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STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. CAMPORA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to speak to agenda item 65 (e), on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament.

As this is the first time I have taken part in a session of the First Committee, it has been explained to me that at this stage of our work, as in past years, we are in the middle of a process of drawing up draft resolutions which the General Assembly will later adopt as guidelines for Governments of Member States in their conduct of disarmament matters, which have such a close link of interdependence with the maintenance of world peace.

This feverish activity by our delegations represents a new chapter in the well-known continuing story of the struggle between those two protagonists, the nuclear-arms race and disarmament. It is the story of a classic competition in which one contender is irrational. As irrationality approaches 100 per cent, our own drops to zero.

All our ability, all the obvious rationality of these deliberations in the First Committee to prove the need for nuclear disarmament, is up against an irrational rival. The nuclear-arms race has at its core an irrational motive, because we all recognize that the use of nuclear weapons would start a war in which there would be no victor and in which all mankind would be the loser. In the history of warfare so far there has never been a situation in which the use of the instruments of war would mean the destruction not only of the enemy but also of one's own side.
As we see it, inclusion of the agenda item on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament is justified by the situation I have just described and undeniably deserves priority over every other kind of arms race.
Political realism clearly shows that the responsibility for nuclear disarmament lies solely and exclusively with those countries which have the dubious privilege of possessing nuclear weapons. Countries which, like Argentina, do not possess nuclear weapons naturally cannot reduce or destroy what they do not possess. Yet my country, which does not possess nuclear weapons, and the vast majority of the countries which make up the international community, which likewise do not possess nuclear weapons, would also be victims in a nuclear war between the nuclear-weapon States.

That complex situation gives all States the right to participate in deliberations on nuclear disarmament, either by submitting proposals or, more simply, by urging the nuclear-weapon Powers to eliminate those weapons. The non-nuclear-weapon States also have a legitimate interest in being kept informed of developments in the negotiations between the nuclear-weapon Powers, in particular the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

For all these reasons, we reaffirm the need to make it possible for the multilateral deliberative and negotiating bodies - the First Committee and the Disarmament Commission on the one hand and the Conference on Disarmament on the other - to carry out effectively the functions assigned to them.

Last year, the General Assembly adopted resolution 39/148 X, on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament. That resolution requested the Conference on Disarmament to consider how it could best initiate multilateral negotiations on agreements on this subject. But, as is clearly reflected in the report of the Conference on Disarmament (A/40/27), no consensus was reached on establishing an ad hoc committee for that purpose.

The delegation of Argentina believes that the General Assembly should repeat that request this year, because multilateral negotiations are a function that cannot be renounced by the body entrusted with it.
(Mr. Campora, Argentina)

It is very clear that the nuclear-arms race has not ceased and that, on the contrary, we are witnessing the proliferation of nuclear weapons, both qualitatively and geographically. International instruments in force among the vast majority of States - such as the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water and the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons - have not achieved their main purpose: the elimination, or at least the reduction, of nuclear weapons.

As compared with the 1960s, the present international situation is the same in some aspects and different in others. It is the same in that the same States are the non-nuclear-weapon States, just as today's nuclear-weapon States are those of the 1960s. In quantitative terms, then, we can say that the unarmed States are still unarmed, while the few nuclear-weapon States have achieved an unimaginable level of nuclear-weapon development and in the geographical dissemination of those weapons throughout the seas and oceans and land areas.

It is well known that nuclear science and technology are of paramount importance in giving a significant impetus to the economic development of any modern country. For many years Argentina has worked energetically to investigate and study the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, which has involved enormous cost and investment, to reach the significant level of knowledge which now gives us the possibility of providing our people with the benefits deriving from such peaceful uses.

I wish in this context to quote a very enlightening paragraph from the message sent by the President of the Argentine Republic, Mr. Raul Alfonsin, to the Conference on Disarmament on 1 August this year. In that message, the Argentine President said that:

"The quest by States for military superiority, which will always be temporary and changing because of scientific and technological developments,
holds out the magical promise of infinite frontiers and the temptation to divert to the goal of domination the fruits of human genius, whose natural destiny is to be used to achieve the well-being of mankind.

"The ambivalent nature of science, which can be used for both peaceful and military ends, is now particularly clear to world public opinion as it relates to nuclear and space technology. The benefits to human progress could be infinite and endless, but at the same time the prospect of those technologies could be terrifying, depending on whether they are applied for peaceful purposes or for military ends."

The aspiration to peace of the constitutional Government of Argentina has already been expressed in many ways, inter alia, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the reduction of military expenditures. That aspiration is expressed also in the peaceful use of nuclear energy. My country, therefore, is and will continue to be a civilian nuclear State, as affirmed by the President of the nation in the message from which I have quoted.

That international conduct is the foundation on which the Argentine delegation firmly grounds its advocacy of nuclear disarmament, for the conduct of the constitutional Government confirms in deeds what we state here in words.
Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): As this is the first time I have spoken at this session of the First Committee, may I add my own congratulations to those of Ambassador Okun to you, Mr. Chairman, on your election to guide our work. The United States delegation pledges its continuing and full support.

In the opening statement of the United States delegation on 25 October, the urgent questions of the use and spread of chemical weapons were briefly addressed. Today I want to return to these important issues and to introduce a draft resolution under agenda item 63, "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". This draft resolution calls for important actions to solve these problems permanently. It was submitted on 6 November, under the sponsorship of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Italy, Japan, Kenya, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Thailand, the United Kingdom and the United States, and is numbered A/C.1/40/L.31.

Last year the General Assembly voted by a large majority to condemn any and all use of chemical weapons and any other actions in contravention of existing relevant international accords. It is disturbing that since that time at least one new case of the employment of these weapons, in violation of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, has been confirmed. It is important, therefore, that this body again place on record its convictions both that the task of putting a stop to the use of chemical weapons is urgent and that strict observance of existing international instruments and obligations in this field is required.

It is disquieting indeed that chemical-weapons capabilities are spreading to the arsenals of additional States, for this means that the existing international barriers to the use of chemical and biological weapons are in danger of being further eroded. It means that the likelihood of the use of chemical weapons in situations of conflict is increasing. And it may make the task of concluding a
comprehensive ban on chemical weapons more complicated and difficult. As Secretary of State Shultz stated in his remarks before the United States National Academy of Sciences on 6 March,

"The sad fact is that a half century of widely accepted international restraint on the use or development of chemical weapons is in danger of breaking down."

The number of States possessing chemical weapons has grown from about five in 1963 to 15 or more today, and other States are also seeking to acquire chemical weapons. This disturbing trend is clearly an urgent matter for the entire international community. The United States welcomes the expressions of concern on the part of other States about the spread of chemical weapons. The General Assembly should join in recording its concern over this unfortunate development.

The draft resolution we have introduced would, moreover, record the continuing and strong support of the General Assembly for efforts to strengthen existing agreements respecting biological and chemical weapons.

We hope that it will attract even broader support than was the case last year, not the least because there is today a wider appreciation of the dangerous trends I have cited and of the necessity, therefore, of accelerating the pace of work in the Conference on Disarmament. The United States strongly supports the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament to conclude a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons. It believes that a comprehensive, effective and verifiable ban on chemical weapons is the best way to put an end, once and for all, to the threat of the further use and spread of these weapons.

The Geneva Protocol and the biological and toxin weapons Convention are of great importance, but we know from bitter experience that they have not been sufficient to remove the threat to international stability that is posed by chemical weapons. They have not completely eliminated the threat of more terror, terror like that experienced by the million gas casualties in the First World War.
The specter of chemical-weapons use continues to haunt States, in both developed and developing regions; it continues to menace people, both military and civilian. Unlike nuclear weapons, which require sophisticated manufacturing operations and delivery systems, chemical weapons are relatively cheap and easy to acquire, and therefore pose a special threat to developing countries. It is indeed in such countries that chemical weapons have been used.

We should do all in our power to reverse the present dangerous trends and to promote the swiftest possible progress towards more and effective international restraints. The force of our common opinion voiced in this forum can make an impact on these efforts. Let us make that impact as strong as possible.

Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): Today is 7 November, and I should like, on behalf of the delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic, to express to the delegations of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR our warmest congratulations and best wishes on the occasion of the sixty-eighth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

From its very inception the Soviet State decisively condemned war as the worst possible crime against mankind and proclaimed a policy of peace, friendship and equal rights among peoples.

The USSR continues to follow that policy today. Its main goals and principles are reflected in the many concrete peaceful proposals it has put forward in recent years at various talks on arms limitation and disarmament and here in the General Assembly.

These proposals have one single aim: to do everything possible to do away with the threat of nuclear war and keep peace on earth.

In this complex and tense situation, the importance of such practical measures is greater than ever, for tomorrow might be too late.
In the statement of the Conference of the Political Advisory Committee of the States members of the Warsaw Treaty, recently held in Sofia, the chief representatives of those States again reaffirmed their will and readiness to ensure a turn for the better in international affairs. They made many constructive and far-reaching proposals aimed at that objective. The Government of Mongolia has published a statement in which it expresses full support for the essence and concrete proposals of the Sofia statement. In our view, implementing the proposals of the participants in that Conference would contribute to a radical improvement in international relations and progress in the field of disarmament.

The discussion in the First Committee also shows that the problems of war and peace and disarmament undoubtedly have pride of place among contemporary international problems, since they have a direct bearing on the maintenance of human civilization and life on earth. These debates again confirm the collective view of States Members of the United Nations, as expressed in paragraph 47 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament that "Nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization." It is quite understandable that practically all delegations have expressed their hopes in connection with the forthcoming meeting of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev, and the President of the United States of America, Mr. Ronald Reagan. Of course, we fully share those hopes and support the proposal of concrete steps by the USSR which are a constructive contribution to ensuring a favourable outcome of the forthcoming talks.

Their meaning is clear: to stop the arms race, which continues at an ever-increasing pace and achieves new qualitative parameters, prevent it in space and radically reduce nuclear weapons. An agreement on those matters would be consonant with the vital interests of the peoples of the world and of Asia in
particular. In this connection, I should like to stress the great importance of the fact that the Soviet Union has confirmed at the highest levels that there are as many of its rockets in Asia as are required to balance the corresponding potential of the United States in that area; that, if the United States does not increase that potential, the USSR would act in the same way, and that should the situation improve it would be ready to react adequately.

It is quite understandable that Mongolia, a socialist State on the Asian continent, wants to make its contribution to a better climate in that vast continent. As is well known, we have proposed the conclusion of a convention on mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations between Asian and Pacific States. This proposal can organically be incorporated in the general concept of pan-Asian security, which could include the five principles of peaceful coexistence worked out some time ago by the Asian States - the Pancha Shila - the 10 principles of Bandung, and many proposals made by Asian countries.

The formula for pan-Asian security could, it seems, involve the following steps and measures: all nuclear States - such as the USSR and the Chinese People's Republic - would renounce the first use of nuclear weapons; non-use of nuclear weapons against countries and areas in that part of the world with a non-nuclear status; adoption by States not possessing nuclear weapons of three non-nuclear principles - not to have, manufacture or import such weapons in their territory; Asian States which have not yet done so acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT); complete cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, including in Asia and the Pacific; freeze on the level of military activity in the Asian-Pacific area; renunciation by the Asian and Pacific States of participation in any plans for the militarization of space; prohibition of the
creation of new and the expansion of existing blocs in the area; liquidation of foreign military bases on the territories of Asian countries, in the Pacific and the Indian Oceans; and abandonment of any support for clandestine anti-Government and armed terrorist groups.

Of course, the elaboration of a concept of Asian security is a long-term task and must be done in stages, from the simple to the more complex. But it is important to take the first step, and we could use the experience gained in Europe from the fight to reduce tensions and ensure détente.

Mongolia attaches great importance to the activities of the United Nations and participation in its work. We have always considered actions in the interest of peace, the prevention of nuclear war and disarmament as the fundamental objective of the work of this world Organization. Mongolia, together with other socialist and many non-aligned and neutral States, tries to take a constructive part in the solution of the problems of limiting and reducing armaments - nuclear, chemical and conventional.

One of the important sectors of United Nations activities, in our view, is to mobilize world public opinion to fight for peace and against war. Our interest is well known in such important United Nations efforts as the World Disarmament Campaign, Disarmament Week, and others.

We must stress the importance of the idea that in the United Nations 6 August be "Hiroshima Day", a day of action against the threat of nuclear war and for disarmament.

In other words, it is necessary energetically to look for ways and means to contribute to the cause of disarmament and strengthen peace and security.

To conclude, my delegation expresses the hope that it will have an opportunity to speak on various agenda items as appropriate when the various proposals and draft resolutions are discussed.
Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First of all, I should like, on behalf of the delegation of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR, to thank the representative of Mongolia for his congratulations on the occasion of our State day, the day of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The Soviet delegation today would like to present a few ideas in connection with the conclusion of the debate in the First Committee and as we are about to embark on a new stage in our work. The exchange of views that has taken place was, in our opinion, fruitful. In the various statements made, assessments of the causes of the increase in international tension and of the failure to solve problems of the reduction and limitation of armaments differed, but these differences, as the debate shows, take second place to the recognition of the grave threat looming over mankind and of the need for practical measures to eliminate that threat.

An almost unanimous consensus that it is time to act in a concrete and practical manner in order to bring about a turn for the better in international relations is, in the opinion of our delegation, probably the main result of our joint work.

We are happy to note that practically all States welcomed the agreement between the USSR and the United States about a summit meeting. We understand this general interest in the success of that meeting and in results which would enable us to arrest alarming trends, to find important areas of agreement and eventually to achieve concrete agreements to curb the arms race on earth and to prevent its extension into space.

The Soviet Union welcomes this attitude of the world community, and for its part it is doing everything possible to ensure the success of the forthcoming meeting. We propose simple and clear-cut measures: totally to bar the way to weapons in outer space, to effect a 50 per cent reduction of the nuclear armaments
of the USSR and the United States, and to curb and reverse the process of
stockpiling nuclear rockets in Europe. The General Secretary of the Central
Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR, Mr. Gorbachev, stresses, in this
connection, that:

"There is now a unique chance of reaching the mutually acceptable agreement
awaited by the peoples of the world. I would like to express the hope that
the United States Administration will take advantage of it and adopt a
responsible attitude to this task."

We consider that, given political courage and readiness to make mutual concessions,
many things can still be corrected. Be that as it may, the Soviet side - we would
like to give you this assurance - will strive in Geneva for a just and constructive
solution to the most urgent problems of our time, and above all the prevention of a
nuclear catastrophe.

In their statements, the overwhelming majority of delegations made clear
appeals for practical measures on a bilateral and multilateral basis to prevent a
nuclear war. These measures are called for not only by Governments but also by the
broader segments of public opinion throughout the world. They are called for as a
matter of common sense, as was convincingly stated by the representative of Sweden,
Mrs. Theorin, in her statements which were imbued by a spirit of political realism
and responsibility. We fully share the concern of the non-aligned countries about
the steadily increasing threat of a nuclear catastrophe. We agree with the
representative of Egypt, Mr. Shaker, that the prevention of a nuclear war is a
matter of the very survival of mankind, and that practical and realistic measures
to solve that problem are required.

We cannot but agree with the representative of Brazil, Mr. Duarte, who
stressed in his statement that the approach of dealing equally with the prevention
of a nuclear war and the prevention of any armed conflict merely justifies the
nuclear arms race. The representative of Indonesia, Mr. Sastadidjaya, correctly noted that "the question of the prevention of nuclear war has become the overriding concern of the international community. It is undeniable that no other form of warfare has confronted mankind with dangers even remotely comparable to the dangers of atomic war" (A/C.1/40/PV.6, p. 33). This is fully in keeping with the very important principle contained in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament that: "while the final objective of the efforts of all States should continue to be general and complete disarmament under effective international control, the immediate goal is that of the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war ..."

However, some people try to prove that it would be unjustified to insist on the primacy of measures to prevent a nuclear war and that efforts should be made to prevent war in general. Behind such outwardly convincing propaganda statements lies an unwillingness to take any concrete measures to do away with the nuclear threat. This is why an attempt is being made to gainsay the argument that practical measures to prevent a nuclear war are a priority matter, as mentioned in the Final Document, and to drown the principal and the specific in the secondary and the general.

Nobody need convince us of the need to do away completely with war from international life. A world without arms, a world without war, is our ideal and we are doing everything we can to bring such a world closer. But if progress is really to be made in that direction, we must take into account the realities of the nuclear-space era, which are that priority measures must be taken to prevent nuclear war, to put an end to the arms race, and above all the nuclear arms race, on earth and not to permit it in space. Finally, it is only by genuine readiness to take such measures that one can assess people's attitude towards this problem of preventing war and especially nuclear war.
(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The pride of place in the debates in this Committee is occupied by priority efforts to do away with the threat of war. Among them are the prohibition and cessation of nuclear weapons tests. The importance of this point for curbing the arms race was convincingly stressed by the representative of New Zealand and many other delegations. Another important issue also recognized by almost everyone is the prevention of an arms race in space. As was rightly stated by the representative of Finland, Mr. Tornudd, the trend to transform space into an arena of military confrontation must be reversed "before technological developments frustrate the efforts for arms control and disarmament" (A/C.1/40/PV.4, p. 23-25).

The proposals of the Soviet Union on both these matters are well known. And these are not only proposals. We have introduced two moratoriums on all nuclear explosions and on the deployment of ASAT weapons in space. The answer of the other side is well known. It refuses even to carry on negotiations to prohibit nuclear weapons tests or of tests of the ASAT system.
Two more priority matters. The General Assembly often called for the
prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. It appealed many times to all nuclear-weapon
States which have not yet done so, asking them to pledge that they would not be the
first to use nuclear weapons. These are fully concrete measures. Why are they not
carried out? Everybody knows why.

Let us take another matter, the freeze of nuclear arsenals. In full
consonance with the demand of the majority of States, the Soviet Union proposes to
carry out that measure in order to move forward towards the reduction and
eventually the liquidation of nuclear weapons. At this session the opponents of a
freeze again actively oppose the solution of that problem. They continue to
prefer implementation of military programmes to a cessation of the arms race. They
would like to freeze, in fact, the very idea of a freeze, to eradicate it from the
conscience of States and of world public opinion.

The need for concrete and practical measures manifests itself obviously also
in the field of prohibition of chemical weapons, its non-proliferation, the
creation of chemically-free zones in Europe and in other parts of the world. There
is a great need for practical actions in the field of the reduction and limitation
of conventional weapons and military forces.

In the statement of the Sofia Conference of the Political Consultative
Committee of States members of the Warsaw Treaty, there is a complete comprehensive
programme of measures leading to that objective. To those who like to discourse
about the need to do away with war in general, we should like to ask a specific
question. Are the NATO States ready to accept those proposals? Are they ready
finally to go beyond declarations and to pass on to acts. This is a not a
rhetorical question. We have asked it, we still have received no answer, but we
continue to expect a constructive reply on the substance.
The obstructionist attitude of a certain group of States towards practically the whole spectrum of disarmament problems can be seen clearly in the example of their position at the Conference on Disarmament. For the past few years the sole multilateral body for disarmament negotiations works practically in a vacuum, but of course, we do not discount the small steps taken this year in the work of the conference when there has been some increase in the activity of subsidiary bodies on matters such as the prohibition of chemical and radiological weapons, the elaboration of a comprehensive disarmament programme, and the fact that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space has started its work. But under present conditions this is obviously insufficient.

The above-mentioned group of States continue to block negotiations to resolve key problems of curbing a nuclear war and ensuring nuclear disarmament with which the Conference, where all five nuclear States are represented, should be dealing with it as a matter of priority.

We are worried about such a state of affairs and we mention this frankly. This certainly does not strengthen the authority of the Conference; and what is just as important, it dilutes the main thing, its character as an organ for negotiations, which was set up by the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

The Soviet Union calls for greater activity in the Conference on Disarmament, the beginning of concrete negotiations on nuclear disarmament and general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests; also as soon as possible the elaboration of a convention prohibiting chemical weapons and conclusion of the work on the text of a comprehensive disarmament programme.

We agree with the opinion expressed by the representative of Sri Lanka, Mr. Dhanatala, that the important and urgent need of preventing an arms race in
space requires that the Conference on Disarmament start negotiations in order to
find an effective solution to this problem.

To work out concrete practical agreements, much could be done in preparing the
third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, and in carrying out
the idea of convening a world conference on disarmament, and also within the
framework of the Disarmament Commission. We want to increase the effectiveness of
the work of the whole machinery of negotiations, including an important link such
as bilateral negotiations.

Some representatives of the Western countries spoke of the Vienna talks on the
mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. They said that
they believed in the objectives of that forum. But the Vienna talks require not
words but a concrete display of political will and mutually acceptable solutions.

For almost 10 months, however, new constructive proposals of the socialist
countries have remained unanswered by NATO States. The essence of those proposals
is that within one year from entry into force of the agreement, there would be a
reduction of the land forces of the USSR and the United States in Central Europe by
20,000 and 13,000, of the main military units, together with their regular
armaments. Once this is done, all parties would pledge collectively on a national
basis not to increase within the next two years the level of their armed forces in
Central Europe.

To ensure that the agreements are carried out, a certain measure of control
has been proposed, including international measures. However, the NATO countries
are in no hurry to answer. And here in New York some of their representatives
attempt to say that regional decisions can only complicate the overall solution of
the disarmament problem.

In a recent statement, the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany,
on behalf of a "German Government", of which we know nothing from post-war history,
(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)
anathematized the very idea of creating nuclear and chemical-free zones in Europe. The essence of that statement is clear: create non-nuclear, non-chemical zones where you want, but without NATO and certainly without the Federal Republic of Germany.

What then about the consensus reflected in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly that nuclear-weapon-free zones should be set up and that regional disarmament measures should be taken. It may be that the negative attitude of the Federal Republic of Germany on regional measures casts additional light on the causes of the difficulties met at the Vienna talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

We are ready to take real practical measures, and this fully relates also to an increase in trust. We have always thought that concrete measures to strengthen confidence should be differentiated, taking into account the specific nature of the various situations. This is the approach taken by the Stockholm Conference.
In various statements made in the First Committee, time and again we heard talk about the need for transparency. That would become a sort of previous condition for settling the problems of strengthening trust, ensuring security and disarmament. Those who are in favour of transparency in military activities do everything they can to ensure the possibility for themselves legally to find out about the military structures of the other side and to control their everyday activities. At the same time - and this is rather significant - when the socialist countries offer to agree to the limitation of military activities, especially as they relate to air force or naval manoeuvres, the advocates of transparency categorically refuse to agree. It would seem that their logic says that one should have transparency in military activities, but that it is not necessary to limit it or to curb it. The same thing is true in the field of a freeze on and the reduction of military budgets.

The Sofia Conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the States members of the Warsaw Treaty confirmed the previous proposals and put forward new ones. We are ready, of course, on a mutual basis, to agree to important reductions of our military budgets by percentages or in absolute terms. However, the achievement of such measures is being blocked. Here again, transparency is but a pretext to hide the unwillingness to settle the substance of the matter. Instead of concrete measures, for years we have heard proposals about studying and comparing military expenditures. We consider that only practical steps towards disarmament and military détente can lead to openness and transparency.

For instance, at the Stockholm Conference where the main lines of a future agreement are being worked out, the Soviet Union came out in favour of certain trust-building measures in the military field, including the proposal that there should be an exchange of yearly plans of certain types of military activities.
Concrete practical steps in the field of disarmament presuppose effective control. Where national technical means prove to be insufficient, we would be prepared to agree on additional procedures. We must mention this, because some people would like to say that the Soviet Union is an enemy of control. That is said by those who, working on new sophisticated types of armaments, want to conceal one fact, namely, that the more weapons there are in the world, the more difficult it will be to carry out control. Those statements about control are made by those who create new types of weapons in order to make control more difficult. Concrete measures on curbing the arms race and bringing about disarmament would be all the more important as there would be confidence that the concluded agreements would be respected. The Soviet Union has always held that view. It also means that no unilateral arbitrary interpretations of already concluded agreements are tolerable. For example, one cannot interpret the anti-ballistic treaty as if it allowed the creation of a large scale anti-ballistic missile system, including one in space.

We should like to draw attention to the fact that one should not seek confrontation on the important question of respect for all present agreements in order to justify acts likely to undermine existing agreements and make it more difficult to reach new ones. We consider that the will to take concrete measures must be enshrined in politically weighty decisions and resolutions of the General Assembly. The Soviet delegation would welcome the adoption of such resolutions by consensus. But for that to happen, one element is necessary, that is, is everybody ready to show not in words, but in practice, the desire and readiness to reduce and curb armaments and to bring about disarmament. We are convinced that a consensus must reflect a practical philosophy and must not be an attempt to vitiate the concrete content of a document.
It is significant to note that consensus has been advocated for some time by the representatives of States that do not wish to take concrete measures to curb the arms race. Furthermore - and this has already been said - they deliberately prevent the implementation of General Assembly resolutions based on very important consensuses reflecting world public opinion, the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament. They also do not stop at undermining consensus, for instance, in the case of the Declaration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. A double standard is obvious in this respect. One has the impression that consensus is envisaged not as a procedure for reaching mutually acceptable decisions, but rather as a way of blocking them. The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is a kind of disarmament charter. It must be carried out. It must serve as a signpost in the search for concrete decisions. If they are carried out, the way would be open to reduce the number of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. It is no secret that several decisions are taken on a single question even when there is a consensus resolution. That situation is explained not by some ulterior motive, but by a difference that exists between the words and the deeds of those who tack on to a consensus decision certain ideas for tactical reasons, without having any intention to carry out the decision.

We consider that it would not be insuperable to overcome the differences of view and positions with respect to concrete disarmament matters if all States were guided by the recognition of their high responsibility for the fate of mankind and were ready to show the necessary political will to reach generally acceptable agreements. The Soviet Union does possess such a will. Our policy was clearly set forth in the recently published draft of a new programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, an important element of which is a broad constructive programme
of measures to put an end to the arms race, to bring about disarmament and to ensure peace and security for the peoples of the world. The document considers that general and complete disarmament under strict and comprehensive international control is a fundamental historical task and, continuing the struggle to carry it out, the Soviet Union will consistently strive to achieve a limitation in the areas of military preparations, especially in the field of weapons of mass destruction. It is necessary first completely to exclude space from that area so that it does not become an arena for military confrontation and a source of death and destruction. The exploration and exploitation of space must be carried out only for peaceful ends and for developing science and technology in the interests of all peoples. The Soviet Union is in favour of collective efforts for the solution of that problem and will actively take part in such international co-operation.
The document says that the Soviet Union also favours measures to ensure the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones free of other weapons of mass destruction. It will consistently strive to implement measures leading to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, the prohibition of the testing and manufacture of all types of such weapons, a pledge by all the nuclear-weapon States not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and the freezing, reduction and destruction of all nuclear-weapon arsenals.

The Soviet Union will strive to achieve the cessation of the production of other types of weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons, as well as their liquidation, and the prohibition of the development of new types of such weapons; a reduction of the armed forces of States, and above all those of the permanent members of the Security Council and States linked to them by military agreements; the limitation of conventional weapons; the cessation of the development of new types of weapons whose destructive power places them on the same footing as weapons of mass destruction; and the reduction of the military expenditures of States.

Finally, the Soviet Union will consistently strive to bring about the freezing and reduction of armed forces and armaments in the most explosive parts of our planet; the liquidation of military bases on foreign soil; and the adoption of measures to strengthen mutual trust to reduce the risk of nuclear conflicts, including conflicts begun by accident. The Soviet Union solemnly confirms in this document that there is no weapon it would not be ready to limit or prohibit on a mutual basis, with effective control.

Mr. MILAD (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I shall deal in this statement with agenda item 64, relating to the nuclear armament of the Zionist entity. At the outset, I wish to thank the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research for its report on the matter (A/40/520) and the Special
Committee against Apartheid for its special report on recent developments concerning relations between Israel and South Africa (A/40/22/Add.2). I deeply appreciate the valuable information they have both provided on the nuclear armament of the Zionist entity as well as the co-operation taking place in various areas between the racist régimes in South Africa and in occupied Palestine, and particularly their nuclear collaboration.

I should like to review the genesis and development of the nuclear armament of the Zionist entity, which since its inception has taken a keen interest in scientific research, particularly in the atomic field. The magazine "All Arabs" published, in its 143rd edition, a study of the nuclear armament of the Zionist entity; this study made it clear that while Jewish terrorist organizations were active in Palestine in 1948, before the declaration of the establishment of the so-called State of Israel, two men were roaming about the Negev desert investigating its metal resources. Their task was hard and fraught with danger, owing to the war then raging between the Jews and the Palestinians. Nevertheless, Ernst Bergmann and Israel Dostrovsky continued their research on phosphate sediments until they reached conclusions that they took to Professor Chaim Weizmann.

After the declaration of the establishment of the so-called State of Israel, Weizmann's gift to the heads of the emerging entity was the fruit of the efforts of Bergmann and Dostrovsky - the discovery of uranium derived from the phosphate sediments in the Negev desert. As first President of the Zionist entity, Chaim Weizmann told the leaders of his entity that the condition for the achievement of Zionist ambitions was special attention to scientific research, particularly in the atomic field. David Ben-Gurion, Moshe Sharett, Yig'el Allon, Moshe Dayan, Menachem Begin, Yitzhak Shamir and other leaders of the armed terrorist organizations listened to that elderly man, who had played a major role
in persuading the British to support the Jews in establishing their State on the soil of Palestine.

The talk about atomic energy at the time meant one thing - the atomic bomb, which had enabled the United States to end the Second World War with victory for the allied countries. But Weizmann did not mean the atomic bomb alone; he was referring to scientific research in all fields, because he believed that the Zionist entity had to face, by quality, the threat of Arab quantity. After Weizmann finished his statement he left the podium and called Bergmann and his colleague Dostrovsky, who had found uranium in the phosphate sediments, and told them "You have a long way ahead of you. We are still at the beginning."

Months after the establishment of the so-called State of Israel, Weizmann, with a group of researchers, laid down the broad outlines of the first nuclear programme, and at the beginning of 1949 he established a Department of Isotope Research in the Weizmann Institute of Science. That Department made an important scientific advance in less than three years, when one of its members succeeded in producing heavy water, an essential material for the manufacture of atomic bombs, in a new way that did not depend on electric energy.

That had two results. The first was that the Zionist entity competed with Norway, which until then had monopolized the production of heavy water by electric energy. Secondly, it opened the door to nuclear co-operation between that entity and France, and in the first half of 1953 the two parties signed an agreement on nuclear co-operation, and France bought the rights to the Dostrovsky invention. I mention that to point out that, since it was inflicted upon Palestine, the Zionist entity has taken a keen interest in the acquisition of atomic weapons and that it possesses a large stockpile of them to launch its aggression against the Arab nations. It could not possibly have manufactured or acquired nuclear weapons but
for the unlimited support of the imperialist States, and above all the United States.

Before the establishment of the Dimona reactor the Zionist entity had already bought a reactor for nuclear research from the United States. Ben-Gurion was encouraged to do so by the declaration of the United States President Eisenhower in a statement to the General Assembly on 8 December 1953 that his country was ready to put some of its nuclear information at the disposal of other States wishing to carry out peaceful nuclear research. The close co-operation that began at that time between the two parties is continuing.

As proof of that, the magazine of the Institute of Palestinian Studies reported in a study of science and technology in Israel between 1980 and 1981 that Uzi Eilam, the Director-General of the Israel Atomic Energy Commission, had said that President Reagan had not only encouraged the establishment of a new atomic reactor to generate energy but had also said that he would encourage the establishment of new fast-breeder reactors, and that the United States would once again take its place in the forefront of States exporting atomic technology. Asked whether Israel was capable of setting up an atomic reactor, he said "I do not know one atomic expert who can claim that Israel is able to build an atomic reactor on its own."
The Zionists do not confine themselves to the conclusion of agreements for the acquisition of uranium and other nuclear materials. They also make use of other ways and means, such as theft and piracy. Between 1963 and 1965, the owner of a Pennsylvania, United States of America, company - who was Jewish - smuggled an estimated 3,600 kilogrammes of enriched uranium and plutonium, sufficient for the manufacture of scores of atomic bombs.

There have been many well-known operations mounted by the Zionist entity to acquire large quantities of uranium. During the Johnson Administration, it acquired some 200 pounds of uranium from a factory in Pennsylvania. In another operation the Zionist entity acquired 200 tons of uranium, which had apparently disappeared on the high seas on 17 November 1967. It was subsequently revealed that it had been smuggled into the Zionist entity.

The Zionist entity has been provided by several countries with the fruits of atomic research. This has helped it make great progress in the manufacture and acquisition of nuclear weapons, which poses a grave threat to peace and security, both in the Middle East and throughout the world. The Zionist entity has insisted on keeping all its nuclear facilities beyond the scope of international safeguards, and has not signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons owing to its fear of revealing its true intentions.

It did not stop there. It attacked an Iraqi nuclear reactor which was under the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and which had been built for peaceful purposes. That was a flagrant violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter and of international law.

The General Assembly, the Security Council and the IAEA have adopted scores of resolutions condemning the Zionist entity for its failure to place its nuclear facilities under the international safeguards system, and have called upon all States not to engage in any collaboration with that entity which could assist it
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in the development or acquisition of nuclear weapons. The Zionist entity has
turned a deaf ear to all those resolutions, and has defied the will of the
international community by deploying missiles armed with nuclear warheads in the
Golan Heights and the Negev desert during the first half of 1985. The deployment
of those missiles is perfectly consistent with the expansionist policy of the
Zionist entity and poses a direct threat to Arab and Moslem States and a flagrant
violation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. It
further escalates tension in the region and throughout the world.

The nuclear and other forms of collaboration between the racist régimes of
Pretoria and of occupied Palestine has been highlighted in the numerous reports
prepared on the subject. Earlier in my statement, I referred to the special report
of the Special Committee against Apartheid on recent developments concerning
relations between the Zionist entity and South Africa. In its introduction, the
report states that:

"Although relations between Israel and South Africa date back to the
assumption of power of the National Party in South Africa in 1948, the last 10
years have witnessed an increasing collaboration between the two régimes
amounting not only to a virtual alliance threatening the peace and security in
southern Africa and the Middle East, but also constituting a threat to
international peace and security". (A/40/22/Add.2, para. 1)

That report discusses the multifaceted co-operation between the two régimes in the
nuclear, military, economic, cultural and sporting fields. I need not cite the
contents of the report, for it is available to all.
The nuclear capability of those two racist régimes has hampered efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and to denuclearize Africa. The international community must adopt the arrangements and measures needed to put an end to that danger, which poses a threat to those two regions and to the world at large.

Mr. QIAN Jiadong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Both the general debate in the General Assembly and the discussions here in this Committee during the past few weeks have clearly demonstrated that in the field of disarmament the prevention of an arms race in outer space is at present a question of universal concern. I have already touched on that question, in my statement of 18 October. I should like now to elaborate a little further on China's position in this regard.

One of the lofty objectives of the United Nations is to safeguard world peace and achieve disarmament. Notwithstanding the efforts made by the international community over the past 40 years, the arms race has been worsening and escalating continuously, and in recent years has even extended from the land, the sea and the air to outer space. As we commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations we cannot but greatly deplore such a situation.

When mankind first succeeded in opening the way to outer space, the peoples of the world were greatly delighted and encouraged, expecting that this new domain would be used solely for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of all. Before long, however, it turned out that outer space was not to be spared from the global strategies of the super-Powers, which, alongside their fierce rivalry for nuclear supremacy, began to engage in a fight to gain advantage in this new "highland" as well. In the past two decades or so they have launched hundreds - thousands - of military satellites and have developed their respective anti-satellite-weapon
systems. Also, they have spared no efforts - at costs running to astronomical figures - in the research on and development of even more sophisticated space weapons.

The arms race in outer space is qualitatively different from either the nuclear or the conventional arms race. While there are still many controversies over the feasibility or cost-effectiveness of so-called defensive space weapons, one thing is already certain: the extension of the arms race into outer space can only further complicate the overall arms race, not reverse it. Scientific and strategic studies on this question have highlighted more and more clearly that the development of space weaponry will inevitably lead to a vicious circle of alternate escalations in the race in offensive weapon systems and the race in defensive weapon systems, as well as to a race between the two kinds of weapon systems. The actual situation has fully borne out that point. One major space Power has repeatedly declared that it will not give up its research programme on strategic defensive weapon systems. The other major space Power, while never slackening the upgrading of its offensive strategic weapons, has also been engaged for years in research and development on defensive space weapons, and, further, has recently made it clear that it is determined to take necessary counter-measures against the other side. An arms race of this kind in outer space, if it goes on unchecked, will definitely bring about greater instability, further increase the danger of war, and cast an even darker shadow over world peace and security.
In their race for supremacy the two major space Powers on the one hand accuse each other for developing space weapons and on the other spare no effort to justify their own space-weapon endeavours. Speaking in the same vein, each claims itself as acting within the anti-ballistic missile Treaty and the other as having violated the Treaty. The ABM Treaty has become the talk of the day, and so much has been said of it that even different interpretations have emerged as to what this Treaty really permits or forbids. The ABM Treaty is a bilateral treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I have no intention to comment on it here. What I want to point out is this: Even if something is not prohibited in the Treaty, is this to mean that it must be done? If it is already sure that the thing once done will only bring about grave consequences, would it not be better not to do it?

Peoples of the world are fully justified in expressing their concern over the arms race in outer space and their demand for effective measures to check it. It is precisely a reflection of the aspirations of the peoples that the General Assembly adopted at its previous session resolution 39/59 on the prevention of an arms race in outer space with as many as 150 votes in favour, while not a single vote was cast against it. It is gratifying to note that this resolution has already yielded some initial results. An Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, which had eluded the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva for several years, was finally established last summer, and some preliminary work has been done. This, of course, is only a beginning; the substantive negotiations still await our further efforts.

China opposes arms races of all kinds, and hence also in outer space, no matter who does it and what form it takes. As the common heritage of mankind, outer space must be solely used for peaceful purposes. My country supports the principles of the demilitarization of outer space and the exclusive use of outer space for peaceful purposes, as laid down in the Outer Space Treaty of 1967.
In line with this position, China submitted to the 1985 session of the Conference on Disarmament a ten-point working paper on the prevention of an arms race in outer space (CD/579). In the four-point proposal on disarmament put forward by the Chinese Foreign Minister Mr. Wu Xueqian during the general debate of the present session of the General Assembly, particular emphasis is also laid on the urgent need to curb the arms race in outer space.

China proposes that the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics immediately stop the arms race in outer space in all its forms. As the only two major space Powers, they should bear a special responsibility in this regard. It is incumbent on them to fulfill this responsibility. Furthermore, we propose that all countries with a space capability refrain from developing, testing and deploying space weaponry. China's fundamental objective is to conclude as soon as possible an agreement or agreements on the complete prohibition and destruction of all space weapons. These proposals, we believe, are both practical and feasible. My delegation has accordingly submitted a draft resolution in document A/C.1/40/L.4, which, we hope, will be given serious consideration by all delegations.

Mr. Cromartie (United Kingdom): I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Bilateral nuclear and space arms negotiations", in document A/C.1/40/L.8, on behalf of the delegations of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Rwanda, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

It is not an overstatement to say that the subject of this draft resolution - negotiations on arms limitation between the two Powers with the largest nuclear arsenals - is of vital concern to all of us in the most literal sense. When I addressed this Committee a year ago to introduce its predecessor, which was
overwhelmingly endorsed as resolution 39/148 B, there had been no direct negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on this subject for more than a year.

Happily, as we all know, the past year has seen a transformation of last year's bleak picture. Firstly, the two sides reached agreement in principle to resume negotiations on reducing their nuclear weapons and also at the same time to initiate negotiations on another vital area, the prevention of an arms race in outer space; secondly, they have commenced these negotiations in Geneva; and, thirdly, each side has now put forward a number of concrete proposals. We are all aware of a fourth development, which will take place shortly - the summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev. We all hope that this will give further impetus to this process, in which we all have a common interest.

The present draft resolution is, as I have noted, the direct successor of preceding resolutions put forward by my delegation with a group of co-sponsors that the Assembly has endorsed. The purpose of this draft resolution is to welcome warmly the positive response to the calls set forth in those previous resolutions; to take note of the comprehensive subject-matter of the fresh negotiations; and to offer firm encouragement to the two parties to achieve their stated objectives. Such an outcome will be in the interests of us all and could open the door to further important steps.

The sponsors believe that a strong and, we hope, united vote for this draft resolution will be beneficial in contributing towards an atmosphere in which the bilateral negotiations will succeed. We therefore appeal for the widest possible support, and additional co-sponsorship would of course be welcomed.
Mr. SAEED (Pakistan): We have asked to speak today in order to introduce two draft resolutions which have been circulated as documents A/C.1/40/L.10 and A/C.1/40/L.11. Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.10, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", has been submitted under agenda item 53; while draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.11, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", is under agenda item 56.
My country pursues a comprehensive approach to disarmament. In our view all disarmament measures, whether global, regional, bilateral or unilateral in nature, whether short term, interim or long term in character, deserve to be supported. With this perspective we believe that, pending the realization of the vital objective of nuclear disarmament, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones represents an important collateral measure that could contribute significantly towards preventing nuclear proliferation and in providing a measure of security to non-nuclear-weapon States of the region concerned. The Final Document adopted by consensus at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament reflected those views and recognized that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at, constituted an important disarmament measure. The first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament also called upon the nuclear-weapon States to give undertakings to respect strictly the status of nuclear-weapon-free zones and to refrain from the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against the States in such a region. Those consensus views accepted in the Final Document are as valid today as they were in 1978.

The Non-Aligned Movement has also supported the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The political declaration issued at the conclusion of the seventh non-aligned summit Conference, held in New Delhi in March 1983, called, \textit{inter alia}, for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world with the objective of achieving ultimately a world entirely free of nuclear weapons. This was reaffirmed in the Final Declaration issued at the end of the Ministerial Meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement held in Luanda in September of this year.
Pakistan, along with other States of its region, is committed to keeping South Asia free of nuclear weapons. This commitment has been expressed in declarations at the highest level by the States in that part of the world. We are therefore convinced that the appropriate conditions exist in South Asia for the regional States to reach an agreement on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

We remain hopeful that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.10 will encourage the States of our region to enter into consultations for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. That draft resolution is on the same lines as the corresponding resolution adopted by the General Assembly last year as resolution 39/55. Its preambular part recognizes, inter alia, the importance of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones as one of the measures which can contribute most effectively to the objectives of nuclear non-proliferation and general and complete disarmament. Its operative part urges the South Asian States, and such other neighbouring non-nuclear-weapon States as may be interested, to continue to make all possible efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, and pending that, refrain from any action contrary to this objective.

We hope that the draft resolution in question will receive widespread support in the First Committee and the plenary General Assembly.

The second draft resolution deals with the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Until such time as our objective of nuclear disarmament has been achieved, the importance of credible guarantees to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons cannot be over-emphasized. Such assurances will not only meet the legitimate security concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon States but minimize the incentives to nuclear proliferation.
Pakistan is strongly of the view that, pending the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, the States possessing them have an obligation to extend security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States. In order to be credible, those assurances have to be unconditional, non-discriminatory and legally binding in character. The unilateral declarations of the nuclear-weapon States on this subject, though useful to some extent, do not meet the legitimate security concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon States and hence cannot be considered an acceptable substitute for effective and credible negative security assurances. In this situation, we have to continue our efforts towards the finalization of an international agreement of a binding character which assures non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Successive meetings of the Non-Aligned Movement have endorsed the concept of what is now referred to as negative security assurances.

In the Conference on Disarmament, where this subject is under negotiation, Pakistan has participated actively in the search for a viable and acceptable international agreement. It is therefore a source of deep disappointment for us that, while no one has put forward any objection in principle to the concept of negative security assurances, the Conference on Disarmament has so far failed to register any progress on negotiating an internationally binding legal instrument on the subject. The basic problem in the Conference has been its inability to come up with a common formula acceptable to all. We therefore consider it important that the General Assembly call upon the Conference on Disarmament to intensify its efforts to reach agreement on a formula that would enable it to elaborate and conclude effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.
Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.11 is on the lines of earlier resolutions on the subject adopted by the General Assembly on Pakistan's initiative. Its preambular part recognizes that the most effective assurance of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, but until that goal is achieved there is need for effective interim measures to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. It also takes note of the negotiations on the subject in the Conference on Disarmament. In its operative part, the draft resolution recommends that the Conference on Disarmament should actively continue negotiations with a view to reaching early agreement on the subject.

Last year the corresponding draft resolution was adopted in the plenary Assembly by 146 votes to none, with 4 abstentions. We sincerely hope that this year the draft resolution will be able to command unanimous support.

Ms. MAKUNGA (Botswana): As this is the first time that I have spoken in this Committee, I wish to join other representatives in congratulating you, Sir, on your election to the chairmanship of this important Committee.

My delegation wishes to address itself briefly to the general issue of the arms race and disarmament, with specific reference to the item on disarmament and development, which, as some previous speakers have already indicated, should be of great concern to developing countries.

Much talk on disarmament has been going on but very little has been achieved. The arms race, especially the nuclear-arms race, is a serious problem which requires immediate solution. While undoubtedly realizing the gravity of a nuclear war, man continues to develop and advance nuclear weapons on the pretext of national security; man continues to increase the risks of a war the consequences of which are well known.
Because of the continued threat to peace posed by the arms build-up, my delegation sees reason in the voice of many who advocate disarmament, be it at the regional or the international level, so that our world may be saved.

We have noted that there is a serious element of mistrust among those engaged in the arms race and that compromise can never be reached while countries are busy aiming at acquiring a first-strike capability. We undoubtedly also realize the difficulties involved, as can be seen from the record of previous disarmament talks, in the attainment of general and complete disarmament. However, we should not relax in our efforts to find solutions.

Despite the threat of war, the arms race has plunged man into confusion, when it comes to setting his priorities. Military budgets have taken precedence over socio-economic matters. The development process has thus stagnated, and poverty, hunger and untold misery have descended upon mankind.
(Ms. Makunga, Botswana)

A nuclear war is a war involving all, armed or unarmed: when it comes, we shall all perish. It is therefore imperative to make it our most important task to disarm and free our world from the perils and fears of a devastating war. The responsibility lies with all of us, but much needs to be seen to be taking place on the part of those of us whom we know for certain hold the balance between the continued existence of our world and its total destruction. Failure on their part to move positively will unfortunately not afford the human species a chance for regrets or amends.

My delegation commends and applauds the efforts made to create nuclear-free zones, the success of which we see as a positive step towards complete disarmament. Botswana, like other non-nuclear-weapon States, hopes that nuclear States and their allies will respect these efforts and not see them as an end in themselves but rather as a means to an end. At this stage, my delegation wish to reaffirm Botswana's support for the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

In spite of everything, we feel encouraged by the convening of the forthcoming Geneva talks between the United States and the USSR and hope that this time, unlike earlier times, many of the differences will be ironed out and that our world will have hope for its own continued existence.

While expressing its fears about a nuclear war, my delegation is also made uneasy by the use of chemical weapons and their continued production. We thus wish to associate ourselves with those who abhor the production and deployment of these deadly weapons. In this regard we attach great importance to the Geneva Protocols on the banning of the use of chemical weapons.

For the good of progress and the continued existence of life on our planet, man needs to set his priorities straight. Let us have the nerve to decide that we all have a moral duty for the fulfillment of life. My delegation thus feels encouraged by the decision to hold an International Conference on the Relationship
between Disarmament and Development, to be held in Paris next year. It is our
earnest hope that the good intentions that have prompted that Conference shall
emerge as the common resolve of all of us and be true to the needs of humanity.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to remind members of the Committee that, in
accordance with the Committee's decision, the deadline for the submission of draft
resolutions under disarmament agenda items 48 to 69 and 145 will expire today at 6
p.m.

As members are aware, a draft resolution on the implementation of the
Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace under agenda item 66 is being
prepared by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and does not, therefore,
depend on any single delegation. I am advised that the Ad Hoc Committee will
require additional time in order to finalize an agreed text. Therefore I suggest
that the First Committee grant, as an exception, an extension of the deadline in
this specific case.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.