

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 847th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 21 November 1962,
at 10.40 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 35:</i>	
<i>Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):</i>	
(f) <i>Decentralization of the economic and social activities of the United Nations and strengthening of the regional economic commissions</i>	
<i>Consideration of the joint draft resolution (continued)</i>	305
<i>Agenda items 33 and 94:</i>	
<i>Economic and social consequences of disarmament: report of the Secretary-General transmitting the study of the group of expert consultants appointed under General Assembly resolution 1516 (XV) (continued)</i>	306
<i>Economic programme for disarmament (continued)</i>	

Chairman: Mr. Bohdan LEWANDOWSKI
(Poland).

AGENDA ITEM 35

Economic development of under-developed countries (A/5220) (continued):

(f) **Decentralization of the economic and social activities of the United Nations and strengthening of the regional economic commissions (A/5196, A/C.2/L.653 and Add.1 and 2, E/3643)**

CONSIDERATION OF THE JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/C.2/L.653 AND ADD.1 AND 2) (continued)

1. Mr. BOLT (New Zealand) said that the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.661/Rev.1 appreciated the objectives of the draft resolution before the Committee (A/C.2/L.653 and Add.1 and 2) but felt that in some places its wording was so condensed that it omitted an essential aspect of the policy of decentralization, namely, the preservation of the central functions of the United Nations which, if it was to operate effectively, must maintain a balance between delegated powers and the powers of the centre. Final responsibility must reside at the centre, but greater effectiveness could be achieved by the delegation of operational responsibilities. The point of balance could be ascertained only in the light of the experience of the detailed workings of the Organization as a whole. Thus, there should be no conflict between the two functions. Furthermore, it was reasonable that there should be some method of regularly reviewing the balance of responsibility between the periphery and the centre in order to ensure optimum results.

2. Since the General Assembly had considered the matter at its sixteenth session, the Secretary-General

had submitted two reports (E/3643 and A/5196) to which reference should be made; on the other hand, there was no purpose to be served by referring to earlier documents, since that would merely reopen the whole history of the subject.

3. The first amendment proposed to replace the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution by three new paragraphs. The first of those paragraphs was a more accurate reflection of the statement in paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's report (A/5196); that paragraph did not say that the policy of decentralization was being pursued increasingly in the direction of country projects but rather that the Secretary-General, in the preparation of the 1963-1964 programme of technical assistance activities, had provided for the delegation of responsibility to the regional secretariats with respect to the implementation not only of regional but also of some country projects, as well as some Special Fund projects. In other words, that paragraph referred to technical assistance projects and their implementation. The reference to the part to be played by the regional economic commissions in the implementation of country projects raised two questions. The first was the relationship between regional and country projects within the regional commissions; it was therefore necessary to recall that paragraph 6 of the Secretary-General's earlier report (E/3643) pointed out that the regional commissions could play a useful part in the implementation of country projects but that it was to regional projects at the phases of conception and implementation that they made their main contribution. The second paragraph proposed in the first amendment reproduced the wording of that paragraph. Secondly, the very fact that the regional commissions were henceforth to play a responsible role in the implementation of country projects might raise doubts in the minds of some of the recipient countries concerning whether there would be any change in the accepted principle that they should have complete freedom of choice concerning country projects. In order to set such doubts at rest, the third proposed paragraph recalled the statement made by the Secretary-General in paragraph 8 of document E/3643 to the effect that, in the case of country projects, countries receiving aid should have free choice of programmes and projects and that country programmes should be drawn up by the requesting Governments in consultation with the resident representatives of the Technical Assistance Board.

4. The sponsors of the amendments believed that in reaffirming the existing policy regarding decentralization, it would be useful to recall that the purpose of that policy was to improve the efficiency of the United Nations as a whole. They also considered that both aspects of that policy, namely, the maintenance of central functions on the one hand and the strengthening of regional economic commissions on the other, should receive due emphasis. They were therefore proposing

that operative paragraph 1 should be replaced by two paragraphs, the first of which would emphasize that by reproducing the wording used in paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 1709 (XVI). In proposing that amendment, the sponsors were merely reaffirming the established policy in an effort to maintain a balance which had already been recognized as desirable. The purpose of the proposed new paragraph 2 was to take into account the position of those countries which did not belong to any regional economic commission, as resolution 1709 (XVI) had done, or of those countries which belonged to different regional divisions within different specialized agencies. Although all countries were represented at Headquarters, it should be remembered that a number of countries within the area of the various regional economic commissions did not have diplomatic representation at regional headquarters.

5. His delegation hoped that, since the amendments were not contentious, the sponsors of the draft resolution would be able to incorporate them in their draft.

6. Mr. TOMEH (Syria) said that, in view of the fact that the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted the amendment submitted by his delegation and four others (A/C.2/L.661), he would withdraw it. That amendment had been submitted in order to draw attention to the position of States that were not members of any regional economic commission. The States of the Middle East, for example, were not members of any regional commission, and the Middle East Studies Section of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs was being deprived of professional manpower and had shrunk in size and responsibility. The Committee's attention had been drawn to that state of affairs by the Iraqi representative on 20 October 1961 (728th meeting), by the Jordanian representative in the Economic and Social Council on 13 July 1961 (1162nd meeting) and by the Saudi Arabian representative in the general debate in the Committee at the current session (821st meeting). While the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs had replied to the Jordanian representative before the Council on 6 July 1962 (1213th meeting), his delegation had not as yet been informed of the specific measures that had been taken in connexion with the administrative and functional reorganization of that section in order to give it operational and substantive responsibility. Such reorganization would greatly contribute to the balanced economic and social development of the region.

7. Mr. EL BANNA (United Arab Republic) welcomed the draft resolution since it reaffirmed various General Assembly and Economic and Social Council resolutions. In carrying out United Nations activities, the regional economic commissions should be used to the fullest since they were best acquainted with the particular problems of the regions concerned. That would in no way derogate from the multilateral character of the United Nations. It was only by strengthening the operational role of the regional economic commissions that it would be possible in practice to carry out the policy enunciated in those resolutions.

8. His delegation had submitted an amendment (A/C.2/L.681) because it thought that regular meetings between the Secretary-General and the executive secretaries of the regional economic commissions would provide a good opportunity for the discussion of matters of common interest and for the exchange of experience. Such meetings, which had already taken place on various occasions, should be put on a formal

and institutional basis. That amendment was also in line with paragraph 3 of resolution 1518 (XV) and paragraph 9 of resolution 1709 (XVI) of the General Assembly.

9. Mr. MARAMIS (Indonesia) said that the purpose of the first two five-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.682) was to amplify the preamble of the draft resolution by references to the Secretary-General's policy in regard to decentralization. In the first amendment, the sponsors endorsed the Secretary-General's approach because they thought that the regional economic commissions, because of their familiarity with the problems of the region, were particularly well placed to give advice to Governments and that it was essential to include in the draft a statement of objectives. The second amendment concerned the crux of the matter, namely, the allocation of responsibility between Headquarters and the regional secretariats. The purpose of the third amendment was to request the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to give more thorough consideration to the matter and to take account of the views of the executive secretaries of the regional economic commissions, because it was difficult at Headquarters to determine needs in the field and because the executive secretaries were in the best position to judge how the regional economic commissions could be of service to the countries in their regions. The Advisory Committee was also asked to take account of the definition of decentralization given in item 2, part A, paragraph 12, of the report which the Secretary-General had submitted on that question to the sixteenth session of the General Assembly (A/4911). The fourth amendment was intended to make paragraph 3 of the draft resolution more specific. Since the Secretary-General had said that decentralization was a continuing process, the sponsors were asking for a report on the progress made in implementing that policy and on the extent to which the fifteen practical measures listed in paragraph 12, part B, of document A/4911 were being carried out.

10. Mr. MALHOTRA (Nepal) said that, while the sponsors of the draft resolution agreed with the idea of the Syrian amendment (A/C.2/L.661), they could not accept the amendment itself because it had been superseded by document A/C.2/L.661/Rev.1. He also wondered whether the original amendment did not conflict with the new paragraph 2 proposed in the revised text, which covered the same point.

11. Mr. TOMEH (Syria) said that, in view of the technical difficulty referred to by the Nepalese representative, he would reintroduce his amendments under a different symbol.^{1/} There was no conflict between the original amendment and the new paragraph 2 proposed in the revised text, because the latter dealt with general policy, while the former dealt with the practical steps taken to implement it.

AGENDA ITEMS 33 AND 94

Economic and social consequences of disarmament: report of the Secretary-General transmitting the study of the group of expert consultants appointed under General Assembly resolution 1516 (XV) (A/5199; A/5203, chap. II; A/C.2/L.647 and Add.1; E/3593/Rev.1, E/3593/Add.1-5) (continued)

^{1/} Those amendments were later distributed under symbol A/C.2/L.685.

Economic programme for disarmament (A/C.2/L.646)
(continued)

12. Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia) said that his delegation's attitude toward the matter under discussion was based on three main convictions: first, the arms race was both burdensome and dangerous; secondly, the peoples of the world had accepted the principle of general and complete disarmament under proper international inspection; and, thirdly, general and complete disarmament was not an idle dream but a readily feasible proposition. The fact that the Consultative Group of experts appointed by the Secretary-General had reached unanimous conclusions in its study on the economic and social consequences of disarmament (E/3593/Rev.1) was highly significant and would have been impossible a few years before. The experts had refuted the argument that armaments were necessary to boost the economies of the industrialized countries. They had reached the realistic conclusion that all the problems and difficulties of transition connected with disarmament could be met by appropriate national and international measures. And they had affirmed that the present level of demand and of economic activity could be maintained in the event of disarmament.

13. The major Powers would have to spend a certain part of the savings accruing from disarmament on their own social requirements. In those countries, too, the demand for goods and services would increase. Nevertheless, a considerable portion of the resources released by disarmament could be used for the benefit of the under-developed countries. Such aid would enable them to save more foreign currency with which to purchase the capital goods they needed for their economic development. There would probably be an increase in private foreign investment and also in the demand for primary commodities. At the same time, large numbers of military personnel would be transferred to productive enterprises. As the experts had pointed out, the conversion following the Second World War had been a vaster undertaking than conversion to disarmament would be and had involved a much more rapid transfer of resources.

14. In short, the study of the experts was an extremely valuable document which had broken down the doctrinaire approach to the problem. It should receive the widest possible publicity.

15. Mr. KANYIKE (Uganda) said that in spite of the obvious benefits of disarmament, the arms race continued. Throughout history, military might had been applauded. But, in the modern world, respect should be accorded not to the so-called great Powers, which had amassed so many instruments of destruction, but to those countries—Scandinavian countries, for instance—which devoted their resources to economic and social progress. All the major military Powers could use the astronomical sums now wasted on armaments to improve the housing, education and health of their peoples. Even the military planners and the armaments magnates could not ignore the benefits that would accrue to mankind from a disarmament programme.

16. The small nations of the world must unite and condemn the great Powers for their refusal to disarm. Throughout history, all the big wars had been motivated chiefly by the desire for material gain, although the advocates of armaments always boasted that their aim was to defend the freedom of the smaller nations. In fact, they used the smaller nations for their own selfish ends. If they could divert the money saved by dis-

armament to economic and educational programmes, they would earn the eternal gratitude of mankind.

17. The study of the Consultative Group of experts revealed that world arms production and war preparations involved expenditure totalling more than \$100,000 million a year and absorbed more than 100 million of the most highly skilled workers. According to the World Federation of Scientific Workers, up to 70 per cent of the world's scientific personnel was engaged in military activities. The most technically advanced trades of modern industry were geared to war production. Resources had been withdrawn from productive work on an unprecedented scale and senselessly squandered.

18. Those resources could be put to constructive use in all countries, but particularly in the developing ones where more than half the world's population were starving. The millions of dollars wasted on armaments during the first half of the twentieth century would have provided the entire population of the earth with free food and could have provided comfortable dwellings for millions of families. His delegation could only agree with the conclusion of the experts that disarmament would have beneficial economic effects on all countries.

19. Uganda was so intent on putting its own house in order that it had no intention of attacking anybody or of joining in the armaments race. At the same time, African States must guard against the danger emanating from the southern tip of the continent. Uganda would whole-heartedly support any programme designed to bring about world disarmament.

20. Mr. PAREMSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) expressed satisfaction that the economic and social consequences of disarmament now occupied a prominent place in the Committee's agenda. A few years ago, the very mention of that problem had evoked a sceptical reaction. Thanks to the original sponsor of the item, the United Nations had taken a first step forward.

21. The arms race was causing increasing concern to all mankind. The world was faced with a choice between disarmament and a relentless march towards nuclear war. The problem was urgent. During a single session of the General Assembly, \$30,000 million was being spent on armaments. As each day went by, immense resources, which could be used for peaceful purposes, were being squandered. It was not just a question of finance. Millions of productive workers, scientists, engineers and other skilled technicians—were employed in military work. Enormous amounts of raw materials were being used to make armaments. At the same time, the needs for housing, health and educational facilities, especially in the under-developed countries, were enormous. Even if only a small part of the savings from disarmament was employed, results could be achieved in twenty-five years which would be unattainable in hundreds of years under present conditions.

22. Disarmament was not a panacea, but it would accelerate economic progress and the solution of political problems. The draft declaration submitted by the Soviet Union and followed by a draft resolution (A/C.2/L.646) contained a realistic outline of the manner in which disarmament savings could be used for a world programme of development. The study of the experts had dealt a decisive blow to those sceptics who had maintained that disarmament would spell

economic disaster. Only a few people benefited from the arms race. Their selfish motives were at complete variance with mankind's aspirations.

23. When the subject had first come up for discussion, some representatives had felt that it was too early to talk about the economic and social consequences of disarmament. But they had supported General Assembly resolution 1516 (XV) and now praised the study of the group of experts. What had at first appeared to be premature had turned out to be timely. Now that the Soviet Union advocated a further step forward, the same representatives renewed their objections and seemed to think that the United Nations should stand still. The consultations recommended by the Soviet Union represented a logical extension of the work already done and would lead to an accurate assessment of the real requirements of the under-developed countries. By the time disarmament was really achieved, the United Nations would be prepared to deal with the situation.

24. Mr. CHOCRON (Venezuela), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the eight-Power draft resolution said that they accepted the amendment of Nigeria and Pakistan (A/C.2/L.680). They wished to modify slightly the third preambular paragraph of the draft by replacing the words "to the real welfare of their people" by the words "to the welfare of mankind".

25. His delegation believed that the success of the United Nations Development Decade would depend not only on the collective action of the nations of the world, but also on the individual efforts made by each State to formulate appropriate development plans. Each Member of the United Nations should base its policy on the need to consider every possible line of action which would further the declared economic development objectives of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.

26. The study of the Consultative Group (E/3593/Rev.1) emphasized, in chapter 6, the volume of resources which disarmament would release for diversion to development aid. That aspect had been endorsed in the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, while the third preambular paragraph reaffirmed the view expressed by the Economic and Social Council in paragraph 2 of its resolution 891 (XXXIV). He hoped that the draft resolution would be supported by all the members of the Committee.

27. Mr. ALLANA (Pakistan) said that his delegation associated itself fully with the conclusion of the Consultative Group that the achievement of general and complete disarmament would be an unqualified blessing to all mankind. It attached considerable importance to the views expressed in paragraphs 137, 154 and 155 of the study. The latter opened up new vistas for humanity and was sure to have a far-reaching impact on the thinking of the Governments and peoples of the world.

28. The eight-Power draft resolution had the general support of his delegation and he welcomed the acceptance by its sponsors of amendment A/C.2/L.680. He wished also to suggest, for their consideration, the elimination of the particular emphasis which paragraph 3 of the draft placed on paragraph 6 of Council resolution 891 (XXXIV). It might be interpreted from the present wording that the other paragraphs of the Council's resolution were not approved or that greater weight was attached to paragraph 6. Paragraph 3 could perhaps be replaced by a paragraph reading "Further endorses Economic and Social Council resolution 891 (XXXIV)".

29. His delegation sympathized with the aims of the USSR proposal but, like some other delegations, believed that certain parts of that text might usefully be rephrased in order to make the proposal more acceptable to the Committee as a whole. It would, however, very much like to see the Committee adopt a common text incorporating the best elements of the eight-Power draft and of the USSR proposal. If the necessary goodwill was shown, a common text could be adopted by the General Assembly which would contribute much to achieving the goal of general and complete disarmament.

30. Pakistan stood to benefit immensely from disarmament since 3 per cent of its national income had to be devoted to defence purposes. Disarmament would free skilled manpower which was sorely needed for peaceful purposes in his country, many of whose problems could be solved by international development aid which world-wide disarmament might make possible. Many other countries were in the same position in that regard.

31. He had great sympathy for the very human approach to disarmament which the Syrian representative had shown in his statement (843rd meeting). The world was witnessing at the same time both unprecedented plenty and crushing poverty. In many countries, including his own, death from hunger was regarded as a far more immediate threat than nuclear destruction. To the poor of those nations, the East-West conflict meant nothing and the present expenditure on the nuclear arms race represented, in their eyes, the most senseless waste.

32. Some had suggested that it was Utopian to draw up ambitious plans for development and prosperity until disarmament had been achieved. Possibly they were right, but he believed that mankind, with its history of striving for its ideals, with its present capabilities and with its future potential, should unflinchingly continue its search for peace, no matter how vain that search might sometimes appear. Every possible effort should therefore be made which might contribute to the work of the United Nations to secure disarmament.

33. Mr. SAHLOUL (Sudan) hoped that the discussion would lead to the unanimous approval of a draft resolution on the economic and social consequences of disarmament, the adoption of which might contribute to disarmament itself. The subject was so permeated with politics and controversy that it might be thought that economists could contribute little to it. For that reason, the Consultative Group appointed by the Secretary-General was to be congratulated on its excellent study.

34. Some delegations had criticized the proposals contained in document A/C.2/L.646 as untimely or propaganda. His own delegation considered it to be a well-conceived proposal which could form the basis for more comprehensive studies in the future. The text might be rephrased, however, in order to make it more generally acceptable. He attached particular importance to the steps advocated in operative paragraph 3 of the USSR draft resolution. Those measures could well be taken without waiting for the successful outcome of the disarmament negotiations. There was no great difference in substance between the USSR proposal and the eight-Power draft resolution, although the latter outlined more practical action to be taken on the basis of the Consultative Group's study. He hoped that the two proposals could be combined in a single text acceptable to all delegations.

35. Mr. TEZEL (Turkey), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.647 and Add.1, said that they were sympathetic to the Pakistan representative's suggested amendment of operative paragraph 3 and would endeavour to modify their text

accordingly. The sponsors would also consider the possibility of making the change in operative paragraph 3 suggested by the Tunisian representative at the 844th meeting.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.