

United Nations

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records*



FIRST COMMITTEE

7th meeting

held on

Wednesday, 18 October 1978

at 3 p.m.

New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 7TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

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

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

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

Distr. GENERAL

A/C.1/33/PV.7

19 October 1978

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 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/33/279, A/33/305, A/33/312)

Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The whole development of world events has placed the problem of the curbing and subsequently the ending of the arms race in the focus of international politics. That is why the recent special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament drew to itself the intense attention of the whole world.

In assessing the special session, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, stated on 25 June this year:

"The session once again confirmed the most profound interest of the whole of mankind in bringing about a cessation of the arms race.

Disarmament was supported by the overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations."

And indeed, the special session did confirm that the continuance of the arms race entails an ever-growing threat to international peace and security and swallows colossal material and human resources which could be used for solving the urgent problems of economic and social development, in order to improve the living conditions of the peoples of the world.

This session also demonstrated that in certain countries there are forces - and quite influential ones - which are hindering a constructive approach to solving the problems of disarmament. Those who participated in the special session will no doubt recall that while, in New York, we were discussing how to curb the arms race and to bring about disarmament, in another city to the south of this one quite the opposite was going on: at the session of the NATO Council a long-term armaments programme was adopted. Can we view this coincidence as anything else but a lack of

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

concern for the vital interests and aspirations of peace-loving peoples? It would appear that for certain politicians discussion of disarmament is just a smokescreen for the stepping up of the arms race. Furthermore, in order to justify to the taxpayers ever greater appropriations for military purposes, references are made to the so-called Soviet threat. Such references are false through and through. The Soviet Union has no intention whatsoever of attaining military supremacy, and this is something we have repeatedly stated and demonstrated in actual fact. On the contrary, we are doing everything in our power to call a halt to the arms race and to reverse it. That was the purpose of the relevant Soviet proposals and the proposals of other socialist countries which have been put forward at the special session on disarmament and at regular sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and that includes those submitted at this session.

We are satisfied with the support and recognition which our proposals won at the special session. An important result of the special session was also the confirmation of the fact that the problem of disarmament - inasmuch as it is universal and something which affects the vital interests of all peoples - can and must be solved by the efforts of all States.

Finally, the session demonstrated that it was necessary for the programme of practical measures on disarmament to be based upon a realistic assessment of the balance of power in the world today. The implementation of that programme should not be detrimental to the security interests of any single participant in the talks on disarmament, nor should it create any one-sided advantages for any one.

Together with negotiations on disarmament measures, the Final Document of the session states that negotiations should be carried out on the balanced reduction of armed forces and of conventional armaments on the basis of the principle of undiminished security of the parties concerned.

In accordance with its policy of principle of ensuring the cessation of the arms race, making a start on measures for real disarmament and ultimately attaining general and complete disarmament, at the special session the Soviet Union put forward a number of concrete proposals along these lines, which are contained in the document submitted to that session, entitled "Practical measures for ending the arms race" (A/S-10/AC.1/4).

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

Since we consider it necessary to ensure a decisive breakthrough in the struggle for the cessation of the arms race, the Soviet Union drew the attention of the special session to the need for the total cessation of any quantitative and qualitative growth of the armaments and armed forces of States, and primarily of those possessing a major military potential.

The Soviet Union appeals for a discussion of the programme for the implementation within a specific, limited period of time of the following measures: the cessation of the manufacture of all types of nuclear weapons; the cessation of the manufacture of all forms of weapons of mass destruction and their prohibition; the cessation of the creation of new types of conventional armaments of great destructive power; renunciation of the expansion of armies and the increase of conventional armaments in the possession of Powers which are permanent members of the Security Council and also in that of countries linked with them by military agreements.

At the present time the First Committee has begun consideration of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its special session on disarmament, from the standpoint of their practical implementation. This is a most important, highly responsible and necessary task because it is easy to understand that if we do not translate the excellent ideas, proposals and decisions of the special session into the language of practical politics and concrete steps on the part of States, they will simply be left in the air. Particular attention, of course, should be devoted to questions of nuclear disarmament.

As we know, the Final Document of the special session contains a provision to the effect that the elimination of the threat of world war, nuclear war, is the most urgent and immediate task of the day and, indeed, the stockpiles which now exist of nuclear weapons are such that the use of those weapons could threaten the very survival of man on earth. We cannot possibly resign ourselves to such a situation, and still less can we permit a situation where the existing danger becomes even more threatening. In the light of this, there is a great deal of practical significance in the need which is stressed in the Final Document for the urgent holding of talks on halting the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear weapons, the cessation

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

of the manufacture of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, and the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes; a comprehensive, phased programme of gradual and balanced reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, leading ultimately to their total and final elimination.

The Soviet delegation would like to draw the attention of the First Committee to paragraph 48 of the Final Document which points out that:

"In the task of achieving the goals of nuclear disarmament, all the nuclear-weapon States, in particular those among them which possess the most important nuclear arsenals, bear a special responsibility." (A/RES/S-10/2, para. 48)

The General Assembly, we believe, would be acting correctly if, by way of implementing the recommendations and decisions of the special session on disarmament, it were to appeal to all nuclear-weapon States to begin the necessary talks, with the possible participation in them of a certain number of non-nuclear-weapon States.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

A first step towards the solution of such a key task as the cessation of the nuclear arms race could be the attainment of an understanding on the assumption by nuclear Powers of the obligation to cease the manufacture of all types of nuclear weapons so as to embark subsequently on a gradual reduction of the stockpiles of nuclear weapons leading to their complete elimination.

In proposing the holding of talks on measures for the limitation of nuclear armaments, the Soviet Union is ready to consider the points of view of other States on the whole broad range of questions connected both with the substance of the problem and the procedures for carrying out these measures. Obviously we should begin with preparatory work, the purpose of which would be the defining of those who would participate in the talks, reaching an agreement on a specific agenda, and so on.

Of course, nuclear disarmament is a major, extremely complex set of tasks. It includes such questions as how to implement the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons; how to proceed to the gradual reduction of nuclear stockpiles; about the stages of progress towards that end; on what scale individual nuclear Powers should be included in this process at each stage in the light of differences in their levels of nuclear military potential; and how to keep intact the existing balance in the field of nuclear power while at the same time constantly lowering its levels. But if the United Nations in the final analysis wants to attain an understanding about such measures as would genuinely put an end to the process of creating and stockpiling nuclear weapons - and how can it fail to aspire to that goal because the alternative to the cessation of a nuclear arms race would be an increase of the threat of world war - then these are questions which must be resolved.

In so far as concerns the Soviet Union, we are convinced that the solution to such problems could be achieved in the course of appropriate talks, as a result of which a programme of measures, extremely radical in nature, would emerge which would in practice be capable of halting the nuclear arms race. On the basis of this, the Soviet Union believes that the present session of the General Assembly should have its say on the question of the cessation of the nuclear arms race and the gradual reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons, up to and

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

including their total elimination, and it should appeal primarily to all nuclear Powers to get in touch with each other for the purpose of practical preparations for the necessary talks.

Of signal importance is the fact that the special session particularly highlighted the link between nuclear disarmament and the strengthening of political and international legal guarantees for the security of States and also the fact that questions of the limitation or prohibition of all types of nuclear weapons should be resolved on a reciprocal and agreed basis without detriment to the security of any State whatsoever.

On the initiative of the Soviet Union the problem of the prohibition of nuclear weapons is directly linked in the Final Document with the prohibition of the use of force in international relations and also with the creation of conditions in which

"... a code of peaceful conduct of nations in international affairs could be agreed ..."

(A/RES/S-10/2, para. 58)

The special session called upon the nuclear Powers to take steps to give States which do not possess nuclear weapons assurances that those weapons would not be used against them, nor would the threat of their use be made against them. At this session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Soviet Union as will be recalled put forward a relevant concrete proposal for the conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of security guarantees for non-nuclear States. That proposal is a timely and urgent one which, given goodwill on the part of States, particularly nuclear States, could in a relatively short period of time yield practical results. But in today's statement, the Soviet delegation does not intend to dwell on it in any detail inasmuch as it will subsequently be a subject for particular consideration here in this Committee.

Of particular importance would be the earliest possible conclusion of the preparation of a Soviet-American agreement on strategic arms limitation which would make it possible to restrain the arms race appreciably and hence serve the strengthening of peace. The conclusion of such an agreement would open up prospects for the subsequent adoption of more

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

far-reaching measures towards the limiting and reduction of strategic arms. As will be recalled, useful Soviet-American talks were recently held on this question in Washington and here in New York. They will be continued in Moscow on 22 and 23 October. The Soviet Union, for its part, has repeatedly stated that it is in favour of the earliest possible conclusion of talks on principles of equal security.

An important contribution to the solution of the problem of the cessation of the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the development of new types of such weapons would be made, as was quite rightly stated in the Final Document of the special session, by the total cessation of nuclear-weapons tests by all States. Guided by the desire to achieve the earliest possible conclusion of a treaty on a complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests, the Soviet Union has taken a number of important steps. It has consented to the carrying out of verification on a voluntary basis of the implementation of a treaty, to a moratorium on peaceful nuclear explosions and also to the effect that the treaty would come into force even if initially not all five nuclear Powers but only the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom acceded to it.

We believe that now real preconditions exist so that the continuing tripartite talks going on in Geneva could arrive at an agreement on the text of a treaty quite successfully. The Soviet Union for its part will do everything in its power to accelerate the reaching of an agreement on outstanding questions.

In the Final Document of the special session reference is made to the fact that it is imperative, as an integral part of the effort to halt and reverse the arms race, to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is clearly pointed out in this connexion that one of the goals of nuclear non-proliferation is to prevent the emergence of additional nuclear-weapon States. The Soviet Union has consistently favoured the further strengthening of the non-proliferation régime for nuclear weapons, expanding the circle of States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the strengthening of the co-operation

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

of States in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, on condition that such co-operation would not become a medium for the dissemination of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

We believe that over the last decade the solution to the problem of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons has made considerable progress. Not everything, however, has yet been done. Further efforts are still necessary and the General Assembly should continue actively to promote the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime and work towards the universality of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

The Soviet Union considers particularly dangerous the appearance of nuclear weapons in the hands of those States situated in areas of conflict and tension which at the present time do not possess such weapons. In this context we are seriously alarmed by the report on the possible manufacture of nuclear weapons in South Africa and Israel. At the same time we consider it extremely important to continue working towards the further strengthening and improvement of the system of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards so that that important organization can fully serve the purposes of the development of international co-operation and the peaceful use of atomic energy and safely exclude any possibility of abuse of such co-operation for purposes incompatible with the task of non-proliferation. An important goal is the use of other means too of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons.

In the course of preparing and holding the special session a number of States said that measures should be taken against the emplacement of nuclear weapons where they do not exist at present. In the light of this, the Soviet Union proposes that international understanding be achieved on the non-placement of nuclear weapons in the territory of States where such weapons do not exist at present.

The undeniable advantage of this Soviet proposal, inasmuch as it is one of the reliable means of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons around the world, is that its implementation, given goodwill, would not require any complicated talks or any agreements that would take a long time to reach. In order to solve the problem, what we need to do first of all is get the consent of all nuclear Powers - and the Soviet Union has already stated its readiness to do this - to come to an agreement not to place nuclear weapons in any form whatsoever in any fresh territories.

On the other hand we need to have an understanding on the part of the non-nuclear Powers themselves that they will refrain from any measures which directly or indirectly would lead to the appearance of nuclear weapons on their territories. The Soviet delegation intends to make a special statement on this question at a later stage.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

Of great significance from the standpoint of restraining the arms race is the question of solving the problem of prohibiting the development and manufacture of new forms and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

Paragraph 77 of the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament point out that

"In order to help prevent a qualitative arms race and so that scientific and technological achievements may ultimately be used solely for peaceful purposes, effective measures should be taken to avoid the danger and prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles and achievements. Efforts should be appropriately pursued aiming at the prohibition of such new types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction." (resolution S-10/2)

The Soviet delegation believes it to be necessary to draw attention to this problem because although the relevant talks have been going on in the Committee on Disarmament for a number of years now they are going on very slowly and in this area more than anywhere else time is not on our side. Taking into account the fact that there still exists the prospect that our planet may be filled by an even greater variety of refined and sophisticated means of mass destruction of people, the Soviet Union resolutely raises its voice in favour of the earliest possible attainment of the necessary agreements on this extremely important question.

As a matter of urgency we must in particular take measures which would prevent the manufacture and development of the neutron weapon. The basis for solution of this problem could be a draft convention as submitted by the Soviet Union together with other socialist countries in the Committee on Disarmament. At the same time the General Assembly for its part could, in our view, make known its views against this inhumane weapon. Another major and important question is the total prohibition of chemical weapons. The Final Document of the special session categorizes the problem of the prohibition of chemical weapons as one of those questions which should be given high priority attention at disarmament talks. The Soviet Union bases its stand precisely upon this. The producing of such a measure as the prohibition of chemical weapons, that is to say, the elimination of a whole category of weapons from the arsenals of States - which affects, incidentally, one of the most important major industries in many countries - requires of course a great deal of attention and great efforts.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

The Soviet Union will continue to work as fast as possible towards the preparation of a joint Soviet-American initiative on this question until such time as we successfully conclude the process.

Among the urgent problems which require solution, the special session of the United Nations devoted to disarmament pointed to the need for limiting the sale of conventional weapons and the supply of them to other countries. The Soviet Union believes that for a solution to this problem to be just and lasting it is necessary that it should be based upon a clear-cut political approach which would make it possible to produce such political and legal criteria, based upon the United Nations Charter, the definition of aggression and other universally accepted international political and international legal documents, as would be in keeping with the purposes of strengthening international peace and security and the strengthening and deepening of international détente.

At the same time we must in this regard take into account both the task of limiting the sale of weapons and the inadmissibility of placing upon the same footing the aggressor and the victim of aggression or doing prejudice to the rights of countries and peoples waging a struggle for freedom and independence.

We can note with satisfaction that the elements of such a realistic approach to this problem have been reflected in the decisions of the special session.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

At the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament the Soviet Union put forward a new initiative on the question of reducing military budgets. It proposed that States with major economic and military potential, including all the permanent members of the Security Council, should come to an agreement on the specific scope of the reduction of their respective military budgets, not in percentage terms but in absolute terms. That proposal is designed to make the reduction of budgets the subject of concrete and businesslike talks among States, leading to a systematic reduction of those budgets. It also shows that the Soviet Union attaches great significance to a reduction of military budgets and is working to make easier and to accelerate a solution of this problem.

A reduction of military budgets would combine two benefits. Material limitations would be placed upon the arms race and at the same time certain additional funds would be released for peaceful purposes. This is a matter of interest to every inhabitant of our planet, since upon a solution of the problem depend both the strengthening of the security of States and the improvement of the material well-being of the peoples of the world.

We hope that the General Assembly will take a decisive stand in favour of a real reduction of military budgets. By so doing it would create the necessary preconditions for the taking of a measure which, as was rightly pointed out in the Final Document ,

"would contribute to the curbing of the arms race and would increase the possibilities of reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries."

(A/RES/S-10/2, para. 89)

The General Assembly stated in the Final Document of the tenth special session that:

"At the earliest appropriate time, a world disarmament conference should be convened with universal participation and with adequate preparation." (A/RES/S-10/2, para. 122)

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

The Ad Hoc Committee created to consider all views expressed, and all proposals submitted by Governments on the question of convening a world disarmament conference and the problems connected with it is doing useful work. However, the Soviet delegation believes that the time has come to set a time-table for the convening of such a conference and the creation of an organ to make practical preparations for it, as the General Assembly at its special session called upon us to do in the important decision that I mentioned before. In our view, that task should be tackled by the General Assembly during the current session. We also have yet to determine the time for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

We welcome other measures of the last special session designed to permit a fuller use of the possibilities of an international machinery for disarmament talks.

The First Committee is for the first time appearing in a new role as the organ for the consideration exclusively of questions of disarmament and related international security questions. The Soviet delegation takes a favourable view of such a change in the Committee's functions, because it believes that at present there is no problem on earth that is more important, of a larger scale or of greater urgency than that of disarmament.

We hope, Mr. Chairman, that under your leadership, in which we have great confidence, the Committee will measure up to these new tasks. We must hope that the organizational changes affecting the Committee on Disarmament itself will also promote these purposes. Although it is understandable that the political will of States is of decisive importance, these changes will also provide further momentum for the work of this body and help it to solve the problems more effectively from the point of view of preparing new agreements and treaties on reducing armaments and on disarmament.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

In this regard we note with satisfaction that one more permanent member of the Security Council, France, will be occupying its place at the conference table in the Committee on Disarmament. At the same time we welcome the entry into that Committee of Cuba, Venezuela, Algeria, Kenya, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Australia and Belgium. The Soviet delegation wishes these new members of the Committee every success in their work.

We welcome the resumption of the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, in the belief that, in playing the role of a consultative organ under the General Assembly, it will be able to make a useful contribution to the consideration of various disarmament problems. We expect that an entirely new organ set up as part of the machinery for disarmament talks will also prove worth-while. I refer to the advisory board established to advise the Secretary-General.

The Soviet Union is ready to do everything in its power to see that the decisions of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the Final Document that it adopted prove to be a real contribution to solving the problem of disarmament, up to and including general and complete disarmament, and that they promote the elimination of the material means of making war. As always, we shall carefully consider any constructive proposals to that end that are presented here. The Soviet delegation is ready to work constructively with all those who truly aspire to a solution of this complex problem of disarmament.

In conclusion, the Soviet delegation expresses its conviction that the maximum efforts will be made to solve the problem of disarmament. In circumstances in which the arms race is becoming ever more intense and the world in this regard is on a slippery slope, the time has come to turn from generalized appeals for disarmament to specific deeds, to find a practical solution to the problem of bringing an end to the arms race. This is required in the interests of the preservation of peace throughout the world and the strengthening of the security of mankind.

The CHAIRMAN: As members of the Committee will recall, the representative of Nigeria was unable to complete his statement yesterday because a report of the Secretary-General was not yet to hand. That document is now available, and I therefore call on the representative of Nigeria to complete his statement.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): Now that the two documents by the Secretary-General are available, my delegation would like to make some brief comments on them.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

We are particularly pleased that the Nigerian initiative which was launched at the special session met with unanimous endorsement and resulted in the decision which appears at paragraph 108 of the Final Document whereby the General Assembly established a programme of fellowships on disarmament. My delegation believes that this decision of the special session is likely to be immediately productive with its potential for creating most needed disarmament constituencies in countries where they do not now exist, particularly of course in the developing countries. It is needless for me to say that the creation of such constituencies will further enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations in the discharge of its central role and primary responsibilities in the sphere of disarmament.

In approving the programme the Special Session decided that

"The Secretary-General, taking into account the proposal submitted to the special session, should prepare guidelines for the programme."

(General Assembly resolution S-10/2).

This guideline has now been submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/33/305. We are grateful to the Secretary-General for the document which contains a well thought out set of guidelines that in turn do reflect the Nigerian proposal according to which up to 20 fellows a year would be selected from nominations by governments, largely from developing countries, to attend at United Nations Headquarters in New York, which would be the base of the programme, a course of lectures and seminars on issues relating to disarmament, including the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

I would like to make just two minor comments on the document itself. First, we would have liked to see the guidelines include a consideration of the possible specific six month period when the programme will be held annually. In our view the ideal period for the programme should be a time which would enable the fellows, in addition to lectures and seminars, to observe the sessions of the Disarmament Commission, as well as the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva. The Nigerian delegation expects that the first group of fellows will inaugurate the programme before the end of the first half of 1979. Indeed we understood that some Governments may already have indicated their interest in nominating fellows for this programme.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

We hope that the Secretary-General will obtain the necessary financial authorization early enough to commence arrangements, perhaps even before the end of this session of the General Assembly.

My second comment concerns the need to expose fellows to all shades of opinion on disarmament issues. In doing this the Centre for Disarmament would have to ensure that lecturers as well as seminar guides for the programme are drawn from as wide a group of countries as possible, and expertise from institutions and institutes from developed as well as from developing countries should be sought for the programme.

In paragraph 98 of the Final Document of the Special Session the decision was taken that the thirty-third and subsequent sessions of the General Assembly should determine the specified guidelines for carrying out studies. It is clear that the list of suggested studies to be carried out either by the Secretary-General and his staff, or with the assistance of outside experts, is quite long. This of course is an indication of the interest being taken in these matters by member States, and I think it has to be commended. However, if maximum value is to be derived from these proposed studies it is necessary at some stage to rationalize them, if for no other reason than to avoid duplication and wasted efforts.

Thus paragraph 98 of the final document is, in the view of my delegation, a very wise step when it urges the thirty-third and subsequent sessions to determine the specified guidelines for carrying out these studies.

My delegation has read with interest the report of the Secretary-General contained in document No. A/33/312. We agree with the Secretary-General that before taking a decision on this question the General Assembly should take advantage of the views of the Advisory Board of eminent persons which the Secretary-General was authorized to set up in paragraph 124 of the final document. We note that the Advisory Board will soon be convened and that the Secretary-General will submit another report following its meeting. We look forward to that follow-up report, and we believe that it would be advisable not to take a final decision on this matter until it has been received.

Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): In accordance with your request, Mr. Chairman, I shall refrain from expressing the deep pleasure of my delegation at seeing you preside over this important Committee, assisted by such able members on the Bureau.

It is only fitting that we begin our consideration of disarmament this year with a review of the results of the special session held last summer. The special session was a unique event in many respects, and if the momentum it has generated is maintained it may form a turning point in the hitherto arid history of disarmament negotiations.

This is not to say that the special session lived up to the hopes and expectations which my country and many other small and medium-sized States had placed in it. The lack of substantive results at the session was due primarily to the failure of the super Powers to come forward with concrete initiatives to halt and reverse the arms race. My delegation particularly regrets the fact that the promise held out last autumn of a SALT II agreement and a comprehensive test ban treaty in time for the special session did not materialize. These measures are still awaited by the international community.

On balance, however, I think everyone agrees that the special session made a significant contribution to conceptualizing the problems of disarmament and charting the course for their resolution. The very fact that, despite the differences between the positions of the great Powers and various groups of countries, the General Assembly achieved consensus on a document which deals with disarmament in a comprehensive perspective is remarkable in itself. And for this we owe a special debt of gratitude to Ambassador Ortiz de Rozas and Ambassador Garcia Robles.

(Mr. Maik, Pakistan)

Among the positive aspects of the special session, my delegation counts the following: first, the fact that it was held with the participation of all States Members of the United Nations, including all the nuclear Powers; secondly, that it dealt with disarmament within an integrated framework setting out detailed goals and principles for disarmament negotiations; thirdly, that it adopted a programme of measures for implementation in the near future, however ambiguous its provisions; fourthly, that it created new and democratic machinery for pursuing the implementation of that programme as well as for elaborating a comprehensive programme for general and complete disarmament; and, fifthly, that it recognized the primary responsibility of the major nuclear Powers for initiating the process of disarmament and acknowledged the legitimate interest of all States, including the small and medium-sized States of the third world, in participating on an equal footing in the disarmament efforts.

The results of the special session are not the culmination but the beginning of a process which should lead to the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. But we believe that the outcome of the special session will, in the final analysis, be judged by the extent to which the decisions and recommendations of that session are implemented. That will have to be a step-by-step process which clearly establishes the linkages between the various stages and the different kinds of disarmament negotiations. At the current session the General Assembly could make a tangible contribution to the process launched at the special session by elaborating a set of realistic priorities within a precise, though flexible, time-table for the implementation of the main measures in the Programme of Action of the special session.

We are all agreed that priority must be given to nuclear disarmament. The Final Document states that nuclear disarmament

"... should be carried out in such a way, and requires measures to ensure, that the security of all States is guaranteed at progressively lower levels of nuclear armaments, taking into account the relative qualitative and quantitative importance of the existing arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States and other States concerned." (A/RES/S-10/2, para. 49)

(Mr. Naik, Pakistan)

It is quite obvious from that that the process of disarmament must begin with the two super-Powers which have the largest and most sophisticated arsenals of both nuclear and conventional weapons.

In that context, my delegation believes that the implementation of the following measures in successive stages should be accorded priority: first, a SALT II accord which should bring to a halt the spiralling race in strategic nuclear armaments; secondly, a comprehensive test ban treaty among the major nuclear Powers, which could be joined subsequently by other nuclear States; thirdly, a ban on the deployment of new types of nuclear weapons and the flight testing of strategic delivery vehicles; fourthly, the negotiation of mutual and balanced reduction of conventional and nuclear weapons in Europe; fifthly, the elaboration of credible security guarantees, both positive and negative, for non-nuclear-weapon States; sixthly, an agreement among the nuclear-weapon States not to be the first to use nuclear weapons; seventhly, a SALT III accord which would provide for major reductions in the strategic armaments of the two super-Powers and a halt to the further sophistication of those weapons; and, eighthly, the complete prohibition of the use and threat of use of nuclear weapons through an international convention or agreement.

We believe that the implementation of those priority tasks would establish a solid foundation for universal and complete disarmament. In particular, the conclusion of a SALT II accord and a comprehensive test ban in the next few months will be an important test of the political will of the States concerned. It is time that the negotiations on the comprehensive test ban were removed from their restricted framework and presented forthwith for consideration by the present Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) at its resumed session later this year - otherwise we are afraid that the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban may be indefinitely delayed.

There was some forward movement at the special session on the question of security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States. However, the unilateral declarations made by the nuclear Powers were, with one exception, so qualified

(Mr. Naik, Pakistan)

and conditional as to lack credibility. At its special session the General Assembly urged the nuclear-weapon States to conclude "effective arrangements" to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. In this context, the Pakistan delegation wishes to express its satisfaction with the Soviet proposal for an international treaty on this question, although we have views on the substance of the provisions of the draft treaty proposed by the Soviet delegation. We shall elaborate those views in the debate when the First Committee takes up the relevant item.

On the question of nuclear proliferation, no concrete agreement could be reached between the divergent approaches of the industrialized and the third-world countries. It was however agreed that a new international consensus needs to be developed on this subject. The restrictive and discriminatory policies followed by some major Powers, especially regarding the supply of peaceful nuclear technology to the third world, were rejected at the special session. Nuclear non-proliferation can be promoted only through voluntary agreement on the part of the non-nuclear-weapon States; it cannot be achieved by the imposition of discriminatory policies.

There is, however, one non-proliferation measure on which general and wide agreement exists, that is, the creation of additional nuclear-weapon-free zones to maintain the denuclearized status of major parts of the third world. There is a present and manifest danger of proliferation in regions of Africa, the Middle East and South Asia, and the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in a most effective way by which that danger can be averted. We have noted the willingness of the nuclear Powers to respect such zones and to undertake the obligations entailed. Pakistan will continue its efforts to promote such a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

In regard to conventional weapons, there are two aspects to be borne in mind. First, there is that of the vast arsenals of conventional arms in the possession of the nuclear Powers and the major military blocs; apart from their inherent threat to peace and security, they form an impediment to nuclear disarmament. As the Final Document provides, the primary responsibility for disarmament in the conventional field - as in the nuclear area - rests with the major military Powers. This is not to say that at the special session the Assembly was entirely unconcerned about the growth of military spending in the third world.

(Mr. Naik, Pakistan)

However, it adopted a balanced and, we believe, an equitable approach to controlling armaments in various regions of the world by upholding the right of each State to preserve its security and for both recipients and suppliers of arms to bear in mind the need to maintain a numerical and technological balance of armaments in various regions of tension and conflict. We hope that that approach will guide the policies of all States concerned. Without it, the arms race is likely to spread in scope and magnitude to various parts of the world.

The special session did not define with sufficient clarity the fundamental connexion between the arms race and the economic plight of the developing countries. We hope that the intergovernmental group established to study the link between disarmament and development will find it possible to analyse, first, the way in which arms expenditures contribute to the fundamental economic and social disorder and, secondly, how the existing economic disparity between the developed and the developing countries is a factor permitting the diversion of the world's resources to the arms race, which in turn perpetuates existing inequities. The objectives of general and complete disarmament and the New International Economic Order are part of the over-all endeavour to restructure the world along more rational and democratic lines and they must be pursued simultaneously and in a complementary way. It was the hope and expectation of developing countries that the major Powers would give a tangible demonstration of their commitment to both those goals by agreeing at the special session on a specific form and manner for transferring resources from arms spending to economic development. We would have been gratified if the concrete and specific proposal made by the delegation of France to that end had been endorsed more satisfactorily and categorically in the Final Document. We hope that the present session of the Assembly will find it possible to agree on at least some interim measures to channel funds from the arms race to meeting the needs of the developing countries, perhaps along the lines suggested by the delegation of Mexico at the special session.

(Mr. Naik, Pakistan)

The principal and concrete achievement of the special session was the establishment of new disarmament machinery, both to conduct negotiations on specific issues and to deliberate on disarmament problems.

The newly constituted Committee on Disarmament will no doubt be a more effective negotiating body because of the wider participation of nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States. The delegation of Pakistan takes this opportunity to congratulate the delegations of Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Cuba, Indonesia, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Venezuela who are joining the Committee on Disarmament. Having served on that Committee for some years - at a time when you, Mr. Chairman, so ably represented the Secretary-General on that body - I cannot but emphasize the importance of ensuring that the procedures and deliberations of the Committee on Disarmament are as open and democratic as possible. At the same time, it is essential that the negotiating role of the Committee be preserved. The Committee on Disarmament should establish its agenda and programme of work when it meets at its inaugural session in accordance with the recommendations which this Assembly will adopt as regards the priority issues for negotiation. However, my delegation would suggest that informal consultations should begin as soon as possible during this session in order that the agenda programme of work and procedures of the Committee on Disarmament may be drawn up.

The Disarmament Commission has the task of giving a sense of over-all direction to the process of disarmament launched by the special session. My delegation attaches equal importance to the three broad functions of the Commission identified in the Final Document. The task of considering disarmament problems, we feel, should include a review of ongoing negotiations, whether bilateral, regional or multilateral, and of situations that are important for the goals of disarmament. With regard to the follow-up of the decisions of the special session, we believe the Commission should not restrict itself to the proposals and ideas mentioned in paragraph 125 of the Final Document but should consider other issues, such as the concepts of zones of peace and regional disarmament, which could serve as valuable instruments for preventing the extension of the arms race. We share the general desire that a comprehensive programme of disarmament should be elaborated as a matter of priority. It should be framed in the context

(Mr. Haik, Pakistan)

of the detailed goals approved at the special session but should not involve renegotiation of the special session's programme or divert us from seeking tangible progress on the measures there agreed upon.

My delegation suggests that the General Assembly should convene the next special session on disarmament in 1981 to review progress on the implementation of the special session's programme and to consider and adopt the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

It is apparent that in the coming years the United Nations will have to play a central and catalytic role in promoting the disarmament process. It should be provided with the capacity to discharge those responsibilities. In this context, we attach importance to the work of the Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies and we shall not fail to make an active and constructive contribution to its work.

My delegation hopes that the debate on the item under discussion will lead to the adoption of specific decisions on the following: 1. a list of priority items for negotiation in the Committee on Disarmament or elsewhere; 2. guidelines to be provided to the Disarmament Commission regarding the follow-up of the decisions of the special session, including those contained in paragraph 125 of the Final Document; 3. the date and other arrangements for the convening of the next special session on disarmament; 4. specific modalities for channelling resources from arms expenditure to development; 5. steps to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to discharge its new responsibilities.

The delegation of Pakistan will make every effort to bring about the early realization of the goals and objectives agreed upon at the special session. Unless all States, particularly the major military Powers, translate those goals and objectives into genuine disarmament, peace and security in the world will remain precarious, and historians might well say of the special session, in the words of John Dryden:

"Such subtle covenants were made

Till peace itself is war in masquerade".

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): May I express to you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the Bureau the sense of satisfaction of the Romanian delegation at the fact that it is taking part in this debate under your guidance. I can assure you of the co-operation of my delegation as you discharge the important tasks that have been entrusted to you.

The Romanian delegation considers it only natural that our Committee should this year have begun its debate on disarmament questions by examining the results of the tenth special session of the General Assembly and the means of implementing the recommendations and decisions adopted at that session. It does so not only because it was the most significant international event relating to disarmament of the last few years but also, and above all, because it is convinced in the light of the Final Document, that the special session marked the beginning of a new stage in the efforts of the United Nations to achieve results in the area of disarmament.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

The participation of all States in this important international debate - the broadest and most representative ever organized - the sheer number of proposals, suggestions and ideas put forward in the course of the debate and the efforts to achieve results have underlined the acute concern felt throughout the world over the serious consequences of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and the danger it poses to mankind as a whole.

They have also led to growing awareness of the need to use all possible means of putting an end to that race and of achieving true disarmament.

Romania, along with other States, was among those that initiated the request for convening the special session on disarmament, and thus took an active part in its preparation and development. Romania proposed a series of concrete acts and measures to break the deadlock in negotiations and to place disarmament efforts on a new and more effective foundation.

The decision of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party regarding Romania's position on disarmament and, particularly, nuclear disarmament, which was adopted in the light of the special session, expressed the conviction that the special session provided the most adequate and representative world forum in which to hold an in-depth discussion of the problems of disarmament, one that was most likely to lead to the adoption of practical measures. The work of the session was followed with the most careful attention and the results have been the subject of detailed analysis at the highest political level. The Executive Political Committee of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party recognized that the special session was an important step because it led to the adoption of a new approach to the problems of halting the arms race and proceeding to disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament. All States participated in the debate on this key issue in international life today. Of particularly positive significance was the more democratic framework established in seeking a solution to disarmament problems by strengthening the responsibility of the United Nations in this matter. The United Nations has once again proved itself

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

to be the most adequate forum available to mankind today to debate and negotiate international problems of world importance.

In fact, the special session stressed the particularly pressing nature of the problem of disarmament; it reviewed the immediate major objectives and subjects for future debates; and it established an adequate framework for those debates. In so doing, the special session opened up prospects for real progress towards halting the arms competition and towards disarmament; it laid down foundations for a new approach to negotiations. The principles which are to guide the negotiations - more democratic and established with the participation and agreement of all States - the new machinery for discussion and negotiation in the field of disarmament, the legacy of ideas and proposals submitted by States at that session and at earlier sessions, based on a desire to give new impetus to the negotiations and set them on the road to more tangible results, all these are new elements allowing us to conclude that the special session produced positive results.

The Romanian delegation believes that it is essential, at this time, to act responsibly in order to translate into action the recommendations and decisions adopted at that session, in strict conformity with the spirit and letter of the Final Document. It is only by the adoption of specific measures to halt the arms race and to achieve disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, that the real effectiveness of any international action in that field can be determined. Thus, it becomes more necessary than ever for disarmament problems to be the subject of determined and decisive measures on the part of Governments. As President Nicolae Ceaucescu stressed:

"It would be a mistake to consider that once the session ended the peoples and forces in favour of disarmament and peace can relax and slow down their efforts to achieve those goals. Quite the contrary, and even more than in the past, we must intensify our action to implement the proposals contained in the decisions of the special session of the United Nations and make even greater efforts to achieve disarmament."

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

It is from this standpoint that we give pride of place to the adoption of measures to ensure the implementation of the Programme of Action adopted by the tenth special session. The same applies to the obligation of the new machinery for debate and negotiation, namely, the Disarmament Commission and the Committee on Disarmament, to take up and examine in detail the opinions, suggestions and proposals submitted by States at the session in order to achieve specific agreements on the reduction of military budgets and the cessation of the production of new weapons, both nuclear and conventional. This wealth of proposals which, under the terms of the Final Document, became an integral part of the activity of the special session, must be considered most carefully. In fact, they constitute a treasure house of measures implementation of which might well break the deadlock in the process of disarmament.

The Secretary-General should transmit officially to the bodies which are conducting debates and negotiations in the field of disarmament, along with the Final Document, all the proposals submitted to the special session and listed in paragraph 125 of that Document, so that they may be taken into account in the work of the bodies concerned.

It behooves us resolutely to make known our positions, as stated during the session, and to embody them in acts and measures likely to promote disarmament. Thus we are very glad to see included in the agenda of each regular session an item entitled "Review and implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". This merely underlines the consistent way in which our Organization intends to follow up that important question. In our view, that item should continue to occupy a position of priority in the debates of the First Committee.

Romania, for its part, submitted to the special session a group of suggestions and measures which I should like briefly to recall here. First, there are the measures which would be more easily implemented in a first phase and which would depend primarily on the political will of States. Then there are the measures more specifically directed towards the gradual reduction and finally the prohibition of nuclear weapons, weapons of mass

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

destruction and conventional weapons. We thus envisage freezing military budgets at the 1978 level and thereafter gradually reducing them, with the sums thus released to be used for peaceful purposes, for the economic advancement of all countries and for assistance to under-developed countries; the commitment of States not to station troops and new weapons on the territories of other States and, ultimately to achieve the reduction and total withdrawal of foreign military forces and the dismantling of military bases on the territories of other countries; the implementation of measures to strengthen trust among States, such as the establishment of demilitarized security zones along national frontiers, the commitment of all States to notify other States of major troop movements and military manoeuvres, and the renouncing of military manoeuvres, particularly those of a multinational nature, close to the frontiers of other States. Romania feels that in order to achieve détente and peace, we must put an end to the division of the world into military blocs. In this connexion, my Government has proposed that States members of military alliances commit themselves not to accept new members, not to increase their effectives and the level of their arms and gradually to reduce the activity of military blocs.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

Among the measures proposed, an important place must be given to disarmament in Europe and, to that end, to military disengagement, without which there could be no true security on the continent. We cannot overlook the fact that it is in Europe today that we find the highest concentration of troops and armaments, conventional as well as nuclear, and that it is there that the most powerful military blocs face one another.

Among this group of proposals, we believe priority should be given to nuclear disarmament. To that end, measures will have to be adopted for the conclusion of a convention by which States possessing nuclear-weapons would undertake never in any circumstances to use such weapons or to use force in general against non-nuclear weapon States. The convention would cover also renunciation by nuclear-weapon States of the emplacement of new nuclear weapons on the territories of other States; cessation of the perfecting and production of nuclear weapons; cessation of the production of fissile materials for military purposes; the gradual reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and means of delivering them until their final elimination; and negotiation of an agreement on the total prohibition of nuclear weapons.

We attach particular importance to the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones of peace and international co-operation, reinforced by guarantees on the part of States possessing nuclear-weapons that they will under no circumstances ever use such weapons against States belonging to such zones, and that they will ensure free access by those States to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. It is in this context that the Romanian Government has reaffirmed its proposal to turn the region of the Balkans - to which Romania belongs - into a zone of peace, co-operation and good neighbourliness, free of nuclear weapons, military bases or foreign troops. Such a measure would be a major contribution to the achievement of security in Europe and in the world as a whole.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

All the measures submitted on the instructions of the President of the Republic by the Prime Minister of the Romanian Government in the course of the special session are, as representatives know, contained in detail among the documents mentioned in paragraph 125 of the Final Document. We wish to state the firm determination of the Romanian Government to strive, at all times and in every forum in which Romania participates, to ensure that the proposals for concrete measures advanced by various States, including Romania, at the special session shall be the basis for negotiations on disarmament.

The basic findings of that session were that mankind today is confronted by an unprecedented threat of self-destruction; that the accumulations of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, far from strengthening international security, only weaken it; that international peace and security cannot be based on the accumulation of weapons and military alliances; that the hundreds of billions of dollars wasted every year on the manufacture or improvement of weapons are in sombre and dramatic contrast with the want and poverty that are the lot of two-thirds of the world's population; that the arms race is flagrantly incompatible with the achievement of a New International Economic Order based on justice, equity and co-operation; that the resources made available as a result of disarmament measures must be devoted to the well being of peoples, and in the first place of the peoples of the developing countries.

Now that, as the Final Document concludes, disarmament has become an imperative and particularly urgent task of the international community, that conclusion must underlie all our actions, in every vote that we cast in the various organs set up by the United Nations for debate and negotiation.

Firm action in the disarmament field is inseparable from the improvement in world-wide political relations, from the strengthening of trust among States and from the consolidation of international détente. That is why it is necessary for a resolute attitude towards disarmament problems to be coupled with action aimed at strengthening the United Nations ability to facilitate, through appropriate international machinery and instruments, the settlement by exclusively peaceful means of all disputes and problems arising in inter-State relations.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

It is in that spirit that Romania has proposed the conclusion of an international agreement whereby all States would commit themselves to settling their disputes exclusively by political and peaceful means, and through negotiations among the parties concerned. My country has also suggested the creation of an organ of good offices and conciliation subordinate to the General Assembly.

It is to the credit of the special session that it succeeded in defining a new and unitary concept of disarmament and in establishing new machinery for debate and negotiation. As stated in the Final Document:

"Although the decisive factor for achieving real measures of disarmament is the 'political will' of States, and especially of those possessing nuclear weapons, a significant role can also be played by the effective functioning of an appropriate international machinery designed to deal with the problems of disarmament in its various aspects."

(A/RES/S-10-2, para. 10)

The special session expressed justified doubts regarding the value of the old international machinery to deal with problems of disarmament, during the life of which military expenditures have reached the astronomical figure of \$400 billion.

It is imperative at this stage to make full use of the new institutional, more democratic framework which has been placed at our disposal by the special session and which promises to enable us to tackle disarmament problems in a new and more effective way. The new principles for negotiation and the machinery in the field of disarmament set up by the special session flow from the concept that lay at the basis of its work, according to which, disarmament being of universal importance, all States have the right and the duty to participate in its achievement.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

A subject of such far-reaching implications as disarmament - and particularly nuclear disarmament, in which all States are vitally interested - cannot be dealt with unilaterally, bilaterally or by limited groups. To achieve lasting, equitable and generally acceptable solutions, it is absolutely necessary for all States to participate in the solution of disarmament problems on a footing of absolute equality. Every people has the right to security and peace. That amply justifies the right of all States to participate in mankind's efforts to solve the problems of disarmament. By virtue of its universal nature the United Nations provides the most adequate framework to that end. Hence it is necessary for the United Nations to take a more active and effective part in the promotion and implementation of disarmament measures, in the debate on these matters and in the formulation of recommendations and the pinpointing of solutions with a view to taking concrete measures, and in the co-ordination and mobilization of efforts undertaken in the field of disarmament.

We believe it particularly important at this time to create conditions for setting the disarmament machinery in motion, bearing fully in mind the political conditions and spirit that prevailed during the preparation of the Final Document of the special session. According to that document, the organs that constitute the new machinery have well defined functions, complement one another and are mutually supportive in their activities.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

From this it would flow that the tendency to stress the autonomy of one organ or another is not justified. The effort to retain certain practices and procedures that belong to the old machinery must lead to tergiversations and a loss of impetus in the achievement of concrete results.

As far as the recently constituted Disarmament Commission is concerned, we should like to stress the need for all States to show a constructive attitude and to help that body, which symbolizes the role that devolves upon the United Nations in disarmament, to fulfil the important tasks entrusted to it in the Final Document of the tenth special session.

In accordance with the spirit underlying the Final Document, the Disarmament Commission is called upon to work as a specialized body of the United Nations in matters of disarmament and thus it is the only one of the organs that meet between the sessions of the General Assembly in which all States can participate, in order to discuss and examine more thoroughly the concrete aspects of disarmament and the means of implementation of the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly, and to recommend action to be taken in order to assist other bodies of the United Nations dealing with disarmament to fulfil their own duties.

As far as the organization of work is concerned, as well as the beginning of the functioning of the new Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, again effective respect for the criteria set forth in the special session regarding that body must be uppermost in the minds of all who work there. In this, we must bear in mind the flaws and deficiencies of the former Committee. In order to reflect all this in the elaboration of the proper instruments that are to be used by the Committee, we must bear in mind the rules of procedure and the agenda as well as the development of daily activities. From this standpoint the Committee on Disarmament will have to take rigorously into account the fact that it is being requested to contribute to the mobilization of the political will of all States, so that concrete disarmament measures can be drafted. That process presupposes debates

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

and negotiations which, in order to succeed, must be carried out within the organized framework of the Committee and not outside that framework, and with the participation at all stages of all States members, as well as other States concerned or interested. It is only thus that the Committee will be able to fulfil its mandate and become a true forum of understanding and harmonization of views. Furthermore, from the very outset it must be agreed that the new Committee must endorse the principle of absolute respect for the interests of all States and duly take into account the proposals and viewpoints expressed by each and every one of them. The consensus method to be used by the Committee in its activities is based on that principle, and it is for that reason that it should encourage concerted efforts carried out with patience and perseverance, in order to harmonize positions.

We believe it to be absolutely necessary for the organization of the activities of the Committee and the development of its work to be democratically based, thus allowing all members to participate in perfect equality. We must at the same time encourage the open participation of States not members of the Committee.

The basic task of the new machinery therefore lies in giving effect to those measures that were adopted at the special session and the proposals made by States during it, so that they can be included in specific agreements aimed at putting an end to the arms race and encouraging disarmament. According to the terms of the Final Document, the organs concerned are called upon periodically to report to the General Assembly on their implementation of their programmes of work. The next special session of the General Assembly to be devoted to disarmament - which we believe should take place at the latest in 1982 - will be called upon to weigh how those organs have been working, what results have been obtained and how closely they have in fact followed the spirit and the letter of that Final Document. Thus we also attach great importance to the widening of the research into and study of disarmament already undertaken by the United Nations. This is intended to give the necessary backing to those organs working in the field of disarmament, so that there may be effective and wise, as well as enlightened, participation on a world-wide basis in the achievement of disarmament. May we stress how seriously the

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

United Nations Centre for Disarmament has undertaken the fulfilment and co-ordination of that activity, and express the hope that that action will be followed up with equal tenacity.

Among the important decisions adopted at the special session, I believe that we should mention the preparation of a world programme for disarmament. That programme contains measures which, if applied in stages, should lead to general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The special session thus met one of the needs that had been felt for many years when it stressed the fact that reactivation of the efforts in the matter of disarmament necessarily implies an effort to organize action and to take an over-all view of the problem. Thirty odd years of experience in the field of negotiations on disarmament have made it obvious that the practice followed in the past, that is, the discussion of these matters in an incoherent and disparate way, was very disadvantageous and could not lead to the solution of the real problems created by the arms race and disarmament.

Romania has consistently favoured the establishment and the implementation of a world programme for disarmament, called for long ago by the United Nations as part of the Disarmament Decade. Therefore we were very gratified at the recent decision that the Disarmament Commission will in the course of its 1979 session give priority to the preparation of the elements of a world disarmament programme. We should like to believe that all States will make every effort to ensure that constructive results are achieved as soon as possible, with the participation of the greatest number of States possible, so that the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva can check the details and establish the final form of the programme. Romania intends to participate actively in the elaboration of that programme, considering it the prerequisite for an effective negotiation process. We believe that that programme should provide for a wide system of measures which organically will lead to the ultimate goal, namely, general and complete disarmament. With regard to the implementation of the programme itself, it will have to be carried out with the participation of all States, in accordance with specific conditions and possibilities.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

My country considers that the conclusion of agreements setting forth decisive measures to put an end to the arms race and to reduce the production of sophisticated nuclear and classic weapons, will have a particularly beneficial and positive effect on the world political climate, and it is for this reason that we believe efforts should be made to organize and undertake new action on an international footing to mobilize all States and all peoples in the achievement of disarmament. We believe that at the present international stage we have a good climate propitious to such an end. Nevertheless, we must act immediately to ensure the adoption of concrete measures, and the immediate applicability of those measures, thus stimulating and encouraging the process of stemming the arms race and creating the necessary conditions for increasingly substantial measures that will bring us closer to our ultimate target, which is still general and complete disarmament, and particularly nuclear disarmament.

Romania is convinced that in order to give effect to the recommendations and decisions of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly, it is more than ever necessary to intensify the united struggle of all Governments and all peoples, as well as of all progressive forces, to achieve concrete disarmament measures and particularly measures governing nuclear disarmament. An assessment at the international level of the situation in which we find ourselves and the formation of a more powerful current of world opinion in favour of disarmament could contribute greatly to this. In the formation of that opinion the United Nations is called upon to play an important role.

In making these remarks, Romania is expressing its conviction that the special session of the United Nations created the necessary premises for giving new content to international action in the field of disarmament. Now it will depend on our collective efforts whether those premises become a reality or not.

As far as Romania is concerned, we are determined to act in the future, as in the past, with all the necessary resolution so that disarmament will be achieved in practice and so that mankind will once and for all be released from the heavy burden of military expenditure and the danger of nuclear war.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I am heartened to see in the Chair a son of Finland, a country that I have watched for many years, a country dedicated to peace, self-defence, independence and setting itself as an example to other small countries like ours. Therefore, I think it was one of the best choices made during this session that you, Sir, were elected to sit in the chair presiding over our deliberations on how to achieve peace through disarmament.

I must also congratulate the Committee on its other officers - the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur, and also, without naming them, the gentlemen sitting on your left and the new gentleman whom we have come to know, sitting on your right. I also see the Swedish gentleman who is interested in peace and who is trying to elaborate certain things with me privately - though not secretly - on how to achieve our goals.

Having participated in the work of the special session devoted to disarmament and read a statement on behalf of my Government, I do not wish to be repetitious. I had occasion to delve into the resolution which was passed on 13 July and also the report which is divided into an Introduction, a Declaration, a Programme of Action and a section on Machinery, and I want to be very frank and objective - as far as it is in my capacity to be objective - and not subjective, because this question of war and peace is a momentous one.

I listened very carefully to some of those in the seat of power who addressed the special session, including the French President and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom - I do not wish to enumerate lest I perhaps forget some - Mr. Trudeau who came from Canada and others such as Mr. Gromyko who, being a member of the Politburo is no doubt also in the seat of power. I was wondering whether we could accelerate the process of disarmament. I would have preferred a different term, perhaps "reducing armament" rather than "disarmament". The question of whether we are able to disarm within a short time - of course, not in my lifetime - is a big one. In most committees there are young people. Even in this Committee there are some young people, and perhaps their generation will succeed where my generation has failed, and consistently failed.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

For, let us not lose sight of the fact that had it not been for the deterrence of nuclear weapons we would have had a third world war. And notwithstanding what I have just said, if we took the conflicts that have occurred since 1945, and the sum total of the devastation, the calamities, the tragedies, the loss of life and the maimed, I think we would have more than a world war. But a future war in which there would be confrontation between the nuclear Powers not only would be calamitous but would bring this world to an end. It would be better to be brought to an end.

That is why I said to many of my friends, not in jest but seriously, that perhaps the creator - I am not talking theologically, but of nature or some other force - that experimented with man is greatly disappointed. Man who calls himself homo sapiens has quite often proved to be homo stupidus. Perhaps the creator is looking for another planet where perchance he can create a better species.

But I am not talking of the man in the street, the apolitical man, I am talking of those who assume the responsibility for their people. I am talking of the leaders. Sometimes they are alleged leaders, but they have power and are in the seat of power. Have they had a new approach since the First World War? Allegedly the First World War was to save the world for democracy. The drums were beaten, the bugles were blown and the flags of every nation were hoisted, and the people went to pray in churches in the name of Jesus, the messenger of love. And the next day cut each other's throats. Religion lost its credibility. Then came ideology. It began with Voltaire and Jean-Jacques Rousseau and others. We Arabs had the Karamita and others before Europe was civilized. The European civilization came from Asia but then we regressed and the Europeans made advances from which we are ready to benefit. And we are ready to benefit from the Americans, of course; America is an offshoot of Europe, parenthetically speaking.

What have they achieved? Saving the world for democracy? What democracy? A democracy which is quite often reduced to democracy by subscription and contribution? The one who pays the piper calls the tune. The one who pays in order to have certain representatives campaign - call it what you want - can then be compensated. What is the alternative? I am not talking about whether one ideology is superior to another. I am saying the war was not fought to

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

save the world for democracy. Nor was it against German militarism, because the biggest military Power at that time - and that can be borne out by historians - was France. Who was the biggest naval Power? Britain. Of course, after Bismarck unified Germany the Germans wanted to be as strong if not stronger than the others. I am not currying favour or criticizing anybody, but it was against German mercantilism because the Germans came late on the scene to grab what were called "colonies" and what happened was that with their known self-discipline, they became a strong industrial Power and our British friends were afraid that they would make incursions into Britain's markets in India. They were especially worried on account of the Kaiser and the Baghdad-Berlin railroad at the close of the century. I too would have been worried. They had markets there. Also the Germans had also made incursions into Latin American markets. The cause was economic. It was not so much about becoming powerful, and they did care much about money - like Julius Caesar, who in the end thought he was a god, which is why Brutus and Cassius put an end to him.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

No, it was a matter of economics, The victors of the First World War, unwittingly, unintentionally sowed the seeds of the Second World War. I do not have to lecture on history here. We are talking about disarmament, but the motivation of wars is wrong from beginning to end. So-called leaders have to give people a motivation in order for them to march like sheep to the slaughterhouse, and they often succeed because of the psychology of the masses.

Who enlightened me on this when I was a young man? None other than the French author Gustave Lebon in La psychologic des foules. I recommend it to every one sitting in this Committee, to see how emotions can be aroused and people can be marshalled and made to kill and get killed. For what? To save the world for democracy? To go and create Danzig on the Baltic, make a Polish corridor?

I was in London when the British told Beck not to accept any offer from Hitler to swap territories. People forget about that. Hitler of course was a tyrant but the others, belonging to the democracies, were they any the less tyrants? Overnight, Dresden was destroyed, although it was not a military target. By whom? By the Germans? It happens to be a German town. And then there were Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I was in mid-ocean returning from San Francisco, when we read on the Queen Mary on 6 or 7 August about that.

Hitler killed people by the dozen, by the hundred, wholesale. I am not holding a brief for any of those so-called leaders and I am sure they hypnotized themselves and thought they were doing the right thing.

Have we made progress since then? Through the United Nations? Of course we have made progress. We are laying the foundation, but it is taking a long time to wake up and not unwittingly to mislead our peoples so that they fall in the same trap as in the past. I mentioned those two world wars. But we, the Arabs, have also had wars in our own area that were unjust. It is in our history, in Asia, everywhere. But we cannot any longer afford such an approach to international affairs because it will not do. Distances have shrunk. We have to deal with one another globally nowadays, and I must here raise my hat - to use a common phrase - to none other than Mr. García Robles and Mr. Ortiz de Rozas who for many years have dedicated themselves to the Organization.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

I am so happy they belong to small countries because they can be objective. Many other small countries have participated too. We do not want those who exercise world power to say to themselves and to the hierarchy around them, "Let those small Powers talk". Each one will say our caravan is marching - let the dogs bark. We do not want to be reduced to barking dogs here at the United Nations because the United Nations is our only salvation.

I checked with both my good friends, Mr. García Robles and Mr. Ortiz de Rozas and I envied them their optimism and I hope it will be infectious so that I may become an optimist like them, but we should not be beguiled by words, by resolutions. Concerning the programme for action, I remember what Mr. Callaghan said, and he was realistic in his speech. He said that perhaps after three years we will resume our deliberations on this question. Three years! Things happen now in one year that used to take 50 years to happen. This step-by-step diplomacy - these are words to mislead us. We need action and not only words. We need goodwill and not machinery. When I speak I stand to be corrected, but they keep silent because they have to clear things with their respective Governments. The Soviet Union and the Americans about this SALT business say they do not care any more because they have more advanced weapons. We are false witnesses here.

This brings me to what I mentioned in my speech during the special session. I gave a programme of 10 points and I said I had no monopoly on innovative ideas. Among other things I said that mothers should be consulted before any war is waged, unless it is strictly for self-defence, for it is the mothers who gave us life, gave man his mentality. War is passé, fini. We should have more women in the higher echelons of the defence ministries. We should have innovative things. I thought that the United Nations could make a film drawing on the archives of two world wars and other wars. I can find people and foundations to finance it, so that it may be shown in schools and on television and so that by chance it may become a deterrent and the so-called leaders will think a hundred times before they embark on any policy that may involve us in war.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

These are perhaps far-fetched idealistic ideas. I have other ideas but I am not going to rehash my speech. It is on record. It is not that I have a monopoly on ideas, as I said. I want every one of us to find a new approach to international affairs, but first to national affairs. The reason I say this is that every Government is under pressure from certain groups. In the capitalist world it is under pressure, depending on the party in power, from business or from trade unions, and politicians are like chameleons. They have to adapt and adjust, otherwise they would not stay in power. No doubt in the socialist countries, which I have not visited since before they became so-called socialist, I believe there must be pressure groups. They do not tell us so, but I am sure that there must be some pressure groups - the technocrats, the élite. Do you think the socialist countries are all like sheep? Some of them have dachas and others have cars and at least the Government pays the expenses. It is not as in the capitalist world through taxation - socialism by attrition, I call it.

Let us be frank. I can be frank. How many years will I live? I am 73. Tomorrow I may not be with you, a couple of years and then I will be gone. But I hope my words will have planted seeds amongst the young which will germinate for peace, for our children and grandchildren, no matter where they hail from, no matter what continent they are on, no matter what colour they are or what religion they happen to belong to.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

Therefore, perhaps there should be a new approach by the Committee. We should all - Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Mr. Garcia Robles and others who are with them - impress on our leaders the need for the dedication to peace that we should have here in the United Nations. We should tell them that they should not smile in each other's faces while their intelligence agencies are subverting one another's countries. As I once said, when he was in Moscow the President of the United States was no doubt feasted on caviar and vodka. I do not know how much vodka he drank, but I know that caviar is delicious. I like it. If Russian leaders - Mr. Kosygin, Mr. Kuznetsov or Mr. Brezhnev, though he has never yet gone to Washington - visit Washington, they are feasted on bourbon and roast beef. The leaders smile at each other, but what are the CIA and the KGB doing? In fairness to them, I should also ask what is being done by the intelligence agencies of smaller States, which ape the larger Powers.

If we did something on a personal basis, we should be called traitors, but in politics it is permissible. That is the old approach. Politics is not a science. The only sciences are the pure sciences, such as chemistry, physics and geometry. Politics should be the art of harmonizing interests at the international level.

I began my speech by emphasizing the economic factor. I have said time and again that politics revolve around economics. If we can develop the art of harmonizing interests at the international level, we may be getting somewhere in establishing peace.

But how are we to find the machinery while those with the wherewithal to invent new arms worse than anything we hear of are doing so surreptitiously? Do they want us to be false witnesses here?

Everyone should have the courage courteously to tell his Government, his leaders, that that approach is finished. We must have a new approach.

Those are my remarks about our accomplishment in having perhaps evoked new ideas in the special session. We are here to pronounce on that special session. I have dreamed of the opportunity to talk en famille, as the saying is. I hope that everyone will talk en famille, because we diplomats have developed a camaraderie amongst ourselves.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

I do not care what is the ideology of any one of my colleagues. I do not care whether he is Communist or capitalist; we are friends. Instead of our always receiving instructions from those in the seats of power, I wish that they would listen to some sages that we have in our midst. I am not a sage, but there are sages amongst us.

I am an activist for peace. I might be a little vehement, but there are many here who can tell our Governments, regardless of their ideology, that they should adopt a new approach if we expect finally to establish peace on this planet.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.