



---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 10TH 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-3556.

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.10  
23 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; A/C.1/33/L.1)

Mr. PALMA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The interest and participation of delegations in this debate indicate, in the view of my delegation, the importance assigned by the international community to the follow-up of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament.

It is not our purpose to draw up a balance-sheet of the results of that session; to some extent this has already been done - at least in part - when at the closure of that session we voiced our regret that there had been no basic achievements such as a general and express condemnation of the use of nuclear weapons as being contrary to the spirit and letter of the Charter of our Organization and a crime against humanity; or a formal, clear-cut guarantee that non-nuclear States would never be attacked with nuclear weapons. We voiced our regret also at the absence of a specific and binding commitment to reallocate to development part of the immense funds that are today poured into the arms race.

But we did express our satisfaction, on that occasion, at the progress made in other fields, among which we mentioned the revival of democratization implicit in the reorganization of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and, as Latin Americans, our special satisfaction at the recognition of the historic and exemplary initiatives contained in the Treaty of Tlatelolco and in the Declaration of Ayacucho, not to mention the conciliatory effort made by the representatives of Argentina and Mexico.

It was our opinion then, as it is now, that the agreement reached on adopting the Final Document by consensus should be considered as a first step in the right direction, and that it was the common hope of mankind that

(Mr. Palma, Peru)

the process would speed up and become dynamic, in keeping with mankind's justified hopes for peace and security. Hence it is very pertinent that this item be added to the agenda of this and forthcoming sessions of the General Assembly in order to allow us to keep under continuing review the implementation of the resolutions and decisions of the special session, evaluating its progress and, where called for, pointing out additional action that should be taken to ensure that the impetus created during the historic June meetings shall not be consigned to oblivion, and that disappointment over obvious flaws shall lead not to a standstill but, rather, to renewed efforts.

We do not believe it indispensable to refer to all the many questions that might be included within the concept of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, and hence I shall take just a few that seem to me of the greatest significance.

I would begin by touching upon what so many delegations have stressed as one of the most positive achievements of the Final Document: namely, the restructuring of the disarmament machinery, which we consider one of the most promising aspects, for when it gets under way it will be one of the best omens for our future work.

The reconstituted Disarmament Commission serves as an emphatic reaffirmation of the deliberative function and central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. Under the dynamic chairmanship of the representative of India, Ambassador Vellodi, an organizational session was held, to be followed up by a first substantive stage of work in May 1979. It has already shown the interest of the Members of the Organization in the work of the deliberative body.

The function of that organ, of course, is not to duplicate the work of this First Committee of the General Assembly but, rather, to give priority consideration to the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme and other items referred to it by the General Assembly, and in particular, within the wide mandate entrusted to it, to make a thorough examination of many of the interesting proposals contained in paragraph 125 of the Final

(Mr. Palma, Peru)

Document. In this connexion, it would be very helpful if the General Assembly could lay down at this session guidelines regarding priorities to be attached to the different tasks of the Commission.

Furthermore, the forthcoming start of the work of a negotiating organ in Geneva - with a system of rotating chairmanship and a changed membership, a body open to the participation of all nuclear Powers, but one in which States that are not among its members can and should make effective contributions - is something on which the international community is pinning great hopes. We are gratified that France has promised to attend the meetings of the Disarmament Committee, and we echo the hopes of many delegations that the People's Republic of China also will occupy its rightful place in that Committee. As members ourselves, we reiterate our decision to continue our active contribution to the success of its work.

The question of putting an end to nuclear-weapons tests, regardless of the environment in which they are conducted, has occupied our attention for a long time and has prompted repeated statements on the part of the international community. Similarly, the conclusion of an agreement on strategic arms limitation between the United States and the Soviet Union has received deserved attention, prompting a number of appeals to both countries for a satisfactory and rapid end to those talks.

We are told that this should come in the near future. Unfortunately, similar announcements have been made on the past occasions. The special session of the General Assembly might have been the best occasion of all. Therefore, my delegation is of the opinion that the present session should speak out clearly on these matters, and we would express our determination to support proposals relating to them, including the proposal on the declaration of a moratorium on all nuclear-weapons testing, which doubtless will be supported also by the vast majority of Members of our Organization.

We might make similar remarks concerning the drawing up of a treaty on the elimination of chemical weapons. We would appreciate some information regarding the approximate date on which current efforts might be concluded.

(Mr. Palma, Peru)

We have already received the Secretary-General's preliminary report on the important question of studies and fellowships. In our view, before we can make a final pronouncement on this, we will have to await the issuance of the supplementary report, which will contain the opinions of the group of eminent persons named to advise the Secretary-General in that task. However, we can say here and now that, if a flexible and practical criterion is used, and if we also recognize the significance of the studies already commissioned, we believe that the time may well have come to call for authorized guidelines, such as those which might be issued by the group of eminent persons, to assist us in adopting appropriate decisions on priorities, links between one subject and the other, and so on.

With regard to disarmament fellowships, we share the views expressed here by the delegation of Nigeria.

(Mr. Palma, Peru)

With regard to the convening of the next special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, my delegation believes that 1981 would be an appropriate date. We believe that by then the most urgent conceptual and programmatic provisions of the Final Document will have begun to be implemented and that the situation will have to be reviewed again and measures adopted, including the consideration of a comprehensive disarmament programme, that will help us to mobilize our efforts which, by then, should be directed at achieving the stated goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): What can a small developing country void of arms, natural resources, defence force or any military establishment expect to contribute or gain from participation in a question as highly sophisticated, political and technical as that of disarmament? Can small developing States enter into any meaningful discussions with super-Powers or even nuclear and near-nuclear States when universal and complete disarmament is the main topic under consideration? Those are questions that are posed - by sceptics, perhaps - inside and outside this international body. The Bahamas delegation does not propose to try to answer any of those questions directly but, rather, to share with the representatives assembled here a few ideas that convinced my delegation that the entire exercise of the special session was very meaningful.

It was in 1976 - and mostly for geographical reasons - that the Bahamas Government began to take more than a cursory glance at matters relating to disarmament. It was at a time when plans were being laid in regional groups to set up a preparatory committee to act as a forerunner to the convening of a special session devoted to disarmament. During the involved and often controversial debates, were it not for the unselfish and skilful leadership of Ambassador Ortiz de Rozas and later the co-operation of the several chairmen of the working groups, the dream of the special session may not have become a reality.



(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

The special session on disarmament has, among other accomplishments, caused noted leaders of the world to assemble here for the sole purpose of espousing progress in the field of disarmament; secondly, it evoked greater efforts to early agreement of SALT II and possibly the beginning of a SALT III agreement - the representatives from both parties referred to the former in positive terms; thirdly, it agreed to adopt a final document by consensus, despite reservations by some Member States; fourthly, it expanded the Committee on Disarmament and established a Commission which would act as a deliberative body of the General Assembly; fifthly, it made it possible for non-governmental organizations and research institutes to contribute to the debate; and, sixthly, it elicited recommendations for special observances and additional sessions on disarmament.

The following three references that I am going to make here paint a picture of the nebulosity of peace initiatives.

First, in 1961, a paragraph in Mr. Adlai Stevenson's statement to the First Committee goes like this:

"We do not hold the vision of a world without conflict. We do hold the vision of a world without war - and this inevitably requires an alternative system for coping with conflict."

The second one is, in 1964 a little girl said it more simply when asked to define "peace": "Peace is when I am not fighting with my sister."

The third point is that Mr. Robert Johansen, in a brochure called "Toward a dependable peace", declared in 1978:

"We can no longer escape an alarming fact of life. The global arms build-up is out of control. At the present time, nobody can regulate it. No one can anticipate the human consequences of new weapons technology rapidly being deployed by the militarily strong and spreading soon thereafter to many Governments."

Those three different, yet similar, statements were made over a period of 17 years. During that time there have been many universal and national conflicts and crises which could cause many today to agree with Mr. Johansen that the situation is hopeless. Yet, on the other hand, as Mr. Stevenson pointed out, efforts have to be made to find an alternative system for coping with conflict.

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

The special session on disarmament was one alternative which exemplified what could be done once the fighting stops. By adopting a negative attitude to the whole question we are inviting chaos. My delegation is convinced that the question of disarmament is a matter that concerns and affects the universe as far as mankind is found, and the more the issue is brought to the awareness of everybody the better the chances for success. Every action taken on a bilateral, multilateral or regional basis is a boost to eventual solution. That is one of the reasons why the Bahamas Government supports the mandate for the establishment of weapon-free zones in strategic areas of the globe.

My delegation believes that although the super-Powers and nuclear-weapon States have the monopoly over arsenals and capability for detonating or testing nuclear weapons, small developing States - as preposterous as it may seem - have the responsibility of bringing greater pressure to bear in order that proliferation may be stopped, build-up slowed down and an appreciable form of complete disarmament implemented. I say "appreciable", for even though my delegation does not fully comprehend the concept, it sees some merit in developing experiments for peaceful means and, more importantly, holding reserves for national security and protection. Similarly, my delegation is aware that these very examples could be prostituted for self-aggrandizement and abused as well.

With regard to the draft convention on security of non-nuclear States, submitted by the Soviet Union, my delegation at face value sees some merit to the document, especially if it is to be combined with other safeguard measures. However, my Government has not yet studied the proposal in depth and may wish to comment at a more appropriate time.

Turning to another phase, I refer again to a quotation from Mr. William Epstein who, in his work entitled "Last Chance", emphasizes the aspect of fear of annihilation if complete disarmament is not achieved. I need not comment on that, since I am sure that the Powers are well aware of the destruction that can come from the proliferation of arms and the use of nuclear weapons. Rather, what is needed is communication on how best to deal with this threat and to express the desire or political will - as that



(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

seems to be the new terminology nowadays - that all States would agree on a viable plan of action for the implementation of what is to be considered general and complete disarmament.

The special session on disarmament has laid the foundation. Through long hours of negotiations Member States have expressed their concerns. Many small developing States were as active as the industrialized countries, and their combined co-operation left a sense of optimism and realism which could imply that the world is a step nearer the goal of disarmament. But much more remains to be achieved through the same concerted efforts shown at the last special session on disarmament.

The Bahamas delegation welcomes the guidelines outlined in the four sections of the Final Document. The contents may not be so letter perfect as to produce total accord, but each one points to the fact that there must be total participation if those measures are to achieve constructive implementation.

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

With regard to the initiatives of the Nigerian Government, my delegation commends the guidelines for the United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament which appears in the Secretary-General's report contained in document A/33/305. Full and early implementation of these guidelines would help to give the developing countries a sense of belonging - a feeling that we are getting into the main stream of the disarmament issues and can negotiate on a more nearly equal basis.

Similarly, the Bahamas delegation views the approach in paragraphs 8 and 9 of document A/33/312, issued by the Secretary-General, as an additional incentive for creating greater awareness. However, there are some areas in which my delegation would have wished to see greater progress; one of these is expenditure on arms development versus economic and social growth in developing countries.

Even at the risk of weakening the impact through repetition, once again my delegation must point to the same tired references to the evidence of pockets of starvation, disease and malnutrition in areas all over the world while billions are being spent on the accumulation of arsenals that could destroy all mankind in seconds. There can be no denying that denuclearization and arms reduction would help to lessen the threat of aggression and stabilize the maintenance of universal peace and security. Everyone concurs in this point of view. A perfect example of having eyes and not seeing, or ears and not hearing is to be found in the situation in southern Africa and the Middle East where there seems to be a feeling of pessimism that at this stage no peaceful solution can be reached. A sad indictment, indeed, of the civilized world. However, if the machinery is not available, then it cannot be used. It is as simple as that. But oftentimes in our deliberations, it seems that the more simple the matter, the more complicated it becomes.

Along similar lines, issues such as human rights, apartheid, racial discrimination and economic questions to which this body has been giving constant attention since its birth are all extensions of the problem of military build-up. None of these can be studied properly in isolation. Consequently we have, if nothing else, a moral obligation to effect a solution

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

of that issue. Naturally, a great responsibility lies with the "haves", that is, the super-Powers, but the "have-nots" cannot be excluded if agreements and settlements are to be made in the interest of mankind.

Here again, my delegation is convinced that the special session on disarmament has begun to clarify the dilemma, and it is hoped that the momentum can be maintained. Needless to say, if nuclear States refuse to realize that preparation for the annihilation of imagined or real adversaries would include the destruction of all mankind, then nothing but the truth will serve. God forbid that we be put to the test.

Finally, there are a number of suggestions and recommendations by Member States which are not included in the Final Document and perhaps if these are aired for further consideration, there could be some agreement about updating the data contained in the present document.

Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): In only the short period of little more than three months since the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament concluded its work it has not yet been possible for Member States to complete a careful and thorough study and appraisal of all the interesting and valuable ideas and proposals which were put forward there and to draw all the necessary conclusions from them. This must remain our constant task in the years to come.

After these preliminary remarks, I now wish to give some thought to the lessons offered and the tasks ahead.

Let me first point out that we consider the holding of the special session and the elaboration and adoption of the Final Document as an event of utmost importance. The special session was the first opportunity to have disarmament issues discussed in the United Nations so extensively, in so comprehensive a manner and in such great depth. The Final Document is a reflection of the fact that not only peoples, but also Governments, are increasingly aware of the dangers involved in continuing the arms race and of the need to put an end to it. This is also a source of encouragement for us in the socialist community of nations because our countries, including Hungary, have, from the very outset, come out consistently in favour of advancing

(Mr. Hollai, Hungary)

the cause of disarmament in every forum. I should also say in this connexion that the socialist countries had wanted to make better use of that opportunity, to take even greater strides forward on the road to disarmament, by elaborating and adopting more concrete measures to that end. This intention was embodied in the proposals of the Soviet Union on practical ways to end the arms race and in the working documents submitted by seven socialist countries, and we continue to be guided by this intention in urging practical measures aimed at the attainment of the objectives defined in the Final Document.

We believe that the Final Document is not only an expression of the commitment of the majority of Member States to the cause of disarmament, but will also serve to mobilize them to exert further efforts. This is all the more necessary, since - as was also evidenced by the special session - not all the Member States are prepared to undertake concrete obligations in this direction.

In the light of experience offered by the special session we feel it is still more timely to promote the convening of a universal disarmament meeting which would have the power to adopt binding decisions. Such a meeting would be the world disarmament conference, on the subject of which the Final Document, too, takes a favourable stand.

Having reviewed the general interrelationships, I should like to make a special point of some concrete propositions contained in the Final Document.

We find it highly important that the Document, in the introduction, should have reconfirmed the non-use of force in international relations, which is in fact at the heart of any effective disarmament measures to be adopted and of an increase of trust among States. Similarly, we fully concur in the statement that:

"Dynamic development of détente, encompassing all spheres of international relations in all regions of the world, with the participation of all countries, would create conditions conducive to the efforts of States to end the arms race." (General Assembly resolution S-10/2, para. 3)

And that:

"Progress on détente and progress on disarmament mutually complement and strengthen each other". (Ibid.)

(Mr. Hollai, Hungary)

The dialectical approach to the long-term goals and immediate tasks is likewise characteristic and welcome in that Document. In that regard it states:

"While the final objective of the efforts of all States should continue to be general and complete disarmament under effective international control, the immediate goal is that of the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war and the implementation of measures to halt and reverse the arms race". (Ibid., para. 8)

The Declaration, which gives a sobering picture of the prevailing situation, contains an almost complete enumeration of the objectives and principles that should serve as guidelines for disarmament talks. Without seeking to be exhaustive, let me pinpoint some of them:



(Mr. Hollai, Hungary)

The reaffirmation by all the States Members of the United Nations of their full commitment to the purposes of the Charter; the duty of all States to contribute to efforts in the field of disarmament; the right of each State to security and exclusion of the right to obtain advantages over others: adequate measures of verification regarding disarmament and arms limitation agreements; and the universality of disarmament agreements.

Although there is general agreement that a close relationship exists between each of the four parts of the Final Document, I think we are not mistaken in singling out for attention Part III on the Programme of Action, which contains priorities and measures that States should undertake with a view to halting and reversing the arms race.

The questions of nuclear disarmament were deservedly the focus of attention in the work of the special session. This is reflected in paragraph 45 of the Final Document, which places nuclear weapons at the head of the priorities in disarmament negotiations and also in paragraph 47, which says that:

"Nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization. It is essential to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race in all its aspects in order to avert the danger of war involving nuclear weapons. The ultimate goal in this context is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons."

(A/RES/S-10/2, p. 11)

We believe practical implementation of the provisions of the Final Document on nuclear disarmament to be the most important and most urgent task for the immediate future. Whether we shall have produced another piece of paper or contributed to effective disarmament depends on the implementation of these and other provisions. Therefore, I should like to emphasize once more that implementation is the most important task to be carried out in the next period and that, in the nature of things, sufficient time should be left for that to be done. It is therefore advisable to bear this in mind in selecting the date for the convening of the next special session on disarmament.

(Mr. Hollai, Hungary)

As regards concrete measures, we would deem it advisable for the General Assembly to pursue, in conjunction with paragraph 50 (b) of the Final Document, the proposal of the Soviet Union for the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed. It is perhaps unnecessary to stress that negotiations to this effect should be held with the participation of all nuclear-weapon States, with the addition of a certain number of non-nuclear-weapon States, and that implementation of corresponding measures should run parallel to, and be inseparable from, the consolidation of political and international legal guarantees for the security of States.

The complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests would be another important step towards curbing the nuclear arms race. In this regard we place great hopes on the ongoing talks between the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain, and we expect the other nuclear-weapon States to adhere to the agreement envisaged.

The early and successful conclusion of the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of offensive strategic armaments would be an important contribution to the consolidation of international peace and security.

In keeping with the Final Document we deem it imperative that the spread of nuclear weapons be prevented. On this point we are of the view that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons has played and will continue to play a useful role, but the Treaty should be strengthened and made universal. Materialization of the Soviet proposal concerning a draft convention on the strengthening of security guarantees for the non-nuclear-weapon States, which deserves special commendation as the first concrete proposal aimed at the attainment of the goals set forth in the Final Document, would, in our opinion, contribute to strengthening the non-proliferation régime.

While on the subject of nuclear disarmament, I should also like to touch briefly upon the question of prohibition of the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. In accordance with

(Mr. Hollai, Hungary)

paragraph 77 of the Final Document, this question should be kept under continuing review. It should not only be kept under review but should also be followed up by concrete measures conducive to a solution. It is imperative that negotiations be started on the conclusion of an agreement, as proposed by the Soviet Union, for the comprehensive prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

I could go on enumerating the tasks, including those contained in the Programme of Action, but the ones I have singled out will suffice to draw the conclusion that there are useful ideas and proposals in connexion with all of them and that the chief focus now is on translating them into practical terms.

The special session pronounced itself on disarmament machinery as well. It should be the main concern of both the deliberative and the negotiating body to promote the adoption of effective disarmament measures.

As in the past, Hungary will be guided by this spirit in its activity both in the United Nations Disarmament Commission and in the Committee on Disarmament.

Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden): When I spoke in the First Committee about a year ago to take part in its general debate, I stated it as my firm opinion that we did not have very much of that precious property called time available for achieving the urgently needed results in disarmament negotiations.

One year of that precious property has now passed. During these 12 months, have we gained ground, have we advanced towards finally achieving anything worth being called disarmament, have we been given additional time?

That does not seem to be the case. The overwhelming majority of us left the thirty-second session of this Assembly in the belief - for which there was indeed solid ground - that positive results of ongoing talks and negotiations regarding the comprehensive test ban and SALT II were to be expected before the opening of the special session on disarmament.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

We all know now that this belief did not come true and that the hopes we cherished eluded us due to the impact of events, or rather lack of events. Indeed, even at this moment the Powers negotiating trilaterally a draft comprehensive test-ban treaty have not finished their work and transmitted its result to the multilateral negotiating body. Positive information has reached us about further progress in the bilateral talks between the super-Powers on limitations in their strategic weapons system but we still have to wait for a SALT II agreement.

The Powers that I have referred to certainly realize that other countries have a right to expect them to carry through their declarations of intent without further delay. It has been said time and again, and it was firmly stated in the Final Document of the special session, that these Powers carry the main responsibility for halting and reversing the arms race.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

It is indeed long overdue that their political will to live up to their responsibility be demonstrated also by concrete results.

The world must be relieved of the nightmare of the continuing arms race and at long last start a process of genuine, quantitative and qualitative limitations and reductions of weapons and weapon systems, especially nuclear weapons. Progress in this regard is essential also as part of the efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Major breakthroughs in military technology in the coming years may erode the little that has so far been achieved in terms of arms limitation, and they are also likely considerably to complicate ongoing disarmament negotiations.

We have not gained additional time for endeavours finally to put an end to a process that has been allowed to develop into a scourge of mankind. Another 12 precious months have been lost, since no concrete step has been taken towards ending the arms race.

But we have been given, through the special session of the Assembly, new approaches to our task, as expected and hoped for by people all over the world. In starting our deliberations anew now in this Committee and in the Disarmament Commission, and our negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament, we should do well to lend an increasingly keen ear to the strong appeals made by people everywhere to the common sense and enlightened self-interest that would eliminate the risks of war and put the scarce resources of mankind to constructive use. It is a source of satisfaction to the Swedish Government that, as a result of the special session, those voices can be heard directly in the United Nations through increased contacts with the international non-governmental organizations. I have taken careful note of the valuable views expressed and suggestions made in this Committee last Monday by the representative of Argentina, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, about the way in which such increased contacts could be established. The Swedish delegation will give those views and suggestions its full attention.

I should like to say just a few words about the outcome of the special session, as perceived by the Swedish Government. Considering the conditions under which the special session had to carry out its work, it managed to produce results that were the best conceivable. True, there was no breakthrough



(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

in disarmament, nor was this to be expected. But new ground has been broken, new approaches have been introduced, and involvement in our efforts has greatly increased. Thus the special session has given new impetus to the disarmament efforts. This time we cannot afford to lose it. It is imperative that this impetus be transformed into concrete results,

No one knows how much time we still have before it is too late to stop and reverse the arms race. But what we do know is that the arms build-up is increasing every day and that this alarming trend must be ended if we are to avoid the ultimate disaster.

The task facing us all today is to transform the present vicious circle of distrust and arms race into a benign circle of détente and disarmament. This task, which challenges us with the force of necessity, involves a realistic assessment of the contemporary state of armaments and the arms race, a concrete analysis of their likely consequences and the conception and application of effective counter-measures.

Notwithstanding the disarmament efforts made so far in various international forums, it remains a saddening and discouraging fact that the arms race, and particularly the terrifying nuclear arms race, continues to accelerate, so that it far outstrips efforts to curb it. Yet there can be no doubt in any nation, in any Government, including the Governments of the super-Powers, that an unrestrained arms race can only bring disaster.

True, from the point of view of national security any armament step may appear to be a rational step. But in summing up the totality of all such seemingly rational decisions we are provided with a picture of monumental irrationality, a picture that is looming large and ominous. Under the impact of modern technology, nuclear and other weapon systems of ever-increasing destructive sophistication are continuously produced. As regards nuclear weapons, we see new examples both with respect to strategic and other types of such weapons. The Swedish Government has repeatedly expressed its deep concern about such particularly worrying examples as the neutron bomb and the SS-20. In this context we have taken careful note of the news yesterday that preparations for the actual production of the neutron weapon are continuing. This option is unfortunately still open.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

The world today finds itself in a situation in which the foundations of the international security system are, by their very nature, fragile. In fact, it is the very intention of those nations that possess nuclear weapons that deterrence should contain fundamental elements of insecurity. Herein obviously lies also the risk of a disastrous mistake. The risks thus created for each single country are indeed great compared with the risks run by each participant in the arms race in contributing to an effective disarmament process. As the situation has developed, is it not time to reconsider and redefine the very concept of national security?

We know well that the transformation of the present arms race into urgently-needed disarmament and arms control is counteracted by pitfalls and difficulties of all sorts. The task is so tremendous and our experiences are such that it is not easy to be optimistic about quick results. We also know that unless the disarmament efforts can draw on and benefit from the active participation of the main contenders in the arms race those efforts are bound to end in frustration.

The disarmament efforts depend for success on a decisive political will, particularly on the part of those mainly responsible for the nuclear arms race, to recognize the crucial connexion between their perceptions of national security and the global situation of insecurity. In order to remedy this situation of global insecurity, they must embark on a strategy of gradually lowering the level of armaments upon which security is based. With a genuine will to disarm on all sides, it should not be impossible to adopt disarmament measures in such an equitable and balanced manner as to ensure that the security of individual States will not be jeopardized.

Disarmament is a common international responsibility; hence disarmament must be a common international commitment. Hence, too, since it has often rightly been said that disarmament can make a breakthrough only in a situation in which trust and confidence prevail to a sufficient degree, it is important to realize that the active promotion of détente is a necessary precondition for a genuine process of disarmament. However, it is obvious that concrete progress in the disarmament negotiations will simultaneously serve to further and deepen détente.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

So far it has not been possible to negotiate the renunciation of weapon systems that are available to one super-Power but not to the other. The price of inactivity is, however, rising at an accelerating rate in both political and economic terms. The trends in technology and the deployment of nuclear weapons in and outside the territories of the leading military Powers increasingly counteract détente.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

The two leading military Powers must reconsider their positions in the disarmament negotiations. The concessions they will have to make may be of different types. The strategic positions, political systems and alliance patterns of the two leading Powers and the military blocs differ considerably. So often do the solutions they choose to their defence planning problems and the restrictions to which they refer in the disarmament talks. Technology restraints and verification measures are two crucial areas where more decisive action by these Powers is definitely called for.

The Swedish Government included in its list of measures regarding nuclear disarmament the cessation of the improvement and new development of nuclear weapon systems.

Those who would like to say that it seems impossible to look into the laboratories or into the minds of men in order to control a complete cessation qualitative developments probably have a good point. But that cannot and must not lead to the conclusion that nothing should be done because all cannot be accomplished.

Let me elaborate on this aspect. While the qualitative aspects of the arms race grow more and more important, present disarmament negotiations, like many of those in the past, concentrate on quantitative aspects of forces and armaments. In some cases, this may be necessary in order to achieve some result. Those who would rest content with modest progress might be prepared to leave out complicated qualitative aspects of negotiations, arguing that their inclusion would with certainty lead to a breakdown of dialogue. In such a case, they would say, the best would become the enemy of the good.

However, we feel that such an argument could be deliberately used for counter-productive purposes. If pushed too far and too long, it means that an important element of the security equation may not be weighed sufficiently into the negotiations. This limits at the start the scope of what such negotiations may achieve and must achieve.

Many complex operational factors elude such negotiations that are focusing too narrowly on a numerical balance. All those factors, however, contribute to increasing unpredictability, and thus also make the perception of the potential of other parties more insecure.



(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

The present stage of the technological arms race makes it increasingly important to keep in mind that new arms and new weapon systems to a large extent result from reactions not only to real preoccupations but also to imaginary threats. Very often these reactions are related to qualitative improvements of the other party's forces. These aspects should therefore to a larger extent be brought into the actual negotiations and be duly taken into account. Only then can more substantial results be achieved.

It is vital that the leading military Powers start reorienting their military research and development to projects which lend themselves to arms control. This could substantially facilitate reaching negotiated agreements. It could also pave the way for unilateral decisions to observe restraint during periods when negotiated agreements remain out of reach.

Arms control assessments of planned new weapons might be more closely related to the international disarmament process. They could in that case facilitate the introduction of relevant weapon issues in different negotiating contexts at the stage of research, development, production and deployment.

My remarks so far should be seen in the context of the proposal made in the Swedish intervention in the general debate in the plenary Assembly concerning a new thorough United Nations study of nuclear weapons.

The proposed study would aim at providing factual information concerning present nuclear arsenals, development trends, effects of the use of nuclear weapons and the implications for security as well as for negotiations on disarmament and arms control of a continued qualitative and quantitative development of nuclear arms.

A study should concern all nuclear arms, that is, both those presently subject to negotiations in SALT and those which are not.

Such a study could comprise: first, three descriptive chapters - dealing with present status of arsenals, conceivable technological trends and effects of the use of nuclear weapons; and second, one chapter analysing implications of the nuclear arms race in terms relevant to the disarmament efforts.

No up-to-date United Nations study exists regarding a sector which occupies a central place in the arms race as well as in the disarmament efforts within and outside the United Nations. A previous United Nations study was carried out



(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

by the Secretary-General with the assistance of a group of consultant experts and published in 1967 as document A/6858. The title of that study was:

"Effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons and ... the security and economic implications for States of the acquisition and further development of these weapons."

It is to be expected that a new and broader study would also register relevant negotiation efforts in the sector of nuclear arms. It is also likely that during the work on such a study we will have a comprehensive test ban treaty and a SALT II agreement.

A United Nations study would indeed be in accordance with the consensus on the need for concrete nuclear disarmament measures reached in the Final Document of the tenth special session. Nuclear disarmament was, as we all then declared, the priority issue for disarmament. Because of the standing and the global role of the United Nations, a study carried out by the Organization itself would be a valuable contribution to international understanding of the issues involved.

We expect, therefore, that the nuclear-weapon States and members of the military alliances will favourably consider an active participation in and contribution to such a study.

A preliminary draft resolution outlining the terms of reference of a study is now being elaborated. As seen from the Swedish point of view, a study could be carried out either as an internal Secretariat study, or as a study by qualified consultant experts appointed by the Secretary-General, or by a group of governmental experts. The time needed for concluding the study would depend on different factors, to which the Swedish delegation will return in due time during this session of the First Committee.

The work could be based on open, non-classified information generally available as well as on any additional information furnished by Governments for the purpose of the study. Compiling this information will have an informative value in itself. In this context I wish to stress that a general description of arsenals and technological trends could probably in substantial parts be carried out without relying on absolute figures.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

One important principle of disarmament is shared by the leading military Powers and many other countries. That is that deterrence can be made to function at a lower number of weapons and weapons systems than the present levels and that a technological arms race could even put deterrence out of function at crucial moments of crisis when its functioning is tested. That is why they have undertaken to negotiate measures on nuclear disarmament. That is also why it is an anomaly that the United Nations, which every year deals with the issue of nuclear weapons and which has adopted a programme of action covering this sector of vital importance, does not dispose of a broad study of its own.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

I turn now to another part of the Final Document of the special session. It is true that the nuclear threat represents the most immediate danger for the survival of mankind. However, we must not forget that the main part of the world's military expenditure is now being devoted to conventional armaments, which are becoming increasingly accurate and destructive. In view of the continuing qualitative developments in this field and the pressing need to reallocate resources from military purposes towards improving the economic and social conditions in the world, effective measures are needed as regards limitations of conventional weapons and armed forces. We thus welcome the call of the Final Document of the special session for conventional disarmament and limitation of all types of international transfer of conventional weapons, with due regard to the legitimate need of all States to protect their national security.

Real progress in this field can, however, not be achieved by measures imposed on a country from the outside. As stated in the Final Document of the special session, it must be based on the common will of the countries concerned. The legitimate security interests of each State can best be assessed in the relevant regional context. Initiatives to promote restraints on armaments on a regional basis can, therefore, effectively contribute to disarmament. The efforts undertaken by the Latin American States set an example in that respect.

In this context, may I recall that in accordance with the decision taken last year by the General Assembly a special United Nations conference will convene in 1979 in order to establish new rules for the prohibition or restriction of use of certain particularly inhumane conventional weapons. This issue, to which the Swedish Government attaches much importance, was referred to at some length by the then Swedish Foreign Minister, Mrs. Soder, in her statement to the General Assembly on 26 September. A separate statement will be devoted to this matter in the course of the present debate.

I shall, finally, say a few words on a subject which falls clearly into the category of subjects that were dealt with by the special session and that require action by the thirty-third session of the General Assembly. You yourself, Mr. Chairman, have enumerated five such subjects, and I am now

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

going to add a sixth to your list the implementation of which has in fact already started. I am referring to the Study on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, initiated pursuant to paragraphs 94 and 95 of the Final Document.

As we all know, the special session gave considerable attention to the grave economic and social consequences of the ongoing arms race and to the urgent need to put the immense human and material resources now consumed by the military machines to constructive use for development purposes, particularly in the developing countries. In accordance with its decision that a forward-looking and policy-oriented study should be made in order to assist in promoting, in a given disarmament situation, such a change, the Secretary-General convened the group of governmental experts appointed by him to its first session in early September this year. As Chairman of the group I am glad to be able to note that at that session the group unanimously adopted a report outlining the organization of work and a tentative time-table, in accordance with the directions of the special session. We are on the road.

The report of the Expert Group is before the Committee in document A/33/317. The type of decision that it requires at this Assembly relates, of course, to the financing of the activities necessary for a meaningful end product of work to be done starting at the beginning of the year 1979.

It is essential that the endeavours that have now begun lead up to results in terms of practical conclusions and recommendations to Governments of Member States. Long enough have we tolerated the immense waste of human and material resources that is the self-evident purport of the arms race. The starving and suffering people of our one and only earth are in better need of these resources than the war machines. Our common global security, our common global future, request us to come to our senses.

Mr. CARPIO CASTILLO (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): This Committee has been entrusted with the mandate of examining the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, which was devoted to disarmament. This is no easy task, and obviously it would be somewhat premature to carry out such a study in view of the fact that only a few months have elapsed since the holding of that session.

(Mr. Carpio Castillo, Venezuela)

From the very outset Venezuela has been among those countries that supported the holding of that special disarmament session, and later we participated in the work of the Preparatory Committee entrusted with the task of studying the programme and all matters relating to it.

We were always guided by the conviction that the special session on disarmament would allow us to attract the attention of the world public to the grave danger in which the world finds itself, being daily confronted with the possibility of a war of total devastation, and to the immense and vital resources that are being devoted to the arms race. We also felt that a special session of the General Assembly would allow us to consider matters carefully and adopt the necessary urgent resolutions, so as to meet the hopes the peoples of the world have placed in the United Nations.

The countries of the third world came to the Assembly convinced that we should have to face immense difficulties and complex problems but equally convinced that the time had come for finding immediate solutions to them. We felt that it was not the power or the prestige of one or two super-Powers or the power or prestige of any nuclear Power that was at stake, but that what was at stake was the fate, the very survival of mankind.

In the history of the United Nations the special session on disarmament occupies a very distinguished place. It was the first time the Assembly had met solely to discuss disarmament. It was also significant because of the high level of the representation, because of the large number of States that participated in the general debate and because at the end of its work it had succeeded in using such an intricate and difficult tool as consensus. We believe that we owe a debt of gratitude and acknowledgement for the dedication and conciliatory spirit of Ambassadors Ortiz de Rozas and Garcia Robles, who, together with the co-ordinators of the drafting groups, did extraordinary work and were unflagging in their efforts to produce a document that was not sprinkled with square brackets particularly when confronted with the possibility that the special session might prove to be a failure in the eyes of the world public.



(Mr. Carpio Castillo, Venezuela)

But we must be objective in our analysis and we must admit that although the Final Document that was adopted by the special session represents the maximum consensus achievable in those circumstances, the consensus rule led to a compromise document which by definition is inadequate and does not reflect the hopes of the great majority of countries and which is not considered as binding by others who did in fact openly express reservations on the Document in part or as a whole.

We consider the evaluation of the disarmament process reflected in the introduction of the Final Document to be very important, since in that section it is stressed that the objectives of the Decade for Disarmament, so solemnly proclaimed in 1969 seem today even farther away than they were then, and it is admitted that no progress has been achieved in the field of disarmament. This recognition binds us to the search for urgent and concrete measures, and we owe that to the international community.

In the second part of the Document, which is entitled "Declaration", the rules and principles are set forth that should in the future govern the activities of States Members in order to stem and reverse the arms race. At this moment we can hardly decide on which rules or which principles are of greater or lesser importance, but we do believe that it is imperative that we stress three specific statements contained in the Final Document that echo the concerns repeatedly expressed by the delegation of Venezuela when disarmament was being discussed.

First of all, the effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war must have first priority.

Secondly, the economic and social consequences of the arms race are so prejudicial that its continuance is obviously incompatible with the establishment of the New International Economic Order based on justice, equity and co-operation.

Thirdly, it is essential that not only Governments but also the peoples of the world realize and understand the dangers inherent in the existing situation.

Regarding the first statement, although we do admit that nuclear disarmament has been given high priority, we deplore the fact that the special responsibility of the two super-Powers in the field of disarmament was not appropriately reflected in the Document. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Venezuela, in the statement he made to the General Assembly on 29 September, spoke of this matter when assessing the results of the special session devoted to disarmament. He said:

"Once again there was clear evidence of the reluctance of the nuclear Powers to give even an indication of their readiness to announce themselves without



(Mr. Carpio Castillo, Venezuela)

reservation in favour of specific and effective disarmament measures in the nuclear field. Clearly, the great Powers, which are permanently in dispute because of strategic rivalries and competition for domination, united on that occasion, as they always do in disarmament forums, to torpedo any initiative which might even remotely imply a commitment to act resolutely in favour of nuclear disarmament." (A/33/PV.14, p. 72)

Regarding the second statement, we would hope that the study that the special session called for and that is to be carried out over the next few years, on the link between disarmament and development, will reaffirm the evident incompatibility between the arms race and the establishment of the New International Economic Order.

As far as the third statement is concerned, my delegation is very gratified that both in the Declaration and in the Programme of Action, recognition has been given to the need to create international awareness of the fact that the arms race must be repudiated and condemned so that a more fully enlightened world public can play a primary role as a pressure group.

We believe that the Programme of Action is only a list of hopes and aspirations, which as at present worded can only with difficulty be translated into concrete action. It is up to the nuclear-weapon States and the militarily powerful nations, inspired by the indispensable political will, to undertake disarmament negotiations in accordance with the priorities set forth in the Programme, in order to ensure that those hopes and aspirations will in fact become acts.

Without being over critical, I could cite paragraph 51 of the Final Document which refers to the possible future treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons tests. In its last sentence it states:

"... various views were expressed by non-nuclear-weapon States that, pending the conclusion of this treaty, the world community would be encouraged if all the nuclear-weapon States refrained from testing nuclear weapons." (General Assembly resolution S-10/2, para. 51)

However, the text continues:

"In this connexion, some nuclear-weapon States expressed different views." (Ibid.)

In point of fact, since 30 June of this year, the day on which the special session closed, a number of nuclear Powers have in fact carried out tests. Since in its programme of work the First Committee will be considering items 35 to 49 of the agenda, I shall refrain at this moment from referring to the many recommendations contained in the Programme of Action which concern those items.

(Mr. Carpio Castillo, Venezuela)

However, I should like to point out paragraph 84 of the Final Act which speaks of the holding of bilateral, regional and multilateral consultations and conferences to consider different aspects of conventional disarmament. We have always been concerned over the proliferation of, the trade in and the transfer of conventional weapons that, especially in the developing countries, drain the vital resources needed for their economic and social welfare. Thus, on the initiative of my country the Foreign Ministers of eight Latin American nations, namely, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Panama, Peru and Venezuela, in June of this year ratified the Declaration of Ayacucho signed in 1974, and among other things, expressed their readiness to explore, together with other Latin American nations, the desirability of reaching an agreement on the limitation of conventional weapons in Latin America. In fact, following that initiative of the Venezuelan Government, in August this year 20 Latin American nations held an informal meeting in Mexico on conventional weapons during which it was recognized that some consultative machinery should be set up among the Latin American nations through which initiatives could be co-ordinated that would lead to the achievement of tangible results in the limitation of armaments. These are ideas that must be explored further, and we trust that all Latin American nations will join in this dialogue since only if they all do so can we be assured of effective results in the regional sector which, as the representative of Sweden just pointed out, stands as an example of what can be done in this field when something is sought.

We have just lately received with great satisfaction the reports of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament and on United Nations studies on disarmament, contained respectively in documents A/33/305 and A/33/312. We believe that the greater the number of persons properly trained to deal with disarmament and related matters the greater the contribution that Member States will be able to make to disarmament deliberations and negotiations. We are gratified to note that the Programme of Fellowships is to begin in 1979 and that special consideration will be given to training candidates from the developing countries.

We have always supported proposals for studies to be made by the United Nations in matters touching on disarmament and the limitation of armaments

(Mr. Carpio Castillo, Venezuela)

since we believe that such studies are of great value to Member States. With the establishment of an advisory board of eminent persons, the role of the United Nations in this field will be strengthened.

There can, however, be no doubt that the most significant contribution made by the special session was when it decided to restructure the deliberative and negotiating machinery of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. We have already seen the results of this restructuring during the first session of the Disarmament Commission held last week. Under the skilful leadership of its Chairman, Mr. Vellodi of India, substantive progress was achieved when the Commission recommended that at its meeting of May-June 1979 priority should be given to the consideration of the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme. We believe this to be a most important recommendation on a task that we must scrupulously carry out in order to speed up progress towards general and complete disarmament.

We are also gratified at the application of paragraph 120 of the Final Document which speaks of the setting up of the new negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament. We should like to express our country's appreciation of the confidence placed in it by its appointment to the Committee on Disarmament as of January 1979. For Venezuela, this has now become a moral duty that we owe the international community, and we know that the importance of the disarmament problems is such that we shall have to do our best and, in the meantime, make our modest contribution towards achieving concrete and urgent results.

We also wish to express our thanks to all those delegations which congratulated Venezuela on its becoming a member of the Committee on Disarmament, a responsibility that we shall endeavour to discharge in a spirit of co-operation.

It will, of course, be left to future Assemblies to assess thoroughly the results of the first special session devoted to disarmament, to seek out its flaws or to stress its advantages, but by the same token it cannot be denied that, if that first special session established the framework within which future work and negotiations are to take place, the speeding up of that programme could be assured by the convening of a second special session on a date to be agreed upon, but in any case soon.

Mr. VELISSAROPOULOS (Greece) (interpretation from French): The convening of the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations was an initiative of great importance in keeping with the wish of all peoples of the world for a new awareness of the problem of disarmament and a new momentum to be given to it. The task was a difficult one, as everyone was aware, but one day or another we had to begin shouldering the task, both solemnly and methodically, and, what is more, with the participation of all States Members of the United Nations.

Perfection is, of course, not of this world, and the work of the special session produced a Final Document that is not without its shortcomings, of course, but, taken all in all, it is a very satisfactory improved text, better, I believe, than we might have expected. It is, generally speaking, balanced and can serve as a solid basis for the continuation of our efforts. So it seems to us that the decision to increase the number of members of the Committee on Disarmament was a good one, well in keeping with the concept of a broader participation of countries.



(Mr. Velissaropoulos, Greece)

Increased participation in the Committee, however, would have been of less importance if the decision had not embraced rotation in membership, a point we reflected in the statement made by our Permanent Representative to the United Nations at the tenth special session, where we expressed our conviction that rotation should take place at regular intervals not to exceed three years. We are also pleased with the reconstitution of the 1952 Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body.

Having said that, the Greek delegation had hoped that the Final Document would have gone into greater detail and laid more stress on the problem of conventional arms. We should not forget that ever since the end of the Second World War all armed conflicts - and they have been numerous, unfortunately - have been waged with conventional weapons. And as was pointed out by our Prime Minister Mr. Caramanlis:

"... for the more the balance of terror makes a nuclear conflict unlikely, the more a war with conventional weapons becomes probable."

(A/S-10/PV.17, p. 22)

Therefore, as we continue our work we should take even more into consideration this particular point. Of course, we understand that the horror inspired by the scale of devastation and loss of life in nuclear warfare without doubt justifies the attention devoted to it in the Final Document. But we should not lose sight of the fact that, for 30 years now, all the devastation and death that has occurred has been caused by conventional weapons. So the enormity of the devastating effects of nuclear weapons should, in our view, be measured against the frequency of conflicts waged with conventional weapons and of their over-all impact.

Another point on which I wish to express a view concerns the role of the United Nations. The Final Document of the special session asserts quite rightly that the United Nations has a central role to play. But for this role to be effective it is essential that the activities of all States should harmonize with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and resolutions of the Organization. The fact is, however, that things do not always happen as one would wish. Therefore, in our work now and in the future, particular stress should be laid upon this



(Mr. Velissaropoulos, Greece)

need and, furthermore, on the desire for the United Nations to be provided with the necessary powers to enable it, in the case of flagrant violations of the Charter and its resolutions, to impose sanctions. Hence its role within the whole system of international security should be enhanced.

The need to strengthen the role of the United Nations in order to create a climate propitious for the peaceful settlement of disputes, and hence a climate favourable to the disarmament process, obviously is served by the use of peace-keeping forces, which is something to which the international community has often had recourse in those parts of the world exposed to internal or external tension. But how much more effective would United Nations action have been if, instead of having recourse to peace-keeping forces to repair the damage done, the United Nations had had more effective powers to prevent the outbreak of conflicts, or at least for their solution. This climate of peace and confidence, so indispensable to disarmament, would have been thereby greatly enhanced. Confidence-building measures among the countries of the world should be stressed further in our work, along the lines I have indicated here.

The Greek Government endorses everything that has been stated in the Final Document on the need for the verification of disarmament, but would stress that all countries should be able to take part in that process, at the appropriate time and place, and, above all, the countries most concerned in particular cases.

Disarmament would be unthinkable if countries did not refrain from the threat or use of force in their mutual relations. The respect for the independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of States, as well as for peoples' right to self-determination, is intimately bound up with the possibility of creating confidence among States. And this is something which should be stressed even more and be given high priority in our work.

Unless a climate of confidence is established, countries will continue to believe that the only guarantee for their security lies in taking adequate measures for their defence - which is, in any case, an inalienable right enshrined in the Charter.

(Mr. Velissaropoulos, Greece)

The increased importance which the Greek delegation would have liked to see attached to conventional disarmament in the Final Document in no way detracts, in our view, from the importance of nuclear disarmament. That goes without saying. Greece endorses the ideas contained in the Final Document, which gives this question its due importance. My country believes that all the major aspects of nuclear disarmament have been dealt with in that document. We endorse the idea of the creation of denuclearized zones, provided, of course, that they are the result of assent freely and spontaneously given by the countries concerned. We favour the SALT agreements and their extension in such a way that they can gradually come to cover an increasing number of disarmament aspects. We are also in favour of non-proliferation, on the understanding, of course, that any agreement on that subject should in no way impede the transfer of nuclear technology and its use for peaceful purposes by all States wishing to avail themselves of it.

The major transformations in the world are the result of a gradual change in outlook. That is why the Greek Government favours all publicity aimed at explaining and propagating the ideal of disarmament among the peoples of the world.

Our delegation welcomes the reactivation of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament. We are also in favour of more consistent and more frequent use of non-governmental institutions specialized in disarmament questions. As we know, scientific theory has always preceded technology, and it might be said, mutatis mutandis, that we could draw an analogy with the work we do here, which could be described as the technological part, as compared with the work done in the theoretical field by the non-governmental specialized agencies, which is, as it were, the scientific part. I would even go so far as to say that these institutions should be encouraged even more to study systematically and consistently the reports of our sessions and to submit to the United Nations Centre for Disarmament their conclusions and suggestions.

In this regard, permit me to refer to the proposal of the President of France made at the special session on disarmament, concerning the creation of an international disarmament research institute. Indeed, that proposal does seem to us to meet the need for objective and advanced scientific work. Furthermore, the idea put forward in the report of the Secretary-General concerning the granting of United Nations fellowships on disarmament is a particularly good idea, since a great number of Member States - and, in particular, developing countries - do not have specialists in this subject. That is why we would voice the hope that this idea will be put into effect as soon as possible.

(Mr. Velissaropoulos, Greece)

The work that has been started will be extremely long and difficult. Its immediate value lies, inter alia, in the fact that the peoples of the whole world realize that the concept of the inevitability of armed conflict has been solemnly repudiated by the United Nations and that the Members of this Organization now refuse to abandon all hope when they enter this building. They have already sent a ray of hope around the world - hope that the enormous sums wasted on the arms race will one day, though a distant day no doubt, be devoted to efforts to abolish the inhuman poverty from which three quarters of our world still suffers. That is precisely the achievement of the work done at the special session and of all those who contributed to that work. I was not among them and that is precisely what entitles me to say that that work should be highly commended.

We hope that future special sessions will give new momentum to the vast enterprise of disarmament. In this context we also consider that a world disarmament conference, provided that it is carefully prepared, with the participation of all States may prove very useful. For the success of the effort, a lot will obviously depend on the political will of Member States, their sense of realism and on the abandonment of certain counter-productive and outmoded habits of mind.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other representative wishes to speak on the item at this stage, I suggest that we go back to the discussion we had yesterday about the arrangements for the commemorative meeting next Tuesday morning.

Since the representative of India, supported by some other representatives, suggested that the commemorative meeting should be held in the plenary Assembly rather than in the First Committee, we have been in contact with persons responsible for the plenary General Assembly. From those contacts we understand that it will be impossible to comply with that suggestion. The plenary schedules are fixed a week in advance and at this point it is impossible to change them. In light of that information I suppose that the only alternative is to hold the commemorative meeting in the First Committee and in this room.



(The Chairman)

There was also some discussion about the statements, which, it was suggested, would be as follows: a statement by the President of the Assembly which I would read; and a statement by the Secretary-General of the United Nations which would be read by the Assistant Secretary-General for Disarmament. I then suggested that there would be statements from regional groups. I understand that does not apply to all possible cases; however, I also understand that a number of regional groups will be able to make group statements, and we welcome that. After that, as I mentioned, there are obviously two delegations which have had a particular interest in this matter ever since the special session and whose representatives would speak. If there were others who asked to be allowed to speak, obviously, if time allowed, they would be recognized by the Chairman.

Does any representative wish to ask questions or express views on this subject?

Mr. FONSECA (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, I followed your remarks very closely. I shall refer only to your last comment to the effect that after the representatives of the regional groups have made their statements delegations which have a particular interest in the subject would be able to speak and you qualified that by saying that this would be subject to the availability of time. What time do you envisage will be left for other delegations or interested parties wishing to make statements?

The CHAIRMAN: The total time at our disposal on Tuesday morning will be from 10.30 a.m. to 1 p.m. As it is to be supposed that most of the statements and messages will be quite short, I do not think there will be any lack of time.

If I hear no comments or views to the contrary, the commemorative meeting will be celebrated in the way that I have described.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.