

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

*Official Records\**



FIRST COMMITTEE  
11th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 23 October 1978  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 11TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 125: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS  
ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION: REPORT OF THE  
SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/33/PV.11  
24 October 1978

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 125 (continued)

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/33/279, A/33/305, A/33/312, A/33/317; A/C.1/33/L.1-4)

Mr. Shamsul HUDA (Bangladesh): This debate offers us an opportunity to review in larger perspective and harsher reality the results of the historic special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. What were its tangible achievements? How did it differ from other arms control efforts and disarmament diplomacy? Where does the world community proceed from here and with what expectations?

The very nature of those questions and the intense degree of introspection with which virtually all speakers have approached them are themselves viable testimony to one of the substantive achievements of the special session on disarmament - the manifest desire of all States to start afresh, and in terms of their own national fears, preoccupations and practical security requirements, to give a renewed, hard and innovative look at finding solutions to the age-old dilemmas posed by disarmament.

Among the most striking positive indicators that emerged from the special session on disarmament Bangladesh counts the following.

First, the virtually universal participation of mankind, remarkable in terms of breadth and level of representation, which was a unique achievement in sharp contrast to the only other global conference on limiting armaments, aborted more than 40 years ago. On the one hand, the special session on disarmament encompassed the participation of all nuclear-weapon States for the first time and, by encouraging unfettered exchange of views, laid down the essential groundwork for closer mutual understanding. On the other hand, the special session accorded an unprecedented role to the direct involvement of peoples through non-governmental organizations and technical institutions, thereby enriching the exchange of ideas and stimulating the debate. The net results

(Mr. Huda, Bangladesh)

were twofold: the special session not only highlighted the pivotal role of the United Nations as the fulcrum for disarmament efforts but also created a climate for increased political commitment to pursue solutions in the interest of mankind as a whole. Above all, it fostered a compelling awareness of the profound threat posed to the survival of mankind by the ever-escalating race in armaments and war technology.

Secondly, in spite of ingrained differences in the world community inherent in the nuclear and non-nuclear, developing and developed, status of its member States and despite the strains in the current international political environment, the special session was nevertheless able to adopt a consensus document. Thus for the first time the international community has before it a comprehensive framework in which are set out in an integrated manner fundamental goals and principles, an order of priorities and a programme of measures.

Thirdly, the restructuring of the disarmament machinery to make it more responsive and democratic constitutes in itself a major achievement of the special session on disarmament, for therein lies the element of continuity in practical terms. By fostering substantive advances in new ideas, developing and pursuing new perspectives and consolidating broad areas of consensus, the deliberative and negotiating bodies established by the special session on disarmament of a real hope of converting ideas into implementable actions.

Finally, it was in the realm of new ideas that the special session was particularly noteworthy, for it promoted a wide variety of useful and important initiatives for further study and negotiation. Indeed, three of the 36 major proposals were incorporated into the Final Document and the remaining 33 were annexed. We believe that many of those proposals deserve closer in-depth study and analysis, and we hope to contribute to deliberations on them once they are revived by their sponsors.

Those advances notwithstanding, Bangladesh believes that the results of the special session leave little room for complacency or satisfaction. A realistic appraisal reveals that what little advance was made was related mainly to the realm of procedure or further preparatory work - thus the emphasis on restructuring machinery and the commissioning of even more paperwork.

(Mr. Huda, Bangladesh)

The Final Document itself was forged out of the pressure of compromise and, of necessity, fell short of the expectations of all the parties concerned. One tangible reflection of that was that even the basic approaches to the problem of disarmament were adversely compromised, with developed countries focusing on the more limited achievements possible through arms control and the continued existence of mutual nuclear deterrence and the developing countries stressing the need for comprehensive measures leading to general and complete disarmament.

The rationale of advocating total disarmament is simple and direct. If one is in fact seeking a disarmed world, then it makes very little intellectual or political sense to advocate anything else. By pressing consistently for general disarmament the international community may eventually sustain the necessary climate of support to make it politically feasible. The content of the arms-control or partial-measure approach has proved illusory in real terms. It has not halted or reversed the arms race in spite of 30 years of negotiations. Perhaps disarmament will be achieved only if there is a viable alternative to arming, by placing it within a broad political context that includes strengthening international means for peaceful change and the maintenance of security. Moreover, advocating general and complete disarmament underscores the need to measure the existing armed world against the goal of a disarmed world, rather than against small steps of arms control which, even if achieved, appear to legitimize the weapons that remain.

In the final analysis, since arms-control realism has proved to be utopian, perhaps the utopia of disarmament may turn out to be the most practical aim to take. It is, in our opinion, certainly the only realistic option, considering the fact that the very survival of mankind is at stake. The Final Document stopped far short of that conceptual approach and in a sense back-tracked on the advances and high expectations generated by the 1961 McCloy-Zorin goal of agreement that "disarmament is general and complete and war is no longer an instrument for settling international problems" (A/4879, p.3).

Among the most serious criticisms of the Final Document is that it lacks any specific proposals for the implementation of arms control and disarmament measures or those that could enhance international security. Missing also from the Programme of Action is a sense of the urgency of carrying out measures within



(Mr. Huda, Bangladesh)

specified time frames. Other more direct shortcomings of the Programme are reflected in the general hesitancy of the militarily most powerful States which have special responsibility in the process of disarmament to accept a more concrete and substantive programme of action.

(Mr. Huda, Bangladesh)

On balance, however, it can be said that the special session marked a new beginning and not the culmination of a process that had in the past bogged down in impasse. The task before us is to achieve, through a graduated process of integral links, the implementation of the programme which we have forged through consensus, in accordance with priorities that have been broadly indicated. The success or failure of the special session on disarmament can be measured in the final outcome only by the degree to which and at what speed specific actions can be accomplished - if possible, concurrently.

In answering the questions posed at the outset of this statement as to where we should proceed from this point and with what expectations, my country, Bangladesh, believes that the paramount priority lies in implementing measures directed at nuclear disarmament. The future of the entire world is being progressively mortgaged by the qualitative arms race. Of immediate concern is the fact that the promise of limiting the strategic arms race through the possibility of concluding a SALT II agreement and a comprehensive test ban treaty in time for the special session did not materialize. The early conclusion of these two agreements is an acid test of the credibility of the major nuclear Powers. In so far as strategic arms limitation is concerned, we believe that the General Assembly should go further and adopt a global consensus urging the super-Powers to move beyond nuclear arms control to substantial nuclear arms reduction through negotiating a SALT III agreement. Among measures which could usefully be incorporated are a ban on missile flight testing and deployment of new types of nuclear weapons, including the related action of stressing the need for effective and unimpeded verification of all arms control agreements.

The priority short-range shut-down measure for arresting the dynamics of the nuclear arms race is the banning of all nuclear weapon tests in all environments. While encouraging the move of three super-Powers to proceed urgently towards reaching agreement on a convention on the comprehensive test ban Bangladesh believes, along with the non-aligned countries, that pending the conclusion of such a convention there should be a moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Huda, Bangladesh)

Bangladesh also is in accord with the view that the first steps towards nuclear disarmament should be aimed at the most heavily armed nuclear Powers. We believe that the international community should decry the use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances as illegal under international law, not only because they are indiscriminate in their destructive consequences and pose the threat of immeasurable destruction to the environment, but also because they are genocidal. As a primary move towards discouraging the use of nuclear weapons, all nuclear-weapon States must be urged to accept a pledge never to launch nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon countries. A concurrent pledge should be given by all nuclear-weapon Powers never to use nuclear weapons first. It is only logical that if the super-Powers advocate the retainment of nuclear weapons as a good for deterrent but difficult to use in war, there is no reason for nuclear Powers not to promise abstinence from at least their first use. In this regard we welcome China's continued propagation and adherence to its pledge of non-first use.

Bangladesh is also happy to note that the special session on disarmament saw some progress on the question of security guarantees for non-nuclear countries, particularly in the unilateral declarations of practically all the nuclear Powers. Nevertheless, these were severely circumscribed in that no binding commitments were made or assurances given not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon State. In this context we welcome the initiative of the Soviet Union relating to a possible international convention on the question as an important procedural step for further elaboration at this session and next year.

The fear of horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons remains a predominant concern of the developed countries as a problem essentially separated from the continued possession of nuclear weapons by the established nuclear club. It goes without saying that smaller nations will not be easily induced to give up their access to nuclear weapons or technology without a reciprocal prohibition against the right of nuclear-weapon States to retain them indefinitely. As has been oft-repeated, the crux of the argument revolves around the continued existence of nuclear weapons in any one State and not the potential possession of nuclear weapons by additional nations. Be that as it may,

(Mr. Huda, Bangladesh)

and despite the patently unbalanced obligations of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, Bangladesh believes that the overriding importance of discouraging nuclear wars by intent or accident is sufficient to justify a more positive appraisal of the potential benefits of the Non-Proliferation Treaty régime, if at the same time the nuclear-weapon States move concretely towards nuclear disarmament. A crucial incentive towards adherence to the Treaty are significant guarantees ensuring the broad availability of peaceful nuclear technology under safe, economic and equitable conditions to non-nuclear States. There is, therefore, imperative need to encourage arrangements for closer co-operation on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the transfer of nuclear technology under adequate international and non-discriminatory safeguards to the developing world.

A vital aspect of non-proliferation which needs to be pursued in furtherance of an international consensus is the generally favourable response to the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. This is particularly so because of the flexibility inherent in such zones, but not present in the Non-Proliferation Treaty, firstly, because they cover areas such as the Indian Ocean in which no sovereign jurisdiction is exercised by any one State, and, secondly, because States, particularly the nuclear Powers, are open to assume obligations which they have refused to assume under the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Bangladesh is fully aware of constraints governing the realization of this objective in our own South-Asian region. We stand committed, however, to promote in any way the necessary co-operation and mutual consultation that could pave the way for the denuclearization of our subcontinent.

Bangladesh subscribes to the growing view that among serious omissions of past disarmament discussions have been measures to curb the phenomenal growth in conventional arms. We therefore welcome the fact that the Final Document has reflected in some measure the need for limitation and gradual reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons, taking into account the realistic need for States to protect their security and to ensure balance at each stage through undiminished security of all States. A first general approach would be, we believe, to lay bare the basic facts governing conventional weapons and then to seek active

(Mr. Huda, Bangladesh)

steps for introducing restraints, either by the indirect method of reducing military expenditures across the board, or by the direct method of curtailing production and limiting arms transfers.

Bangladesh believes that a cardinal imperative in any approach to disarmament revolves around the linkage between disarmament and economic development. Nobody can deny the enormously extravagant waste of resources on armaments or the consequent sacrifice of the alternate use to which such resources might have been put to facilitate progress and the acceleration of economic development. It is therefore with regret that we note that this subject-matter did not receive adequate attention in the special session due to the reluctance of developed nations to consider it. Bangladesh is fully appreciative that the problem is complex and not subject to simplistic solution. Nevertheless, we firmly believe that it is both possible and desirable to link disarmament and development in a systematic fashion so as to improve the prospects of achieving both. It is in this context that we welcome the minimal compromise achieved by the special session that the United Nations undertake a comprehensive study to spell out the implications of global military expenditure on all relevant aspects of the economy and to examine methods for planned reallocation of resources towards more productive ends, including in particular contributions to be made to the development efforts of poorer countries.

(Mr. Huda, Bangladesh)

Much has been said on the question of the new machinery that has been established. It is our view that by and large the arrangements made reflect an adequate compromise of the suggestions raised during the special session. Though we would have preferred to have seen a more organic link between the negotiating and deliberative forums, to reflect the central role of the United Nations, we feel that the two bodies are reasonably closely associated so as to allow a due reflection of the interests of all States. One cardinal factor which we believe must be taken into account is that both these bodies should not construe their mandate to be a continuation of their past establishments but to function, as it were, from a new beginning.

In so far as continuing the momentum towards disarmament, Bangladesh fully supports the view expressed in the Final Document towards the holding of a new special session devoted to disarmament. We concur with the suggestion that this be convened in 1981 not only to review the progress in the implementation of the programme of the special session on disarmament but also to allow sufficient time for the elaboration of the comprehensive programme of disarmament now allocated to the machinery established.

As I stated earlier, the special session was remarkable for the extent of ideas that it generated, many of which require further study and elaboration. In order to rationalize this vast scope of work the Secretary-General was empowered to establish a group of experts composed of eminent persons to advise him on a programme of studies on aspects of disarmament. We fully endorse the early establishment of this panel of advisers and believe that this is a matter on which a decision should be taken at this session at an early date.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): When we have so many demanding tasks to accomplish, it behooves us from now on to concentrate on essentials, with as little loss of time as possible.

Above all, with one marathon session behind us, and many others still ahead of us, at least on this occasion we can avoid repetition of previously stated positions.



(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

Henceforth, brevity should be our motto, and concrete results our ambition. This is what will guide my delegation in future.

The main feature of a special session is its departure from the familiar routine of the regular sessions. The special session on disarmament was attended by an unprecedented number of world leaders at the highest level. Both by its nature, therefore, and by the level of representation, it represented the most up-to-date thinking and evaluation on the over-all aspects of disarmament by each individual participant, based on the experience acquired over the past decades.

It follows, therefore, that with the exception of the long established priority for nuclear disarmament, all other proposals put forward before the special session, irrespective of whether they are called new or old, deserve equal treatment. There are none subordinate to others, although naturally questions in some areas may be considered as more urgent or liable to solution than others. But, while allowing the maximum flexibility and pragmatism, no single proposal can be set aside.

Our compendium of good intentions is all included in the Declaration on Disarmament, the foundation of our work. The new impetus given by the special session propels us to move forward. A more representative platform for discussion now exists, and the way is open for all nuclear-weapon States to participate in the negotiations. Current ongoing bilateral and trilateral negotiations between nuclear-weapon States may also produce some results, it is hoped before this Assembly is over. These are the plus factors. But from now on we must recognize that we have no excuses which can be adduced if we fail to produce results, other than the inability of those with primary responsibility to contribute to disarmament, and perhaps the inefficient way in which we conduct our discussions inherited unchanged from a leisurely past.

Even as over the last two weeks we spent several valuable hours debating on the order of priorities and the respective functions of the bodies dealing with disarmament, a familiar pattern began to unfold outside these halls. In one single news broadcast, for instance, I heard announcements

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

of preparations for enhancing weapon systems and experimentation, and also for increasing delivery potential. If this pattern is to continue, then the preparation and the declarations we are making will all appear as new exercises in futility. There are, in fact, ominous but current reports of a potential new heat in the arms race between the super-Powers.

The evidence of past and recent events only confirm my delegation's conviction that we have to give added impetus and priority to political efforts aimed at concerted action to reduce areas of tension and to diminish mutual suspicion, particularly between the major military alliances. It follows, therefore, that we must act in parallel on these questions. My own delegation will have more to say on this approach at the appropriate time. The root of the arms race is not, after all, a technical question. Technology may render the negotiations much more complex, but it cannot become their master. What is really needed is for us to take advantage of modern technology as a means of achieving disarmament, and not to continue to hold it as an impediment. Here I wish to stress the timely nature of the suggestion by France for an international satellite monitoring agency so that perhaps the uncertainty on which the arms race is based will to some extent be decreased in future.

My delegation also trusts it will be possible at this session, and as an interim measure, for comprehensive guarantees to be given to non-nuclear-weapon States not having nuclear-weapons on their territory. The declarations made by nuclear-weapon States during the special session, and the more recent ones, were encouraging steps in this direction, which I hope will be pursued further to arrive at a result of mutual satisfaction.

There were a number of other proposals which are equally valuable and which seemed to my delegation to be convergent in scope. These could, we hope, be merged so as to reduce the number of new ideas that we shall have to investigate.

I have in the meantime studied the contents of document A/33/312 prepared by the Secretariat. While awaiting with interest the expected views of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, it occurs to me to observe even now that the studies proposed should not be a substitute for

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

concrete action on disarmament. None should be undertaken on which the answer is a foregone conclusion, or which in essence merely duplicate the work done by recognized institutions. It is also important that the whole world should derive maximum benefit from any studies undertaken. They should be designed primarily to create an impact on an admittedly disinterested public opinion; consequently, they should be brief, readable and not couched in the indigestible jargon of United Nations resolutions. The Secretariat and its consultancy should be completely free in preparing these reports, and should have automatic authority to up-date them as often as necessary. The number intended for delegations should be strictly limited, so as not to burden us with an additional number of documents with which increasingly we are not even able to cope. They should not merely reproduce what is already available or can easily be collated from other research organizations. And, of course, they should be produced in good time to allow for adequate study.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

Finally, and perhaps most important, the experts and consultants should be in a position to give an independent and informed opinion on disputed technical issues if called on to do so.

We should also try to derive maximum benefit from the proposed courses in disarmament, as explained in document A/33/305. It also occurs to me to suggest here that, in addition to the students from developing countries benefiting from the bursaries, the courses could also be open to qualified members of missions in Geneva and New York. This would increase cost efficiency and provide expertise for a larger number of participants. It would require, of course, courses being planned, and notification being given to all delegations in advance. This would also mean that rooms for lectures or seminars, and so on, should be large enough to accommodate a greater number of pupils.

Those are the observations we wanted to express briefly at this stage of our work.

Before concluding, I want to extend congratulations to the countries recently elected to the Committee on Disarmament and express our best wishes for steady progress in the common interest of us all.

Mr. SHEVEL (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The special session of the General Assembly which was held a few months ago made it clear beyond any doubt that the cessation of the arms race, disarmament itself, is quite rightly considered to be the main problem of contemporary international relations, and it is no accident that the search for approaches and the definition of areas for the concrete solution of this problem were the main issues discussed at the special session.

Now, when the results of the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations are being discussed in the First Committee, we agree - and this has been stressed by a number of speakers, including you, Mr. Chairman - that the discussion which is now being held should be action-oriented; that is, it should focus major attention on the real implementation of the recommendations of the special session of the General Assembly. We are in favour of that.



(Mr. Shevel, Ukrainian SSR)

It is time to turn from words to deeds. This, in our view, is the crux of the issue, and that is why today more than ever we need to take action to call a halt to the arms race and bring about disarmament.

The Final Document of the special session infused new life into steps and efforts designed to curb the arms race. Recently, in the course of talks on the cessation of the arms race and disarmament which have been held in various places, the positive influence of the special session made itself felt. Here too, at the present thirty-third session of the General Assembly, questions of disarmament and the strengthening of international security have also been the focus of attention.

The intensification of the search for ways and means of halting the arms race is understandable and the favourable influence of the trend towards international détente has been making itself felt. There has been the palpable influence of the persistent and purposeful course pursued by the socialist countries and other peace-loving forces in matters of disarmament; and also the powerful demands of the popular masses and peace-loving world public opinion for a cessation of the arms race.

As the Committee will recall, the voice of public opinion was heard, too, within the walls of the United Nations at the last special session. In spite of all this, so far there has been no real breakthrough in work towards halting the arms race. On the contrary, the arms race has now begun to assume genuinely global proportions. Ever newer forms of weaponry are appearing, followed by the discovery of means to combat those weapons, and subsequently weapons are invented and manufactured which are designed to circumvent the defensive measures which have been taken. Accordingly, action engenders counter-action, and as a result we are faced with a chain reaction of arms escalation.

Furthermore, the nuclear arms race is taking place at the same time as a conventional arms race. The nuclear arms race and the conventional arms race go hand in hand and together they are leading to an uncontrolled stockpiling of weapons of death and destruction. The major danger, of course, is constituted by the stockpiling of the nuclear weapon with its unimaginable

(Mr. Shevel, Ukrainian SSR)

destructive power. There are enough of these weapons stockpiled to destroy every living thing on our planet. According to United Nations estimates, their total power is equal to that of 1.3 million bombs of the type dropped on Hiroshima. But new forms of conventional weaponry are appearing which in their death-dealing capacity are rapidly becoming weapons of mass destruction.

The race in the field of conventional weapons, furthermore, is increasing the financial burden of the peoples of the world in no less a fashion than is the nuclear arms race. After all, the cost of certain forms of conventional weapons has risen out of all proportion in the recent past. During the Second World War, a tank, for example, cost about \$55,000, while the cost today of certain individual models of tanks, according to Western sources, exceeds \$1 million. A submarine has increased in cost 70 times; a contemporary fighter 130 times. Even a simple rifle today costs almost three times as much as it did.

This expensive arms race has been imposed upon the world, and we know who imposed it and continues to impose it. It is the military-industrial complexes of Western countries, primarily the military industrial complex of the United States, the leading capitalist country in the world. At its bidding in the United States a tremendously high military budget was approved for 1979. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), at its spring session in Washington, adopted an unprecedented long-term programme - that is, covering the period up to 1990 - increasing strategic nuclear forces, tactical nuclear devices and armed forces equipped with conventional weapons. The decisions taken by NATO demonstrate that a quite unjustified programme of military construction on a colossal scale is being developed. This is undermining the process of détente and the ensuring of peace and security. These essentially provocative decisions are satisfactory only to those circles in the world which have already proved themselves to be supporters of the fruitless and dangerous policy of strength and force in international relations.

It is time to put an end to the arms race; if we do not take decisive measures to put an end to the arms race as soon as possible the cost will be high.



(Mr. Shevel, Ukrainian SSR)

The problem of nuclear disarmament quite properly takes pride of place in discussions. In the Final Document of the special session it was stressed that we must halt and reverse the nuclear arms race in all its aspects so as to avert the danger of the outbreak of a war in which nuclear weapons would be used. The attainment of this goal, the Document indicates, requires the urgent holding of talks in order to achieve, stage by stage, the necessary agreements. In spite of the concrete proposals for the preparation and holding of these talks submitted by the Soviet Union and other participants in the special session, those talks have still not started.

It would appear that the time has come for the General Assembly to lay down and determine concrete actions to implement its own recommendation on this, and in particular to call for talks to begin. So far the action provided for by the United Nations has not been taken, but other action has been taken which infinitely complicates the possibility of halting the arms race.

In this regard we should like to draw the attention of the General Assembly once again to the fact that, far from being removed, the danger of the introduction into military arsenals of the nuclear neutron weapon has actually increased.

(Mr. Shevel, Ukrainian SSR)

It will no doubt be recalled that this past spring the socialist countries submitted a draft convention on the prohibition of the manufacture, stockpiling, development and use of the nuclear neutron weapon, once again demonstrating their wish to halt the arms race. However, on 30 September - that is, in the course of this very session of the General Assembly - the United States Senate approved the financing of components of the neutron weapon, and on 18 October this year, the President of the United States decided that the Energy Commission should embark upon the production of these components. But to embark upon the production of constituent elements or components of the neutron weapon is, in essence, something that means embarking upon the manufacture of that weapon itself. So the situation emerges which we know in our Ukrainian proverb: "Danielo has died, it does not matter how. He died anyhow".

We should like to stress once again that the neutron weapon is a peculiarly anti-humane means of mass destruction of people that inevitably brings us closer to the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war. Its introduction into military arsenals will, without doubt, open up a new area in the nuclear-arms race, as happened, for example, in the 1940s with the atomic bomb and in the 1950s with the thermonuclear weapon.

Finally, those assertions made to the effect that neutron bombs and shells are, as it were, defensive weapons are entirely spurious. We have to face the facts boldly and to state them, namely that this is an aggressive weapon that, at the cost of the mass destruction of people is aimed at the seizure of the territory, cities and industries of other countries. The broad movement of the peoples of the world and the protests of world public opinion against the neutron weapon and in favour of its prohibition and the unreserved renunciation of its manufacture prove that the world understands very well the danger connected with such a continuation of the nuclear arms race. We should heed the voice of the peoples and unreservedly prohibit the manufacture of the nuclear neutron weapon.

A draft convention relevant to this, which was submitted this past spring in the Committee on Disarmament by the socialist countries, served this purpose and warrants universal support. The conclusion of an international agreement on this question would clearly demonstrate the sincere wish of all States to adopt a course aimed at achieving genuine success and action-oriented results in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Shevel, Ukrainian SSR)

The problem of curbing the nuclear-arms race and ensuring the security of States is multifaceted. The Soviet Union has undertaken the first concrete step towards implementing the recommendations of the special session relating to this area. In light of the views of a large group of States, primarily the non-aligned countries, the Soviet Union submitted for the consideration of this session of the General Assembly a proposal for the strengthening of security guarantees for non-nuclear States and the non-emplacement of nuclear weapons on the territories of those States where it does not already exist. Action taken on this proposal would represent a concrete step towards the implementation of the recommendations of the special session.

Of great importance too are the talks now taking place between the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States on the total cessation by all States of all nuclear-weapon tests. The General Assembly could call upon the participants to the talks to accelerate their work to produce an agreement, and this is something, as we know, that the special session called for.

For some years now, discussions have been going on the proposal to conclude a treaty on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. We cannot permit a situation where industrial conveyor belts are receiving new models of ever more deadly weapons from laboratories and designing offices. If a start is made to produce such weapons, then they will actually be incorporated in arsenals and it will then become much more difficult to ban them. Therefore, it was proposed to conclude a comprehensive agreement, and, of course, it would not preclude that we might also conclude separate individual agreements affecting various specific new types of weapons of mass destruction, and this should occur with regard to radiological weapons. Talks that have been held for the purpose of plugging this particular channel in the arms race should, of course, in the view of the Ukrainian delegation, be continued and pursued energetically. In paragraph 75 of its Final Document, the special session pointed out that:

"The complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction represent one of the most urgent measures of disarmament". (A/RES/S-10/2)

We entirely agree with this appraisal.

(Mr. Shevel, Ukrainian SSR)

We must accelerate work on producing an appropriate understanding. Of course, difficulties do arise here, especially with regard to the problem of control over observance of the agreements. We are talking, of course, about actions of genuine disarmament that incidentally also affect one of the major industries in many countries. Difficulties can, however, be overcome. The problem of control could be resolved on the basis of national means of verification supplemented by well thought out international procedures.

An important question that has been approached in the United Nations on the initiative of the Soviet Union is the reduction of military budgets. In developing that initiative at the special session, it was proposed that States with a major economic and military potential - principally the permanent members of the Security Council - should come to an agreement on the specific size of a reduction of their military budgets by each of them, not in percentage terms but in absolute terms. This last proposal contains a genuine approach to a real way out of an academic discussion that was concocted by certain Powers in the United Nations on the subject of what is known as the structure and comparability of budgets, their dimensions and so on.

Now what we are really talking about is that we should come to an agreement on a specific sum of money that could be used for peaceful purposes, and this would include assistance to developing countries. Every year at the sessions of the General Assembly, the developing countries quite rightly raise the question of speeding up the solution of the problem of overcoming their backwardness, which is the heritage of colonialism, and their demands have been made with just as much urgency at this session too. The former colonial Powers and their allies are trying to shirk the task of satisfying these demands and are referring to the crisis situation in the capitalist economy and on the concept of interdependence of countries within the system of the world economy, which they interpret in various ways.

But where are we to find the tremendous resources required for the purposes of development? The proposal for the reduction in absolute terms of military budgets provides a concrete answer to this question. Having acted on this idea, the Members of the United Nations, including the developing countries, would come to find solid resources that could be



(Mr. Shevel, Ukrainian SSR)

devoted to peaceful and productive purposes. We call, therefore, for support for the proposal for the reduction of military budgets and we appeal for an end to any further delays in implementation by means of "studying" the various "models" of comparability of budgets of States.

(Mr. Shevel, Ukrainian SSR)

The discussion that has taken place in the Committee shows that many, if not the majority, of the important recommendations of the special session have not been implemented. It is clear that we have still to overcome serious obstacles before we can actually bring about disarmament. The special session, or even a number of such sessions, is only a step towards that goal; therefore we have always supported and continue to support the idea of convening a world disarmament conference, a universal forum at which would be adopted not recommendations but binding decisions. The time has come to fit a time-table for the holding of a world disarmament conference and to set up a body to prepare for it.

Those are some of the views of the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR with regard to the implementation of the recommendations of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and concerning the practical action on the part of States which is needed to halt the arms race and embark upon disarmament.

Mr. BOATEN (Ghana): Although you have said, Mr. Chairman, that we should not congratulate you, and I accept your ruling, I feel it my duty, as the previous Chairman of this Committee, to offer congratulations on your election. It is a duty that I discharge with absolute pleasure.

My delegation has taken note of the views expressed by the various delegations which have spoken before us since the debate on item 125 opened a week ago. In the same spirit of further advancing the work of this Committee I am happy to express the views of my delegation.

The tenth special session of the General Assembly provided us with a unique opportunity for adopting a common approach, indeed an agreed plan, for tackling the problems of disarmament. In the view of my delegation, the Declaration on and Programme of Action and machinery for disarmament negotiations adopted at the special session mark a significant turning point, a fresh approach to our disarmament efforts. New vistas



(Mr. Boateng, Ghana)

have been opened up. The General Assembly, the Disarmament Commission and the Committee on Disarmament will harmonize their efforts and work assiduously towards a disarmed world.

Paragraphs 50 and 51 of the Final Document have delineated nuclear disarmament as our first priority. In particular, the Final Document has called for the cessation of qualitative production and development of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems and of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes. In parallel, a programme of balanced reduction of nuclear stockpiles within agreed time frames is also to receive priority attention. The objective, of course, is the complete elimination of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems.

It is our view, however, that the phrase "agreed time frames" should not be an excuse for inaction. What is implied here is that the negotiation of agreements for a phased reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery is to be concluded without further delay. That is to be done in such a manner as not to place either of the parties involved at a disadvantage, bearing in mind at the same time the concern of the international community as a whole.

We therefore suggest that at this session our concern for the early conclusion of agreements on the reduction of nuclear weapons should be adequately expressed. We further suggest that the report to the Disarmament Commission should be candid, indicating areas of agreement and disagreement.

We are naturally concerned with the outcome of the negotiations. This is not to be construed as an attempt on our part to impinge on the sovereignty of the super-Powers: on the contrary, it is a genuine desire stemming from the concern of the international community for peace and security which may be generated by the conclusion of the negotiations. My delegation will therefore support any proposal that may emerge from this session requiring the submission of any technical problems on which there may be deadlock to the United Nations for consideration and possible solution. That would be in keeping with the broad principles reaffirmed in the Final Document on the central role which the United Nations is expected to play in disarmament matters.

(Mr. Boateng, Ghana)

The General Assembly's action at its tenth special session in attaching urgency to the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty is worthy of commendation. My delegation believes that the conclusion of such a treaty would have a double effect: it would stop the further expansion of existing arsenals and prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. It had been our expectation that the intensive negotiations reported some 18 months ago on the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban agreement would have been concluded by now and the results transmitted for consideration by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in accordance with General Assembly resolution 32/78. Unfortunately that has not been so. My delegation therefore suggests that at this session all the nuclear Powers participating in the negotiations be reminded of the urgency of transmitting the conclusions of their talks to the Committee on Disarmament. We should like to mention in this connexion that the Ghana delegation would support the proposal originating from the Indian delegation for the imposition of a moratorium on the testing of all nuclear weapons pending conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. It is the view of my delegation that there should be no difficulty in supporting such a proposal, which, after all, may be considered as a test of the political will of the negotiating parties.

The security of non-nuclear States also received due recognition in the Final Document. In this connexion we think the Soviet proposal on the agenda of this Committee - item 128 of the agenda of this session - on the conclusion of a convention guaranteeing the security of non-nuclear-weapon States deserves attention. Although in our view the Soviet proposal would need to be improved, it is nevertheless deserving of support as it seeks in the main to initiate action on the practical application of paragraph 59 of the Final Document.

(Mr. Boateng, Ghana)

My delegation has read the guidelines provided by the Secretary-General for the awarding of fellowships on disarmament, largely to developing countries.

The training programme proposed by the Secretary General is acceptable to my delegation. In order that these fellowships may benefit the international community as a whole, it may be useful to take into consideration equitable geographical distribution, bearing in mind that the fellowships are to go largely to developing countries. The question of establishing a selection panel to assist the Secretary-General is acceptable to my delegation.

On conventional weapons, the restraints and restrictions proposed for international transfer of these types of weapons are consistent with the policy of Ghana. My delegation, however, feels that the issue of international transfer of these types of weapons needs to be tackled more seriously at this session for a number of reasons. First, the introduction of these highly sophisticated weapons into areas of political conflict seriously threatens international security; secondly, it is obvious that recipient countries purchase these arms at the expense of pressing social and economic needs.

It is noted that this concern is expressed in paragraph 85 of the Final Document, where it is proposed, inter alia, that major arms suppliers and recipient countries should jointly work out plans for limiting international transfer of these types of weapons. My delegation, however, will urge that this session set out guidelines which would exercise effective restraining influence on both the supplier and recipient States. We submit that the present trend of international transfer of conventional weapons poses a serious threat to international peace and security and constitutes one of the major destabilizing factors in the developing countries.

One of the significant achievements of the special session is the establishment of deliberative and negotiating machinery to strengthen the disarmament process and as an effort to reaffirm the central role of the United Nations. Under the new arrangement, the Disarmament Commission and the First Committee will serve as the two major deliberative organs, while the Committee on Disarmament will be the negotiating organ. Membership in the latter has not only been enlarged, but the question of co-chairmanship, which in the past has hindered participation in the work of the Committee by



(Mr. Boateng, Ghana)

two nuclear Powers, has been successfully resolved by the special session. It is hoped that this will enable all the nuclear Powers to participate in the work of the Committee. Further, under the new arrangement, Member States which are non-members of the Committee are allowed to participate in its deliberations whenever a particular subject is being discussed in which they feel they have the necessary competence. The restructured Committee on Disarmament is therefore in a better position to undertake the increased responsibility assigned to it by the tenth special session.

Having said this, my delegation would like to observe, however, that the term of office of the non-nuclear Member States on the Committee needs to be clearly defined. In other words, we feel that the specific period for which a non-permanent Member is eligible to serve on the Committee should be spelled out clearly to give meaning to the principle of rotation implied in paragraph 120 of the Final Document. It is the view of my delegation that the phrase "reviewed at regular intervals" does not sufficiently bring out the import of the paragraph as regards the term of membership of the Committee. For the avoidance of any doubt, my delegation recommends that membership in the Committee for non-permanent members be for a maximum period of three years. The procedure for electing such members, however, should remain as established. My delegation will support any resolution to this effect.

In saying this, we are not downgrading the expertise which one acquires by serving on the Committee. We feel, however, that with the establishment of the Commission, and with the awarding of fellowships, expertise will not be confined to members of the Committee on Disarmament. Expertise will be more widely spread than it is now.

I should like to make one last point. To inculcate greater understanding and awareness of the problems of the arms race and armaments and above all, to keep up the momentum of our disarmament efforts, the Programme of Action has identified several wide-ranging aspects of the disarmament process which are to be handled by various bodies. My delegation appreciates the idea of creating United Nations bodies to handle various aspects of the disarmament process. However, we feel care should be taken not to proliferate these bodies. For the creation of more bodies could well make the co-ordination of results and the meaningful assessment of our efforts very difficult.

Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): Czechoslovakia considers it a matter of extraordinary and primary importance that real progress be achieved in the field of disarmament, which includes the implementation of the conclusions adopted by this year's special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Our position has been unequivocally explained at the current session of the General Assembly by the Czechoslovak Minister for Foreign Affairs who emphasized that

"Czechoslovakia ... as a socialist and peace-loving country, is vitally interested in the ending once and for all of all armaments and all the dangers of military confrontation". (A/33/PV.18, p. 32)

We see the results of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament as an important impulse toward strengthening and expanding international co-operation aimed at limiting and halting the arms race, at uniting all sincere efforts to eliminate the material basis of wars, and to secure a peaceful future and development of nations.

Their significance is all the greater, since - as it has been stressed here repeatedly - they were adopted with the broadest possible participation and on a unanimous basis, in keeping with the principle of consensus.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

Above all, the special session reaffirmed convincingly the undeniable fact that, as it says in the Final Document:

"Removing the threat of a world war - a nuclear war - is the most acute and urgent task of the present day. Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation."

(General Assembly resolution S-10/2, para. 18)

At the same time the session stressed:

"Since the process of disarmament affects the vital security interests of all States, they must all be actively concerned with and contribute to the measures of disarmament and arms limitation...". (ibid., para. 14)

We believe these are good conclusions and that on the basis of them it is possible to make real progress in the solution of disarmament issues.

The special session produced a synthesis of dozens of proposals and positions on practically all current disarmament issues. The Final Document adopted by the session was substantially enriched by a number of proposals and recommendations submitted by the socialist countries, including Czechoslovakia. In order to ensure that all the positive decisions adopted by the special session do not remain mere recommendations but are translated into practice, it is necessary, systematically and purposefully, to create the necessary political conditions, to strengthen the political will of States and to make use of all the possibilities provided in that respect by the special session. It is important, in our view, to take fully into account the concrete proposals contained in the Soviet document on practical measures for ending the arms race, which shows a realistic and practicable way to the permanent elimination of the danger of a world nuclear war and the establishment of durable international peace and security throughout the world.

The implementation of the conclusions and recommendations adopted will undoubtedly require long-term and concerted efforts by all States Members of the United Nations. At this stage we may note with satisfaction that the special session achieved the objective which it had set for itself, and on the whole laid good foundations for an international disarmament strategy aimed at general and



(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. This strategy consists of finding joint solutions for further progress in that direction, of determining the main policy objectives deserving of priority attention, and of providing the necessary organizational prerequisites to facilitate disarmament negotiations in the respective international bodies. The special session reached the basic conclusion that the decisive prerequisite of success in negotiations is provided by the political good will of the participants. It specified and stressed the mutual responsibility of nuclear and non-nuclear States and showed that in the current world the achievement of disarmament is a common concern of all countries and peoples. Despite the fact that the conclusions reached by the special session are not always the optimal ones and that in some issues only half of the way has been covered, they represent, on the whole, a constructive and realistic outcome pointing the way towards overcoming the arms race. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic associates itself fully with the appeal made by the special session that

"The pressing need now is to translate into practical terms the provisions of this Final Document and to proceed along the road of binding and effective international agreements in the field of disarmament." (ibid., para. 17)

An important, future-oriented result of the session is the complex of agreed principles to govern further disarmament negotiations and measures. They reflect the inevitable interrelationship between the main requirements of the present time - disarmament, international détente and development. We attach great importance also to the decision according to which disarmament measures are to be adopted in such a way as to ensure the right of each State to security and to prevent one State or a group of States being able, at any stage, to gain one-sided advantages to the detriment of other States. The importance of that principle is surely best known to those who are taking part in negotiations on concrete disarmament measures, like the talks on the reduction of armed forces in Central Europe.

The special session improved the prospects for success of disarmament negotiations when it stressed the close interrelationship between progress in

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

disarmament and the renunciation of the threat of force or the use of force by one State against another. It provided that measures in the field of disarmament be accompanied also by measures strengthening the security of States and generally improving the international situation.

Czechoslovakia also highly appreciates the fact that the Final Document of the special session proceeds from the main objectives of the United Nations Charter and expresses the common determination to observe and follow its principles in resolving the pressing tasks of disarmament. This fact, too, documents the lasting value of the Charter as an irreplaceable instrument in the endeavour of the United Nations to safeguard world peace and security.

The special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament rightly placed special emphasis on the wide range of questions related to the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war and to the achievement of nuclear disarmament. It stressed that

"The ultimate goal in this context is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons". (ibid., para. 47)

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic supports the appeal contained in the Final Document of the special session calling for the cessation of the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear-weapon systems; for the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, and of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes; and for the adoption of a comprehensive phased programme for progressive reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons leading to their ultimate and complete elimination. It is necessary that, in keeping with the Final Document, negotiations be initiated on these urgent issues by all nuclear Powers, which should approach preparatory consultations at least as soon as possible. The needed impetus could be provided by an appeal addressed to the nuclear States by the current United Nations General Assembly. The progress of such negotiations could be further facilitated through the participation of a group of non-nuclear States, as in some instances in the past. As for Czechoslovakia, it is prepared to take part in such negotiations.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

Czechoslovakia has repeatedly voiced its support for the idea - also expressed in the Final Document of the special session - that it is necessary for measures in the field of nuclear disarmament to be accompanied by the strengthening of political and international legal safeguards of security. We believe it is most timely to elaborate and conclude a world-wide treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. We are convinced that the adoption of such a treaty would have a far-reaching positive impact on the over-all improvement of the international situation and on the strengthening of confidence among States, and would open the way to more radical measures also in the field of disarmament. We should, therefore, devote less space to formalistic arguments complicating the situation and make use of the political potential that would be released by such a treaty.

For the same reasons we fully support the proposal submitted by the Soviet Union to the current session of the General Assembly to conclude an international agreement strengthening the security safeguards of non-nuclear countries. It provides simultaneously the best response to the appeals addressed to nuclear States in paragraphs 54 and 59 of the Final Document of the special session.

We believe, furthermore, that the current session of the General Assembly should give support to the relevant proposal by the Soviet Union and call on all nuclear States not to deploy nuclear weapons in the territory of States where as yet those weapons are not deployed. This measure would surely make an important contribution to the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime proclaimed by the special session to be the objective of general efforts by States.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

Since the signing of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in 1968 undeniable successes have been achieved in that field. As was stressed by the Geneva Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty, the strict implementation of the provisions of the Treaty is the main aspect of the common task to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. We are all the more concerned over the fact that about one third of the States of the world, including some nuclear Powers, have not acceded to that Treaty. That is why we believe that the General Assembly should adopt effective measures aimed at achieving universality of the Non-Proliferation Treaty as an important instrument of strengthening international peace and security. With that objective in mind, it will be necessary to approach with full responsibility the preparation for the second conference of States Parties to that Treaty, to be held in 1980. Czechoslovakia is prepared to take an active part in it. Simultaneously we must strive for constant improvement and strengthening of the system of safeguards within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Those safeguards are an important prerequisite for the development of fruitful international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy by preventing that co-operation being accompanied by the danger of nuclear arms proliferation.

Among the most pressing tasks in the field of nuclear disarmament is the achievement of complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. We fully agree with the conclusion reached by the special session that that step would correspond with the interests of mankind and would help to halt the improvement and development of new types of those weapons. The information submitted by the three nuclear Powers on their negotiations shows that a realistic basis exists for their successful conclusion. The General Assembly should contribute to the achievement of that objective by ensuring favourable conditions in which that treaty could become universal in future.

A question of fundamental importance is the conclusion of a new agreement on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons between the Soviet Union and the United States. We trust that both sides will be able to submit results in the foreseeable future that will represent an important prerequisite for progress in the entire field of disarmament.



(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

Another pressing task is to speed up the work of the Committee on Disarmament on drafting a treaty prohibiting the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems thereof, as called for in paragraph 77 of the Final Document of the special session.

Czechoslovakia, just like the other peace-loving countries, is deeply concerned at the preparations for starting the production of nuclear neutron weapons that are being constantly announced, even by leading representatives of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The Committee on Disarmament must devote due attention to the elaboration of a treaty on the complete ban of those destructive weapons, using as a basis the proposal submitted to the Committee this year by the socialist countries. Furthermore, we are convinced that all necessary conditions should be created in the nearest future for the conclusion of international agreements on the prohibition and elimination of the stockpiles of chemical and radiological weapons.

The General Assembly of the United Nations should take new steps to facilitate the achievement of a gradual reduction in military budgets. That would be an important measure which, as is stressed in the Final Document of the special session,

"... would contribute to the curbing of the arms race and would increase the possibilities of reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development..." (resolution S-10/2, para. 89)

Up to now that task has been complicated by technical problems arising in negotiations on the reduction of military budgets in terms of percentage points. We have therefore welcomed the proposal submitted by the Soviet Union to the special session to reach agreement on mutual reduction of military budgets, especially those of the large States, in the simplest possible way, that is in absolute figures. We firmly believe that, with the support of the General Assembly, this proposal should become feasible and generally acceptable.

The special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament spoke out resolutely in favour of continuing negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe and emphasized that a positive outcome of those talks would represent a significant step towards strengthening international peace and security. We are speaking of a region



(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

which, within a short historical span of time, was the incubator and the scene of two horrible, destructive wars. At the same time it is a region where today the largest accumulations of well-trained troops and military technology confront each other. It is also a region about which negotiations have been going on for the past five years without any practical results.

Last summer the socialist countries, including Czechoslovakia, submitted another convincing proof of their sincere endeavour to reach a needed compromise solution in the Vienna talks. The new initiative and new proposals by the socialist countries are aimed at finally getting the talks out of their deadlock. They are going a long way to meet constructively the positions of the West. We can say without exaggeration that the socialist countries have covered more than half the way leading to agreement. They have constructively taken into account a whole series of important questions to which the Western participants have been attaching priority significance since the very beginning of the Vienna talks. They agreed, for instance, that as an outcome of the reductions common collective ceilings will be established for the armed forces of the two military groupings in Central Europe. They accepted the demand that the manpower reductions of armed forces should apply to ground forces only, as well as a number of other positions of their Western partners.

The proposals submitted by the socialist countries envisage a just settlement of the question of mutual reductions of armed forces in Central Europe and are strictly in accordance with the principles agreed upon in the preparatory consultations in 1973. They proceed from the position that the high level of military confrontation in Central Europe must be substantially reduced, without endangering, as a result of the reductions, the security of any participant in the talks.

Even the Western participants in the talks cannot deny the advantages of our proposals. The Head of the United States delegation to the Vienna talks, Mr. Dean, noted last July that the proposals by the socialist countries represent substantive steps forward and that they have considerable potential significance for the preparation of a possible future agreement. In the last, as well as in the current, round of talks the socialist countries have

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

explained their proposals in detail and fully answered the questions of the Western delegation. As yet, however, the Western participants have not responded to those constructive proposals. That can lead to nothing else but further delays in the negotiations. However, we would like to believe that the new proposals by the socialist countries, representing a realistic basis for reaching an agreement, will eventually help the West to prove by deeds its proclaimed readiness to reduce the military confrontation in the heart of Europe.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

All these measures called for and envisaged by the Final Document of the special session, supplemented also by effective steps towards limitations of conventional armaments and reductions of military budgets, would undoubtedly establish a sufficiently broad basis for the adoption and gradual implementation of a programme for general and complete disarmament.

We firmly hold the view that, with this in mind, it is necessary to prepare and hold a world conference on disarmament which, with the participation of all countries of the world as well as the nuclear States, would adopt the necessary and, above all, binding disarmament measures. The necessity of convening this conference has been reaffirmed by the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which agreed on its implementation "at the earliest appropriate time". That is why we believe that the current session of the United Nations General Assembly should take an unequivocal decision on initiating practical preparations for the conference and, to that end, set up a preparatory committee. The definitive organizational and substantive preparation of the conference could be co-ordinated in such a way as to make it an immediate task for the next special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. A clear-cut decision along these lines would surely help to increase concerted efforts by the international community for the solution of the pressing problems of disarmament.

We trust that a positive step in that direction will be made also by the activities of the newly established United Nations Disarmament Commission, which has these past few days successfully concluded its first organizational session. We are also looking forward with hope to the establishment of an advisory board for the United Nations Secretary-General to deal with studies in the field of disarmament. We trust that this body too will help to increase further the effectiveness of United Nations activities in this field.

The current session of the United Nations General Assembly will address its requirements for the consideration of a number of urgent disarmament issues to the newly reorganized Committee on Disarmament. We noted with satisfaction the decision of another nuclear State - France - to participate in the

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

deliberations of the Committee. We also welcome the eight new members of the Committee and we should like to assure them that they can always count on the constructive co-operation of the Czechoslovak delegation. As is known, Czechoslovakia attaches special importance to this Committee. It regards it as an irreplaceable negotiating forum. Its mission consists not only in considering partial disarmament measures but also in acting as a major instrument for the implementation of the will of the entire international community to achieve general and complete disarmament. That is why we are determined, as one of the member countries of this Committee, to exert every effort in order to contribute responsibly to its work also in the future.

Virtually within a few hours the first international week devoted to fostering the objectives of disarmament, proclaimed by the special session of the General Assembly, will be opened. Czechoslovakia supports the ideas pursued by this week and believes that its holding will contribute to the mobilization of efforts by all nations to halt the arms race and achieve disarmament.

In conclusion, I should like to express the conviction that the results of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament will provide a lasting stimulus for a broad activation of the struggle for disarmament and for the constant growth of the effectiveness of disarmament negotiations. It was the special session that has shown that the transition from the arms race to its halting and to disarmament is still a realistic possibility.

I should like to express the hope that, under your personal guidance, Mr. Chairman, and with your well-known abilities and expertise, this session will mark a further step towards this goal.

Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time that I have spoken in this Committee, I should like to congratulate you and your fellow-officers upon your election and express my conviction that, under your skilful guidance, the First Committee will successfully complete its work.

The peoples of the world want peace and security. Above all, they understand that peace and security requires the cessation of the arms race and disarmament. This is something which was once again demonstrated by the course and results of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Although certain States had some reservations, the Final Document was nevertheless adopted by consensus. Its provisions are in the nature of a programme, are action-oriented and promote the continuation of the process of détente. On the other hand, we have, regrettably, to note that the arms race is still going on and that certain imperialist, militarist and other reactionary circles are doing their best to poison the international atmosphere, to block the path to disarmament and to fan the flames of the arms race. We are all familiar with the doom-laden theories about the so-called inevitability of a new world war and we have been witnesses of the great-Power chauvinist policy which directly threatens neighbouring peoples and is designed to bring about a recrudescence of the notorious, so-called anti-Comintern pact of pre-war days in a new edition.

Nevertheless, we believe that there are favourable conditions for arriving at agreement on limiting arms and on disarmament. As the tenth special session stressed, what is needed is the necessary political will on the part of States. The Final Document of the tenth special session called upon States which are already conducting talks on various aspects of limiting arms and disarmament to achieve the conclusion of agreements as soon as possible.

The German Democratic Republic would welcome it if the Soviet Union and the United States could as soon as possible come to agreement on limiting strategic weapons - I have in mind SALT II - because the successful conclusion of these talks would have a very favourable effect on the international climate as a whole. We should like to express the hope that those North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) circles, particularly in Western Europe,



(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

which are always attempting, by putting forward ever newer demands, to make these talks more difficult will not be able to hinder the achievement of mutual understanding.

The German Democratic Republic has been taking part directly in the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. The issue here is a reduction of military tension in this area, where it is particularly great and where the confrontation of the armies of two military-political alliances is particularly dangerous. More than four months ago the socialist States submitted to their partners in the talks a far-reaching compromise proposal whereby, as a result of reductions by all participants in the talks, the number of soldiers in Central Europe would be reduced in three to four years by 200,000. So far, there has been no sign of a positive response. According to data available with regard to the military presence in the area under consideration for reduction, there exists a rough equality of military potential. The Soviet Union stated at the tenth special session that, unlike the NATO countries, it had long desisted from increasing its armed forces in Central Europe and had no intention in the future either of increasing them by a single soldier or by a single tank.

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

In spite of all this, the Western partners so far have not demonstrated their readiness to any extent whatsoever to reduce their armed forces. Furthermore, they are expecting from the socialist partners in the talks agreement to the effect that within the framework of so-called collective maximum limits a certain country that is already very heavily armed would increase its armed forces and its strength beyond the present level. In other words, what we have is armament instead of disarmament. That is a situation which we cannot find satisfactory and we shall spare no effort to see to it that at the talks results are achieved which meet the aspirations of the peoples of the world to peace and security.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic once again wishes to express itself in favour of the early success of talks on the total prohibition of chemical weapons and nuclear-weapon testing. The cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests is something to which we attach particular importance. The Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly quite rightly described the elimination of the threat of nuclear war as the most urgent and immediate task of the present day. Agreement among the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom on the complete and general prohibition of the testing of nuclear weapons would undoubtedly help in the attainment of that goal, although it should be clear that a final solution to this problem is impossible if we limit the situation to those three States. Sooner or later it will become necessary to secure the participation of all nuclear States. That is something that should certainly not be passed over in silence.

Generally speaking, in any case, the time has really come for all nuclear States to get together around one table and discuss the question of how to comply with the demand of the General Assembly at the tenth special session for the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and their stage-by-stage destruction, up to and including the total elimination of that extremely dangerous type of weapon the use of which threatens the existence of entire peoples. The complexity of this task should not be allowed to prevent anyone from embarking upon the solution of the problem.

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

As members will recall, it has been proposed that non-nuclear States should also take part in these talks. My delegation supports that proposal.

Together with the multifaceted general tasks, an important place should be accorded to the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. To a large extent the solution to this problem will determine whether nuclear disarmament will be brought about at an early date or whether in fact, in connexion with the emergence of ever-newer nuclear Powers, further serious obstacles will be created. Among the numerous so-called near-nuclear Powers which are capable, on the basis of their scientific and technological resources and possibilities, of creating nuclear weapons, there are aggressive States such as, for example, South Africa with its racist régime. It is frightening to think that that régime could plunge mankind into a thermonuclear catastrophe. That is something which can and must be prevented. States which supply nuclear materials, equipment and technology bear a great responsibility. The size of profits cannot possibly be allowed to justify such deliveries to Pretoria.

The German Democratic Republic considers that the effectiveness of the non-proliferation régime should be increased. It would be desirable for all States to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

In this regard, my delegation welcomes the new Soviet proposal for the strengthening of nuclear guarantees for non-nuclear States on whose territory no weapons of this kind have been placed. It is good that this proposal, in accordance with its significance, was included in the agenda as a separate item. At a more appropriate time my delegation will go into further detail on its views on the fundamental ideas of concluding a convention.

We quite often hear extremely eloquent statements here about the significance of disarmament, an idea to which everyone can subscribe. However, when we talk about concrete steps for halting the arms race, limiting armaments and bringing about disarmament it turns out that it is very difficult to induce those various States to take action. For example, there is no denying, generally speaking, the need for preventing the development of new

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. The proponents of the arms race, however, are threatening us with new versions of frightful weapons of mass destruction, for example, the induced radiation weapon and the reduced residual radiation bomb. Action should be taken to thwart once and for all the designs of the representatives of the military industrial complex to abuse every new scientific discovery for the creation of new cruel weapons of mass destruction.

A preventive prohibition of the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, as proposed by the socialist States, would be highly appropriate.

Something which we find even stranger is the fact that this summer the Western countries did not send their experts to take part in the talks of the Geneva Committee on Disarmament on such a prohibition. Although, of course, those States did not vote in favour of resolution 32/84 A of the previous regular session of the General Assembly, which provided for a general and complete solution to this problem, nevertheless even the much less comprehensive resolution which they proposed, resolution 32/84 B, asked that attention be focused on the question of developing new forms of weapons of mass destruction. How are we to regard such conduct?

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic understands the difficulties connected with the appraisal of phenomena the use of which for military purposes would lead to the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction, since that is connected with very complex scientific and technological problems.



(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

The German Democratic Republic supports, as exceedingly expedient and appropriate, the Soviet proposal to entrust the consideration of this matter to a special group of qualified governmental experts.

The German Democratic Republic welcomes the fact that in the bilateral talks between the USSR and the United States of America on the prohibition of radiological weapons it has been possible to achieve some success, and we hope that these talks will swiftly be successfully concluded. However, we are concerned by reports about the nuclear neutron weapon. The German Democratic Republic associated itself with the Amsterdam Appeal to peoples and Governments of all countries, which stated:

"The neutron bomb is the most fearsome weapon, designed solely to destroy people, and what we need is an unambiguous renunciation of any plan for the manufacture of the neutron bomb."

We hope that the rising tide of universal indignation about the intention to produce and use this cruel weapon will become even more intense. With every justification people are alarmed, particularly in densely populated Europe, and we should be exceedingly vigilant towards the concepts of imperialist military strategists with regard to the use of such weapons in a so-called limited nuclear war. Powerful protests against the creation of the neutron weapon have so far been successful in averting its manufacture.

Further development of components and carriers, with frank reference to preparations for the use of the nuclear neutron weapon, compel the delegation of the German Democratic Republic once again to draw attention to the following fact. It would be highly unrealistic to suppose that the threat of this new weapon could exert political pressure on the socialist countries. That was not possible when the atomic weapon emerged, and still less is it liable to be effective today. Statements of official persons of socialist countries and the proved capacity to cope with serious problems should be common knowledge.



(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

The socialist States are anxious to prevent an exacerbation of the arms race and reconfirm their proposal for the conclusion of a convention on the renunciation of the manufacture and deployment of the nuclear neutron weapon. The Geneva Committee on Disarmament could prepare an appropriate convention. This would be in keeping also with the demands of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

In order to attain the agreements which have been concluded so far, the Geneva Committee on Disarmament, as a multilateral negotiating organ, has already done fruitful work. The interest of many States in taking part in the work of the Geneva Committee on Disarmament demonstrates the great authority of this organ. It should be expected that the admission of new States - which we congratulate upon joining the Committee - and other decisions about the work of the Committee will enhance its effectiveness and efficiency.

Now, one more nuclear Power has taken the decision to co-operate in that Committee, and that is something which we for our part welcome. Among its members, as is characteristic, there is still one last nuclear Power missing. The German Democratic Republic, as a member of the Committee, will continue to work for constructive talks.

The problems of the limitation of armaments and disarmament are multifaceted and without doubt very complex. Great efforts need to be exerted, and a constant quest must be conducted for new ways and means of achieving appreciable results. The German Democratic Republic shares a point of view which is ever gaining ground - that a means for the attainment of a genuine breakthrough would be a world disarmament conference.

As the Committee will recall, an exchange of views on the advisability of convening such a conference also took place during the tenth special session. It was decided that a world disarmament conference should be

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

convened as soon as possible. Therefore, we should, right now, already be drawing practical conclusions. The General Assembly should set the site and date of a world disarmament conference and convert the Ad Hoc Committee into a preparatory committee for the world disarmament conference and entrust it with the task of directly preparing for the conference.

The best preparation for such an international meeting on questions of disarmament would be the prior harmonization of measures on disarmament. For example, in order to achieve agreement on a reduction of military budgets of States possessing major economic and military potentials, including all the permanent members of the Security Council, we do not need to convene either a new special session of the General Assembly or a world disarmament conference. For too long now people have been evading the solution of this problem on some very shaky grounds. Military budgets are published; and if it is not possible to achieve agreement on the reduction in percentage terms, then it should be possible to determine comparable absolute figures. I would say in this regard that we should act according to the German proverb: "Where there is a will, there is a way".

With regard to the question of reducing military budgets, the United Nations should be consistent and not slacken its efforts to resolve this problem.

Since a certain party, even within the framework of the United Nations, is still insisting on talking about certain medium-range rockets, I should like to draw attention to the following facts. The territory of the German Democratic Republic, a relatively small country, directly borders, along a frontier of more than 1,300 kilometres, on a member State of NATO which contributes more than 10 per cent of the general military expenditures of that body, and has already declared that next year it will take an even greater than normal part in the expenditure on armaments.

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

There is a plan for the expanded deployment of NATO forces in the vicinity of our country's frontiers, for the perfection of conventional weapons and for the stepped up development and introduction of new so-called tactical nuclear weapons in Western Europe.

The people of our country for their part have set for themselves tremendous goals of peaceful construction. At the present time we are carrying out a social and political programme that is the broadest ever known in the history of our country. We are successfully carrying out a broad programme of housing construction, and we note with pleasure that, along with the permanent improvement in social conditions in the German Democratic Republic, the birth rate is on the increase, and we want to do everything possible to maintain this process in conditions of peace and security.

The foreign policy of the German Democratic Republic, from its very foundation 30 years ago, has pursued the goal of creating favourable external conditions for peaceful social, economic and cultural development of our country. We have no social or political groups that grow rich through the production of armaments. The German Democratic Republic does not have any territorial claims on any other country and there is no issue that the socialist countries have any intention of resolving by force. For us peace is the highest international obligation, and aspiring to disarmament on the basis of strict observance of the interests of the security of all countries is a matter of State policy enshrined in our constitution.

The means and resources released by disarmament would be used by us to accelerate our rate of peaceful development. Given substantial progress in the field of disarmament, we could participate much more effectively in the solution of urgent world-wide problems of preserving the environment, using natural resources and also eliminating hunger and disease.

It is not the excessive stockpiling of ever more dangerous weapons that brings mankind closer to conditions of a guaranteed peace. A solid foundation for lasting peace can be created only on the basis of effective measures of disarmament. Such a policy has been consistently and firmly pursued by socialist countries for a long time now. Irrefutable proof of this is provided by the

(Mr. Florin, German Democratic Republic)

numerous concrete proposals for the limitation of armaments and for disarmament. In light of these proposals, fabrications about the so-called military threat posed by the socialist countries appears as nothing less than absurd. There is no type of weapon on which the socialist countries would not be prepared to negotiate with a view to disarmament.

In conclusion, I should like to point out that the course and results of the special session devoted to disarmament showed that those that are profoundly interested in peace and disarmament represent a tremendous force. The provision of support for the broadly-based and powerful movement of States and peoples, organizations and mass movements and the channelling of this mighty force into effective action against the arms race is the highest priority in the work of the United Nations.

Mr. GARBA (Niger) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Niger is particularly happy to speak on agenda item 125 on the eve of the first solemn commemoration of disarmament week that will begin tomorrow, the anniversary of the founding of the United Nations dear to all peoples that love peace and liberty. This first disarmament week unfolds at a time when the forces of evil trying to annihilate the efforts of the international community are being combatted in order that peace and security may be established throughout the world. In such circumstances it would be fitting that we place this item under the heading of fighting foreign exploitation and the exploitation of man by man, of which apartheid constitutes the most shameful form known to man since the advent of our epoch. Thus paragraph 12 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly states quite clearly that

"the massive accumulation of armaments and the acquisition of armaments technology by racist régimes as well as their possible acquisition of nuclear weapons, present a challenging and increasingly dangerous obstacle to a world community faced with the urgent need to disarm". (A/RES/S-10/2)

But those who follow this insensate policy have again hurled a challenge to the international community in systematically refusing the organization, under the aegis of the United Nations, of free and democratic elections in Namibia.



(Mr. Garba, Niger)

That attitude does not surprise us, coming as it does from a régime that ignores and rejects any possibility of a dialogue and negotiation.

But on the other hand, we Africans are surprised and disappointed at the recent capitulation to the Pretoria group by the five great Western Powers which, without any explanation, have so easily upset the decisions of our Organization that they themselves had freely accepted a few weeks earlier. That attitude bespeaks contempt for the African peoples and a lack of rigour and determination characteristic of the proceedings of the Western Powers whenever it is a question of defending the independence and dignity of Africa. So the only answer that our people can make to this shameful inconsistency of the Western Powers is to continue their armed struggle against the racist minorities.

The ordeal of apartheid will obviously call for the sacrifice of thousands more Africans, but victory is certain, and the black people, which have survived deportation, the long dark period of colonialism and two world wars that were not of their making, will be able ultimately to recover their freedom and dignity. The struggle for decolonization for which so many children of Africa have shed their blood will be concluded by the coming generations. No force can shatter this determination. It is true that military means and technology placed in the hands of the racist minorities by the Western Powers will allow their protégés to slaughter hundreds of Africans, but these same means have an effect on the organized masses of Africa and will stiffen their determination to defend their right to life and peace on earth. They are all the more determined because they are being offered the support of friendly nations. Africa is comforted by the knowledge that there exist progressive peoples in the world which are sincerely dedicating their efforts to peace, freedom and equality in the world without any racial barriers.

Unfortunately, it is their erroneous concept of human life that has imposed a guilty silence on the Western Powers when faced with the genocide that is taking place against the black peoples of Africa. It is this concept that at present is being used in the crusade for human rights, a crusade to the rights of a specific group belonging to an allegedly superior race.



(Mr. Garba, Niger)

Peace can be achieved through disarmament but not through friendship with those who are threatening freedom and peace in the world.

Secondly, no one can with impunity constantly deny and hamstring the peoples of Africa. My delegation has referred to the crime of apartheid because we believe that the incomplete decolonization of our continent is one of the basic causes of the threat to the security of our countries and of the skirmishes and battles that are taking place on our continent. These local conflicts, which the "policeman" of the world attempt to minimize because they themselves have started them, constitute one of the greatest scourges of the peoples who are trying to develop.

Economic xenophobia seems to have taken possession of the Western Powers and may ultimately lead to another world conflagration.

Once again we reaffirm paragraph 8 of the Final Document, which states that "the immediate goal is that of the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war". We are fully aware of the devastating effect of such a war but we continue to contend that the settlement of local conflicts that turn our peaceful countries into battlegrounds for the testing of more and more sophisticated conventional weapons is a short-term objective that could greatly contribute to the reduction of the danger of a nuclear war. That fact has also been recognized in paragraph 13 of the Final Document, which states:

"... the causes of the arms race and threats to peace must be reduced and to this end effective action should be taken to eliminate tensions and settle disputes by peaceful means." (resolution S-10/2, para. 13)

We are happy also to note that paragraph 16 of the Final Document reaffirms the close link between military expenditures and economic development and states that the continuation of the arms race is "incompatible with the implementation of the new international economic order".

My delegation was one of those which tried last year to make more tangible the link between disarmament and development and we are gratified by the decision of the General Assembly at its tenth special session to request the Secretary-General, together with qualified experts, to undertake a thorough study of that link.

(Mr. Garba, Niger)

Furthermore, paragraph 26 of the Final Document stresses the importance of "... non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States; the inviolability of international frontiers; and the peaceful settlement of disputes ...". (ibid., para. 26)

That reaffirmation incontestably strengthens the Charter of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity and arouses hope for peace in the world.

The Final Document goes on to say that the Security Council shall whenever necessary take appropriate and effective steps to prevent the frustration of the denuclearization of Africa. We venture to hope that the five permanent members of the Security Council will be good enough to take into account the wishes of the General Assembly and in future to prevent any effort by South Africa to flout that objective.

Another important decision of the tenth special session was the establishment of a programme of disarmament fellowships. We are convinced that in the distribution of such fellowships account will be taken of the great need for information on disarmament felt by the developing countries.

I turn now to the subject of machinery for disarmament negotiations. The establishment of the two new organs is undoubtedly one of the successes of the tenth special session. In the past we had a Committee on Disarmament. Today we have an expanded one, which has thus become more representative, in which France - and perhaps in the future China - will take its place, and a Disarmament Commission made up of all States. To that must be added the will of all Member States to strengthen the primary role of the United Nations in disarmament. But complete success at that level will, when all is said and done, depend upon giving up the old habits and on the relative flexibility of Member States, particularly the most powerful. One of the objectives of the special session was to bring all Members, regardless of their stage of development, into the negotiations on disarmament. The creation of the Disarmament Commission and the expansion of the Committee on Disarmament met that requirement. That being so, it becomes indispensable that neither of those organs works in a vacuum and that the great Powers abandon their attempts to dictate to smaller nations, in the field of disarmament, as we saw happening at the special session. The

(Mr. Garba, Niger)

three days of discussion among the great Powers resulted in more success than was achieved in the first 37 days during which the smaller nations tried desperately to make their voices heard.

There is no doubt that the Commission and the Committee will receive great help from the eminent persons who will form the board of advisers to assist the Secretary-General on the different aspects of disarmament studies. In the view of the influence of such a team on the orientation of studies on disarmament, my delegation is led to hope that in the setting up of that board regard will be had to geographical distribution and respect for a balance among countries of a certain region, in order to avoid the same States finding themselves occupying seats in the different disarmament bodies as though they had exclusive competence in that field.

Mr. FOKINE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In his statement of 19 October the representative of the United States, referring to the Soviet proposal relating to the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States, gave his interpretation of the position of the Soviet Union on the question. In order to correct the incorrect impression which may have been created in the minds of members of the Committee, I should like to quote fully the appropriate part of the statement of the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko, at the plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 26 September:

"It will be recalled that recently our country has taken a step conducive to instilling among non-nuclear States greater confidence in their security. The Soviet Union has declared that it will never use nuclear weapons against countries which renounce the production and acquisition of nuclear weapons and which do not have them on their territory.

"Following our lead, the United States and the United Kingdom, for their part, have made declarations to the effect that they would not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States. On the whole, this could be regarded as a positive fact, were not such declarations replete with all kinds of reservations which devalue them." (A/33/PV.8, p. 33-35)

Mr. FISHER (United States): Without any spirit of contention, I accept the translation in English that I just heard. My prior quotation relied on the official provisional verbatim records, and I think I was justified in relying on them.

To the extent that the proper translation reduces a potential difference between my Soviet friends and myself, I cannot claim to be irritated but, rather, encouraged.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to make clear something which I said on Friday in regard to the commemorative meeting to mark Disarmament Week. I said that two delegations would address the Committee after the messages had been read out. I referred to them as having a special interest in the matter. What I meant was that these two delegations had particularly suggested during the special session that the Disarmament Week be held, and, obviously, therefore have an initiator's right, if I may put it that way.

Concerning additional co-sponsorship of certain draft resolutions, Zaire has become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.2, Jordan has become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.4, and Ghana has become a co-sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.3 and L.4.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.