

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-THIRD SESSION
*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE
15th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 25 October 1978
3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 15TH 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)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

* 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.15
26 October 1978

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.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/33/42, A/33/279, A/33/305, A/33/312, A/33/317; A/C.1/33/L.1-4)

Tan Sri ZAITON (Malaysia): Mr. Chairman, in deference to your request I shall not open my first statement in this Committee by offering my compliments and congratulations to you and the other members of the Bureau, much as I would like to and well-deserved though they may be.

My delegation is pleased to participate in the debate on the review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. As the representatives of one of the non-aligned Members that strongly supported the convening of the special session, my delegation cannot but feel gratified that before us we have a Final Document which for the first time are set out in a comprehensive and integrated manner the principles and priorities for disarmament measures.

Although the special session did not entirely meet all our expectations and hopes, it was nevertheless an important first step. The adoption of the Final Document by consensus demonstrates not only universal recognition of the dangers that the arms race poses to the survival of mankind but also a preparedness on the part of the Members of the United Nations to grapple with the issues of the arms race and to begin the process of genuine disarmament. The President of the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, Mr. Lazar Mojsov, declared that the end result of the special session had charted a new course and opened new channels for future negotiations on disarmament. Indeed, the special session marked a new beginning for us in acting in concert in the United Nations and its various forums to generate a new impetus towards complete disarmament.

(Tan Sri Zaiton, Malaysia)

Complete disarmament cannot be achieved overnight. The difficult and sometimes polarized negotiations during the special session amply demonstrated the complexities of the problem and revealed that in more instances than not some countries continued to subordinate disarmament to their national security interests. Nevertheless, the special session was a step forward and we remain hopeful of progress in our common endeavours to achieve the goal of general and complete disarmament. In the final analysis, what is crucial is not whether we can implement the decisions of the special session but whether we have the determination and the political will to do so.

(Tan Sri Zaiton, Malaysia)

Let me in this light offer a few observations on the result of the special session. It is indeed most heartening that follow-up action has already been taken regarding some of the decisions and recommendations of the special session. Yesterday, we observed the beginning of Disarmament Week. My delegation, in this connexion, fully supports the annual observance of Disarmament Week on a world-wide scale. For it will serve to remind us of the continued dangers to mankind posed by the arms race.

My delegation is happy that the existing international disarmament machinery has been revitalized and reconstituted with a more representative character for disarmament deliberations and negotiations. The relevant bodies established should, in our view, be subordinated to the United Nations which must remain the central organ for the regulation of all disarmament efforts and activities.

In regard to the mandate of the Disarmament Commission, it is gratifying that the opportunity is now provided for the entire membership of the United Nations to participate in drawing up the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament which will be submitted in the form of recommendations through the General Assembly to the Committee on Disarmament. We look forward to the first substantive session of the Disarmament Commission in May/June next year. I am in full agreement with the view expressed by my colleague from Yugoslavia that in order to assist the Commission to discharge its mandate, it would be useful for the General Assembly at its current session to determine the priority tasks of the Commission and provide some orientation for its work.

As regards the order of priorities set up by the special session, there is a consensus that nuclear disarmament heads the list. The urgency of reducing and subsequently eliminating the threat of nuclear weapons demands that the nuclear-weapon States shoulder their special responsibility squarely and act in concert to halt and reverse the arms race. While we recognize the merits of a gradual and balanced approach to the reduction of nuclear stockpiles and their delivery systems, leading ultimately to their

(Tan Sri Zaiton, Malaysia)

elimination altogether, we are concerned that, in the meantime, the security of non-nuclear-weapon States is not ensured unless and until there is a prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

In regard to nuclear disarmament, let me also add our concern that the negotiations on a SALT II agreement and the comprehensive test-ban treaty have still not produced the results we had expected. We sincerely hope that the recent statements of the United States and the Soviet Union indicating that there has been further progress in their bilateral talks will soon result in a SALT II agreement.

The conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty would be another significant step in nuclear disarmament and would bring us nearer to the goal of general and complete disarmament. Paragraph 51 of the Final Document emphasized that the ongoing negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty should be concluded urgently and the result submitted for full consideration by the multilateral negotiating body with a view to the submission of a draft treaty to the General Assembly at the earliest possible date. We urge the three negotiating States to proceed without delay towards the positive conclusion of their talks. Pending the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, my delegation strongly favours a moratorium on all nuclear tests. Our position on this question is fully reflected in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.3 of which we are a sponsor.

The Malaysian Government has consistently supported efforts for the establishment of zones of peace in various regions of the world. We attach great importance to the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean and will offer our full co-operation in efforts by the United Nations to bring about its early realization. I am happy that the proposal for the establishment of a zone of peace in South-East Asia is noted in paragraph 64 (a) of the Final Document. We are strongly committed to the realization of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia. It is our firm belief that the establishment of such a zone will make an important contribution to strengthening the security and stability of the States in our region and will enable us to channel increased efforts towards further economic and social development for

(Tan Sri Zaiton, Malaysia)

both national and regional well-being. Discussion on the proposal is continuing, and we are confident of achieving further progress in its implementation.

Finally, I recall that there was agreement at the special session to the effect that at the thirty-third session ~~the~~ General Assembly should decide the date for the next special session on disarmament. The year 1981 has been proposed and supported by several preceding speakers. Although my delegation would have no difficulty with this date, it is our view, however, that the convening of a second special session and its preparation must not in any way detract from the urgency of our present task of translating into practical terms what we agreed to, and was entrusted to us, at the last special session. We must ensure that we do not meet at the next session just to hear and to voice expressions of regret and disappointment at the lack of concrete achievement.

Finally, it is imperative that we dedicate ourselves resolutely to the course of further work which the special session has charted for us. The results of the special session have given us new encouragement and a renewed sense of shared responsibility for the international community to work towards realizing the goal of complete disarmament and of arms control. It is our fervent hope that the momentum generated by the special session will serve as the basis for further progress in our common endeavour.

Mr. LAI (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament convened this year on the proposal of the non-aligned countries was the first of its kind in the history of the United Nations. The convening of the session itself reflected the strong resentment of the large number of third-world and other small and medium-sized countries concerning the super-Powers' fierce rivalry for world hegemony and their intensified arms race; it also reflected the urgent desire of the aforesaid countries to safeguard national security and world peace. At the session, many countries strongly condemned the imperialist and hegemonist policies of aggression and war, pointed out that the real cause of the

(Mr. Lai, China)

intensifying arms race between the super-Powers was their increased rivalry for world hegemony and demanded that the super-Powers be the first to carry out genuine disarmament. The tenth special session has a positive significance inasmuch as it has exposed the super-Powers' arms expansion and war preparations and demanded that they be the first to carry out disarmament.

Thanks to the efforts made by the large number of third-world and other small and medium-sized countries, some of their just propositions and reasonable demands have been incorporated in the Final Document adopted by the special session on disarmament.

(Mr. Lai, China)

Among other things, the Document pointed out that there has been no real progress so far in the field of disarmament, that the arms race continues, and that the threat of a new world war is becoming ever more acute; it stressed that the States which possess the largest military arsenals bear a special responsibility in achieving the goals of disarmament; it stressed the necessity for the total destruction of nuclear weapons in order to remove the threat of a nuclear war and affirmed the importance of reducing conventional arms; it provided for the equal rights of all countries to participate in disarmament negotiations and the need for a reform of the disarmament machinery; it called on all the nuclear-weapon States to undertake not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States and affirmed the inalienable right of all countries to the peaceful use of nuclear energy; and it reiterated the necessity for all countries to abide by the principles of respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of other countries and non-interference in the internal affairs of others, and so on.

On the other hand, however, as a result of the obstructions raised by the super-Powers, a series of reasonable views and proposals put forward by many small and medium-sized countries, as well as the Chinese delegation, has not been duly reflected in the Final Document. For instance, the Final Document has failed to point out explicitly that the intensifying rivalry between the two super-Powers for world hegemony will be the source of a new world war. While pointing out the "special responsibility" of the States which possess the largest military arsenals, namely the two super-Powers, for nuclear and conventional disarmament, the Document has failed to incorporate in its relevant part precise and concrete provisions on the principle that the two super-Powers should be the first to carry out disarmament. There is insufficient stress on the question of reducing the conventional arms of the super-Powers. The Document contains no proper criticism of the so-called international treaties and agreements, such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), a complete test ban treaty and so on, concocted by the super-Powers to cover up their arms expansion and war preparations and to inhibit other States from developing their capabilities for self-defence. The Document has failed to reflect the legitimate demands

(Mr. Lai, China)

of many small and medium-sized countries for the withdrawal of all troops and military bases on foreign soil. In spite of certain progress in the reform of disarmament machinery, the new negotiating body still falls short of the demands of many countries, and it can hardly get rid of super-Power control. In addition, the super-Powers have inserted into the Final Document things which sound plausible but are in fact false and untrue. As pointed out by the representatives of some third-world countries in their statements in the general debate, the Final Document has in many respects failed to reflect truly the wishes of the great majority of States. At the tenth special session the Chinese delegation stated in a comprehensive way its principled position and reservations on the Final Document.

During the tenth special session, the super-Powers, particularly that super-Power which pretends to be more enthusiastic about disarmament than anyone else, while chanting "peace" and "disarmament", did their utmost to evade any obligations and responsibilities for real disarmament and to obstruct the session in its adoption of any document of practical significance and in a thorough reform of the disarmament machinery. This shows how difficult it is to make the super-Powers accept the reasonable disarmament proposals of the many third-world and other small and medium-sized countries, and even more to make them take real disarmament measures. Developments since the conclusion of the special session have repeatedly shown that the super-Powers have not the slightest intention of mending their ways, but are persisting in their obdurate course of rabid arms expansion and war preparations in quest of hegemony everywhere, in complete disregard of the reasonable demands of the numerous small and medium-sized countries. It can be seen that at present the people of various countries are unfolding extensively and winning new victories in their struggle for the defence of world peace and against hegemonism and the policies of aggression and war pursued by the super-Powers. On the other hand, the super-Powers are locked in intensified rivalry, and in particular social-imperialism is stepping up its activities of aggression and expansion, leading to more turmoils in the international situation and a growing number of local wars, thus increasing the danger of a new world war. In their speeches at the current session of the General Assembly, many countries have

(Mr. Lai, China)

expressed their strong anxiety and dismay at these developments. They have pointed out that "the rivalry between the major Powers has become more acute"; "new hotbeds of armed conflict have appeared in various parts of the world"; "the danger of war is increasing, peace is fragile". They have voiced strong demands for the super-Powers to stop their arms race and to take the lead in carrying out disarmament.

The super-Powers possess the largest military apparatus in the world, and they use their increasing military strength as an instrument for practising hegemonism, thus seriously menacing the independence and security of all countries. Disarmament should begin with the super-Powers, and this is a basic principle in the question of disarmament today. However, the super-Powers are spreading the fallacy that everyone is to blame for the arms race, while trumpeting so-called "general disarmament" by all countries as a shield for refusing to be the first to carry out disarmament. One may ask: what kind of disarmament are the numerous small and medium-sized countries expected to carry out when their defence capabilities are seriously inadequate for resisting aggression and defending their own independence and security? Even according to the principle of "equal security" as propagated by the super-Powers, the small and medium-sized countries have every reason to demand that the super-Powers be the first to reduce their super-arsenals. Failing this, what kind of "equal security" can the small and medium-sized countries have when they are under the menace of the powerful military supremacy of the super-Powers?

Today, the nuclear arms of the two super-Powers are piling up, and their nuclear arms race is mounting without let-up. In the face of the super-Power nuclear threat, the numerous small and medium-sized countries strongly demand that the super-Powers stop their nuclear arms race, prohibit the use of nuclear weapons, reduce nuclear stockpiles and thoroughly destroy nuclear weapons. However, the super-Powers have turned a deaf ear to these reasonable demands, and instead have been trumpeting the so-called "complete nuclear test ban", "non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" and "cessation of the production of nuclear weapons", describing them as important measures to stop the nuclear arms race and eliminate the danger of a nuclear war, as well as major steps towards nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Lai, China)

In this regard we have pointed out on many occasions that, under the circumstances in which the super-Powers have tremendous nuclear supremacy, these so-called "measures for nuclear disarmament" cannot at all prevent them from continuing to wield their nuclear weapons for nuclear threat and nuclear blackmail; on the contrary, they can only tighten their nuclear monopoly, bind other countries hand and foot and create a false impression of progress in nuclear disarmament so as to deceive the people of the world. This is of no help and is detrimental to the maintenance of international peace and security.

In our view, only the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons can really free the people of the world from the danger of a nuclear war. Pending the realization of this lofty goal, all nuclear countries must undertake not to resort to the threat or use of nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones at any time and under any circumstances. The Chinese Government has declared publicly and solemnly on many occasions its commitment to this obligation. Furthermore, we have repeatedly stated that, when major progress has been made in the destruction of the nuclear weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States and in the reduction of their conventional armaments, the other nuclear countries should join the Soviet Union and the United States in destroying all nuclear weapons. If the super-Powers are in the slightest degree sincere about nuclear disarmament, and if they are willing to demonstrate any value in their talk about "consolidating peace and reducing the danger of a nuclear war", they should unconditionally undertake on their own initiative not to use nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones and pledge to take practical measures to reduce drastically their nuclear weapons, instead of going ahead with their tricks of "guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States", which are in fact a fraud of sham disarmament designed to strengthen their nuclear monopoly and practice of nuclear blackmail.

It can also be seen that, while intensifying their nuclear arms race, the two super-Powers are sparing no effort to expand their respective conventional armaments. The Soviet Union, in particular, is going all out to expand and deploy its sophisticated conventional weapons of mass destruction, which are equipped with modern technology, thus seriously menacing international peace and

(Mr. Lai, China)

the independence and security of all countries. Consequently, the reduction of conventional armaments is also becoming an issue of great urgency. At the United Nations special session devoted to disarmament, many countries demanded that the reduction of conventional armaments be given priority in disarmament negotiations. The Final Document of the special session also explicitly pointed out that the super-Powers "have a special responsibility in pursuing the process of conventional armaments reductions" (resolution S-10/2, para. 81). Today the super-Powers are taking advantage of the desire of the small and medium-sized countries for nuclear disarmament to delay the reduction of their conventional arms, and even to intensify their race in these arms. This is impermissible. We consider that equal importance should be attached to the reduction of conventional armaments and to that of nuclear armaments, and that the two should proceed in conjunction. The super-Powers must be asked to carry out reductions in both armaments in actual fact.

The Chinese Government has always deeply sympathized with and firmly supported the small-and medium-sized countries in their just demand for the establishment of peace zones and nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world in order to combat the super-Powers' pursuit of their policies of intensified aggression, expansion and nuclear threat. We have undertaken a specific obligation in regard to the Latin American nuclear-free zone, and we sympathize with and support the demands of the countries concerned for the establishment of nuclear-free zones and peace zones in South Asia, South-East Asia, the Middle East, Africa, the Indian Ocean and Mediterranean regions. We support the legitimate demands of the small and medium-sized countries for the dismantling of all military bases of the super-Powers on foreign soil and the withdrawal of all their armed forces abroad, including their mercenaries. We hold that all countries have the right to develop, without discrimination, nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, and that it is imperative to oppose the super-Powers' attempt, behind the smokescreen of nuclear non-proliferation, to monopolize nuclear technology and obstruct other countries in the development of their own nuclear industry. We support the proposals put forward by the small and medium-sized countries for strengthening international co-operation on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We support all the

(Mr. Lai, China)

reasonable disarmament proposals made by the small and medium-sized countries, and we are firmly opposed to the super-Powers' hoax of sham disarmament to cover up their real arms expansion.

The third-world and other small and medium-sized countries strongly demand a change in the super-Powers' manipulation of the disarmament negotiations. The decision taken by the special session on restructuring the disarmament machinery has expressed such a desire to a certain extent. Now, the new deliberative organ, the United Nations Disarmament Commission, has already been set up, and the Chinese delegation is taking part in its work. We maintain that this Commission should fully consider and deliberate on the views and proposals put forward by various countries and should make the new negotiating body accountable to it, so that it may become a deliberative organ in the true sense. As to the newly established negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament, which shows some improvement over the original body, it will still be difficult for the new body to free itself completely from super-Power control and ensure the realization of the reasonable disarmament propositions of the small and medium-sized countries, in that the composition of this body is not based on reasonable geographical distribution and is not fully representative, that there is no explicit provision making the new negotiating body accountable to the deliberative organ composed of all the United Nations Member States and stipulating that the agenda for negotiations should be determined by the deliberative organ through consultation. Therefore, it is imperative to keep on exerting joint efforts for a change in the aforementioned unreasonable state of affairs at an early date.

(Mr. Lai, China)

Since it is the universal demand of the people of all countries for the super-Powers to be the first to carry out disarmament, the newly established bodies should fully reflect such a legitimate demand and give priority to the consideration of actual measures to urge the two super-Powers to take the lead in reducing their nuclear and conventional armaments. At the special session on disarmament the Chinese delegation tabled a "Working paper on disarmament" in which it put forward the following concrete proposals on actions to be taken by the two super-Powers: first, declare that they will at no time and in no circumstances resort to the threat or use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones; secondly, withdraw all their armed forces stationed abroad and undertake not to dispatch forces of any description to other countries, dismantle all their military bases and para-military bases on foreign soil and undertake not to seek any new ones; thirdly, stop their nuclear and conventional arms race and set out to destroy by stages their nuclear weapons and drastically reduce their conventional weapons; fourthly, undertake not to station massive forces or stage military exercises near the borders of other countries, and undertake not to launch military attacks, including surprise attacks, against other countries on any pretext; and fifthly, undertake not to export weapons to other countries for the purpose of bringing them under control or for fomenting wars or abetting threats of war.

We deem it necessary for the newly established disarmament bodies to consider and deliberate seriously on the reasonable views and proposals put forward by the numerous third-world and other small and medium-sized countries, as well as the aforesaid working paper and proposals put forward by China at the special session on disarmament.

Historical experience and the stark reality today tell us that, in order to carry on aggression and expansion and compete for world hegemony, imperialism and social-imperialism are bound to strengthen and never to weaken their war apparatus. It will be anything but easy to force the super-Powers to take practical measures for disarmament and carry out genuine disarmament. Progress in disarmament depends essentially on whether the super-Powers can be forced to change their intransigence and not entirely on the negotiating machinery. Meanwhile, one must never entertain any illusions about so-called "sincerity" about disarmament as trumpeted by the super-Powers.

(Mr. Lai, China)

The struggle for disarmament should be closely linked with and subordinated to the struggle for the defence of national independence, state sovereignty and territorial integrity and against super-Power hegemonism and their policies of aggression and war. Only thus can positive contributions be made towards maintaining international security and world peace and postponing the outbreak of war. Like the people of the rest of the world, the Chinese people love peace ardently and oppose a new world war. We are ready to join the third world and other small and medium-sized countries in unremitting efforts for the realization of this common goal of mankind. We are convinced that so long as the people of all countries unite, heighten their vigilance, are prepared in every way to repulse the aggressors, frustrate every scheme of aggression and expansion on the part of the super-Powers, upset their global strategic plan and firmly oppose the policy of appeasement of the aggressors, it is entirely possible to postpone the outbreak of a world war and defend world peace.

If the super-Powers should dare to risk and unleash a war, the people of various countries will not be caught unprepared to their disadvantage. Our task is arduous, but the future is bright. We should have full confidence.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Mr. Chairman, in compliance with your injunction I confine myself to endorsing all that was said or implied by previous speakers on your high qualifications as Chairman. Indeed, res ipse loquitur.

We have listened with great interest to the many valuable statements presented here on the results of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Surely the session was without doubt the single most important conference of the United Nations on the question of disarmament. It may not have come up to the expectations for prompt action on disarmament, but in retrospect it is clear that the members agree that much was accomplished.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The significance of the special session lies chiefly in its being the expression of universal concern over the escalating arms race and the anxiety felt over an approaching disaster already looming on the horizon. The anxiety is justified by scientific data, by developments in the constantly deteriorating world situation and by an apparent absence of any effective reaction from the international community over the years.

The special session was the needed alert. First it proceeded to reorganize the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament which has become the Committee on Disarmament with increased membership and a rotating chairmanship, and now with the participation of France. The special session has invigorated the negotiating process, in which so much dedication and talent has been applied over the years but with little result. Therefore, we expect now that something will be done. We are hopeful that in the coming years the Committee on Disarmament may prove instrumental in achieving progress.

One of its main objectives will have to be the comprehensive test ban treaty, which for some time now has been considered as practically ready for signature. The conclusion of this treaty is important, as it would put an end to the pursuit of the qualitative improvement of more deadly nuclear weapons. The continuance of competitive underground testing and the climate of apprehension and fear it generates - lest the other side achieve a breakthrough - accelerates and intensifies the nuclear arms race. The conclusion, therefore, of a comprehensive test ban treaty would prove an important step forward towards curbing the arms race.

Why this hesitation in concluding the treaty? The reasons are fundamental and are due to the fact that the arms race, as things are, is difficult to discontinue.

The special session has succeeded in reviving the Disarmament Commission as a continuing deliberative body. The special session has thus afforded the opportunity and time required for substantial deliberation and in-depth examination of the reasons for the stagnation in the disarmament endeavour and for relevant studies in search of new and more imaginative approaches to the arms race, which is the very core of the whole disarmament problem.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Two important studies by experts are those concerning the interrelationship between disarmament and development, on the one hand, and between disarmament and international security on the other.

The study on the interrelationship between disarmament and development, by bringing awareness of the effects of the arms race in blocking the way to development and the establishment of a New International Economic Order, is of vital significance as it enhances the urgency of effective halt in the arms race.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The study on the interrelationship between disarmament and international security, on the other hand, is of parallel significance but of a different nature. It does not relate to the consequences of the arms race but rather to the root causes that, over decades of years, have rendered all efforts for its cessation persistently unproductive, and this is the purpose of the study.

The linkage between disarmament and international security emphatically emerged from the special session. Recognition of such linkage is shown clearly in the Final Document which declares that:

"Enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations ...". (A/RES/S-10/2, para. 13)

This linkage appears also from the decision of the special session that henceforth the only subject before the First Committee of the General Assembly will be disarmament and the related international security questions. I wish in this connexion to reiterate the proposal made by Cyprus in the Ad Hoc Committee and the special session by which the next special session should be named the "special session on disarmament and international security", as a proposal not merely of form but also of substance. For indeed these two subjects - international security and disarmament - are closely linked and interconnected in such a manner that one cannot be separated from the other. And this should appear in the title of this special session.

The growing recognition of this relationship shows a realistic understanding of the problem of disarmament and of the essential element of international security in any progress for its solution. In its Declaration, the recent Non-Aligned Conference of Foreign Ministers at Belgrade, referring to the arms race as a major threat to the survival of mankind, stated that:

"This situation is mainly due to the lack of adequate international security as provided for in the United Nations Charter, and the failure to replace the outdated concept of balance of power as a means of security."
(A/33/206, annex I, para. 147)

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The General Assembly at its thirty-second session adopted by consensus a Non-Aligned resolution, introduced by Cyprus, for a study by United Nations experts on the interrelationship between disarmament and international security. It was presented in an interim report of the Secretary-General to the special session. This study lends substantial support to the view that disarmament is, in the last analysis, and even for that matter in its early stages, dependent upon the achievement of effective progress in international security, allowing for a reasonable degree of trust and security to make possible the cessation of the arms race.

A proposal by Cyprus for the continuation and completion of the study was adopted by the special session and included in the Final Document, as follows:

"The Secretary-General shall, with the assistance of consultant experts appointed by him, continue the study of the interrelationship between disarmament and international security requested in General Assembly resolution 32/87 C of 12 December 1977 and submit it to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly." (A/RES/S-10/2, para. 97)

Among the many elements of the security system envisaged by the Charter which are related to the question of disarmament, both to make disarmament possible and security meaningful, are those related to the functioning of the Security Council, particularly to action that might be necessary in respect of breaches of the peace and acts of aggression. Regrettably, these Charter elements which give meaning and effect to the relevant Charter provisions, namely, that the Security Council bears primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, have not been developed and applied, and have remained unused. These provisions must be applied as they constitute the pith and marrow of the United Nations function as an instrument for international security and peace for which the Organization was established.

It is thus a matter of grave concern that resolutions of the Security Council, which should be mandatory for all Members of the Organization, remain unimplemented even when such decisions are adopted by unanimity. My delegation holds and insists that closer consideration should be given to the malfunctioning of the security system envisaged by the Charter, and more particularly

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

to the role of the Security Council as an indispensable instrument for international security and peace - probably the only one acceptable to all Member States - in a world that should be at some stage free of the scourge of the arms race.

In this respect, I would like to say that my delegation considers it necessary at some time to have a special session of the General Assembly to deal with this major, fundamental problem - the functioning of the Organization and particularly the Security Council, in its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international security and peace. For indeed, it is inconceivable that the main organ of the United Nations, the Security Council, should adopt resolutions which are without effect, thereby prejudicially affecting the authority and prestige of the United Nations. This is a matter which should be given full consideration parallel to the consideration given to disarmament by a special session, as the two aspects are so closely related and interconnected.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The system of international security through the United Nations functions through the effective implementation of Security Council decisions, thereby providing the modicum of international security and legal order so necessary in our world today. The need for such security emerges also in this year's report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization, where the following is stated:

"the United Nations is seldom ... in a position to enforce its decisions ... This fact has tended to downgrade the prestige and effectiveness of the Organization and to detract from its primary purpose as the impartial and respected guarantor of international peace and security. The practical result has been that some small States no longer turn to the United Nations as the protector of their sovereign rights." (A/33/1, p. 5)

The report gives examples of this bypassing of the United Nations by small States because of certain events, particularly in recent years. Resolution 3212 (XXIX) on Cyprus, adopted unanimously by the General Assembly - without a single vote against, without a single abstention - fully endorsed by the unanimous vote of the Security Council, yet remains to this day completely unimplemented. That example affects the respect shown for the United Nations by those who expect that its resolutions will be implemented, and that is why the examples mentioned by the Secretary-General have appeared in his report for this year.

It is our submission that in the last analysis the solution of the problem of the arms race and disarmament depends on the degree of compliance with the provisions of the Charter concerning international security.

Notwithstanding exhortations from all sides, the cessation of the arms race cannot realistically be attained so long as the security of nations still hangs on the thin thread of a supposed balance of power - in other words, a balance of weapons - which by its very nature feeds and spurs on the arms race. The continuing efforts by each side to attain or retain such a balance naturally and inevitably results in the phenomenon of the feverish escalation of the arms race, which has continued for over three decades now. To find a way of relieving nations of the burden of the policy of the balance of power should be the abiding concern of the international community in its efforts really to halt the arms race, for indeed maintaining the balance of power is tantamount to maintaining the arms race.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Therefore, in order to provide possibilities for progress on disarmament by a realistic approach, we must introduce into the disarmament process the element of international security through the system provided for in the Charter, which should be effectively implemented. That alternative system of security would gradually supplant the concept of the balance of power still prevailing in the policies of nations.

Much is said, and often, about the need for the political will to take new steps in limiting or reversing the arms race and achieving progress on disarmament. However, and we must face the matter squarely, the application of political will to the problem as it has been posed will continue to be unavailing. Political will is indeed required, and is important, but it must be applied to a purpose which in itself is logically attainable. It is not logical to expect disarmament in a vacuum, while the arms race continues, and without the existence of an alternative system of security to that of the balance of power. In such a situation political will can achieve little since the balance of power feeds the arms race. The appropriate objective for the exercise of political will is the implementation of an international security system which will provide the assurance and the guarantee of the safety of the vital interests of States in a disarmed world, and also the alternative security system that will make the cessation of the arms race at least logically possible. Political will can and should also be applied in the elaboration of international peace-keeping machinery and the acceptance and implementation of modalities for the peaceful settlements of disputes. Those two concepts - the peaceful settlement of disputes and the maintenance of international peace through the United Nations - are also linked in Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4, and in Chapters VI and VII of the Charter. They should be developed in parallel with the course of disarmament.

The General Assembly at the special session turned its attention also to the importance of mobilizing public opinion as an integral part of the achievement of disarmament. It enhanced the role of the non-governmental organizations in the field of disarmament. The United Nations has always asserted that world public opinion is an integral part of the achievement of disarmament. The cultivation of public opinion is a function not merely of Governments but also

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

of the media and of non-governmental organizations. The responsible action of those organizations at the special session wisely led to the break with custom in the delineation of a role for them by the special session and a reference to them in the Final Document.

I wish now to reaffirm the proposals made by Cyprus at the special session.

First, the proposal made by the President of Cyprus for the total demilitarization and disarmament of the Republic of Cyprus and the implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations referred to in paragraph 125 (u) of the Final Document.

Secondly, the proposal for the continuation and completion of the study on the interrelationship between disarmament and international security to be made by consultant experts and included in a report by the Secretary-General to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, to which study I have already referred. It is our hope that the Secretary-General will proceed expeditiously to the early establishment of the group of consultant experts so that it may complete its study in time for the thirty-fourth session.

Thirdly, the proposal that

"The Secretary-General shall periodically submit reports to the General Assembly on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and its extremely harmful effects on international peace and security."

(Conference Room Paper No. 8, para. 20)

Such periodic reports will be essential in maintaining awareness of the increasing dangers and threats resulting from the continuing arms race.

Fourthly, the proposal for the establishment of an organ of the General Assembly for the peaceful settlements of disputes, which would give meaning and substance to the provisions of Article 33 of the Charter.

Fifthly, the proposal (A/S-10/AC.1/PV.15, 27) that the next special session should be named "Special session on disarmament and international security".

The President of Cyprus, furthermore, in his statement at the special session proposed a number of elements to be included in the Final Document, including the following:

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

First, that disarmament efforts should fully reflect the triangular interrelationship and interconditioning between disarmament, security and development. Progress in any of those spheres has a beneficial effect on all of them: failure in one has a negative effect on all the others.

Secondly, that in accordance with Article 11 of the Charter the United Nations has the primary responsibility for international security and disarmament. Accordingly it should play a central role in that field and, in order effectively to discharge its functions, the United Nations should supervise facilities and encourage all disarmament measures, unilateral, bilateral, regional or multilateral, and be kept fully informed of all disarmament efforts that are not carried out under its aegis.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Thirdly, the problem of disarmament directly affects the security and the very life of all peoples. That is why all peoples have the right to know what is going on in the field of armaments and disarmament efforts, so that they can defend their vital interests. Public opinion, the conscience of human solidarity, has proved to be a power stronger than force, and efforts aimed at disarmament cannot be successful unless they are properly backed by the peoples of the world.

It is our firm submission that all proposals made at the special session that owing to various circumstances, including lack of time, could not find their place in the Final Document should be transmitted to the Disarmament Commission and to the Committee on Disarmament for further consideration.

The special session has created the conditions for effective progress on disarmament. The momentum generated has to be continued with faith and determination and without hesitating to take new and more imaginative approaches to the problems of disarmament, with a broader vision, as the inhabitants of our small planet facing common dangers and common needs. We have to cast away the unduly absorbing notions of parochial self-interest in disregard of the real interests of mankind as a whole, of which we all form a part.

Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): Mr. Chairman, may I offer you my delegation's support in your task of guiding this Committee through the complex issues which face it. We feel we are in good hands.

New Zealand drew a fair measure of satisfaction from the outcome of the tenth special session, on disarmament. It was particularly good that all five nuclear-weapon States took part in the discussions. It was encouraging that it was possible to achieve a comprehensive document covering the whole range of disarmament issues. I suppose it was inevitable that in working for a consensus we tended sometimes to skirt over some of the more intractable problems. Nevertheless, the broad strategy outlined in the Final Document provides a valid and useful basis for further efforts in the field of disarmament. The special session brought disarmament to the forefront of the

(Mr. Francis, New Zealand)

international agenda; it underlined and dramatized the dangers and burdens of the arms race, and it gave us sensible guidelines to follow. Those were worth-while achievements.

Our task at this session of the Assembly is to see that the momentum generated by the special session is maintained. New Zealand had hoped that we would be able this year to discuss disarmament in terms of definite and detailed proposals; in terms of agreements reached rather than agreements hoped for. It is a great disappointment that that is not to be so, especially in regard to that section of the Programme of Action to which priority has been given, namely nuclear weapons.

Last year New Zealand welcomed the negotiations which were then under way on a number of major disarmament issues. In particular, we welcomed the Geneva talks between three nuclear-weapon States on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Like the overwhelming majority of United Nations Members, we have always attached the greatest importance to such a treaty. In June this year the special session reaffirmed the need for a treaty and called for the speedy conclusion of negotiations among the three Governments. But the hard fact is that a draft treaty has not yet reached the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), let alone this Assembly. The promise of resolution 32/78, to which the negotiating nuclear-weapon States and 123 other countries subscribed, has not been fulfilled. I have no doubt that there are reasons for the delay. Nor do I question the sincerity with which the negotiations have been conducted. But certainly New Zealand regrets that the international community at large has not been shown what degree of progress has been achieved.

We are told, however, that agreement is not far off and that the remaining difficulties relate to relatively minor aspects of the agreement. My Government fervently hopes that that is so. I hope therefore that a draft treaty will be concluded in time for it to be taken up by the CCD this year and by a resumed session of the General Assembly early next year. My delegation is discussing with a number of interested delegations the outlines of a draft resolution which would propose such a time-table. We hope it will command the same broad support as did resolution 32/78 last year.

(Mr. Francis, New Zealand)

The conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty is a key element in preventing horizontal and, especially, vertical proliferation. We hope and expect that such a treaty will attract the widest possible adherence. We hope equally that it will signal an end to all testing for any purposes by all States in all environments, for that is certainly New Zealand's goal. We are opposed to all nuclear testing, whatever the purpose of that testing, wherever that testing is carried out. If New Zealand can help in the verification procedures underwriting a comprehensive test ban it will certainly do so. It will, as a participant in the Ad Hoc Group of seismic experts, make its facilities available to an international seismological data exchange system should that be the recommendation of the Group when it reports to the Committee on Disarmament next year.

The psychological significance of a test-ban agreement would be profound. It would be a display of political will and confidence by major nuclear-weapon States that could well open the way for progress in other areas of the Programme of Action. If a test-ban agreement were to be associated in time with a second SALT agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union the impact would be so much the greater. We all know how serious are the issues raised by this attempt to halt, and then to reverse, the strategic arms race. None of us would minimize the difficulties involved in these negotiations. It is all the more reassuring, therefore, that both parties are so clearly committed to the success of the negotiations.

My Government particularly welcomed Secretary Vance's statement on 29 September that it is hoped to conclude a second SALT agreement before the end of this year. My Government has also been encouraged by the fact that both the United States and the Soviet Union have previously given assurances that they are willing, after signature of SALT II, to move on to the next phase; they would then negotiate substantial reductions in their levels of strategic arms as well as stricter qualitative limitations.

The spread of nuclear weapons poses as great a risk to world security as does the arms race between the two leading nuclear-weapon States. In New Zealand's view the special session did not give sufficient weight to that issue.

(Mr. Francis, New Zealand)

We all accept the need to develop, and quickly, an effective international system of safeguards. However, the Final Document gives us no guidance as to how we make sure that everyone benefits from peaceful uses of the atom without risking the emergence of new nuclear-weapon States.

Peaceful nuclear technology must be shared; the growing world energy shortage and the economic needs of the non-oil countries, both industrialized and developing, demand it. But this transfer of technology must be carried out under an effective international nuclear non-proliferation régime. The Non-Proliferation Treaty, whatever defects some may think it has, is the only comprehensive non-proliferation instrument available to the world community. It cannot be ignored unless we have brought into operation some other satisfactory internationally binding commitment to non-proliferation, and we do not have that yet. It is our hope that the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference of 1980 will help us to find a way forward. The development of stricter mandatory safeguards at all stages of the fuel cycle should help encourage a freer flow of nuclear material and technology.

(Mr. Francis, New Zealand)

Turning to the non-nuclear section of the Programme of Action, New Zealand regrets that efforts to conclude a treaty on the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons, and on their destruction, have run into difficulties. Negotiations have been going on for several years. We welcome the limited progress that has been made. It is disappointing that the negotiating States are not yet in a position to put forward a joint initiative which might form the basis of a multilateral treaty after its consideration in the Committee on Disarmament. We hope that firm proposals will be put to the Committee next year. Perhaps we may hope also, following the First Preparatory Conference, for similar progress in respect of particularly inhumane weapons.

The special session gave only passing attention to the issue of conventional arms control. Paragraph 85 of the Final Document calls for consultations "among major arms suppliers and recipient countries on the limitation of all types of international transfer of conventional weapons". (A/RES/S-10/2, para. 85) It was, in New Zealand's view, right that the focus of the special session should have been on nuclear weapons. They pose, in the words of the Final Document, "the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization". (ibid., para. 47) But four-fifths of the world's military expenditure goes to conventional forces and weapons. The millions of casualties suffered in wars since 1945 have all resulted from conventional arms. The problem is a complex and a sensitive one, for too long ignored. Nations have the right to maintain forces for their own defence. They should not be forced to develop arms industries to equip those forces. Nor should they be obliged to shoulder burdens so costly as to hinder their economic and social development.

We welcome, therefore, the bilateral discussions which the United States and the Soviet Union have initiated to consider ways of restraining both the buying and transfer of conventional arms. We also watch with considerable interest the initiative of several Latin American countries in this field. These bilateral and regional efforts will provide valuable information for a comprehensive expert study on the production and transfer of conventional arms. My Government would certainly support such a proposal.

(Mr. Francis, New Zealand)

The special session took its most decisive step forward when it decided on new disarmament machinery. The reconstitution of the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body, and the agreement on a reformed and expanded negotiating body, constituted a considerable achievement. We particularly welcome France's participation in that negotiating body, and the new opportunities for non-members to play their part in it. We see these changes as revitalizing and making more representative our disarmament forums. We do not think, however, that the process should stop there. New Zealand wholeheartedly endorses the sentiments of paragraph 28 of the Final Document which says:

"All the peoples of the world have a vital interest in the success of disarmament negotiations ... all States have the duty to contribute to efforts in the field of disarmament. All States have the right to participate in disarmament negotiations."

In our view, this means the negotiating forum, the Committee on Disarmament, as well as the Disarmament Commission.

We acknowledge the need to keep membership of that Committee within reasonable limits. It was for that reason we suggested at the special session that there should be some rotation of its membership. We still feel that some system of rotation offers the best way of keeping the Committee to a manageable size, while making sure that all States have the opportunity, from time to time, to take a direct part in its negotiating work. We intend to raise this question again in the context of the regular review of the Committee's membership foreshadowed in paragraph 128. In our view that first review should be completed before the second special session.

As far as the mandate of the Disarmament Commission is concerned, my delegation believes it should offer to all Member States the opportunity, outside regular Assembly sessions, to take part in the debate on current disarmament issues. We do not see the choice of subjects as being in any way restricted by the Committee on Disarmament's agenda. There is no reason why issues under negotiation in the Committee should not be discussed at the same time in the Commission. Paragraph 118 gives the Disarmament Commission a broad mandate. It encompasses not only the decisions and recommendations

(Mr. Francis, New Zealand)

of the special session, but also various problems in the field of disarmament and the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament. It seemed to us that this prescription is broad enough to include all the proposals and ideas listed under paragraph 125, as well as any new proposals which may be offered from time to time by Member States.

There will be an opportunity to discuss some of the other issues raised in the Final Document when we come to items 35 to 49 of our agenda. I do, however, want to record here - because we think it is a matter of great importance - our satisfaction that the expert study on the relationship between disarmament and development is already under way.

I also want to say that while my delegation does not have any very strong views on the timing of the next special session, we were impressed by the arguments of the representative of Nigeria who emphasized the importance of adequate preparatory work. There is a great deal of truth in the view that we need to give time for the Programme of Action of the first special session to be carried out. That suggests that it might be wiser not to choose a date before 1982.

Mr. CHERKAOUI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, I would not wish to infringe upon the rules, but you will permit me to tell you how pleased I am to be able to work along with you and to take advantage of your extensive experience. You may be assured of the total co-operation of the Moroccan delegation.

The First Committee of the General Assembly is beginning its work this year in a special set of circumstances. Indeed, barely four months ago, for the first time in the history of our Organization and with the participation of numerous heads of State and Government, a special session devoted to disarmament was held. That session, convened on the initiative of the non-aligned countries, raised enormous hopes in the international community, which was worried by a situation characterized essentially by the frenzied arms race and the enormous build-up of stocks of weapons, becoming so aggravated as to intensify conflicts in various parts of the world, increase the risk of nuclear war and seriously threaten world peace.

(Mr. Cherkaoui, Morocco)

My delegation is indeed gratified that the Committee has inscribed as its first item the question of the "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session", in accordance with the recommendations of paragraph 115 of the Final Document. Such a decision is an expression of the will of the Member States to maintain the momentum shown during the special session so that substance could be given to the recommendations and decisions contained in the Final Document.

One of the first results of the special session was that it enabled Member States to agree on a framework for global action whose authority and importance are increased by virtue of the fact that it was adopted by consensus.

(Mr. Cherkaoui, Morocco)

Indeed, the Final Document does the following: first, it enunciates a certain number of fundamental principles for negotiations in the field of disarmament and defines the goals and priority tasks required to achieve genuine disarmament; secondly, in the Programme of Action it lists the specific measures aimed at stopping and reversing the arms race and giving an impetus to efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control; thirdly, it sets up international machinery for dealing with disarmament problems in their various aspects.

We should point out, first, that it is a good omen that a convergence of views emerged at the special session concerning the guidelines which must be followed in all negotiations on disarmament. Thus the special session stressed the need to be guided throughout all the negotiations by the principles contained in our Charter and reaffirmed in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States as well as in the Declaration on the strengthening of international security.

With respect to the specific measures which States should adopt in order to achieve disarmament, the Final Document rightly recognizes that nuclear disarmament must be given priority in all disarmament negotiations. In this respect, we must note the recognition by the special session of the responsibility of nuclear Powers, and especially of the super-Powers.

Moreover, my delegation attaches particular importance to the recommendations contained in paragraph 51 of the Final Document concerning the need for the urgent conclusion of a treaty prohibiting all nuclear tests. We hope that the trilateral negotiations on this subject will be successful.

We continue to believe that pending the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of tests, States possessing nuclear weapons must abstain from conducting nuclear weapon tests.

We also hope that the bilateral negotiations between the United States of America and the Soviet Union on strategic arms limitation will soon lead to an agreement which can be communicated to the General Assembly. That would constitute a decisive step in the process of nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Cherkaoui, Morocco)

The special session clearly emphasized that within the framework of efforts to stop and reverse the nuclear arms race, it is essential to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It reaffirmed in paragraph 65 of the Final Document that the goal of non-proliferation is on the one hand to prevent the emergence of any additional nuclear-weapon States and, on the other, progressively to reduce and eventually eliminate such weapons. This fully confirms the spirit and goals of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Among disarmament measures, the establishment of nuclear-free-zones is an important step in the process leading to nuclear disarmament. In this respect, we are entitled to be gratified at the wise decision of the African countries to spare no effort in order to protect the African continent from nuclear weapons. Indeed, almost 15 years ago the Organization of African Unity adopted a declaration on the denuclearization of Africa. Unfortunately, African efforts as well as the resolutions of the General Assembly are still being blocked by the obstinacy of the racist régime of Pretoria and by its determination to acquire nuclear weapons, thus exposing the African peoples to the danger of a nuclear holocaust.

We are pleased to see the international community, through the special session, become aware of the seriousness of this situation and affirm that the Security Council will take effective steps to ensure that the goal of the denuclearization of Africa is not frustrated.

It is also encouraging to see that the question of the denuclearization of the Middle East is making progress, particularly by the fact that the special session decided to associate the Security Council with the efforts of the international community to establish a nuclear-free-zone in the Middle East.

The establishment of nuclear-free-zones must be accompanied by effective arrangements to protect the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or the threat of the use of such weapons. The nuclear-weapon States are requested by the special session to take all the necessary steps to that end.

(Mr. Cherkaoui, Morocco)

The Moroccan delegation appreciates the Soviet initiative to place on the agenda of the thirty-third session an item relating to the question of guarantees for the security of non-nuclear States. We shall not fail to consider carefully the draft convention presented by the Soviet delegation.

One of the merits of the special session in particular has been to emphasize the close links between disarmament and development. The squandering of material, technical and human potential deprives mankind as a whole of vast resources which could otherwise be usefully applied to economic and social development, in particular of the developing countries, thereby strengthening international co-operation.

We have noted with satisfaction the establishment and convening of a governmental group of experts appointed by the Secretary-General, in conformity with paragraph 94 of the Final Document, whose mandate is to undertake an in-depth study of the relationship between disarmament and development. We hope that this group of experts will take into consideration the elements contained in paragraph 95 of the Final Document. We hope that all the proposals made in this connexion at the special session will be transmitted to that group of experts.

The Moroccan delegation is especially pleased by the decision adopted by the General Assembly to establish a programme of fellowships on disarmament. We have taken note of the guidelines concerning this programme, contained in the report of the Secretary-General, and we express the hope that the developing countries will be able to take the maximum possible advantage of this fellowship programme. We believe that the developing countries, which have limited means, should be given priority in the allocation of these fellowships. An effective duration for such studies should not be less than six months. With respect to the organization of those studies, we are convinced that the United Nations Centre for Disarmament will place its experience and its competence at the service of that programme to enable it to achieve the goals which have been set for it.

(Mr. Cherkaoui, Morocco)

Our present session is called upon to set the date for the convening of the second special session devoted to disarmament, in pursuance of paragraph 119 of the Final Document. The Moroccan delegation believes that we must take into account the following considerations. First, a second special session must be sufficiently well-prepared. Then, it would be useful to give Member States, governmental organizations and non-governmental organizations, an opportunity to act on the recommendations and decisions of the first special session. Finally, the next special session should not be held before the report of the group of experts entrusted with study on the relationship between disarmament and development has been completed.

For all these considerations, we believe that 1982 would be a good time to hold the second special session.

One of the significant achievements of the special session has been the agreement on the restructuring of the disarmament machinery. We note with satisfaction the establishment of a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly - the Disarmament Commission - which will serve as a deliberative body alongside the First Committee. We should see to it that there is no duplication of effort and no overlapping of work between those two bodies.

It is encouraging that the Disarmament Commission had been able, at its first session, which was held from 9 to 13 October 1978, to agree on the organization of its work. We hope that at its next session in May-June 1979 the Commission will begin the consideration of substantive problems, in particular the formulation of the elements for a comprehensive programme for disarmament.

(Mr. Cherkaoui, Morocco)

We are pleased that the special session has made it possible to set up a more representative negotiating body, governed by more democratic rules, as this will facilitate the conclusion of agreements on disarmament. Indeed, in addition to the former members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), eight new countries will make their contribution to the work of the Committee. This will have the benefit of the participation of a fourth nuclear Power, France, participation which was solemnly announced at the rostrum of the General Assembly. In welcoming these countries we express the hope that the Committee on Disarmament will in the near future also have the benefit of the contribution of the People's Republic of China.

We have welcomed with interest the fact that States not members of the Committee will have the possibility of submitting proposals to that body and expressing their views when subjects of particular interest to them are examined in that Committee.

My country, which had the honour of taking part in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva will collaborate with the new members and will continue to make a positive contribution to the work of the Committee on Disarmament.

Those are some of the reflections that the review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session have suggested to us. We believe that the new approach which emerged at the special session will constitute only the beginning of a new phase in the efforts of our Organization, whose role and responsibility in the field of disarmament will thus be strengthened. The institutional machinery with which we have provided ourselves will be effective only if States Members demonstrate the political will to solve disarmament problems in the interests of international peace and security.

Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): My delegation intervenes in this debate somewhat late when it might appear as if all of us had heard enough on the subject. Our late intervention, however, is not without some benefit to ourselves in that we have had an opportunity of hearing the views of a number of delegations,

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

including colleagues who were actively involved in the special session devoted to disarmament. Their statements have been of help in the formulating of our own views.

We are making this review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session - the first special session on disarmament - just four months after its conclusion. As some delegations have already noted, it may be too early to undertake such a review, but perhaps what is expected of us is something of the role of the Roman deity Janus, one of whose faces looked at the year just ended and the other at the year just begun. In our own case, may I say that we look back with satisfaction on what the special session was able to accomplish and forward with optimism - I may say guarded optimism - to where we go or can go from here.

By way of a preface I would commence with a brief reference to a matter - or, more accurately, a condition or attitude of mind - that was referred to by some previous speakers. I have in mind what is described as the political will and its presence in or absence from disarmament deliberations and negotiations. I mention it here also because the Secretary-General, in his report on the work of the Organization, has himself referred to the necessity for this political will in two areas. The first is in connexion with the need to reform the underlying structural disequilibrium in the world economy as we approach the special session in 1980. The second reference occurs in his review of the special session on disarmament. He says:

"The objective of the special session was rather to tackle one of the most elusive problems of our time: how to disarm. The Final Document, in its comprehensiveness, provides us with machinery which, given the necessary political will and technical knowledge, could well provide the answer to that problem." (A/33/1, p. 12)

We might ask ourselves whether that political will manifested itself during the special session. My delegation's recollection is that it did, though in varying degrees. In the area of nuclear disarmament, the halting and reversal of the arms race and the final elimination of nuclear-weapon stockpiles were included in the Programme of Action, but there was a decided reluctance to

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

concede the urgency of negotiations on implementing those measures. As my delegation stated at the conclusion of the special session:

"For the nuclear-weapon States security was still based on the theory of mutual nuclear deterrence and the survival of mankind was subordinated to their security." (A/S-10/PV.27, p. 77)

Unless and until there is a change of political will in regard to this theory of mutual deterrence, which we are told has kept the peace for over two decades, we are less than optimistic about the prospects for significant advances in the area of nuclear disarmament. I might as well amplify this by reference to what happened during and has happened since the special session. We had hoped that the conclusion of SALT II would materialize even during that session. It did not, although now three months later reports give hope of some finality. A comprehensive test-ban treaty was reckoned to be a possibility and even a necessity for the implementation of the machinery for disarmament in the Final Document. That treaty is now admitted to be more remote. None of these remarks are intended to question the earnestness of the negotiating parties or the complexities of the problem. Rather, there seems to be an obvious divergence on concepts, priorities and goals inhibiting the emergence of this political will, which requires us to rethink those concepts, priorities and goals. May I assure the Committee that we are addressing our own minds to this question - I mean our own political will - and are not oblivious of the concerns of those who think otherwise.

Turning to some of the more encouraging aspects of the special session, I would refer to section IV of the Final Document, which deals with the new machinery for disarmament. The deliberative machinery, in the form of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, has already had its first organizational meetings. While the Commission's mandate and role are set out in paragraph 118 of the Final Document, its first substantive session and the agenda for that session - and I have in mind the deliberations that will precede the formulation of that agenda - will indicate whether the Commission is to fulfil the functions envisaged for it.

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

Sri Lanka has been included among the eight new members of the new negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament. That five of the eight new members are from non-aligned countries is, we believe, an acknowledgement of the role of the non-aligned movement during the special session and of the movement's continuing concern with disarmament. As a new member it would hardly be appropriate for us to say more than that it will be our constant endeavour to both learn from and contribute to the work of the Committee. Perhaps I might be permitted just one comment: we regard the special session as a watershed and trust that the institutions created by it, while benefiting from the experience of their predecessors, will develop their own ways to give new momentum to disarmament. We also wish to acknowledge and thank the United Kingdom delegation for the contribution it made during the special session to breaking through what seemed like a log-jam over the negotiating body. That, to our mind, was an illustration of the political will which has been the subject of so much comment during this debate.

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

What remains is for my delegation to thank those delegations which supported our membership in the Committee and have now welcomed us. Not least of all we express our appreciation for the time and effort expended by Mr. Mojsov, the President of the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, who was entrusted with the arduous task of consultations on the new membership. He accomplished that on practically the last day of a distinguished presidency.

Many delegations have made their comments on paragraph 125, which lists the 33 proposals made by different delegations. Time and, I should say, differences of view precluded a more careful consideration of these proposals. Paragraph 125 represents the compromise that enabled us to achieve consensus on the Final Document.

My own President, Mr. J. R. Jayewardene, made a proposal for a world disarmament authority, which is mentioned in paragraph 125. At the conclusion of the special session, commenting on the outcome regarding my President's proposal, we said:

"It was made in the context of a goal which may seem distant but should not be lost sight of: general and complete disarmament. Even though we are preoccupied with the urgent present - the immediate realities, as they are called - some contemplation of the better world we seek should not be beyond our capacity." (A/S-10/PV.27, p. 81)

I might say that that comment could apply to proposals other than ours, and all the authors will agree that they would not want to see their respective proposals lost sight of.

The First Committee is to make its recommendations regarding the disposal of all these proposals. My delegation is of the view that, keeping in mind the consultations we were obliged to hold in the early hours of the morning of Friday, 30 June, on the drafting of that paragraph, this Committee should transmit all these proposals to both the deliberative and the negotiating body. Individual delegations could thereafter follow up their own proposals in the appropriate body or in both. I say this, not suggesting that this Committee shirk its own responsibilities, but having in mind the only criterion that proved acceptable during that consultation on 30 June, namely, equal treatment of all proposals.

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

We must also be alive to the fact that not all of us are members of the Committee on Disarmament, although paragraph 120(h) allows all members access to the Committee. My proposal does not preclude members from pursuing their proposals in the First Committee as some have already done, though they have perhaps thereby opted out of the proposal made here.

We should like to express our appreciation to the delegation of Nigeria for its thoughtful initiative on the United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament. Though it might be less than discreet for me to say it here, one does hear that disarmament is too serious and too complex a problem to be trifled with by the uninformed. We should prefer not to enter into a debate on this but to deal with the situation as it is. The First Committee has dealt with disarmament for as long as one can remember. The special session confirmed that the United Nations has a central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament. In short, all the Members of the United Nations share this primary responsibility, and any proposal that facilitates the proper discharge of that responsibility deserves our support.

My next remarks might be more appropriate at a later stage of this Committee's work but, having heard other delegations speaking somewhat in anticipation of the strict order of our work schedule, I thought a comment would not be inappropriate. The special session's Programme of Action places the greatest emphasis on nuclear disarmament. I should say in parenthesis that spelling out the degree of priority might better be avoided. That was a reflection of the anxieties of all of us and particularly the non-nuclear weapon States. Any step taken in furtherance of that objective is welcome. During the special session some nuclear-weapon States gave assurances of non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. Though qualified, these assurances were in the right direction, if not a step forward. We shall shortly be discussing the conclusion of an international convention on guarantees of security for non-nuclear States, and the USSR delegation has made a specific proposal. That would also be in the right direction, if not a step forward.

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

During our meetings next week we shall have an opportunity of expressing our views on the draft convention accompanying the USSR proposal. Notwithstanding the exchanges that have taken place in this Committee on both the assurances and the proposal for a draft convention, my delegation finds that paragraph 59 of the Final Document has taken cognizance of both. The relevant sentence of paragraph 59 reads:

"The General Assembly notes the declarations made by the nuclear-weapon States and urges them to pursue efforts to conclude, as appropriate, effective arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons." (resolution S-10/2, para. 59)

At this stage my delegation would wish to proceed in the spirit of paragraph 59.

My delegation's only other comment is that the nuclear-weapon States giving the assurances consider it appropriate that the Security Council take formal note of them, while the proposal for an international convention is to be referred to the Committee on Disarmament. The United Nations Disarmament Commission does not seem to figure in any of these arrangements. The Commission includes the entire membership, the overwhelming majority of which are the non-nuclear-weapon States, whose interest is, I believe, the burden of these two proposals.

The relationship between disarmament and development figured extensively in the deliberations of the special session, and several delegations have commented on the inadequacy of what appears in the Final Document. The delegation of Sweden has given us an account of the progress made so far by the group of governmental experts appointed under the terms of paragraphs 94 and 95 of the Final Document. My delegation sees the pace of progress here as having to run parallel with the pace of progress in another Committee appointed by the General Assembly. The questions are the same and so are the answers - there must be a political will. Until then, my delegation will be content with progress at least in disarmament, because we believe that, if there is disarmament, development will almost inevitably follow. The funds going into arms are of such magnitude that even a fractional reduction in arms spending must have an impact on development, and the developing countries cannot but benefit from this.

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

This Committee is also to decide on the date of the next special session. Some delegations have expressed their preference for 1981, while others have commented on the inadvisability of fixing too early a date. We should expect that a consensus will emerge on this before the end of our deliberations.

In the coming meetings we shall have other opportunities to express ourselves on the subjects before this Committee. Let me conclude by thanking my colleagues in the Committee and you, Mr. Chairman, for the patience with which you have heard me.

Mr. GRITOYR (Norway): In my Government's view, there is, on balance, sufficient ground for giving a positive assessment of the outcome of the special session devoted to disarmament. The fact that the session was convened and that it produced a consensus on an integrated Programme of Action in itself merits our acclaim.

The most immediate positive result of the special session was, in our view, the restructuring of the disarmament machinery. Through the re-establishment of the United Nations Disarmament Commission all Member States have been given an opportunity to take an active part in global deliberations on disarmament matters. The Disarmament Commission should be given a role in the follow-up of the special session. In the words of the Secretary-General, the United Nations Disarmament Commission should "stimulate the conversion of ideas into action". (A/CN.10/PV.1, p. 7) The United Nations Disarmament Commission might also be given a role in preparing the next special session.

The restructuring of the Committee on Disarmament could facilitate a more constructive role of that body in working out agreements in the field of disarmament. A broader participation in that body has now been made possible. In particular, Norway welcomes France's decision to participate in the Committee on Disarmament. We hope that participation of all the nuclear Powers will be achieved at a later stage.

In the years ahead until the next special session, it will be our shared responsibility to implement the decisions of the special session on disarmament.

Although we have experienced armed conflicts in various regions, peace has been preserved for more than 30 years in the world at large, inter alia, through a system of military balance and mutual deterrence between the major Powers.

The need for a minimum of military security will also in the future play an important role, as all States have a legitimate right to maintain their national security.

However, the world community is now becoming increasingly aware of the inherent instability of the system of deterrence. The precarious military balance may easily be upset by major break-throughs in military technology.

(Mr. Grytoyr, Norway)

The mere possibility of such break-throughs intensifies military research and development, which requires a substantial portion of resources available in all major industrial countries. The overriding aim is to deny the competitor an edge that could tilt the balance.

The arms competition between the industrialized countries may also have severe repercussions on the economies of the developing nations.

In this context one should keep in mind the effect of the example set by the industrialized countries in placing weapons first on their list of priorities. If nuclear or advanced conventional weapons are necessary for the security of industrialized countries, this will be the case for developing countries as well.

The high degree of sophistication and, hence, the costs of modern military weaponry places heavy burdens on the economies of industrialized countries. For the developing countries, however, the acquisition of modern military technology often goes at the expense of vital resources needed for the survival of coming generations.

Present-day military requirements limit the economic options of Governments both in industrialized and developing countries by binding available resources. But the demands wrought by rapid technological advances tend to limit even more future economic freedom of action.

The special session offered several solutions to the manifold problems of containing the arms race and preventing it from being diverted into new channels. The international community has become aware of the sinister possibilities inherent in technological advance. In many instances, the rapid development of military technology leaves negotiating themes and arms control agreements obsolete and powerless before they have been completed. It should therefore be a priority item for the international community to prevent technological development from circumventing and escaping efforts to bring the arms race under control through relevant agreements.

A step towards meeting this challenge was indicated in a proposal by Norway at the special session, involving the establishment of a procedure of arms control impact statements.

(Mr. Grytoyr, Norway)

Such a procedure would require that Governments provide analyses of the impact on current arms control and disarmament agreements of any major procurement of new weapons systems.

One important aim of the strategy of arms control impact statements is to handle the long-term momentum of the arms procurement process. Modern weaponry must be planned long ahead, implying that decisions on the acquisition of new weapons for future needs will have to be taken five to ten years in advance.

The idea of restricting the arms race in its genesis was reflected in the Final Document of the special session on disarmament by a recommendation that States should assess the possible implications of their military research and development on existing agreements. This demonstrated the acceptance of this approach to arms control. A further step to take would be to introduce arms control impact statements as an integral part of the decision-making process at the stage when Governments are considering the acquisition of new major weapons and weapons systems.

Another useful suggestion pertaining to the containment of the arms race was put forward by the Canadian Prime Minister during the special session. He called for a strategy of suffocation based on the assumption that the arms race generates from research laboratories.

I believe what is needed now is just such a policy of suffocation, combining a scrutiny of new projects in their early stages of development with due consideration of their real capacity for enhancing security and their conformity with current arms control agreements at the stage of actual procurement.

Our aim should be to create credibility for the idea of establishing a framework of international, regional and bilateral agreements effectively to contain and reverse the arms race.

To achieve this, a certain minimum of international confidence and trust is needed. It will therefore be of importance to develop the process of détente still further to achieve results in disarmament and arms control. It may be a piecemeal job, building one block of confidence upon another. But we should not set minimal requirements for détente to be

(Mr. Grytoyr, Norway)

fulfilled as a condition for progress in disarmament. Disarmament and détente are interdependent in the sense that headway in one field is required for progress in the other. They should therefore be pursued simultaneously.

In conclusion, I should like to offer a few remarks on some of the items of the Programme of Action to which my Government attaches particular importance.

In my Government's view, halting the further proliferation of nuclear weapons is at present the most urgent task facing the world community. If we are not able now to convince nations of the dangers and the futility of acquiring nuclear weapons for self-defence, it will be increasingly difficult to do so in the future.

One of the lessons learned from our discussions at the special session was the need for re-emphasizing the shared responsibility between nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States for halting nuclear proliferation.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty itself provides such a balance by stipulating that the nuclear Powers shall agree on certain measures to curb the nuclear arms race, while the non-nuclear nations shall undertake not to produce or acquire nuclear weapons. To strengthen the non-proliferation régime, it is therefore a matter of the utmost urgency that agreement be reached on a comprehensive test-ban treaty and SALT II.

If we are to obtain a truly universal non-proliferation régime, there seems to be no adequate substitute for negative security guarantees on a global scale. All nations meeting the same conditions of denuclearization have a legitimate claim to universally applicable security guarantees.

(Mr. Grytoyr, Norway)

In the Programme of Action of the special session, the nuclear-weapon States were called upon to take steps to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The General Assembly noted the declarations made by the nuclear-weapon States and urged them to pursue efforts to conclude, as appropriate, effective arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of nuclear weapons. We welcome the unilateral pledges made by the nuclear Powers during the special session as important contributions in the right direction.

What may be achieved as a next step is perhaps a Security Council resolution noting the different negative security assurances given by the nuclear-weapon States, as proposed last week by the United States representative.

Nuclear energy for peaceful purposes should be available to all countries. To avoid a conflict of interest between, on the one hand, efforts to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons and, on the other hand, freedom of access for all States to the benefits of nuclear energy, more proliferation-resistant technologies are necessary. In this respect we would express our appreciation for the efforts being made within the framework of International Fuel Cycle Evaluation, and would welcome the efforts by the United States Government, among others, to find more proliferation-resistant nuclear fuel cycles that could make nuclear technologies safe from a disarmament point of view. Such a development could facilitate international co-operation in this field with fewer restrictions on the transfer of nuclear material.

Another area of major concern to my Government is the amount of resources used for armaments, nuclear as well as conventional. In the wake of the special session it will be our task urgently to find ways and means gradually to divert funds and industrial capacity from military purposes to the solution of other pressing problems of mankind, while at the same time taking into consideration the need for a minimum of security for all countries.

In this regard, my Government expresses its satisfaction with the decision of the special session to initiate an expert study on the relationship between disarmament and development. This study should, by presenting options for future concrete measures, serve as a suitable vehicle for fulfilling our

(Mr. Grytoyr, Norway)

aspirations to find more reasonable applications for scarce world resources. thereby helping to remove some of the underlying causes of armed conflicts.

A preparatory meeting of the expert group has already been held in Geneva, and we are grateful for the fact that the process is well under way. Norway, for its part, is ready actively to contribute to the work of the study.

My Government attaches importance to a strengthening of the United Nations activities in the field of information and studies on arms control and disarmament. We therefore sponsored the proposal adopted at the special session to establish an advisory board of eminent persons to advise the Secretary-General on these matters. The advisory board may be entrusted, inter alia, with the task of suggesting priority areas for studies and giving advice to the Secretariat on the carrying out of studies. We support the suggestion of the Secretary-General that the advisory board should develop a programme of studies responsive to the requirements imposed by the Programme of Action on disarmament adopted at the special session.

We believe that the studies conducted under the auspices of the United Nations primarily should be action-oriented.

Mr. KHATRI (Nepal): The special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was a historic event in the annals of the United Nations. The high level of representation and the keen and active part taken by all delegations in its deliberations focused world attention on the complex problem of disarmament.

Several heads of State or Government addressed the Assembly at the special session. However, it was disappointing that the Heads of State of the United States of America and the Soviet Union were unable to attend. Their presence would undoubtedly have added more import to the session.

It must be admitted that the special session fell short of expectations because of a lack of substantive results. Nevertheless, the adoption by consensus of the Final Document, which charts a new course to halt and reverse the arms race and to achieve disarmament, is an accomplishment that had eluded the international community for a long time.

(Mr. Khatri, Nepal)

My delegation would like to join with other delegations in paying a tribute to Ambassador Carlos Ortiz de Rozas and to Ambassador García Robles for their work at the special session.

It is of utmost importance that this momentum created by the special session on disarmament must not be allowed to slow to the point of stagnation. On the contrary, all Powers big and small, developed and developing, should be united in their efforts to stop this insanity of the continuing arms race, which is not only a growing threat to international peace and security but to the very survival of mankind. My delegation, therefore, attaches special significance to the item under discussion, since progress in disarmament can only be judged by how far and how soon we can translate the provisions of the Final Document into concrete reality.

It is universally recognized that nuclear weapons pose the greatest threat to mankind and that such weapons should be completely eliminated. At the special session stress was laid on the special responsibility of the nuclear-weapon States, in particular those possessing vast nuclear arsenals, to achieve nuclear disarmament. Yet the much awaited comprehensive test-ban treaty has not materialized. It will be recalled that the comprehensive test-ban treaty was expected to provide the best possible augury for the special session. My delegation cannot but express deep disappointment at the delay, in view of the fact that paragraph 51 of the Final Document states that the negotiations in progress on such a Treaty "should be concluded urgently".

The world community is also looking forward eagerly to the speedy conclusion of a SALT II agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and a prompt follow-up by negotiations on a SALT III agreement, as envisaged in paragraph 52 of the Final Document.

(Mr. Khatri, Nepal)

The elimination of chemical weapons has also been marked as a high priority item by the special session which states that it is one of the most urgent tasks of multilateral negotiations. We hope that the long drawn out negotiations on this question will soon be concluded successfully and will lead to the materialization of the eagerly awaited joint American-Soviet initiative in this regard.

My delegation is of the firm conviction that the nuclear-weapon States must demonstrate their genuine desire for disarmament. The negotiations on matters that I have referred to are not the product of the special session, but have been going on for several years. What the special session did was to urge these States to conclude their negotiations successfully as a matter of urgency. Any further delay is bound to raise serious doubts as to their intention to make significant progress towards disarmament. We implore the two super-Powers to fulfil the expectations of the international community through early conclusion of such negotiations.

We note with interest the recent Soviet proposal for an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States (document A/33/241). My delegation has always held the view that a legally binding commitment by the nuclear States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States would be a major contributing factor towards the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime.

The Programme of Action has laid down the priorities in disarmament negotiations and further states that nothing should preclude States from conducting negotiations on all priority items concurrently. This is in consonance with our own views. My delegation considers that the question of conventional arms control must be treated as a matter of serious concern in view of the increasing sophistication of conventional weapons, the utter wastage of resources, and the danger these weapons pose in escalating areas of tension and conflict.

(Mr. Khatri, Nepal)

Along with nuclear disarmament, appropriate measures must be taken for the limitation and reduction of conventional weapons. We note with satisfaction that this finds reflection in the Final Document which also points out that States with the largest military arsenals have a special responsibility in pursuing the process of conventional arms reduction. We hope that meaningful consultations will soon commence among major arms suppliers and recipient countries on the limitation of all types of international transfer of conventional weapons, in accordance with paragraph 85 of the Final Document. We have also been advocating the freezing followed by the gradual reduction of military budgets of the nuclear Powers and the militarily significant States, the funds thus released to be utilized for the economic development of the developing countries in particular.

We, therefore, look forward to the interim report to be submitted to the thirty-fourth session by the Secretary-General and the group of qualified governmental experts on the relationship between disarmament and development. It is our hope that the study will be forward looking and policy-oriented and will place special emphasis on the reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries, in accordance with paragraph 95 of the Final Document.

My delegation welcomes the establishment of a programme of fellowships on disarmament. It was a timely initiative of the Nigerian delegation at the special session. We thank the Secretary-General for submitting his report on the guidelines for such United Nations fellowships, which provides the criteria of greater needs of developing countries for such fellowships and also contains a good programme. Early commencement of this programme would be of immense value to countries like mine in our effort to develop the necessary expertise in the complex field of disarmament.

As has been stated by all delegations here, the most tangible result of the special session was in the section dealing with machinery which established the First Committee and the Disarmament Commission as the two deliberative bodies, and an enlarged Committee on Disarmament as the negotiating body.

(Mr. Khatri, Nepal)

The Committee on Disarmament is to replace the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in January 1979. I would like to take this opportunity of extending our sincere congratulations to the delegations of Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Cuba, Indonesia, Sri Lanka and Venezuela who will soon be joining the members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in this important body. Now that most of the impediments which had previously obstructed the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament have been removed by the special session, it is but natural to hope that the newly-constituted negotiating body will work with full vigour and discharge its duties in accordance with the mandate specified in paragraph 120 of the Final Document. We welcome France's announcement that it will participate in the Committee on Disarmament. We feel it is imperative that all nuclear Powers be members of this negotiating body, and we hope that China also will join soon.

The Disarmament Commission, under the wise chairmanship of Ambassador Vellodi, has just recently concluded its session devoted to organizational matters as a result of which the substantive session is due to be held in May-June, 1979. Its main task will be to consider the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament to be submitted to the General Assembly, which should certainly be taken as a matter of high priority. We hope that the Disarmament Commission will not restrict itself to the proposals enumerated in paragraph 125 of the Final Document, but will also consider other matters, such as the creation of zones of peace which would help prevent any extension of the arms race and could make a significant contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security.

We have supported all initiatives for the establishment of such zones. We reaffirm our proposal that Nepal be declared a zone of peace. We firmly believe that all States have a stake in the future of mankind and, as stated in paragraph 28 of the Final Document, have the duty to contribute to efforts in the field of disarmament. In paragraph 114 of the Final Document it is stated that the United Nations should facilitate and encourage all disarmament measures - unilateral, bilateral, regional or multilateral. We, therefore, look forward to receiving further support for our proposal.

(Mr. Khatrī, Nepal)

As regards the date for the second special session devoted to disarmament, my delegation is of the view that, owing to the momentum generated by the last special session and the resultant increased global awareness regarding disarmament, the next session should be held in the not-too-distant future. We feel that the date originally suggested by Mexico, 1981, would be appropriate. It must be emphasized that there should be adequate preparation for such a session.

The central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament has been strengthened by the special session. My delegation will continually strive for the further strengthening of this body, for it is only through it that we can make significant headway along the path to general and complete disarmament under effective international control, which remains the ultimate goal of the world community. In that task it is imperative that all States, especially the nuclear Powers, demonstrate the political will to achieve real measures of disarmament, by working in the spirit of paragraph 126 of the Final Document.

For our part, we shall spare no effort for the early attainment of the goals and objectives of the special session devoted to disarmament.

In conclusion, I wish to assure you, Sir, of my delegation's full co-operation. I personally recall our association in the United Nations a few years ago and wish to say how happy I am to be in this Committee under your able chairmanship.

Mr. DIARRA (Mali) (interpretation from French): Since I am speaking here for the first time, Mr. Chairman, I am happy, on behalf of my delegation, to congratulate you most warmly on your election. I wish also to congratulate the other officers of the Committee. I am convinced that you will guide our work to success, and I assure you of the complete co-operation of my delegation.

(Mr. Diarra, Mali)

The importance of the tenth special session of the General Assembly has been emphasized by many, but it is not superfluous to recall it. Indeed, it was the first time in the history of the United Nations that a General Assembly session had been devoted to the important question of disarmament. It is the non-aligned countries that can take credit for having taken the initiative for the convening of the special session, which was a world-wide manifestation of an awareness of the need for general and complete disarmament. It is true that the results achieved were insufficient, but its success lies above all in the fact that for more than a month it mobilized and sensitized world public opinion on a subject of such importance for the survival of mankind.

The Final Document, which embodies the conclusions of the special session, gives useful indications for a better approach to problems of disarmament. It is now up to us to implement the principles and guidelines in that Document and resolutely to commit ourselves to general and complete disarmament under international control.

A review of the recommendations and decisions crowning the work of the tenth special session prompts my delegation to make the following remarks.

The establishment of a group of experts and consultants and of the Disarmament Commission and the expansion of the Committee on Disarmament have injected a new dynamism into the process of disarmament. Since the historic tenth special session the primary responsibility for disarmament has rested on the General Assembly. That is an undoubted success for the United Nations.

This is a problem on the solution of which the survival of mankind depends, therefore the United Nations information services, in co-operation with Governments, should take all necessary steps to make the facts of disarmament known to the people. The introduction of the subject of disarmament into school programmes would contribute towards associating the younger generations with the crusade for peace and international security. The mad arms race can have no other purpose than the development and proliferation of sophisticated and deadly weapons, which will lead mankind to cosmic suicide. In that conviction, my delegation considers that in the process of general and complete disarmament priority must be given to nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Diarra, Mali)

The actual establishment of the proclaimed nuclear-free zones and the dismantling of all foreign bases throughout the world would represent an important step towards disarmament, which is ultimately conceivable only if an atmosphere of confidence is restored and détente consolidated. An atmosphere of confidence is incompatible with recourse to force in the settlement of disputes among States and with the destabilization caused by the use of mercenaries.

My delegation can but denounce and condemn Israel and South Africa, whose access to nuclear capability threatens the Middle East and the African continent, which have been declared nuclear-free zones.

Vast amounts are allocated by the great military Powers to the arms race, to the detriment of economic development, while mankind faces the greatest challenges of its history: hunger, disease, ignorance and economic and monetary disarray. Were those enormous resources allocated to economic development they would at once make easier the establishment of the New International Economic Order, in which lies mankind's hope of survival.

One of the successes of the tenth special session was certainly the establishment of a new mechanism which, by means of deliberation and negotiation with the participation of all the nuclear Powers, will make recommendations for the implementation of the principles embodied in the Final Document. The new Committee on Disarmament, the negotiating body, has been enlarged to include non-nuclear States. Its democratic structure will enable it to play an important role. However, the change in its composition and the periods scheduled for its meetings should take into account the need for effectiveness.

(Mr. Diarra, Mali)

The fellowships decided on by the tenth special session, if judiciously distributed, could assist in training disarmament experts in the developing countries.

My delegation hopes that our Committee will make concrete proposals on the date for holding the next special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We believe that the second session will lead to acceptance of the principle of convening a world disarmament conference.

My delegation will associate itself with any decision which this Committee takes towards general and complete disarmament under international control.

Mr. KITI (Kenya): The convening of the tenth special session devoted to disarmament was an important and historic event, as many of the representatives who have spoken before me have attested. Equally important in the view of my delegation is the fact that the delegations of Member States gathered during that historic session were able to put aside their particular interests to enable the world body to adopt the Final Document by consensus. My delegation considers that second aspect of the outcome of the special session as quite significant. By adopting the Final Document by consensus, each Member States is - or, better still, should be - committed to the objectives of the Declaration and the Programme of Action contained in that Final Document.

While the two aspects of the outcome of the special session are significant and historic, my delegation considers that their importance would diminish unless there was a vigorous and deliberate implementation of the decisions and recommendations contained in the Final Document and to which Member States are committed, as I have stated earlier. It is in the light of this conviction and also its wish to maintain the momentum generated during the special session that my delegation was ready, indeed happy, to support the Chairman's proposal to give this item the priority it deserves.

(Mr. Kiti, Kenya)

My delegation is happy to note that we are speaking in this Committee a day after the Organization implemented yet another of its recommendations contained in the Final Document, namely, the celebration of the week starting 24 October as a week devoted to the objectives of disarmament. It should be recalled that the first decision taken by the General Assembly was to transfer all those items which do not conform with our main agenda, namely, disarmament, to other bodies of the Organization. This being the first time that we are celebrating such an occasion, it is probably understandable that there were no elaborate programmes planned by the Organization itself or by many Member States. It is the hope of my delegation that during the next celebrations the United Nations will take a leading role in propagating the aims of that recommendation. It would be quite helpful if the Secretariat in its plans for that important event would formulate some general guidelines that could be followed by Member States so as to give the celebrations maximum impact.

When we call for the Secretariat to lay down those general guidelines we are in no way inviting Member States to sit back and just wait for those guidelines from the Secretariat. The Final Document is quite adequate and gives those guidelines. We urge Member States to take actions, individually and severally, to ensure that the objectives and aspirations of disarmament are well circulated in their areas. We say this because we remember the experience of the time when we were negotiating the Second Development Decade and the opposition by some Member States on legalistic points of view that they would not be able to do so. We hope that this time, disarmament being an item that concerns us all, they will find it necessary to increase their advancement toward disarmament and decrease their recruitment into the armies.

It is my delegation's view that the discussion of this item should not take the form of a review of the achievement or otherwise of the tenth special session. Rather, we think that we should concentrate on those aspects of that session that require our action. In other words, to borrow a statement - from the representative of Mexico, I believe - it should be "action-oriented". My statement will therefore be confined to brief comments on those aspects of the Programme of Action that we consider to require urgent implementation. Having said that, permit me however to make one general comment.

(Mr. Kiti, Kenya)

My delegation, which has always held the view that disarmament is the concern of all, considers that one of the most positive achievements of the tenth special session devoted to disarmament is the restructuring of the disarmament machinery. The reconstitution of the Disarmament Commission reflects the clear determination of the Member States to reaffirm their faith in the deliberative function and central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. It is the hope of my delegation that when the General Assembly takes up the first report of the Commission it will lay down some specific guidelines regarding the priorities to be attached to the different tasks assigned to the Commission in its mandate contained in paragraph 118 of the Final Document.

Kenya, which is one of the new members of the Committee on Disarmament, also welcomes the democratic manner in which that negotiating body will function. We are particularly happy to note that in the Committee it will be open to any Member State wishing to make proposals on this vital aspect of disarmament to do so. We urge all Member States to avail themselves of this opportunity to give the outcome of the work of that important organ universal acceptance as expeditiously as possible.

My delegation welcomes the statement of the French Government that it will be participating in the deliberations of the Committee on Disarmament, and we hope that China, the other nuclear-weapon State, will follow suit in a short time.

Kenya, while maintaining the view that disarmament is the concern of all, is equally aware that the knowledge of armaments, hence disarmament, is not equally available to all Member States. It is for that reason that my delegation fully shares the sentiments expressed in paragraph 108 of the Final Document and calls for the speedy implementation of that plan.

Kenya is grateful to the Secretary-General for his report on guidelines for the programme of fellowships on disarmament in document A/33/305. We support those guidelines and call on the First Committee to endorse them. My delegation, like that of Nigeria and many others, considers that, for the first programme to be effective, it is important that it should start as soon as possible so as to enable the fellows to observe the deliberations of the

(Mr. Kiti, Kenya)

Disarmament Commission at its first substantive session in May-June 1979 and then proceed to Geneva to observe the negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament.

I hope that I can be forgiven if I state that Africa, containing probably the most disadvantaged of the countries which have any information on disarmament, should probably be given the largest share of the fellowships under consideration. It is also the view of my delegation that the financing of those fellowships should not wait for savings from certain areas, but should be a separate and ongoing programme in the regular budget.

(Mr. Kiti, Kenya)

In the Final Document, the Secretary-General is called upon to undertake certain studies on disarmament. My delegation has studied carefully the Secretary-General's report on this subject in document A/33/312. We are in general agreement with the general thrust of the proposals contained in this document. We would however like to make the following few observations.

My delegation is anxiously awaiting the final report of the Secretary-General on the relationship between expenditure on armaments and economic and social development. Kenya has again and again expressed its anxiety at the unhealthy situation in international security that is being perpetuated by the waste of enormous amounts of resources on armaments while millions in Africa, Asia and Latin America go without decent shelter, food or health services. International security cannot be sustained when millions are perishing in poverty and a few are swimming in luxury.

In paragraph 124 of the Final Document, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to set up an advisory board of eminent persons, selected on the basis of their personal expertise and taking into account the principle of equitable geographical representation, to advise him on studies to be made in the field of disarmament. This is one of the areas where my delegation agrees with the report of the Secretary-General (A/33/312) and hopes that with the establishment of that advisory body of eminent persons the United Nations will be in a much better position to play its central role in disarmament matters.

I should like now to turn briefly to those aspects of the Final Document that give my delegation and indeed many delegations, if not all of us, the greatest concern. We are all agreed that "Nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization". (resolution S-10/2, para 47) Yet, it is a matter of much regret, that no significant step towards the elimination of this menace seems to have been taken since the tenth special session ended. We all listened to beautiful speeches that raised our hopes that at last the major super-Powers were willing to engage in meaningful negotiations on limiting their strategic

(Mr. Kiti, Kenya)

weapons. We are not in any way minimizing the difficulties facing the major Powers in this respect. We understand them. All we are asking is for them to understand our fears too, for as an old African saying goes: "When two elephants fight, it is the grass that suffers". Kenya and many developing countries fear for their existence. For a long time we have been deprived of legitimate resources for development. We therefore urge the United States and the USSR to fulfil the aspirations of the tenth special session, expressed in paragraph 52 of the Final Document. We pray that the current contacts between the two may be crowned with success.

The second thing that worries us is the unwillingness of nations to stop nuclear-weapons development or tests. My delegation, which supports a total test ban, will support any measures that will lead to this ultimate objective, including the imposition of a moratorium on nuclear tests.

Thirdly, my delegation is concerned at the slow pace in the realization of the desire of the majority of Member States to establish zones of peace and nuclear-free zones. We therefore call on all Member States to take urgent steps that will lead to the implementation of the provisions of paragraphs 62 to 64, in conformity with the respect they should give to the Member States in those regions.

Finally, my delegation firmly agrees with the views expressed in paragraph 93, namely:

"In order to facilitate the process of disarmament, it is necessary to take measures and pursue policies to strengthen international peace and security and to build confidence among States." (ibid., para. 93)

Kenya, being a small and non-aligned State, believes that these conditions can be fulfilled if Member States implemented paragraph 26 of the Final Document, and especially the following sections of that paragraph concerning:

"... the ... importance of refraining from the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or against peoples under colonial or foreign domination seeking to exercise their right to self-determination and to achieve independence; non-intervention and non-interference in the internal

(Mr. Kiti, Kenya)

affairs of other States; the inviolability of international frontiers; and the peaceful settlement of disputes, having regard to the inherent right of States to individual and collective self-defence in accordance with the Charter." (ibid., para. 26)

Kenya will adhere to the principles.

We have already taken the first step by convening the tenth special session devoted to disarmament. Let us now take the second step by boldly implementing the decisions and recommendations of the Final Document.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: Since we still have a few minutes before our scheduled time ends, I thought that perhaps we could use the time usefully by considering what we have achieved and what lies ahead of us in the immediate future.

It is my calculation that the debate on item 125, in which we have been engaged, will be concluded by Friday evening, although there are still 32 names on the list. But at the speed which we have maintained today, for instance, that should be possible.

As members of the Committee may recall, in our work schedule it is then envisaged that we should take up item 128: "Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States". We originally allotted 10 meetings for that item. That would mean in effect the next week. The list of speakers on that item is already open and I should be very grateful if those representatives who intend to speak in that debate would inscribe their names as quickly as possible. This would also help advance planning since in any case the list of speakers on that particular item will have to be closed rather early next week.

A number of draft resolutions have been issued and distributed under item 125. It is clear, however, that there will have to be more draft resolutions under that item, if only because the Final Document prescribes that the First Committee should take this or that action. And, as I understand it, that action can only be taken, in most cases, by a draft resolution. I suppose that nothing prevents the possibility of drafting an omnibus resolution, particularly on those items which flow directly from the Final Document.

As members of the Committee will also recall, when we decided on our work programme a few weeks ago, there was an understanding that most or all items would be left open, so that members would have enough time to draft resolutions, and also so that it would be possible to take up all the draft resolutions at the end of our work for this session.

It would still be very helpful if draft resolutions could be submitted as early as possible. Perhaps the end of the next week would not be too early for those on item 125.

(The Chairman)

If there are no comments or objections, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to my suggestions.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.