitation of the nuclear arms race and will thus constitute a significant step towards the strengthening of the structure of peace and security at the regional and the global level.

It has always been the view of my delegation that co-operation and agreement between the countries in a region should play a crucial role in the attainment of regional objectives. Therefore, the establishment of nuclear-free zones will ultimately depend upon the co-operation and understanding among the countries of the region concerned. It is for this reason that my delegation would suggest that the countries of the region should enter into consultations for the purpose of implementing that concept. Those consultations could deal, among other things, with such problems as the geographical definition of the zone, the rights and obligations of the parties involved, the security interest of the countries in the region and other relevant problems. As far as Indonesia is concerned, it has always been our position that when confronted with issues concerning a region we are primarily guided by the views of the countries of that region. With regard to the specific proposals to establish nuclear-free zones in the Middle East and South Asia, we are very much interested in hearing the views of all the countries of those regions.

In conclusion, I should like to address myself briefly to an item which my delegation considers to be very important, namely, item 103, on the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health, which has been put on the agenda on the initiative of the Soviet Union.

(Mr. Anwar Sani, Indonesia)

The significance of this item has been thoroughly and convincingly explained by Ambassador Malik of the Soviet Union. Indonesia considers the Soviet proposal to be an important initiative as it deals with a problem which is of great concern to the international community, namely, the preservation of the environment for all mankind. Such measures for the preservation of the environment, if adopted, would at the same time constitute another step forward in the efforts to limit the arms race.

Indonesia has no difficulty in supporting the Soviet proposal. The draft convention annexed to the draft resolution merits serious study. My delegation would like to stress that nothing in the proposed measures should impede the efforts of States in the field of economic, scientific or technological development for the purpose of the preservation and improvement of the environment for peaceful purposes.

In this connexion, my delegation would like to draw the attention of the Committee to the remarks made by Ambassador Yango of the Philippines in his statement in this Committee on the destructive potential of tropical storms which have so often caused great destruction in his country.

Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia): Permit me, Sir, through you, to add the voice of my delegation to the voices of those that have congratulated Ambassador Ortiz de Rozas on his elevation to the chairmanship of this prestigious Committee. We supported his election in the firm conviction of his ability and sagacity to lead our deliberations to a successful conclusion, and his performance since then has strengthened that conviction. We wish also to congratulate you personally, Sir, and your colleagues, the other Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur. We assure the officers of the Committee of our whole-hearted co-operation.

Let me say at the outset that full and complete disarmament by a new approach is the highest aim of the Liberian Government, for we do not think that one can put new wines in old wineskins.

(Mr. Dosumu-Johnson, Liberia)

In the history of human society one of the most instructive lessons is that the idea of getting together, knowing each other, and working as a team in co-operation is a necessary factor in all areas of development. Nevertheless, man's inveterate and implacable foe throughout his period of evolution is his refusal to subordinate self to the interest and well-being of mankind generally, a refusal that gives rise to misapprehensions, avarice, national political confrontations, distortions and wars.

To correct the political and social imbalance aggravated by two world wars, the United Nations, as an idea, as a movement and as an institution, was born to challenge old habits of thought and to redirect or reform existing conditions to the end that peace and abundant life might prevail over the cruel forces of national prestige, racial hatred and discrimination, want and war.

In advocating the universality of the United Nations, the founding fathers envisaged its survival of the rigours of mediaeval ideological dissension and ushered in among men a new world order in which that larger part of humanity which used to be passive sufferers might become active participants and effective actors in the pursuit of global peace.

But as we listen to the opinions of various delegations, especially those of the nuclear Powers, we are dismayed. When on 31 October one representative of a nuclear Power referred to the non-proliferation Treaty as "a discriminatory, misleading, illusory and in the end, ineffective instrument" (2005th meeting, p. 21) after six years of its existence; when we heard the diatribes of two permanent Powers of the Security Council here in this Committee on 4 November -- we cannot believe that their aim is to defuse the perils of nuclear or bacteriological extermination of the human species.

At the heart of the disarmament problem, in my opinion, is the tendency to put the cart before the horse, instead of moving beyond cold war fears and creating the means of achieving new attitudes for the elimination of fears and national rivalries -- in essence, a call for self-scrutinizing understanding of the psychological aspects of the armament dilemma. Disarmament can be secured only if we first seek confidence, if we first seek trust and mutual understanding.

(Mr. Dosumu-Johnson, Liberia)

You cannot understand the apprehension of small nations like my own which take no kind even of small arms for police service. Mature reflection then leads me to the conclusion that small nations do not have a foreign policy in the sense of flexible alternatives: they have merely a policy of existence, and this policy of existence ultimately depends upon the help of others. And these others, as members of the world community, should make their actions and performances defensible, conscionable and worthy.

Having spoken on this issue for many years past, and relying now upon the diagnosis of abler speakers before me, it would be superfluous for me to occupy the Committee's time with a further recital of the history and statistics of this issue, and I shall refrain from doing so unless forced by future developments. I shall therefore be very brief.

Membership in the world community implies constructive accommodation and a creative relationship with all States in the search for a new approach to world disarmament on the basis of mutual respect and humanitarianism rather than ideological confrontation and the use of cliché opinions. The alternative to coexistence is co-destruction. Friendship in theory must be translated into friendship in practice for the good of all mankind.

The items on disarmament on the United Nations agenda since 1945 have been most controversial and will so continue unless we act like men of thought. Article 26 of the Charter states:

> "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 establishemnt of a system for the regulation of armaments."

However, national prestige has seemingly negated this great ideal.

In the intervening years many conferences have been held and proposals submitted, but because of big-Power rivalries and small-Power jealousies no acceptable formula has been agreed upon and the discussions and debates become more political and sterile. It is now obvious that the

(Mr. Dosumu-Johnson, Liberia)

responsibility for total and complete disarmament, which is my delegation's highest priority, rests in the main with the super-Powers which make most of the deadly weapons of war. Among the super-Powers I include all nations possessing the potentialities for the manufacture of unconventional arms and nuclear weapons, for peaceful purposes or for war.

The discussions on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty, the non-proliferation Treaty and other aspects of disarmament have resulted in many resolutions. My delegation thinks that the billions of dollars spent annually for arms should be diverted to the peaceful use and benefit of all mankind, thus saving succeeding generations from the scourge of another world war.

Work for peace and security is the responsibility of the United Nations, but Members must divest themselves of bloc influences or regional solidarity so as to understand the national will to power or the paranoid delusions of heads of Governments. It is not enough to encourage technologists to look at human problems in disinterested ways. What is necessary today is a technology of behaviour, a reconstructed view of goals and priorities. The fate of this world is determined by the values which govern the decisions of the super-Powers. We have talked too long on test bans, on nuclear-free zones, on the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) and on other aspects of war. Let us now find a new approach to peace and confidence, for in times of emergency no area will be free, even in terms of conventional means. The Second World War was fought in Europe, but what did we see? The Graf Spee was scuttled in the waters off Montevideo.

Because disarmament involves moral, economic, strategic, political and diplomatic implications, it is difficult to achieve instantaneous agreement. The agreements that are achieved are not always kept for long, but persistence in the search for an acceptable modus vivendi is a prima facie assumption of the merit of our efforts.

The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will not solve the disarmament problem. They will arouse suspicion and fear of blackmail on the part of other States. Hence the tendency to make various regions nuclear-free zones may lead ultimately to home-made bombs.

(Mr. Dosumu-Johnson, Liberia)

Different States may project different perspectives of arms control and disarmament and of the strategic arms limitation negotiations in progress, and this is understandable considering political concerns, geographic circumstances and economic ties. SALT may not allay the fears or fulfil the hopes of many States, or change political attitudes or slow down progress in weapons development. It is difficult to solve great international problems: to think otherwise would be intellectual arrogance. The most we can do is hope to survive world problems and entertain hopefully the confidence that these talks will contain weapons development at the margin and, by some personal diplomatic process, increase the degree of control of national Governments over the course of events in their respective countries. They should never be viewed in the context of attempting to keep any nation or State permanently in a position of political inferiority. If anything, they should bring nations closer together and ensure their national security.

The urgency of the present situation demands that immediate steps be taken to convene a world disarmament conference, which my delegation wholeheartedly supports, to deter States with nuclear capabilities from developing their own stockpiles and small nations from seeking, through fear, development protection on a regional basis. But, most important, it should serve as a conference in search of the means of ensuring and improving trust, confidence and the social development of States without which no global disarmament is possible in our time.

Africa has a great stake in disarmament and confidence is the key. Our guarantee is global security in which every nation is protected by all other nations.

(Mr. Dosumu-Johnson, Liberia)

While my delegation supports, and should support, all resolutions on disarmament, however innocuous, and, ipso facto, all declarations and conventions for regional nuclear-free zones, the impending escalation of nuclear capability in a world of doubts and distrust should make imperative, as the best safeguard against the annihilation of the world, a vigorous effort to make the whole world a nuclear-free zone. Regionalism invites suspicion, fear and distrust, especially when of different ethnic affinity.

Money or, if you will, great wealth is the kingpin to the acquisition of technological expertise and, thereby, nuclear capability. Oil is an important factor in the accumulation of national prestige, wealth and power, and with it a new form of geopolitics. In this context Mexico, Iran, the OPEC States, the North Sea countries, Nigeria, Indonesia, South Viet-Nam, Malaysia, Taiwan, to name only a few, are all destined for the super-Power club because of their expected wealth. Unless we are wise and act now to ensure world confidence to direct these new oil States to help mankind to live better, their natural resources may in time be applied to the prestigious production of bombs and weapons of mass destruction, despite assurances of their peaceful uses. In the constants of history, there are ever-present temptations to make treaties worthless, unless these treaties are internationally maintained.

If, as the Founding Fathers contemplated, the voting patterns in the United Nations were on merits rather than on polarized ideological blocs, a moratorium on disarmament discussions would be suggested in favour of a vigorous prosecution of food-getting and its distribution, on the assumption that no State would venture to make war on another Member State with impunity. Nevertheless, when it is realized that hunger and famine and their concomitants of malnutrition, disease and death are as challenging as the ravages of war, the great Powers of our world may be induced to reconsider their disarmament conceptions and subordinate their great Power influence to make war to the production and distribution of food as their highest national and international priority. Altruism is the hallmark of civilized society. In an interdependent world, resources must be shared and concepts of altruism adjusted. The nations of the world need food, shelter and clothing, not war machines.

(Mr. Dosumu-Johnson, Liberia)

According to former Chancellor Willy Brandt, when he spoke in the General Assembly in 1973,

"... morally it makes no difference whether a man is killed in war or is condemned to starve to death by the indifference of others." (A/PV.2128, p. 17)

A moratorium on arms production would generate thousands of millions of dollars to create the social and economic revolution necessary to reduce the stranglehold of third world poverty; and this is possible only from the idealism, self-sacrifice and dedication of the super-Powers in co-operation with the developing world.

It is a tragedy of our humanity that, even though we know that the road which we have been following is not the right road, we none the less persist in following it.

There would have been no super-Powers adamant on a ban of nuclear weapons, if these super-Powers did not have satellites among the developing States to support and condone their every act on ideological or so-called non-aligned bases. In other words, they maintain their super-Power posture because they have inflexible satellites to encourage their intransigence.

While it is the prerogative of each State to do as it pleases within its national hegemony, as members of the world community they are in the exercise of their sovereignty committed to the well-being of the world within self-imposed limitations.

It is the considered judgment of my delegation that the five permanent members of the Security Council, and all prospective nuclear Powers, will participate fully in the work of the coming disarmament conference as an earnest indication of their genuine interest in the social, economic and peaceful political benefit and security of the third world and so obviate some of the extravagant speculations engendered by misplaced confidence and divisiveness.

Disarmament, I assure you, will not with the best intentions be easy to achieve; it may be traumatic, even catastrophic, with great stress on the international political fabric. The crucial thing to do now is to create a peaceful order for an increasingly interdependent world. This will require a new generation of leadership, understanding and generosity of spirit without parallel in the history of international political practice.

(Mr. Dosumu-Johnson, Liberia)

Permit me to close my statement with a story entitled "Dedicated to those in search":

"Once our Master, Rabbi Hayyim of Zans, told us this parable:

"A man had been wandering about in the forest for several days to find the way out. Finally, he saw a man approaching him in the distance. His heart was filled with joy. 'Now I shall surely find out which is the right way out of this forest', he thought to himself. When they neared each other, he asked the man, 'Brother, will you please tell me the way out of the forest? I have been wandering about in here for several days and I am unable to find my way out.'

"Said the other man to him, 'Brother, I do not know the way out either, for I too have been wandering about in here for many days. But this much I can tell you. Do not go the way that I have gone, for I know that it is not the way. Now come, let us search for the way out together.'

"Our Master added: So it is with us. The one thing that each one of us knows is that the way we have been going until now is not the way. Now Come, let us join hands and look for the way together."

While reserving my delegation's right to speak again on the relevant draft resolutions if it becomes necessary, it is our fervent wish that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament will put its hands in the labyrinth of disarmament conferences and institutions and evolve ways to global détente, genuine disarmament and international security. Bearing in mind that we live in a world polarized between communism and capitalism, scientific socialism and other political nomenclatures, disarmament demands delicate handling and altruism.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Liberia for his very kind words addressed to the Chairman and officers of the Committee. We have thus concluded the list of speakers for this morning's meeting but, Ambassador Templeton of New Zealand has asked to speak, in accordance with the procedure established by the Committee, in order to introduce a draft resolution which was distributed this morning. I therefore call on the representative of New Zealand.

Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): Mr. Chairman, as this is the first occasion on which my delegation has raised its voice in this Committee this year, I should like to congratulate all its officers most warmly on their election.

I am grateful for the opportunity to speak very briefly at this stage, in order to introduce, on behalf of the sponsors, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.683.

I do not propose during this statement to discuss at length the reasons why my delegation has again this year considered it necessary to take part in the preparation of a draft resolution on the testing of nuclear weapons. I shall have an opportunity to say something more on this subject in the remarks which I hope to make later in the general debate.

At this moment I should merely like to express my great gratification at the fact that 15 countries have so far joined in sponsoring the draft resolution. There are three countries from Africa, three from Europe, three from Latin America, three from Asia and three from the South Pacific, namely, Australia, New Zealand and Fiji. I should mention that, since the draft resolution was submitted, the delegation of Colombia has confirmed its intention of becoming a sponsor. The geographical spread of this sponsorship is sufficient indication, I believe, of the fact that the problem of continued nuclear-weapon testing remains one of deep world-wide concern.

A second feature which gratifies my delegation very much is that sponsors of both of last year's draft resolutions have come together to discuss a single text. I should like to express my delegation's thanks especially to the delegation of Mexico, which made a number of valuable suggestions

(Mr. Templeton, New Zealand)

about the wording of our draft, and is one of its sponsors. My delegation would very much welcome further sponsors, when delegations have had the opportunity to study the text.

I do not think it is necessary for me to explain each paragraph in the draft resolution, since many of them are in fact self-explanatory. The preamble sets the scene, as it were, for the operative part, and explains the reasons why we have found it necessary to put forward a draft resolution in such strong terms. We believe that the world is gravely concerned that weapons testing continued in 1974 without any slackening. We believe that testing intensifies the arms race and facilitates the development and proliferation of nuclear-weapons capacity. This, in turn, increases the threat of nuclear war. We are faced, moreover, with the risk that radio-active contamination from nuclear explosions will have consequences of an irreversible nature for the health of mankind, both now and in the future.

The operative part of the draft resolution begins by condemning all nuclear tests, wherever they may be conducted. I know that some delegations will feel that this is strong language to use about an activity engaged in by countries with which many of us have close and friendly relations. I wish therefore to make three points about this paragraph:

First, we are not condemning any Government. What we are condemning is the holding of nuclear-weapon tests. Secondly, our draft throughout is absolutely fair and even-handed. It is directed against all testing, in whatever environment it may be conducted. Finally, the Assembly adopted a resolution last year by a large majority which "condemned with the utmost vigour" all nuclear-weapon tests. Some may feel, therefore, that the language of this paragraph in our draft resolution is excessively moderate.

The second operative paragraph reflects deep concern that, while testing continues, we must again record "no progress" towards a comprehensive test ban. While we take note of the special report which the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has made, we must, I think, record our disappointment that it has not been able to do more, and especially in regard to the drafting of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

(Mr. Templeton, New Zealand)

The third paragraph of the draft resolution therefore, as an interim measure calls upon States which are not yet Parties to the partial test-ban Treaty to adhere to it. This call has been made in many previous Assembly resolutions. My delegation for its part, is very conscious of the limitations of this Treaty. Nevertheless, the Treaty exists and is in force and, pending completion of a comprehensive treaty, an increase in the number of countries adhering to the partial test-ban Treaty, together with a voluntary moratorium on all testing in all environments, as envisaged in operative paragraph 6 of our draft resolution, offers the best opportunity of making immediate progress towards our final goal of a complete and comprehensive cessation.

The core of our draft resolution is contained in operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 7. In those paragraphs we emphasize the urgency of concluding a comprehensive test-ban treaty: we remind the nuclear-weapon States of their special responsibility to initiate proposals for such a treaty; and we request the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to give the highest priority to this task.

It is our earnest hope that 1975 will be the year in which substantial progress is made towards the conclusion of a comprehensive treaty. It is in this hope that we commend the draft resolution to the Committee, and ask for the widest possible support.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Ambassador Templeton for his kind words addressed to the officers of the Committee. I have also noted that Colombia has become a sponsor to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.683.

I call on the representative of Israel who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. ERELL (Israel): It will have been fairly obvious to all those who have listened this morning to the representative from Syria that the main purpose of his intervention in the debate, if not the only purpose of that intervention, was to give the Committee his views and his feelings on Israel. As is customary with Syrian representatives there was a noticeable lack of moderation and civility in the extreme language he used. I trust that for this

(Mr. Erell, Israel)

he will be commended by his superiors. It is perfectly clear that he and the people who sent him here are very sorry that Israel exists and it is also clear that they will do everything they can to bring about Israel's demise.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Syria on a point of order.

Mr. AL MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The Israeli representative is using language that has no relation whatsoever to the item being discussed by the Committee and therefore I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to call him to order.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to draw the attention of the representative of Israel to the remarks just made by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I hope he will concentrate on the items under discussion here in the Committee. As the Chairman said a few days ago, they require a very constructive approach.

Mr. ERELL (Israel): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I assure you that as I proceed my remarks will be at least as constructive as those of the representative of Syria, and I shall certainly refer to disarmament.

The question of Syria's policy with regard to Israel has a very great deal to do with disarmament, as anyone will readily appreciate. In October 1973, the Syrian Government and another Government --

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic on a point of order.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The items we are discussing in this Committee are related to disarmament, not to the foreign policy of specific countries. If the representative of Israel wishes to speak on the policy of Syria towards Israel, that subject does not concern the Committee at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN: Once again I request the representative of Israel to note the wishes of the Chair. The discussion should and must be concentrated on the items under discussion.

Mr. ERELL (Israel): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I should like to assure you once again that my remarks will be as closely related to disarmament as were those of the representative of Syria.

I should like to explain that the chances of disarmament in the Middle East are constantly undermined by the policies of the Syrian Government, which are, as I think is clear to us all, aimed at the destruction of the State of Israel.

(Mr. Erell, Israel)

My Government sincerely hopes that the day will come when the Syrian Government will understand that the people of Israel also has the right to exist and to exercise self-determination. We hope that the Arab empire will one day appreciate that it has plenty of territory and plenty of opportunities for peace and for progress, and that it must recognize that the people of the Bible has a place to live and flourish in the land of the Bible.

I do appreciate that the fact that Israel continues to exist in all probability does something to unbalance the minds of certain people in Syria. If so, I can only regret it. But I assure the representative of Syria that Israel has no intention to disappear, and it would be well for his Government to make up its mind that peace and security in the Middle East --

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Syria on a point of order.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): Unfortunately, although I have drawn the Chairman's attention to a point of order, the Israeli representative continues to disregard the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. That is nothing strange to the policy of his Government, which is known to disregard international law and the Charter of the United Nations by using napalm and other incendiary weapons.

In my statement I spoke very clearly about the use of napalm by the Israeli forces against the refugee camps, the Syrian people and other Arab peoples. That crime is by no means different from other crimes of war. It comes within the framework of the agenda items we are discussing.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

Mr. ERELL (Israel): What I shall say now will be very brief and very relevant to the items on our agenda.

I should like to remind the Committee that in 1948 the Secretary-General of the Arab League informed the United Nations officially that the Arab countries

(Mr. Erell, Israel)

were proceeding to launch on Israel a war it described in a telegram in the following terms:

"This will be a war of extermination and a momentous massacre which will be spoken of as the wars of the Crusades and the massacres of the Mongols."

It is obvious from the interventions of the representative of Syria that that remains the policy of his Government. So long as it does, disarmament in the Middle East will have little chance of success.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Yemen, on a point of order.

Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) (interpretation from French): I am making this point of order to recall once again that a delegate who represents the authorities that obliterated the name of Palestine from the face of the earth by the force of arms has no right to speak of either peace or disarmament.

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

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): Once again the Israeli representative is trying to divert the attention of world public opinion from the terroristic reality of Israel, which was brought into existence through terrorism and violence. He has again failed to speak of napalm. I challenge him to deny before this Committee, if he can, that Israel has used napalm against civilians and against refugee camps in Arab countries.

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

Mr. EBELL (Israel): I should simply like to refer the representative of Syria, who has just asked me about the use of napalm, to the statements I made previously in this Committee on that question. They are in the record, and I invite him to read them.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Syria.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The statements to which the representative of Israel has referred cannot give the lie to facts, and the effects of napalm are still to be seen in refugee camps in Syria and in Egypt. Through such lies he cannot and will not be able to divert the attention of world public opinion from the Israeli authorities' crime of using napalm.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.