

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



FIRST COMMITTEE  
53rd meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 28 November 1978  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 53RD 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)

AGENDA ITEM 35: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE FIRST REVIEW CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES **TO THE** TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SECOND CONFERENCE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 36: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 32/76 CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL I OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLATELOLCO) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 37: CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 38: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 32/78: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 39: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 32/79 CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL II OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLATELOLCO) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 40: EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO IMPLEMENT THE PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DISARMAMENT DECADE: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 41: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE DENUCLEARIZATION OF AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 42: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN THE REGION OF THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

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

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/33/PV.53  
29 November 1978

ENGLISH

AGENDA ITEM 43: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH ASIA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 44: PROHIBITION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND MANUFACTURE OF NEW TYPES OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND NEW SYSTEMS OF SUCH WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 45: REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 46: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A ZONE OF PEACE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 47: GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY;
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 48: WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 49: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS OF USE OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE DEEMED TO BE EXCESSIVELY INJURIOUS OR TO HAVE INDISCRIMINATE EFFECTS: REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY CONFERENCE (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 125 (continued)

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION (A/33/42, A/33/279, A/33/305, A/33/312, A/33/317)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will this morning resume consideration of the draft resolutions introduced under agenda item 125, which was started yesterday. Further, as the Committee will recall, it was my intention - approved by the Committee - that, after having disposed of the draft resolutions presented under agenda item 125, we would go on and take up in the proper order the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 128. However, I have received a request from the delegations which have introduced draft resolutions under that item that the consideration of them be deferred, because consultations are going on. In order to allow the maximum time available for consultations on this important matter, it is my intention at this time to take them up on Friday. If I hear no objections, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now continue consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1, concerning "Paragraph 125 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session on Disarmament". As members will recall consideration of that draft resolution was suspended late yesterday afternoon. At that time the Committee had before it three oral amendments proposed by the representative of Nigeria - the first referring to operative paragraph 1 and seeking to delete the words "as well as studying"; the second referring to the same paragraph and proposing the addition after the words "information and comments made by Member States" of the words "during the thirty third session of the General Assembly" and the third referring to operative paragraph 2 and proposing the insertion after the words "Committee on Disarmament to report" of the words "as appropriate".

(The Chairman)

Later on, during the further discussion of that draft resolution, the representative of Mexico proposed a further amendment to operative paragraph 1, namely, to add, after the words "proposals and suggestions listed in paragraph 125 of the Final Document," the words "together with the official documents of the tenth special session".

(The Chairman)

There was an agreement that there would be consultations between the sponsors of the draft resolution and the delegations proposing amendments and I should be grateful if a representative of either of the parties to those consultations would be good enough to report to the Committee on the result of them.

Mr. JOSEPH (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, your advice that we should sleep on the amendments that were suggested proved to be invaluable. On behalf of the sponsors who met yesterday, I must say that we discussed the subject thoroughly among ourselves and, subsequently, with the representative of Nigeria, who has very kindly seen the point that we were trying to make in working out the draft resolution as we have, and has very kindly agreed to withdraw his first and third amendments. We have agreed to accept his second amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I note, however, that the representative of Sri Lanka made no comment on the fact that the representative of Mexico had also proposed that the words "studying organs" should be deleted, and had furthermore suggested an additional amendment to the first paragraph. I wonder what the status of those amendments is at this time.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Before I speak, I should like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, to be so good as to explain which is the Nigerian amendment that the co-sponsors have agreed to incorporate into the text?

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the only amendment now remaining of the original Nigerian amendments is the one proposing the insertion in paragraph 1, after the words, "information and comments made by Member States", of the words "during the thirty-third session of the General Assembly."

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish):

Mr. Chairman, as you so rightly pointed out a moment ago, what my delegation had suggested yesterday was on the one hand - and here we were in agreement with the first Nigerian amendment - the omission of the words "as well as studying". Our second suggestion was the result of the addition proposed by Nigeria, which has now been accepted by the sponsors, to the effect that it should be specified that the information and comments offered by Member States on the proposals and suggestions in question meant the information and comments offered during the thirty-third session.

Yesterday, therefore, my delegation had suggested that if that addition were made it might also be desirable to explain that when the suggestions and proposals listed in paragraph 125 of the Final Document, were transmitted they should be accompanied, as expressly requested in that Final Document, by all the official documents of the special session devoted to disarmament. It seemed to us that it was desirable to make this addition in view of the specific inference to the thirty-third session.

However, and to facilitate matters, if the representative of the Secretary-General on disarmament questions, the Director of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, feels that despite this addition the Secretary-General will understand that, in accordance with what is stated in paragraph 125 of the Final Document, he would not only send the text of the proposals listed therein but also all the official documents of the special session, my delegation would be satisfied on this point with that statement and would not press the amendment.

This in no way affects the position of my delegation concerning the other point, that is to say, the specific reference to the studying organs. However I should like to say something on that after we have heard the clarification from the representative of the Secretary-General, and I would ask you, Mr. Chairman to call on me again then.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Director of the Centre for Disarmament, the Assistant Secretary-General, in order to reply to the query and the suggestion of the representative of Mexico.

Mr. BJORNERSTEDT (Assistant Secretary-General, Centre for Disarmament):

In the statement I made yesterday to the Committee, I indicated that the Secretary-General had not taken a decision on the way in which the implementation of the decision in the Final Document to make available all the records and all the documents of the special session would be applied. I think that I stated also that this had been delayed in the expectation that the discussion and the decision of the First Committee would be used as guidance for the decision to be taken on the formal transmission of these documents.

(Mr. Bjornerstedt, Assistant Secretary-General, Centre for Disarmament)

If the Committee feels that what has now been suggested as an interpretation by the representative of Mexico is the agreed way in which these documents should be made available, certainly this practice will be followed by the Secretary-General.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The reply given by Mr. Bjornerstedt would appear to require a decision by the Committee since he said that, if the Committee considers that this is the proper interpretation, the Centre will make the transmission. Therefore, perhaps the best way to determine what the Committee considers would be to add the words suggested by my delegation to what is in paragraph 125: "all the official documents of the tenth special session". This is my suggestion concerning the addition.

Therefore, there would be two additions: that suggested by Nigeria and that suggested by Mexico.

As for the other point - that is to say, the words "as well as studying" - my delegation, before coming to a final conclusion, would like to have a clear idea of the authors' purpose in including those words.

Hence, I would put the following questions to them. First, which are the study organs they have in mind? Secondly, of the 33 proposals listed in paragraph 125, which would be transmitted to those organs and how would they be distributed among each of those organs? In the light of their replies to my questions, I can arrive at a conclusion as to whether or not we maintain our amendment.

Mr. JOSEPH (Sri Lanka): I am sorry that this discussion is being prolonged but, since the questions posed by the representative of Mexico formed the core of our discussions with him yesterday, I am in a position to say that the sponsors considered the points he put forward this morning and decided that they could not accept the changes that were being suggested and would prefer our draft resolution to stand as it is, with the amendment suggested by Nigeria.



Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): It seems to me that the reply given by the representative of Sri Lanka to my two questions is the kind of reply that in French, I believe, is qualified as fin de non-recevoir. In other words, he totally disregards the two specific points on which my delegation would like to have the opinion of the sponsors. However, since apparently it is not possible to obtain the clarification that my delegation considers necessary in order to take a decision on this point, I should like now to explain how we view the situation. I regret that this may prolong our debate somewhat, but fortunately we are not too pressed for time, and in any case, if I do so, it is because I have been unable to obtain the clarification that I regarded as essential.

We have 33 proposals. How many study organs are there at present? The study organs, as my delegation understands them, are the following. We have a group of experts dealing with the relationship between disarmament and development. There is another group of experts which is to deal with the relationship between disarmament and international security. Quite possibly, by the end of our deliberations there may be a third group of experts to deal with the effects of nuclear weapons; that is to say, to bring up to date the study requested in 1967. Lastly, there is an Advisory Board whose task is quite different from that of the other three study groups to which I have referred. This is an Advisory Board which was originally established following an initiative of the Secretary-General, who felt that he needed a body to advise him in respect of those studies requested of the United Nations, and which would advise him, too, concerning a comprehensive study programme.

Let us look then, at those 33 proposals one by one, and let us see whether any useful purpose would be served by remitting all those proposals to the study organs.

As regards subparagraph (a), the decision adopted on 9 May by the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party on the position of Romania concerning disarmament questions, Romania is a member both of the Disarmament Commission, to which we all belong, and of the Committee on Disarmament: in other words, the deliberative and the negotiating organs. If we transmitted that document to those two organs Romania could ask in those bodies for whatever it wished. If it deemed a study necessary, it could suggest that a study be carried out. Therefore it would appear to be superfluous to send it to the study organs.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The views of the Government of Switzerland, as all those who have read point (b) will know, referred exclusively to the special session. Therefore what I said with regard to the first point would apply to the second as well.

As regards subparagraph (c), the proposals of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, it is quite obvious that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as a member of the Committee on Disarmament and, indeed, until now one of the co-Chairmen of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is in a favourable position to ask whatever it deems fit in that particular negotiating body.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Then come the two French memoranda, (d) concerning the establishment of an international satellite monitoring agency and (e) concerning the establishment of an international institute for research on disarmament. We have adopted agreed draft resolutions on those two points, so they are fully covered.

Then we have (f), a proposal from Sri Lanka on the establishment of a world disarmament authority. That would be the first of the proposals concerning which we could usefully consider making a recommendation for a study.

Then we come to (g), the working paper submitted by the Federal Republic of Germany entitled "Contribution to the seismological verification of a comprehensive test ban". There is a working group which up to now has been a subordinate body of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and which would no doubt become a subordinate body of the Committee on Disarmament which deals with seismological questions; so it would be for the Committee on Disarmament to refer this document to that body, since it would be its own subsidiary body; thus if we sent it to the negotiating body it will already be fully covered.

As for (h), the question of an international chemical-weapon verification workshop, the working paper submitted by the Federal Republic of Germany, the question of chemical weapons is one of the priority items on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament, as well as of the General Assembly. If we refer it to the Committee on Disarmament, then any purpose we might be pursuing will already be met.

Then we come to (i), the working paper on disarmament submitted by China. If we were to send that to the Committee on Disarmament and to the Disarmament Commission it also would be fully taken care of.

The same would go for the working paper referred to in subparagraph (j), submitted by the Federal Republic of Germany. In this connexion we already have a draft resolution submitted by the Federal Republic of Germany before this session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The proposal by Ireland for a study of the possibility of establishing a system of incentives to promote arms control and disarmament referred to in subparagraph (k) would be the second, after the proposal of Sri Lanka on which, if the authors so wished we might consider the possibility of undertaking a study.

The working paper submitted by Romania - subparagraph (l) - on a synthesis of the proposals of the field of disarmament comes next and what I said with respect to the document referred to in subparagraph (a) applies here also.

Then comes (n), the proposal of the United States on the establishment of a United Nations peace-keeping reserve and on confidence-building and stabilizing measures in various regions, including notification of manoeuvres, and so on. What I said with regard to the Soviet Union applies also to the United States, since the Soviet Union has still one of the chairmanships of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and will no doubt be one of the members of the Committee on Disarmament.

Then comes the proposal by Uruguay, subparagraph (n), on the possibility of establishing a polemological agency. That is a third proposal which, if the authors so wished, might be considered from the point of view of the possibility of carrying out a study.

Next comes the proposal by Belgium and 12 other States on the strengthening of the security role of the United Nations in the peaceful settlement of disputes and peace-keeping. The Committee on Disarmament could no doubt most usefully consider that proposal. It could also be considered by the United Nations Special Committee which is considering ways and means of strengthening some of the provisions of the United Nations Charter, but there is no need here for any other study.

Next we come to subparagraph (p), the French memorandum on the establishment of an international disarmament fund for development. Yesterday, we adopted a draft resolution on this subject.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Subparagraph (q) is the proposal by Norway on the evaluation of the impact of new weapons on arms control and disarmament efforts. The Committee on Disarmament deals with this question, among other questions, and therefore it would be necessary to have a draft resolution that would recommend to the Committee on Disarmament the continuation of the task it has undertaken. In consequence, the Committee on Disarmament is the competent body for dealing with this question.

Subparagraph (r) concerns the note verbale transmitting the text of the Declaration of Ayacucho. The Declaration was not submitted for study; the authors simply transmitted it for purposes of information on what had been done in Washington by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the countries mentioned in the subparagraph to reaffirm the principles of the Declaration of Ayacucho.

We come now to subparagraph (s), the Liberian memorandum entitled "Declaration of a new philosophy on disarmament". That would be the fourth point on which we might consider the possibility of a study's being carried out, but only after we had discussed and considered the subject in detail.

Then we come to subparagraph (t), the statements made by the representatives of China on 22 June concerning the draft Final Document of the tenth special session. Those who attended the special session and who took part in that meeting know full well that those statements tended to spell out the position of China concerning the Final Document and did not call for, nor do they call for, any study.

Then we move on to the proposal of the President of Cyprus - subparagraph (u) - for the total demilitarization and disarmament of the Republic of Cyprus and implementation of United Nations resolutions. I am certain that the representative of Cyprus would agree with me that it was not his President's intention that any study should be carried out on that proposal, either at the special session or at the current session of the General Assembly, and as soon as Cyprus wishes a study to be carried out it will be for the representative to propose it.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Subparagraph (y) concerns the proposal by Costa Rica on economic and social incentives to halt the arms race. That, together with the other four proposals I mentioned earlier, would be one on which if the author deemed fit he could himself propose, at the appropriate time, that a study be carried out.

Then in subparagraph (w) come the amendments submitted by China to the draft Final Document of the special session. I do not know what we have to do with this at this stage of the proceedings, when the Final Document has already been adopted, four months ago.

The Canadian proposal, subparagraph (x), on the implementation of a strategy of suffocation of the nuclear arms race - quite obviously the proper body to deal with this is the negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament.

Then we have the draft resolution mentioned in subparagraph (y), submitted by Cyprus, Ethiopia and India, on the urgent need for cessation of further testing of nuclear weapons. Yesterday we adopted a draft resolution on that subject,

Subparagraph (z) concerns the draft resolution submitted by Ethiopia and India on the non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war. Here again we adopted yesterday a draft resolution on the subject.

Subparagraph (aa) is the proposal by the non-aligned countries on the establishment of a zone of peace in the Mediterranean. In that connexion the non-aligned countries could, if they wanted a study to be carried out, request it and if they think that the Committee on Disarmament, the negotiating body, should deal with it, the matter could simply be referred to that body.

Subparagraph (bb) concerns the proposal by the Government of Senegal for a tax on military budgets. Here again it would be for the delegation, if it wished a study to be made, to make a proposal and to ask for the matter to be discussed in depth so that, as with the other study proposals, a decision could be taken either in favour of or against it or for postponement.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Next comes the Austrian proposal, in subparagraph (cc), for the transmission to Member States of the working paper and ascertainment of their views on the subject of verification. Member States have already been asked to give their views. We have to await those views, so for the time being we have nothing more to do but wait.

Then there is a proposal by the non-aligned countries in subparagraph (dd) for the dismantling of foreign military bases in foreign territories and the withdrawal of foreign troops from those territories. This is one of the specific items which has appeared on the agenda of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament for many years and which no doubt will be included in the agenda on the Committee on Disarmament; it must therefore be referred to the negotiating organ which is the competent body.

The proposal by Mexico in subparagraph (ee) deals with the opening, on a provisional basis, of an ad hoc account in the United Nations Development Programme to use for development the funds which may be released as a result of disarmament measures. My delegation, the author of this proposal, does not want to send it to any study group. This proposal does not require study. When we deem it feasible and useful, we shall submit it either to the General Assembly or to the Committee on Disarmament.

The next item is the Italian proposal in subparagraph (ff) on the role of the Security Council in the field of disarmament, in accordance with Article 26 of the Charter of the United Nations. This proposal, which is the penultimate one in the list, has been raised at least half a dozen times in the Committee on Disarmament. Obviously it is the Committee on Disarmament which is the competent body to deal with it.

There is then the Netherlands proposal in subparagraph (gg) for a study on the establishment of an international disarmament organization; and this is the last proposal in the list. This would be one of the proposals which we could add to the six previous ones in respect of which, as I said before, it would be up to the author of the proposal, if he wished, to propose that a study be carried out.

Thus, if we are to be realistic, if - as I have just done rather rapidly - we consider this question in detail, we shall see that the proposals in respect of which possibly we might decide to carry out a study once each of these points has

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

been carefully and thoroughly studied and considered, would be as follows: the proposal in subparagraph 125 (f), by Sri Lanka for the establishment of a world disarmament authority; subparagraph (k), the Irish proposal for a study on the possibility of establishing a system of incentives to promote arms control and disarmament; subparagraph (n) the proposal by Uruguay on the possibility of establishing a polemological agency; subparagraph (s), the memorandum from Liberia entitled "Declaration of a new philosophy on disarmament"; subparagraph (v) the Costa Rican proposal on economic and social incentives to halt the arms race; subparagraph (bb) the proposal of Senegal for the establishment of a tax on military budgets, and finally, subparagraph (gg), the proposal of the Netherlands for the establishment of an international disarmament organization.

I repeat that if we are to proceed in an orderly fashion, each of these subjects requires a discussion on the possible merits of a study. We should not send 33 proposals to each and every one of the study groups. My delegation always seeks to act in a responsible manner, especially with regard to disarmament questions, so it is for these reasons that my delegation is compelled to maintain its earlier position. We shall not be submitting an amendment, but request that a separate vote be taken on the words "as well as studying".

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Mexico for his clarification of this point. He has also made the proposal that while he will not be submitting an amendment, he requests a separate vote on the words in the operative paragraph 1, second line, "as well as studying". If the Committee is now ready to proceed to a vote on this draft resolution, we will first vote separately on the words "as well as studying" in operative paragraph 1, second line in document A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1. Secondly, we will vote on the insertion in the third line of the same paragraph, after the words "all the proposals and suggestions" of the words "together with all the official documents of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". A recorded vote has been requested. A vote will now be taken on retention of the words "as well as studying".



A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Paraguay, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Denmark, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela

By 76 votes to 17, with 28 abstentions, it was decided to retain the words "as well as studying" in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution

A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall next vote on the insertion in the third line of the operative paragraph, after the words "all the proposals and suggestions" of the words "together with all the official documents of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Angola, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Australia, France, Gabon, Ivory Coast, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Uruguay

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Fiji, Iran, Malta, Philippines, Romania, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, United States of America

By 103 votes to 9, with 12 abstentions, it was decided to insert the words "together with all the official documents of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament" in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: The original request of the sponsors was that this draft resolution be adopted by consensus. With the changes made, is there any delegation which finds such a procedure objectionable?

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): I do not have any objection to the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus. But before we do that I should like to seek some clarification so that I am clear as to exactly what we are adopting.

On the last vote we took on the proposed addition by the representative of Mexico I am not sure of the particular spot where that suggested addition can appropriately be made. My understanding was before we took the vote that you had indicated it should come after the word "suggestions" in the third line. But on reading it, it seems to me that there may be a little difficulty in putting it there because it might give the impression that the documents that are to be sent along with these proposals are such official documents as are listed in paragraph 125. It would seem to me perhaps that the addition of the representative of Mexico can best be placed at the end of the third line.

Of course, I leave this to your wise judgement, but I think we should take a firm decision on this before adopting the draft resolution as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN: I understood the intent of the amendment to be that since they were mentioned in paragraph 125 of the Final Document, they should also be mentioned here. Reading paragraph 125 of the Final Document in no way contradicts that opinion. But, of course, the Chair has no objection to putting them in the place proposed by the representative of Nigeria, if this is agreeable to the proponent of the amendment, the representative of Mexico.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I have no objection if the words which I suggested and which have been accepted appear at the end of the third line after the words "Final Document", as suggested by the representative of Nigeria. In that case, the words "together with" at the beginning of the fourth line would have to be changed to "as well as". Since it is very difficult to work in two languages, I shall use the English text as a working basis. I would suggest using the words which appear in paragraph 125 of the Final Document. The text would then read:

"Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the deliberative and negotiating as well as studying organs dealing with the question of disarmament all the proposals and suggestions listed in paragraph 125 of the Final Document, together with all the official records of the tenth special session of the General Assembly as well as information and comments made by Member States on these proposals and suggestions with the following addition proposed by the representative of Nigeria and accepted by the co-sponsors -

"at the thirty-third regular session," - and it would continue -

"except those covered by separate resolutions;"

The CHAIRMAN. I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): It seems to me that we are reopening the debate by adding to or subtracting from the text. I believe that the representative of Nigeria stated plainly that he did not have any objection to adopting the draft resolution by consensus. Certain changes have been suggested with respect to terminology which could complicate matters and reopen the debate. I should like to suggest that if the representative of Nigeria has no objection, as he stated, then perhaps we could proceed forthwith to adopt the draft resolution by consensus. Otherwise we might have a new debate. I know the difficult position in which you find yourself, Mr. Chairman, but we should understand that we cannot reopen the debate. The representative of Mexico had some suggestions and I also might have some suggestions as well as other members of the Committee and the discussion could become interminable. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask you succinctly

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

to ask the representative of Nigeria whether he still has no objections, and if that is the case to proceed without further discussion to the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I concur most heartily with the statement made by the representative of Saudi Arabia. We should not reopen the debate on this draft resolution. It now seems to be an uncontroversial draft resolution and I hope that we can come to a final decision on it rapidly.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): The suggestions of the representative of Mexico, it seems to me, have been made with the clear aim of assisting the Committee in adopting a readable text. With that in mind, I completely agree with his suggestions and I think that they should not reopen the debate. All they do is put in a readable form a paragraph which, as you would well admit, Mr. Chairman, we have adopted in bits and pieces. I would therefore hope that those suggestions would not create any problem and would not reopen any debate.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair closes the debate on this draft resolution at this point and rules that the slight drafting changes were technical changes which do not affect the substance of the draft resolution in any way.

As there is no objection, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1, with those changes, is adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1.

The Committee will now consider draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.13/Rev.1, entitled "Monitoring of Disarmament Agreements and Strengthening of Security". This draft resolution has 27 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of France at the 46th meeting of the First Committee on 21 November 1978. The sponsors have expressed the wish that this draft resolution be adopted by consensus. As the Committee will recall, we deferred action on this draft resolution yesterday afternoon because it had financial implications. Those

(The Chairman)

financial implications have now been circulated in document A/C.1/33/L.47. I understand that a recorded vote has been requested on this draft resolution.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. OXLEY (Australia): The Australian delegation will support draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.13/Rev.1. The purpose of making this explanation of vote at this stage is as follows.

In making arrangements for the proposed group of governmental experts to be set up to prepare the report on the legal, financial and technical implications of establishing an international satellite monitoring agency, it is my delegation's hope that the Secretary-General will avail himself of the expertise, as appropriate, of the Outer Space Affairs Division of the Secretariat.

(Mr. Oxley, Australia)

Australia has the honour of holding the position of Chairman of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. Through that position, it has been able to observe throughout the years that by its servicing of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space the personnel of the Division has developed a reserve of expertise about questions concerning the use of outer space for peaceful purposes, including a network of contacts with various international organizations, such as the Committee on Space Research (COSPAR), which could be of great value.

It is my delegation's view that where such reserves of expertise exist in the United Nations Secretariat they should be made use of.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.13/Rev.1, we have a number of comments on the substance of this question which we wish to make at the outset.

The question of ensuring the most effective and reliable verification possible of compliance with disarmament agreements most certainly deserves serious attention. When concluding such agreements and carrying them out in practice, States naturally wish to be quite sure that those agreements are being unswervingly complied with by all other parties to them as well. That is a legitimate requirement, because the security of States is at stake.

The desire of many States to establish standard forms of international verification and control which would not vary and would not represent interference in the internal affairs of States or lead to the disclosure of State or commercial secrets is also quite understandable and justifiable.

However, the question arises whether one should seek - or, indeed, whether it is possible to find - some kind of universal instrument for monitoring and controls which would be applicable to any agreement pertaining to the curbing of the arms race and disarmament. In fact, experience over many years shows that disarmament agreements are always individual in nature and always have their own specific characteristics. Consequently, for each of them special forms and

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Methods of monitoring are needed. It is no mere coincidence that in any disarmament negotiations the question of the adequacy of measures for the verification of the agreement in question always arises.

There is another aspect of this question which I wish to bring to the Committee's attention. The formation of any supervision and monitoring organs not connected with the implementation of various practical disarmament measures would simply create the appearance of doing something in this sphere. Also, might not the creation of such organs simply lead to a heightening of mutual suspicion among States?

In our opinion, these considerations apply to the proposal for the establishment of an international satellite monitoring agency. We must be quite frank about it and say that this proposal does not relate to practical disarmament measures. From this point of view, the establishment of such an agency would thus do nothing more than create a mere appearance - a wholly superficial appearance - of efforts being made in this sphere.

As for the specific draft resolution now before us, we consider that it provides for a report, within a certain time-limit, only on the opinions of States on the proposal for the establishment of an international satellite monitoring agency and the carrying out of a study on that proposal with the assistance of a group of qualified governmental experts. In other words, it does not, as we see it, prejudge the establishment of such an agency.

Bearing all this in mind, the Soviet delegation intends to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States has asked to speak in order to explain its vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.13/Rev.1.

That draft resolution is clearly a serious proposal. It touches on fundamental issues of national security. The United States has concluded, however, that the project endorsed by the sponsors of this draft resolution is not feasible, necessary or desirable in the foreseeable future. To elaborate, the estimated cost of even a two-week study, according to the information provided by the Secretariat in document A/C.1/33/L.47, is well over \$100,000. Moreover,



(Mr. Fisher, United States)

the cost of developing an international satellite verification agency would be enormous. There are more urgent national and international requirements which need funding.

An agency created to verify arms-control agreements not yet in existence would be premature. There is a close relationship between the design of technical means of verification and the precise nature of the arms-limitation agreements they are to monitor. It would be a mistake to create costly capabilities which could prove ill-suited to their tasks. Decisions concerning priorities and analyses in the operation of such an agency would inevitably be affected by political considerations. Control over and access to its information could become highly controversial issues. There is no consensus either on the need for an international satellite verification agency or on how to cope with the difficult political issues its operation would raise. Moreover, attempts to reach adequately verified arms-control agreements have not been impeded by the absence of such an agency.

In the light of all the considerations which I have set forth, the United States has considerable doubts as to the justification for the study which this draft resolution would authorize and it will therefore abstain in the vote on it.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation concurs in the initiative which has found expression in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.13/Rev.1. We had thought that the study on the technical, financial and legal aspects of this proposal should, at least at this initial stage, perhaps have been carried out simply by a group of qualified experts. However, we do appreciate the reason why the French delegation, which is responsible for the proposal, has requested that the study at this point be carried out by a group of qualified governmental experts. We should therefore wish to stress, since we do not wish to meddle with the draft resolution, that in carrying out the study and in selecting the group whose members, as we find from document A/C.1/33/L.47 have already been fixed as 12, that it will be necessary since they are going to be governmental experts, for the Secretary-General to draw them from as wide a geographical base as possible and that the drawing from the geographical base should also be equitable.

With that understanding, the Nigerian delegation will vote for the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.13/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Hungary, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.13/Rev.1 was adopted by 107 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.\*

---

\* Subsequently the delegation of Luxembourg advised the Secretariat that had it been present it would have voted in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Japan who wishes to speak in explanation of his vote after the vote.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): With regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.13/Rev.1 which has just been adopted, my delegation wishes to explain its affirmative vote as follows.

As I stated clearly in my statement of 22 November 1978, my delegation has been interested in the French proposal regarding an international monitoring satellite agency, but believes that there are a number of legal, financial and technological problems which require careful study before that proposal is put into effect. Since the agency can only be set up with the co-operation of those countries which are capable of launching satellites or already operate them, it is most desirable that further consultations should take place among the concerned parties, with a view to securing the participation of the aforementioned countries at every stage of the study to be undertaken by the United Nations bodies concerned.

It is on this understanding that my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We will next take up under agenda item 125 the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/33/L.17/Rev.1 which concerns the study on the relationship between disarmament and development. This draft resolution has 20 sponsors. It was introduced to the Committee by the representative of Sweden at the 48th meeting of the First Committee on 22 November 1978.

I would ask the Secretary of the Committee to inform the Committee about the financial implications of this draft resolution.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the First Committee): The decision to initiate a study on the relationship between disarmament and development has already been taken, the Committee may recall, by the General Assembly at its special session in paragraph 94 of its Final Document, resolution S-10/2. The financial implications of that decision are contained in a document of the Fifth Committee, A/C.5/33/64, on the revised budget estimates for 1979 for the Centre for Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no objection, may I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.17/Rev.1 by consensus?

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.17/Rev.1 was adopted.

(The Chairman)

With the concurrence of the Committee, we will take up next, under item 125, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.20/Rev.1 concerning "A new philosophy on disarmament". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Liberia at the 39th meeting on 15 November 1978. Its sponsor is the delegation of Liberia.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): I should like to make a slight modification in operative paragraph 2. That paragraph would read: "Requests the Secretary-General, with the assistance of the Advisory Board ...", and so on. This eliminates the words "if necessary" and "qualified experts, including".

The CHAIRMAN: May I repeat what I understood was the modification of the representative of Liberia. It was to operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which would now read: "Requests the Secretary-General, with the assistance of the Advisory Board to study ways and means ...".

Is it the wish of the Committee to adopt the draft resolution, with that modification, by consensus?

As I hear no objection I declare draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.20/Rev.1 adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.20/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.20/Rev.1.

I am very pleased to announce to the Committee that, with the adoption of the last draft resolution, the Committee has concluded its consideration of item 125 of the agenda and the draft resolutions submitted under it.

AGENDA ITEMS 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 and 49  
(continued)

The CHAIRMAN: With the Committee's consent, I should now like to take up a matter which is explained in document A/33/389, dated 24 November 1978. It concerns agenda item 47, under General and Complete Disarmament, but since

(The Chairman)

it is not a draft resolution the Bureau has felt that this might be an appropriate time to consider it. It concerns an initiative by the delegation of Saudia Arabia on the production of a United Nations film on wars and their consequences.

We have with us the distinguished Under-Secretary-General for the Office of Public Information of the United Nations, who, in the report of the First Committee of last year, was given the task of undertaking preparatory research work concerning the feasibility of making such a film. With the Committee's permission, I would now call on him.

Mr. AKATANI (Under-Secretary-General, Office of Public Information): It is my great privilege to introduce the report of the Secretary-General on the production of a United Nations film on wars and their consequences, as contained in document A/33/389.

When the representative of Saudi Arabia made his far-seeing proposal iast year, the Office of Public Information felt challenged to provide a response of comparable vision and impact.

This has not proved to be easy.

The theme of war, its misery, devastation and evil has engaged the attention of filmmakers from the very beginning of cinematography and has held high interest for producers right up to the present time. Many powerful and notable films dealing with this subject have been produced and circulated. The topic is widely international, has direct appeal to the most basic emotions and can very readily be depicted on the motion picture screen. Many of the memorable anti-war films were made in the course of normal commercial production and cinema distribution. Some of them attained world-wide influence and attracted audiences of tens of millions. The subject lent itself very readily to a documentary approach, and with the evolution of this form of filmmaking there coincided the spread of television around the world. This new medium became a principal vehicle for the dissemination of anti-war films.

(Mr. Akatani)

It seemed appropriate for the Office of Public Information to ask itself a number of searching questions about the proposed new production. What kind of film could we make that would have the impact sought in the Saudia Arabian suggestion but which nevertheless does not duplicate many of the hundreds of existing films on this subject? How can a suitable film be made that would work in many regions and languages, that would appeal to a wide spectrum of audiences - particularly youthful audiences - without a personal knowledge of the consequences of armed conflict?

My colleagues of the Radio and Visual Services Division gave these matters deep and careful thought and conducted explorations with a number of leading producers and directors from several countries in Europe, America and Asia.

At the same time, it became clear that a prime resource for the project was the vast accumulation of cinematographic footage depicting the misery and destruction caused by conflicts of the twentieth century.



(Mr. Akatani)

That footage is stored in national and private film archives around the world. The extent is enormous and the spectrum encompassed is very wide. That knowledge led the Office of Public Information to favour a film of the documentary type, a compilation film, to which contemporary actuality and a limited number of short, powerful statements might be added.

The decision was therefore taken to offer proposals for a 60-minute-long documentary, intended primarily for television. Shorter versions could later be made for educational distribution to clubs, schools and universities. The choice of a suitable film director who would use the indicated materials for maximum impact led the Office of Public Information to interview the authors of several recent and notable documentaries. The final choice has not yet been made, but there is reason to believe that a film producer-director can be found whose professional credentials, sympathy, concern for reaching a predominantly youthful audience and mastery of the medium all give promise of a noble and successful undertaking.

Until a detailed film plan is available, cost estimates cannot be made precise. The Office of Public Information considers that the out-of-pocket costs for a project of the scale and character sketched out will cost approximately \$200,000, for which no provision exists in the 1978-1979 programme budget. The sum referred to is based on the expectation that the substantial amount of staff time and in-house facilities will be assigned to the project. Should the First Committee decide to recommend to the Assembly that the film being produced, the Secretary-General would seek the additional appropriation required during the current session of the General Assembly.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): First of all, I should like to thank the Secretary-General for the study, which we asked him to have made on this subject, which I raised last year in this same Committee in the form of an amendment. At the same time, I should like to thank the Assistant-Secretary-General, Mr. Bjornerstedt, and my good friend the Under-Secretary-General in charge of the Office of Public Information, Mr. Akatani, both of whom went deeply into the question and, with their aides who met me several times, have produced the laudable document which is now before the Committee.

Some of my colleagues who were here last year may recall that our Swedish colleague introduced a draft resolution, which was later adopted, to the effect that a periodical should be produced which would explain to the young and to the old the miseries and devastation of war, and could have such an impact in every country - if it were translated into the languages of many countries - not in conditioning but in enlightening people everywhere as to how anti-social a war could be and, more than that, how it could bring about the end of the human race.

It occurred to me, thanks to our Swedish colleague, that the objectives behind that idea could be expanded perhaps asking the United Nations to produce a film. It occurred to me that the medium should be an auditory-visual one - visual meaning sight, of course, a film, and auditory meaning sound. It would be a "talkie", in other words, although I belong to the era of silent films. It would be a visual and auditory film which should be shown in schools and on television and might perhaps be more instrumental in showing what I consider would be the impact of a future war. To be more precise, my amendment read as follows:

"that consideration be given to the making of a United Nations film candidly portraying the vast devastation wrought by the last World War and subsequent wars, and also highlighting the human tragedies and untold miseries brought about as a consequence of these wars, so that such a United Nations film could be shown in schools and universities and on television all over the world with the hope of creating a genuine aversion to all wars in the future". (A/33/389)

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

I have lived through two world wars. In the late 1920s I happened to be in Europe and I was taken to Verdun, and although I was a young man I could not suppress the tears that sprang to my eyes on seeing a forest of crosses commemorating young men, German, British, French, buried under the sod.

Now in that same period people were been given to understand that the First World War had been fought for certain objectives: "to save the world for democracy" and other rubrics with which the minds of men are conditioned, such as "the war to end all wars". Suffice it to say that 20 years after the ending of the First World War there was another, more atrocious war - the Second World War.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

How were the young conditioned to march into war? Was it always self-defence? I shall not analyse these questions. The drums were beaten, the bugles sounded, the flags of each nation were hoisted, and men walked like sheep to the slaughter. I am not here talking about the justice or injustice of any conflict. Not even the so-called political scientist can go into the motives of modern war. The historian A. J. P. Taylor - and I am sure the representative of the United Kingdom knows who he is - corrected many notions about the Second World War. But we will not go into the genesis of that here.

Of course, some wars are inevitable. When someone marches into the territory of someone else without cause, that can start a war, but we cannot afford wars any more. The First and the Second World Wars were regional wars; they were European wars. Fortunately for us, some good derives from evil. Had it not been for the atomic weapons, perhaps we would have had a real world war, a global war. Perhaps some people may not have been involved, but the whole biosphere would have been poisoned and the waters polluted, not just the atmosphere. I think that by miscalculation we may still have a global war.

We must enlighten the young in every country visually, with films. The United Nations should make a film. I say that because it should be an apolitical film. Assuming it contains scenes of Dresden, Stalingrad or Coventry - I will not say how this film should be made; I will leave that to the experts - we will not say as the French did "Look what the Boche did.", or as the British did, "Look what the Huns did". We will not use words that may rekindle hatred, like the manipulators of propaganda in any country, or those who have a political or economic axe to grind. This should be an apolitical document with material selected from the archives, and showing battles candidly without labelling them. I shall not try to suggest what should be shown. But we should show examples of how forests and crops were defoliated without mentioning who did it and why it was done. In this way an aversion against war could develop in the minds of the young as well as the old.

I do not think such a document should create any controversy because the United Nations will pass on the final version through the Secretariat, the public information office and a committee of all countries which will look at and agree the film. The expenses are a bagatelle. I checked with some of my friends in the

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

Secretariat and was told that a morning meeting of the Committee, without the fringes - as they say in this country - costs \$8,000; to that must be added \$4,000 or \$5,000 when it ends late - and I am not talking only about this Committee, but every Committee. This is why I felt I must put an end to the small amendments in the resolution we adopted less than half an hour ago. It was costing us money unnecessarily. I for one thought we need not have had an avalanche of resolutions in this First Committee when we finished the tenth session on disarmament three or four months ago. It was too soon, and it has cost us much money. We do not know what the outcome will be. Why? Because the people in the seat of power do not have a new approach to international affairs. I am not criticizing them. Those people follow the traditional approach regardless of ideology. We have all heard of the balance of power, power politics and spheres of influence. The small nations egg on the big nations. I am not talking about super-Powers or major Powers. We have no new approach, unfortunately.

All this has led me to think that the young should see the horrors of war, but this is not the only way. Last year the representative of Sweden suggested that a periodical would be useful. This gave me an idea, and the Secretary-General was asked to go into that suggestion and make a study of it before precipitating a vote on it. In fairness to the Committee, it should have a document before it with regard to the implications, financial and otherwise. The financial implications are a bagatelle. They are as stated by the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Akatani, and I believe they amount to \$200,000 for a United Nations film which would be accessible to every Member State. We do not want to impose it on Member States, but they had better show it because if they do not, it may be thought there is something suspicious about that. They had better show the film on television to the young. I do not say this is a panacea. It may help those in the seat of power to come together to find radical solutions for their differences which, if not resolved, might plunge the whole world into conflict. The Committee will remember that a single bullet in Sarajevo started a chain reaction that led to the First World War. What is wrong with that idea?

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

This dedicated gentleman, another Swede, Mr. Bjornerstedt, said, "That is a good idea". I said, "Why don't you go into it with the Secretary-General?" Of course the Secretary-General depends on him and on Mr. Akatani to find out about the feasibility of such a project.

Now, gentlemen, you remember you just voted for a draft resolution that would cost \$114,000 for two weeks. That is the financial implication here. This film would cost \$200,000, including the translation because we have the translators here in the United Nations. And what if it costs a million? That is nothing compared with the time we have spent in deliberating on the subject, trying to beguile ourselves with the hope that we are going to stop the arms race. This may help the people in power perhaps to modify their approach to world affairs. It will make them realize that they cannot act in the same way as they had even before the First World War, and that things could be worked. But how? Not by conditioning - the words "conditioning" or "indoctrinating" may have a nefarious meaning - but by enlightening the people at large so that they will not be marched to the slaughterhouse like sheep. This is my objective.

I could go on and on, but my statement is costing money too. Please do not open a debate on it. In the end it might cost \$10,000 or \$15,000 which could be allocated to this project. Think of the benefits we can get. I hope the Committee will adopt without any objection the report of the Secretary-General and the suggestions that were given to us by our friend, Mr. Akatani. If there are any questions I am ready to answer them, but I do not think there can be any questions. Here is the report of the Secretary-General. Here is the clarifying statement made by Mr. Akatani.

(Mr. Baroodi, Saudi Arabia)

With the goodwill we all have I believe that this Committee one day will be thanked. It will have been an honour to have had you here, Sir, a representative of a small country like Sweden, dedicated to peace, as is Saudi Arabia, and as are all of the small countries. We want to see peace in the world. And what is this amount of \$200,000 to make a United Nations film accessible to the whole world, an apolitical film with no undertones of anything that could be construed as having an ulterior motive.

This is the whole question. I hope that in a year or so such an anthology or gathering of the archives will be completed. This would perhaps be a small step but an effective step to pave the way to making sure that wars will not be precipitated as they have been in the past.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Saudi Arabia for his statement in further clarification of the suggestion which he made to the General Assembly last year, in connexion with which we now have at our disposal also a report by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: Before we adjourn I want to give representatives an idea of the programme for this afternoon. Upon conclusion of the consideration of item 125 it had been my intention to take up immediately item 128. However, the sponsors of draft resolutions submitted under that item have requested that more time be allowed for consultations. Accordingly, with the consent of the Committee, it was agreed that we should postpone further consideration of the item until Friday, when we will conclude our voting on it. Therefore, it is the intention of the Chair, unless the Committee dissents, to continue this afternoon with the consideration of draft resolutions under items 35 through 49.

Members will recall that we have agreed to take draft resolutions in order of the items and, within those items, in the order of submission. This still remains the intention of the Chair, unless there are reasons for proceeding otherwise.

(The Chairman)

Normally, therefore, we would start with item 35 on "Implementation of the conclusions of the first Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons". However, I am informed by the Secretariat that in connexion with one of the draft resolutions there are financial implications the statement of which is not yet ready. Therefore, we will not take up the other draft resolutions under that item either. Instead, I suggest that we proceed to item 36 and take up draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.28, which concerns "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/76 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco". Items 37 and 38 also have financial implications.

We would then take up item 39, on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/79 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, and draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.27 submitted thereunder; item 40, on effective measures to implement the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade, and draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.23, which relates thereto; item 41 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, and draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.30/Rev.1; item 42, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, and draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.31; and item 43, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, and draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.25.

Are there any questions or observations?



Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): My delegation is always ready to help in every possible way in expediting our work, and by and large what you have proposed, Mr. Chairman, is acceptable to my delegation. However, since our original time-table had indicated that consideration of some of these questions would not be considered before tomorrow, my delegation would be appreciative if draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.25 were not considered this afternoon. We would be ready, however, to have it considered tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN: I recognize that this somewhat sudden change of plans may have posed difficulties for some delegations. Therefore, I shall be glad to accede to the request of the representative of India.

As there are no further comments, I take it that we shall proceed in accordance with the plan I have put forward, always with the understanding, as I have emphasized, that I shall exercise the utmost flexibility so as not to cause any delegation any difficulty.

I wish to inform the Committee that the Federal Republic of Germany, Singapore and the Ivory Coast have become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.35, and that Bangladesh has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.39.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.