

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records \*



FIRST COMMITTEE  
17th meeting  
held on  
Thursday, 26 October 1978  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 17TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

later: Mr. PALMA (Peru)  
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

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

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

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/33/PV.17\*\*  
8 November 1978

ENGLISH

\*\* Reissued for technical reasons.

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 125 (continued)

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/33/42, A/33/279, A/33/305, A/33/312, A/33/317; A/C.1/33/L.1-5)

Mr. ELLIOTT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the wish which you expressed at the beginning of our work, I shall confine my brief statement to the precise item on our agenda which we are at present discussing, that is, review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session.

I hope in the third part of our discussion to be able to revert to certain problems which are of particular concern to my country in the crucial area of disarmament.

I would add that, having listened very carefully to the numerous speakers who took the floor before me in this discussion, I feel somewhat perplexed about my ability to introduce anything original in my remarks. However, the special session which the General Assembly, for the first time, devoted exclusively to the question of disarmament is too important not to risk repeating what others have said by recalling the remarks made by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Belgium in this connexion during the general debate of the thirty-third session:

"Our Assembly took an important step forward in that direction during the special session devoted to disarmament. Of course, I know that the results have been evaluated and commented on, often very differently. The participation of 23 Heads of State and an impressive number of Ministers has indicated the importance of that session to all parts of the world. For the first time a detailed inventory has been drawn up of the problems with which we are confronted and also of certain priorities which we should respect. For the first time the road has been opened up for new endeavours which should finally make possible genuine disarmament measures.

(Mr. Elliott, Belgium)

"Although we agree that nuclear arms pose the heaviest global threat to mankind we have recognized nevertheless that we must not underestimate the danger of local, conventional conflicts which may degenerate and a conflagration may break out affecting entire regions. Hence we welcome the fact that the question of conventional armaments was retained by the special session of the General Assembly as one of the priorities to be dealt with alongside the question of nuclear weapons. We are pleased to note the extent to which the regional dimension of the problems of security and therefore of disarmament was stressed during the work of that session." (A/33/PV.17, p. 77)

That statement shows very clearly the importance which Belgium attaches to the follow-up of these recommendations adopted by the special session of the General Assembly, and particularly the hope we place in the use that will be made of the new machinery which has been set up and which should make possible continuous progress, even if it is arduous and slow, in the paramount but complex area of disarmament.

Having said that, I should now like briefly to review three questions which you, Sir, mentioned when introducing item 125. I shall not dwell in detail on the Disarmament Commission's report on organizational questions, which has just been distributed and which, I assume, will be discussed under item 47 (c) of our agenda.

(Mr. Elliott, Belgium)

The proposals made by the Secretary-General concerning the guidelines for the United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament, as contained in document A/33/305, appear to us on the whole to be both judicious and acceptable. Improvement in technical and political training of those "involved in or earmarked for work on disarmament and related matters" (A/33/305, para. 4) seems to us of prime importance for the future progress of our action, and it is only logical that a special effort should be made to benefit the developing countries.

The same is true of the question of the studies undertaken by the United Nations on disarmament.

While the report of the Secretary-General is necessarily provisional and incomplete - the opinion of the advisory board will be very important in this connexion - nevertheless it does indicate what has already been accomplished and also indicates the future outlines of the problem. I only regret that it does not mention in its exhaustive survey the proposal made by my country for a study on all aspects of regional disarmament, a question which I should like to come back to later.

The enumeration of the suggestions which have been made bears out the importance which these various types of research can have for our work. All those who have studied in any way the items on our agenda, and those who participated in the work of the First Committee or in the work of the special session of the General Assembly, must have felt, at some time or another, despite their great competence and their long experience in this area, that in certain cases it might have been useful for them to have more complete and more balanced studies containing a well thought out summary of the facts and arguments put forward by the various sides. Furthermore, many of our Governments do not have a sufficient number of qualified agents who are essential if they are themselves to undertake, at one and the same time, the tasks of management, consideration, discussion and negotiation which are ours.

(Mr. Elliott, Belgium)

In other words, we believe very much in the usefulness of entrusting to the Secretariat of our Organization, assisted by qualified experts, certain well-defined studies the value of which, for our work, has been generally recognized. However, while not questioning the need for adequate means, we request simply that in the case of both the fellowships and the studies care should be taken that the principles of sound administrative and financial management are observed, and that in so far as possible we should avoid any wastage of human or material resources.

At any rate, our colleagues in the Fifth Committee will have to give some thought to this aspect of the question when they take into account the figures which will undoubtedly be provided by the Secretariat in the near future.

In conclusion, I should like to say something about the date of the forthcoming special session to be devoted to disarmament. At first blush, it may appear paradoxical, since we are so convinced of the importance of a special session, that the Belgian Government should be tempted to join the other countries which in this body have suggested that we be given a certain amount of time before such an important meeting as a second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is reconvened.

But I believe that despite the impatience which we all feel to see the rapidest possible progress in our work in the field of disarmament, we should above all remain realistic and realize that a certain amount of time is necessary if we wish to build a solid and lasting edifice. And we can say that in the meantime we shall not remain inactive - far from it.

The tenth special session has given a new impetus to the whole question of disarmament research. It has set up new machinery which should make it possible for us to achieve constant progress, whether it be in the First Committee, during the meetings of the Disarmament Commission or in the Committee on Disarmament. At the same time studies are being undertaken which should help us in our discussions, but to which we should allow sufficient time to mature.

(Mr. Elliott, Belgium)

Finally, as certain of our colleagues have pointed out in some detail, the time-table for work which is going on in parallel with ours is particularly heavy in the next two years. In view also of the need to give the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session sufficient time to carry out its work, this leads my Government to believe that a period of four or five years from the first special session would be a reasonable time before reconvening such an illustrious gathering of some of the most eminent personalities of our respective countries.

Mr. RAKOTONIAINA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): As a large number of delegations have pointed out in their statements in this Committee, it is not easy to proceed to an assessment of the implementation of the recommendations of the tenth special session devoted to disarmament. In fact, with the exception of certain specific actions of a procedural nature, those recommendations, by their very nature and scope, apparently will not begin to be implemented until some time has elapsed.

If need be, the evaluation requested of us could be conceived in a broader perspective which would enable us to analyse the contents of the Final Document in comparison with our expectations and hopes before the special session and after it, while we determine how we are to orient our future action on the basis of the provisions of the Final Document. It is in this context that the delegation of Madagascar will now make its contribution to our deliberations.

The tenth special session may be regarded as a historically and politically important event from two points of view. First of all, there have been very few conferences of this kind where there has been universal participation at such a high level. The very fact that the conference was convened is, in our view, of special significance. It shows that the members of the international community have overcome many of their difficulties and have set aside their divergencies while agreeing to sit down together to exchange views in a field as complex and controversial as that of disarmament.

True, all the key problems were not resolved at that session, but it is comforting to note that despite their opposing views, States were able to define and crystallize in the Final Document their lowest common denominator in the quest for ways and means of ensuring peace and security.

(Mr. Rakotoniaina, Madagascar)

Among these aspirations, pride of place is taken by the desire to put an end to the arms race which absorbs enormous sums of money and diverts vast human and material resources. This race does not serve the interests of anyone; quite to the contrary, it threatens the very survival of mankind. Faced with this vital necessity of putting an end to the arms race, the special session established an order of priority which places first the question of nuclear armaments. This is understandable, moreover, when we realize that the nuclear weapons in the arsenals of States represent a permanent danger to the existence of mankind.

But in the Final Document we do not exclude the possibility of envisaging other measures in other fields providing they all lead towards general and complete disarmament. It is along these same lines that the great Powers and the militarily important Powers are asked to curb the qualitative and quantitative proliferation of weapons.

(Mr. Rakotoniaina, Madagascar)

No one could fail to subscribe, at least in principle, to any initiative aimed at strengthening international peace and security. However, experience has amply shown that through trying to do too much, thus dispersing our efforts and diverting our attention over too many fronts, we might perhaps fail to reach our true objective, that which we have established as a priority and as an urgent question to be resolved.

In this same context we believe that it would be desirable, for a specific period, to focus our efforts essentially on a small number of specific questions which call for urgent solutions in view of the imperatives and realities of the international situation.

Thus we welcome for our part any suggestion aimed at promoting the implementation within a specified time-limit of the provisions in the Final Document relating to the cessation of nuclear tests for military purposes, and the manufacture and stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction.

Obviously such an action could not be carried out without the participation of all the nuclear States for the simple reason that the whole concept of balance of forces continues, and regrettably will continue for a long time, to guide States in their approach to disarmament questions. We associate ourselves with the appeal addressed here to all the nuclear Powers to take their rightful place in the ennobling task of freeing mankind from the nightmare of war and of annihilation.

My delegation also wishes to emphasize two points which relate to the conduct of future negotiations. The special session stressed the central role that the United Nations must play in the future in the field of disarmament. Although the fortunes of history and international relations have prevented our Organization from fully playing the role entrusted to it under the Charter, we must henceforth spare no effort, however, to ensure that the new life breathed into United Nations bodies is not ended by discussions confined to a few Powers and held outside the United Nations. Otherwise we shall have created or revitalized yet another committee or commission on disarmament doomed to the same fate as that of their predecessors.

(Mr. Rakotoniaina, Madagascar)

Next, my delegation wishes to point out that while the measures adopted by consensus have a fairly good chance of being applied by the parties, we must not lose sight of the experiences of the past which remind us that this procedure has very often been used to keep negotiations dragging.

In view of the uncertain outcome of negotiations, we should find the means to guarantee and strengthen the security of non-nuclear States. The initiative of the Soviet Union along these lines deserves to be taken into account by all of us.

The Final Document stresses that it is important to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and that the ultimate objective of non-proliferation is to prevent the emergence of new nuclear States apart from those which now possess such weapons. May we be allowed to express here our serious concern at the nuclear co-operation enjoyed by South Africa and Israel.

The special session reaffirmed, and rightly so, the idea that the creation of nuclear-free zones is an important disarmament measure. Undoubtedly, it is a long-term undertaking, the success of which depends particularly on the elimination of hotbeds of tension in those areas and in the international situation in general. The special session recognized the difficulties it was confronting but it developed certain interesting ideas which could serve as a general framework for future discussions. In this same context, the special session also showed that the creation of zones of peace in various parts of the world could help to strengthen international peace and security. In this connexion we venture to hope that the new enthusiasm which appears now to inspire the members of the international community will exert a favourable impact on those countries which have shown themselves to be reticent about the creation of zones of peace.

The special session did not remain silent on the dangers inherent in the perfecting of conventional weapons to the point of making them as lethal as the weapons of mass destruction. The flourishing trade in such weapons, which represents a heavy burden for the budgets of the developing countries, to the detriment of their social and economic development, should be the subject of an urgent study leading to measures on the limitation of such weapons.

(Mr. Rakotoniana, Madagascar)

The World Conference on Disarmament, concerning which the General Assembly is called upon to take a decision at the current session, should in our view be the subject of careful, thorough preparation and ensure universal participation. To maintain the new impetus given to the whole disarmament process it would be desirable to hold the Conference in the not too distant future.

Important changes have been made in the negotiating machinery on disarmament questions while drawing a distinction between the deliberative and negotiating bodies. In my delegation's view we must clearly define the functions of the First Committee and those of the Disarmament Commission in order to avoid possible duplication.

Finally, we believe that no institutional provision can replace political will. We believe in fact that regardless of what institutions may be set up, they will remain imperfect since they are man-made. The solution of problems such as those of disarmament with which we are confronted is, above all, a political matter.

Mr. SY (Senegal) (interpretation from French): The tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is undoubtedly an epoch-making event in the history of our Organization. In fact, for the first time in history, all countries have come together and have succeeded in agreeing on a framework of action for general and complete disarmament. For six weeks and in the presence of a number of Heads of State and Government, delegations from all countries worked very hard in order to draw up the Final Document which was adopted by consensus. It is the implementation of that Final Document that today we are called upon to consider. It is a very difficult task in view of its novelty, but it is nevertheless a necessary one.

Did we not all proclaim our solemn intention to do everything we could to make as much progress as possible towards disarmament? The peoples of the entire world to whom we gave a ray of hope tinged, it must be said, with a measure of scepticism, expect concrete action. How many statements have they heard about the desire to disarm? How many wars have broken out just after solemn peace promises had been made? How many armed conflicts

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

came to an end after the special session on disarmament? In Africa, for example, the racist régimes of southern Africa have intensified their aggressions against neighbouring States and also their slaughter of unarmed African populations.

I should not like to appear too pessimistic but I feel that it must be emphasized at this stage that the adoption of a document does not necessarily lead to disarmament. Additional efforts have to be made. To the peoples of the world yearning for peace, we must prove that the Document which we endorsed is more than a simple declaration of intent, that it is an irrevocable commitment to peace. We must take action to prove our good faith. We must take specific disarmament measures as soon as possible. In this connexion I am thinking in particular of the United States and the Soviet Union, the two main producers and possessors of arms in the world. These two countries have a special responsibility in the follow-up to the Programme of Action adopted by the General Assembly, particularly with regard to nuclear disarmament, which is a matter of priority.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

It is now up to them to set an example. A number of speakers have already emphasized that the fact that these two countries signed a second agreement on the limitation of strategic weapons must be regarded as an important step forward in the process of disarmament. These two countries should therefore take care that the publicity given by the press to progress in the negotiations is in fact in accordance with the facts by signing a treaty before the end of the year.

Similarly the treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear tests now being negotiated by three nuclear Powers is still being awaited. The usefulness of such a treaty for the international community hardly needs to be shown. Therefore, these Powers must make even further efforts in order to overcome their difficulties and to present a draft treaty to the Committee on Disarmament.

Another area where it is essential to get out of the rut of definitions and studies is the question of disarmament and development. It must be recognized that this matter, despite its importance, has made very little progress since resolution 380 (V), of 17 November 1950. In that resolution the General Assembly appealed to every nation to agree:

"To reduce to a minimum the diversion for armaments of its human and economic resources and to strive towards the development of such resources for the general welfare, with due regard to the needs of the under-developed areas of the world;". (Resolution 380 (V), para. (d))

Since then, the squandering of resources on armaments has increased, while the question of converting these resources into development goals remains at the stage of definitions. Certain States obstinately refuse to take any account of the need for simultaneous efforts to establish a New International Economic Order and achieve general and complete disarmament.

My delegation believes that the relationship between disarmament and development should not be viewed only as something to be dealt with over the long term - that is to say, following general and complete disarmament. The possibility of dealing with it over the medium term should also be considered. There is, in fact, a direct link between the arms race and the increase in

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

military budgets. Therefore, without reducing military budgets it is highly unlikely that the arms race can be halted. This means that measures aimed at a progressive reduction of military budgets should be taken as soon as possible. The resources thus saved could be devoted to economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries.

To this end, the General Assembly adopted a number of recommendations, particularly resolution 32/85 in which it requested the Secretary-General to urge States prepared to do so to participate in a pilot test on the reporting of military budgets. Furthermore, at the present session the Soviet Union has made a number of interesting proposals in this connexion. My delegation, therefore, hopes that the major Powers will renew their talks on the question of reducing military budgets with a view to finding an area of agreement which will make possible the adoption of concrete measures. The absence of a solution on this issue can only be prejudicial to the efforts of the United Nations to find a generally acceptable way of relating disarmament to development.

In this connexion, my delegation would like to congratulate the Secretary-General for the diligent way in which he has implemented the recommendations of paragraph 94 in connexion with the creation of a governmental group of experts whose job it would be to study the relationship between disarmament and development. The work of this group is already under way. My delegation hopes that it will succeed and that its report will be the last in the series of United Nations reports dealing with the economic and social consequences of the arms race. What we mean by this is that it will have to provide a basis for specific and concrete action, so that it will no longer be necessary to request yet another study. For all these reasons, I should like to support the proposal made by the representative of Nigeria to the effect that the General Assembly should once again insist that this study should be forward-looking and policy-oriented.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

The question of the proliferation of nuclear weapons is today certainly a cause of utmost concern. On the African continent the Pretoria régime is endangering the denuclearized status of Africa by its frenzied efforts to acquire nuclear weapons. It is therefore urgent that the permanent members of the Security Council, particularly those which maintain relations with Pretoria, take steps to induce South Africa to sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to accept the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency. These measures can only be regarded as a minimum, because as long as the apartheid régime exists, peace and international security will be threatened in Africa and throughout the world.

I should now like to say something about the deliberative and negotiating organs which the General Assembly has decided to set up. In the case of the Disarmament Commission, my delegation believes that it should be given an importance which is equal to the three components of its mandate. Although special circumstances have led us to support the idea that priority should be given to consideration of the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme, we nevertheless believe that this question will not always be on the agenda of the Disarmament Commission. Therefore, we should now give some thought to the questions which will have to be taken up by the Disarmament Commission and ensure that they do not lead to a simple repetition of the debate in the First Committee.

The Disarmament Commission could take up the important proposals which were made on disarmament and development: the question of the verification of disarmament agreements, the creation of new zones of peace, and so forth. These proposals which were formulated during the tenth special session of the General Assembly are contained for the most part in paragraph 125 of the Final Document. This is why my delegation believes that they should be referred to the Disarmament Commission and subsequently to the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

In the case of the negotiating body, my delegation is very pleased at the changes which have occurred as they will help to strengthen its democratic and universal character. We welcome the French Government's decision to participate in its work. Equally, it is our hope that the Chinese Government will soon join in the work of the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation would also like to congratulate Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Cuba, Indonesia, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Venezuela on their appointment to this important body. We are quite certain these changes will make it possible to overcome any possible risk of manipulation and monopolies in disarmament negotiations by some Powers. Furthermore, my delegation sincerely hopes that the new Committee on Disarmament will not simply be a private club which is reserved to the great and medium-sized Powers. In this connexion, it is important that the provisions of paragraph 120 of the Final Document, which stipulate that the membership of the Committee on Disarmament will be reviewed at regular intervals, should be faithfully applied.

Regarding the question of convening a second special session on disarmament, my delegation feels that it should be held in the not too distant future, perhaps in three years time. We should not lose the momentum provided by the first special session. On the contrary, we believe it is necessary to set a reasonable time-table, lest the negotiations envisaged under the Programme of Action drag on as has happened in the case of the convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. The main task of the second special session would be to review the implementation of the Programme of Action contained in the Final Document. It will not, in our view, require such lengthy preparation as was needed for the first special session on disarmament.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

It will be a question less of inducing States to agree on a programme of action in the field of disarmament than of seeing whether the relevant agreements have been applied.

I should not like to conclude my statement without touching on the important question of the dissemination of information on disarmament. Indeed, an informed and alert public opinion is the best possible ally in breaking down the wall of mistrust which bars the way to progress in disarmament negotiations. Therefore, it is essential that our peoples understand what we are doing. The personal participation of the Head of State of Senegal, President Leopold Sedar Senghor, in the work of the tenth special session on disarmament led in Senegal to a broad dissemination of information on the arms race and on other problems relating to disarmament. We therefore intend to take other steps in the field of education. In this connexion, we are very much looking forward to the holding of the UNESCO world congress on education in disarmament matters.

In conclusion, I should like to say that my delegation endorses the directives contained in document A/33/305 on the United Nations disarmament fellowships. However, it would be advisable that in the distribution of these fellowships account be taken of the needs of regions such as Africa, where skills in the disarmament field are most lacking.

Mr. HUSSEN (Somalia): Mr. Chairman, this is my first intervention in the debate in the First Committee and I would like to make it clear that I refrain from extending my sincere congratulations and expressions of confidence to you and your fellow officers only because of your directive in this respect.

With regard to the first item of our programme of work, I must first of all express my delegation's satisfaction that the tenth special session achieved a historic consensus on disarmament principles and priorities, on a Programme of Action and on the new machinery for implementing disarmament measures. We trust that this consensus will not become a matter for cynicism and indifference, as in many other cases where widely approved resolutions have failed to achieve the desired results. The gravity of the disarmament question and the terrible

(Mr. Hussen, Somalia)

consequences for mankind if we fail to implement our decisions make it imperative that the consensus of the tenth special session be translated into positive action.

It is gratifying that there have been some immediate results of the special session in that steps have already been taken to reorganize and revitalize our disarmament machinery. Of course, without the political will to use it, the new machinery could prove to be as unsatisfactory as the old. However, we believe that the clearer lines of authority and procedure which we now have will in themselves give added force to our efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

My delegation is particularly happy that the new arrangements reflect the primary role and responsibility of the United Nations in disarmament matters, in accordance with the principles and purposes of our Organization.

The fact that this Committee now deals exclusively with disarmament and the related question of international security means that it will contribute to the deliberative function of the General Assembly with a sharpened focus. The need for a standing deliberative organ of the General Assembly has become even more apparent in view of the new direction and impetus the special session has given to the task of implementing the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme. We therefore welcome the reactivation of the Disarmament Commission which will fill this important need. We also welcome the changes in the Committee on Disarmament. Its essential function as the body for multilateral disarmament negotiations remains unchanged, but we are happy that the recommendations of the non-aligned group on a closer relationship with the General Assembly, on a rotating chairmanship and on provisions for participation by non-members have all been accepted.

Another area where implementation of the decisions of the tenth special session is immediately practical is the strengthening of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament and the extension of its research and information functions. Its valuable resources can be increasingly used within our Organization and can be central to the task of mobilizing public opinion in support of disarmament.

(Mr. Hussen, Somalia)

We note with satisfaction that the Secretary-General, in response to paragraph 108 of the Final Document, has submitted excellent guidelines for the United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament, and has proposed that the Centre for Disarmament be charged with organizing the programme.

With regard to the task assigned by the special session to the General Assembly of determining specific guidelines for carrying out disarmament studies, we believe that this Committee and the expert committee now being constituted to advise the Secretary-General on this matter should follow as far as possible the priorities for disarmament set by the tenth special session. Highest priority was, of course, given to the question of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament and to the elimination of other weapons of mass destruction.

On the matter of the specific recommendation of the Final Document of the special session that a study of the relationship between disarmament and development should be initiated, we are glad to note that the Committee of Experts appointed by the Secretary-General is already moving in that direction. The international community has long accepted in principle that resources now applied to destruction and death should increasingly be channelled towards improving the quality of life of the majority of the world's people in the developing countries. We hope that the work of this expert committee will help to translate this cherished principle into a living reality. Studies are already in train on the reduction of military budgets of the nuclear Powers and other militarily significant States which, of course, are also relevant to this objective.

The General Assembly was also charged with recommending a date for the convening of the next special session on disarmament. There are two considerations which seem to operate here. One consideration, which supports the convening of a second special session on disarmament in 1981, rightly emphasizes the desirability of keeping up the momentum achieved by the tenth special session. An opposing consideration is that our energies should not be deflected by the preparation and execution of a debating exercise, but rather should be applied to practical efforts to deal with the long list of complex disarmament problems which have been identified. My delegation believes that this Committee could well allow some time for the preponderance of the merits of one or other of these views to emerge and put off a decision on the date of the next special session on disarmament until the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Hussen, Somalia.)

With regard to the substantive issues dealt with in the Final Document of the special session, we are perhaps still too near to that event to expect much progress to have been made. However, my delegation had hoped that this Committee could have had before it the draft of a nuclear test ban treaty and of a treaty outlawing chemical weapons. These treaties fall within the area designated by the world community as having the highest priority. They have long been under consideration by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), so the spade work has been done. The parties concerned in the tripartite nuclear test ban negotiations and in the bilateral negotiations for a ban on chemical weapons have all expressed their desire to comply with the international consensus on these questions. And yet the promise of agreement on these treaties so long held out before the world community remains unfulfilled. It seems to my delegation that there is an urgent need to establish time frames as incentives for the speedy conclusion of these treaties.

The outstanding difficulties seem to be largely those of verification, a situation which validates the emphasis placed by the special session on the need to develop appropriate verification methods and procedures. In this context we welcome the valuable report of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts on Seismic Events. A related matter is the proposal for the establishment of a disarmament agency which, among other functions, could have those of a central verification body. We hope that the Disarmament Commission will give early consideration to this proposal. The undoubtedly complex issues involved are of vital importance for the achievement of our disarmament goals.

As I have already noted, the Final Document of the tenth special session gave the highest prominence and priority to ending the arms race in nuclear weapons and to the elimination of those and other weapons of mass destruction. The nuclear Powers bear the heavy responsibility of implementing the decisions made in this area of disarmament. In this regard, we note that agreement on the SALT II negotiations seems imminent and that such arrangements at least promote the idea that nuclear weapons and weapons systems should be controlled.

(Mr. Hussen, Somalia)

They do nothing, however, to replace the unacceptable concept of the balance of terror which remains the precarious basis for international peace and security. If the nuclear Powers are sincere in their support of the principles and priorities unanimously approved by the tenth special session, they must be prepared to take more vigorous measures to remove the constant threat that nuclear armaments present to mankind's survival.

In view of the dangerous and complex situations that have arisen from the development and deployment of nuclear weapons, the special session was rightly concerned about the development of new weapons of mass destruction. In this connexion, my delegation cannot agree with those Member States which maintain that agreements should only be concluded on new weapons of mass destruction which have been clearly identified. We support those initiatives which would establish in principle the prohibition of all new weapons of mass destruction and which also take account of new weapons of this kind which have been identified or considered for possible development.

In this same context, we hope to see speedy progress made by the United States and the Soviet Union in their joint initiative on the prohibition of radiological weapons.

I turn now to the question of conventional weapons and in this regard we note with deep concern that inhuman weapons such as napalm and anti-personnel cluster bombs have figured prominently, in quite recent times, in the attacks by racist and colonialist régimes on peoples fighting against injustice or for the inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

We therefore place great importance on the outcome, next year, of the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be Deemed to be excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects.

As an African State which is a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and which firmly supports the denuclearization of Africa, the Somali Democratic Republic welcomes any measures which might enhance the security of our region and our continent. The need to ensure that Africa remains free from nuclear weapons has, of course, become urgent in view of the fact that South Africa's racist régime has been allowed to acquire the technology to produce nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Hussen, Somalia)

We also support the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other areas of the world where a common desire for these security measures has emerged. The establishment of a zone of this kind in the Middle East, where tension and conflict are endemic, would obviously be a valuable contribution to world peace and security. Unfortunately, Israel continues to refuse to take the necessary step of becoming a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, obviously because of its nuclear-weapon capability.

The preservation of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is a matter of direct concern to my Government. We welcome the proposal of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean to convene a meeting of the littoral and hinterland States in New York next summer as a first step towards the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean. The resumption of talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on their military presence in the Indian Ocean is highly desirable, in view of the continuing build-up of military installations and facilities in the zone by the two super-Powers. We hope that in future such talks will meet the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

We must of necessity concern ourselves with the many and complex details of the disarmament process, but in our preoccupation with the specifics of the arms race in nuclear weapons and in increasingly sophisticated conventional weapons we must not neglect the underlying factors which give rise to militarism and armed aggression. Indeed, there will be no significant progress towards our disarmament goals unless - and I repeat, unless - we also deal with the reasons why weapons are developed, marketed and acquired.

(Mr. Hussen, Somalia)

Among these reasons is the desire for power and profit strikingly demonstrated by the military-industrial complexes of the world's two power blocs. They are prepared to endanger the long-term prospects for international peace and security for the sake of their immediate materialist and hegemonistic interests. This destructive trend can be offset only by the constant pressure of an informed and effective international public opinion.

It must also be recognized that as long as peoples and countries are subjected to grave injustices there will be tension and conflict to fuel the arms race, which in turn will encourage the rivalry of the super-Powers in their insatiable appetite for spheres of influence and hegemonistic ambitions.

The complex problems that are the legacy of colonialism in Africa and the Middle East take many different shapes and forms, but they all have as a common feature the perpetuation of injustice, either through the denial of the right to self-determination and independence or through the imposition of racist minority rule.

The United Nations has itself recognized the legitimacy of armed struggle against such unjust situations in cases where all avenues of peaceful change have been exhausted. It is therefore apparent that it is futile to talk about ending the arms race when we lag behind in dealing with the basic causes of conflict with the seriousness and urgency they demand.

We must, of course, attack the problems on our disarmament list with vigour and in the light of the principles and priorities set by the tenth special session. But our efforts will not be assured of success unless the major Powers and power blocs accept the principle of equitable solutions to any and all major international problems as a binding moral obligation.

Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): When we speak of disarmament, we are talking about a major goal of the contemporary stage of international development, namely, to preserve what we have achieved in the way of civilization, science and technology and to transform the state of precarious peace, accompanied by a situation of tense unrest and a sense of pessimism among the international community, in the shadow of nuclear terror, into a situation where international détente prevails and the international community co-operates to consolidate the new international economic order.

(Mr. Abdel Meguid, Egypt)

The efforts being deployed to reduce tension and to establish international relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence and trust among all States, the non-use of the threat of force, the non-use of force against the territorial integrity or the political independence of any State, the peaceful settlement of disputes, the right of peoples to self-determination and independence and the putting of an end to military alliances and nuclear umbrellas, based essentially on what we call the balance of deterrence or the doctrine of strategic superiority - all these are matters which come within the framework of the process of promoting disarmament issues.

Disarmament measures must be accompanied by corresponding arrangements to ensure that just solutions are found to political problems, for that is an inseparable part of international stability, and to put an end to the arms race and the transformation of the world into a terrifying stockpile of weapons. What we in fact need is complete adherence to the purposes and principles of the United Nations and its Charter and an affirmation of the principles relating to refraining from the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any State, the principles relating to the peaceful settlement of disputes and the principles relating to respect for the right of peoples to self-determination and independence.

Egypt, like the other States of the third world, had hoped that the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament, would lead to tangible and specific results. Although the non-aligned group may have been disappointed in that hope by the results produced by the session, we nevertheless believe that the session made it possible for the non-aligned group to ascertain for the first time the positions of East and West and the degree of their responsiveness to our sincere desire to achieve general and complete disarmament.

Despite the limited nature of the results of the tenth special session, my country's delegation believes that we have emerged from that session with the following concepts and conclusions:

First, affirmation of the role which must be played by the United Nations and by its principal organ, the Security Council, in the spheres of disarmament or in the establishment of specialized bodies to conduct studies on disarmament issues;

Secondly, accentuation of the importance of negotiation among the various groups and States, with a view to arriving at bilateral, regional or global agreements;

Thirdly, the relationship between disarmament issues and the finding of solutions to political problems, with emphasis on the right of peoples to self-determination and independence and the principle of refraining from the threat or use of force in international relations;

Fourthly, the establishment of priorities for disarmament negotiations and a realization of the fact that there is nothing to preclude the conducting of negotiations on all priority topics simultaneously;

Fifthly, the achievement of broader democracy in the negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament, and in the establishment of the United Nations Disarmament Commission;

Sixthly, affirmation of the right of States to exercise their inalienable right, on a non-discriminatory basis, to acquire and utilize the nuclear technology, equipment and materials necessary for the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes;

Seventhly, the creation of circumstances propitious for the adoption of additional measures for the consolidation of international trust and increased alleviation of the acuteness of international tension;

Eighthly, emphasis of the principle of the balance of reciprocal responsibilities as between nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States;

Ninthly, the importance of verification as a major element in the implementation of agreements;

Tenthly and lastly, affirmation of the close relationship between disarmament and development.

(Mr. Abdel Meguid, Egypt)

My delegation would like to comment on certain implementational aspects of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, devoted to disarmament. With regard to the nuclear aspect, paragraph 50 of the Final Document sets forth the urgent steps that will have to be taken at appropriate stages for the negotiation of agreements to deal with the nuclear aspects of disarmament, including cessation of the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, cessation of the production of all nuclear weapons and their means of delivery and the establishment of a comprehensive phased programme for progressive and balanced reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery. The Final Document further states that the SALT II agreement should be concluded at the earliest possible date and that the drafting of a treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests should be completed. My country's delegation considers that the steps outlined in the Final Document should be discussed by the deliberative body so as to set a time-table for the specific stages involved in dealing with the nuclear problems to be discussed by the negotiating body, since this is a topic of the highest priority for the majority of the States of the world.

The nuclear States have a special responsibility to take the necessary measures to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war, to prevent the use of force in international relations and to give all guarantees to the non-nuclear States that there will be no use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against them.

We believe that those undertakings should be compiled in the form of an official document to be issued by the Security Council. This document should stress as a major principle that the strengthening of security guarantees for non-nuclear States lies in nuclear disarmament and the elimination of nuclear-weapon stockpiles and that the undertaking not to use nuclear weapons against them is a step contained within the framework of nuclear disarmament, because it is, in our view, inadmissible for us to make do with such undertakings while the nuclear terror still exists or while there remains the possibility of a miscalculation.

(Mr. Abdel Meguid, Egypt)

Paragraphs 60 to 63 of the Final Document emphasize the importance of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in many regions and set forth in detail the principles, measures and guarantees which should govern the establishment of those zones, with regard to both the States within each zone and to the nuclear States. Those paragraphs also highlight the importance of the role which must be undertaken by the Security Council, both in preventing the frustration of the objective of the denuclearization of Africa and in advancing the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Egypt was one of the first States to call for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, in accordance with the provisions of article VII of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, taking into account the special circumstances of each zone and the legitimate right of the States of each zone to acquire sophisticated technology under an appropriate system of control and guarantees. Hence arose the Iranian-Egyptian initiative four years ago in favour of declaring the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone, as a positive contribution to the prevention of nuclear proliferation and the maintenance of international peace and security. We are fully aware that the use of nuclear weapons will make no distinction between a nuclear zone and a non-nuclear zone, but, in view of the gravity of the situation confronting us, we must all participate sincerely in curbing proliferation, as a part of our common endeavour for nuclear disarmament.

The role of the Security Council is an essential and important one in the forthcoming stage in the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and in dealing with any violations aimed at frustrating the objective of the denuclearization of certain zones, having due regard to the letter and the spirit of Security Council resolution 255 (1968).

In view of the nature of the situation in the Middle East, the Egyptian delegation proposes that the States of the region should solemnly declare that they will refrain on a reciprocal basis from producing, acquiring or in any other way possessing nuclear weapons and nuclear explosive devices, and from permitting the stationing of nuclear weapons on their territory by any third party and agree to place all their nuclear activities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. The States concerned should deposit the official documents of their

(Mr. Abdel Meguid, Egypt)

declarations with the Security Council so that the Council may then declare the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Paragraphs 68 and 69 of the Final Document stress the inalienable right of all States to apply and develop their programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for development and their right to have access to and freedom to acquire technology, equipment and materials for peaceful uses of nuclear energy, under international safeguards applied by the International Atomic Energy Agency on a non-discriminatory basis. We believe that the nuclear States should promote this trend and should not stand in the way of its furtherance for the benefit for all States, and the developing countries in particular, in affirmation of article IV of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In this connexion, we should strengthen the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency and review the nature of its work so as to ensure that it plays an effective and non-discriminatory role.

My country's delegation views with concern the rapid development of the production and development of weapons of mass destruction and the possibility of their use, particularly in limited wars. We urgently appeal that binding agreements be concluded to put a halt to the use, possession and development of such weapons, and we believe that the deliberative body, the United Nations Disarmament Commission, should establish priorities both for the completion of agreements already in preparation, such as the agreement on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction and for initiating the preparation of other agreements to put an end to the possession and development of such weapons.

(Mr. Abdel Meguid, Egypt)

I would like to turn now to another important subject, namely, the increase in military activities in outer space. The activities of the space Powers have passed from observation operations to the possession of military satellites which have become part of the strategic weapon arsenals for attack and interception. The wording of paragraph 80 of the Final Document shows the extent of the concern of the space Powers to avoid going into this subject. In the view of my country's delegation, current activities in outer space will take us into another arms race and will affect our endeavours to confine the uses of outer space to peaceful purposes. This leads us to examine the various shortcomings of the 1967 Treaty on Outer Space, with a view to adapting it to rapid technological developments and emphasizing the provisions of the Treaty prohibiting the stockpiling of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction in outer space and banning the use of the moon and other celestial bodies for military purposes. We call upon the two major Powers to enter into bilateral discussions for the purpose of negotiation concerning their military activities in outer space and the establishment of comprehensive principles to ensure that no military activities are carried on in outer space. Those questions must be accorded special attention at that stage by the deliberative body and the negotiating body.

One of the positive results of the tenth special session was the consensus on the importance of the role which the United Nations, representing the international will, can play in assuming responsibility for disarmament, in advancing efforts to achieve it under effective international control and in conducting studies under the supervision of the advisory board which is to assist the Secretary-General. The United Nations was also given the important role of establishing the basis on which we shall rely in effecting a reduction of military budgets and armed forces, conducting an exhaustive study of the relationship between disarmament and development and an investigation of the way in which disarmament can contribute to the establishment of the new international economic order and effecting a redistribution of resources currently used for military purposes to benefit economic and social development, particularly that of the developing countries. It is important that those studies be utilized to advantage, whether by the deliberative body or by the negotiating body and we must also make the best use of the proposals that have been put forward, in particular the Soviet proposal, the French proposal and the proposal of the Secretary-General in this field.

(Mr. Abdel Meguid, Egypt)

The revitalization of the deliberative body, namely, the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the introduction of a modification in the current negotiating body has brought about greater democracy and broader participation of States in disarmament issues. That has also helped to establish a close link between the negotiating body and the General Assembly. Egypt, which has had the honour of participating in the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, will continue to deploy its efforts for the success of the work of the new negotiating body. We congratulate the 10 States which have newly joined it and welcome the fact that France has become a member. We hope that in the near future China will also become a member of the new negotiating body.

We realize that disarmament and the problems which it involves are not issues which lend themselves to rapid solutions, in view of their historical background and their complexity. What we have to do is to co-operate and persevere to maintain the impetus through our political will, which can ensure the adoption of steps leading to general and complete disarmament. The steps towards disarmament must be the subject of an ongoing follow-up, and we hope that the second session on disarmament will be convened in 1982, so that we can assess what has been achieved and deal with the obstacles standing in the way of disarmament. Lastly, I wish to refer to what I said in my statement before the General Assembly on 10 October 1978, namely, that Egypt, which is making a resolute effort for peace, believes that the approach adopted by the international community in the solution of its problems must evolve and become based on courageous and pragmatic confrontation of the challenges of the future.

Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to state for the record that it abides by Rule 110 of our rules of procedure and will refrain therefore from duly congratulating the Chairman and his colleagues on the Bureau for their skilful conduct of our work.

With respect to the recommendations adopted by the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the delegation of Ecuador was among those which viewed with optimism the results of its deliberations and the preceding stages of arduous preparations extending over a number of years that led to what will in fact be the second world disarmament conference in our century, if we consider the one which took place in 1932 at the League of Nations as the first. Ours is a cautious optimism in the light of the lack of specific progress on the subject which is the very *raison d'être* of the United Nations.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

We acknowledge, however, that the production of a Final Document which was adopted by consensus is in itself an historic event which clearly demonstrates the firm desire of all the peoples of the world soon to achieve general and complete disarmament under United Nations control.

It would be premature to speak of results, but it might be timely to talk about the existence of a programme of action and several definitions. With respect to priority actions to arrive at an effective stage of disarmament measures, the Foreign Minister of Ecuador proposed the following at the special session:

"firstly, total prohibition of all kinds of nuclear tests; secondly, prohibition of the testing or production of new weapons of mass destruction, whether radiological, chemical, biological, or meteorological; thirdly, destruction or effective limitation of rocket delivery systems for such weapons; and, fourthly, a commitment by each State not to be the first to use nuclear weapons in case of conflict." (A/S.10/PV.9, p. 46)

We know that these subjects will be dealt with at the current session. However, it emerged at the special session, as a clear and a reputable statement of fact, that the nuclear Powers, especially those which have the largest arsenals, bear the primary responsibility for disarmament.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

Paragraph 48 of the Final Document under the Programme of Action, confirms this fact. It is also quite clear that the hub of action in the field of disarmament and of the promotion, negotiation and dissemination of such action can be no other than the United Nations since the danger, the cost impact and the right to a life of security and opportunity with justice and freedom concerns all countries large and small, nuclear and non-nuclear alike.

For this reason, we await with interest, and in full awareness of the importance that the world attaches to the United Nations disarmament machinery, the action of the Disarmament Commission, which will commence its substantive work in May 1979, and of the Committee on Disarmament, which will meet in January of the same year, the latter under the new system of rotating chairmanship, and, it is to be hoped, with the participation of all the nuclear Powers.

We further believe that the entire United Nations system is involved in this great undertaking, precisely because the disarmament question will continue to hinder progress in all other areas covered by the Organization unless progress is achieved towards genuine disarmament and therefore towards the much hoped for release of vast resources which are at present absorbed by the armaments race, but which could be devoted to the lofty cause of the establishment of a New International Economic Order.

In this connexion, we welcome with interest the proposal for inclusion of a new item for consideration in due course on the strengthening of the guarantees relating to the security of non-nuclear States. The fact that the matter was brought up by a nuclear Power is the result of the exhortation contained in paragraph 59 of the Final Document, and is, further, encouraging for those countries which advocated the common thesis which underlies the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

Another significant development towards the establishment of zones of peace as a genuine and realistic course to follow for achieving the reduction of military expenses of every kind is the strengthening of the United Nations system to ensure the peaceful settlement of international disputes. Thus, in the Declaration, in paragraph 13 of the Final Document, it is recommended that

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

"At the same time, the causes of the arms race and threats to peace must be reduced and to this end effective action should be taken to eliminate tensions and settle disputes by peaceful means." (resolution S-10/2)

This question is also mentioned in paragraphs 12 and 26 of the Final Document, and again in paragraph 110 it is stated that

"Progress in disarmament should be accompanied by measures to strengthen institutions for maintaining peace and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means." (ibid.)

In this connexion, bearing in mind the characteristic interdependence of the various forums of the world Organization, the delegation of Ecuador has always stressed the need to strengthen this machinery of the United Nations and the work of the special Ad Hoc Committee to improve the effectiveness of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations.

We also attach importance to the initiative taken by a number of countries on the strengthening of the security function of the United Nations in the peaceful settlement of disputes and peace-keeping operations, which is included in the Final Document for future consideration.

In another sector of the United Nations system the Ecuadorian delegate pertinently emphasized the need to lighten the costly burden of the arms race in order to counter the dangerous imbalance between high per-capita-income countries and the majority of the peoples of the world, all at differing stages of development. In fact, we stated in the debate on the reaffirmation of the mandate of the Committee of the Whole, which henceforth should be the negotiating forum to seek agreements while helping to improve the action of the other forums, that the important world development undertaking would be more productive than the present arms race, which absorbs such astronomical resources.

A world at peace would be a prosperous world, and a growing economy would benefit all. Even the great Powers acknowledged at the special session the great value of the Treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America - the Treaty of Tlatelolco - to the denuclearization of the world. Since this subject will be dealt with under special items numbers 36 and 39 later, I need not dwell on it here. Suffice it to add that we see in Latin America a healthy school of thought in support of a new stage which would go beyond the prohibition of nuclear weapons and move forward

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

into the area of conventional weapons with a view to making Latin America a true zone of peace.

This was the scope and meaning of another Latin American contribution to disarmament, namely, the Declaration of Ayacucho, which is cited in paragraph 84 of the Final Document. That initiative by eight Latin American countries in December 1974 was reiterated by their Foreign Ministers in a note verbale to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 22 June 1978, which

"... reaffirmed the need to redouble efforts to bring about conditions which will be conducive to the effective arms limitation in the region and to devote all possible resources to the economic and social development of each and every one of the countries of Latin America."

(A/S-10/AC.1/34, p. 1)

The Foreign Ministers

"... agreed that the continued existence of problems in the international field is one of the major causes of armaments and they accordingly reaffirmed their will to seek the solution of all disputes by peaceful means, thus contributing to the elimination of tensions and the preservation and strengthening of peace." (ibid.)

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

In that same document, the Foreign Ministers expressed their readiness to explore, together with the other Latin American countries, the possibility of concluding an agreement on the limitation of conventional weapons in Latin America. With the same purpose, and thus complying with the recommendation to be found in paragraph 84 of the Final Document, in its Programme of Action, certain countries of Latin America and the Caribbean met in Mexico in August of this year to discuss the prospects of reducing conventional weapons in the region.

Since disarmament implies not only the reduction and elimination of weapons, but also their limitation and prohibition, we have been maintaining the need to keep outer space as a new area of peace, free of military activities, which would be used only to help those peoples that need it most, in order to help to narrow the gap between industrialized and developing countries. This view was upheld by the delegation of Ecuador, together with other equatorial countries, in the Special Political Committee. At that time we pointed out the gaps in the outer space Treaty, which requires changes, and we urged the need to regulate both the segments of the geostationary orbit which fall within the sovereignty of the equatorial countries and those segments which should be used for the benefit of the other developing countries, as well as those used by the space Powers.

The existence of satellites to hunt other satellites, the use of nuclear energy to power satellites and the over-crowding of the geostationary orbit with space craft are matters which call for regulation and for some coherence in the law, within the context of the concept of the exclusively peaceful use of outer space. Neither in space nor in the atmosphere should any use other than peaceful use be permitted. It is unacceptable that attempts should be made even by developing countries to divert rockets to non-peaceful purposes.

For all those reasons, my delegation has followed with keen interest the progress achieved in the special study requested from the Secretary-General on the existing relationship between disarmament and development. The volume of resources devoted to armaments is so gigantic and that of the resources set aside for development is relatively so small, that it is offensive to our intelligence and sense of logic that no solution can be found to balance out

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

that ratio. Indeed it bears within itself the possibility of a solution given the political will and the necessary historic dynamic vision.

The majority of the developing countries of the world have only one strength, that of their voice, which is in fact the voice of world public opinion and which can also be heard within the great Powers themselves. That public opinion was represented by 260 non-governmental organizations at the tenth special session of the General Assembly. Some of those bodies represented the aspirations of many millions of human beings. It is true that only a few of them and certain research institutions can make specific technical contributions to this complex subject, but it would be desirable to undertake a vigorous campaign in the United Nations addressed to world public opinion concerning the various aspects of disarmament, as recommended in paragraphs 103 to 107 of the Final Document.

That vigorous campaign must begin in the United Nations and in each of the 150 Governments of the Member States and all public and private institutions concerned. It is one of the responsibilities incumbent upon us to increase awareness about disarmament and this must be an action parallel to that of improving information about the United Nations, since it would in fact help to strengthen the Organization itself. This opinion has been expressed by my delegation in the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization.

There are certain measures, especially in the field of education and of the mass media throughout the world, whether public or private, which could be adopted straightaway and which would allow us to hope that, thanks to the growing support of world public opinion, the resolutions and recommendations of the United Nations will be implemented and not simply relegated to the archives of this Organization.

This great variety of action can be undertaken by individuals and peoples at all times. Since this process cannot be stopped once it has achieved such important and dynamic dimensions, it is only logical that we should think about its next stages.

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

My delegation agrees with those who advocate the convening of a second special session within three years, in 1981, and that there, on the basis of the progress achieved or to be achieved, the date of the world disarmament conference should be set as stated in the Final Document. That would be a historic event that perhaps will be able to correct the course of human evolution orienting it in obedience to the imperatives of disarmament before the end of the century in which we live.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): On behalf of the nine countries of the European Community, I should like to make a statement with regard to the date of the next special session.

When the special session devoted to disarmament concluded its debate there was a widespread feeling among the Member States of the United Nations that the date for the second special session devoted to disarmament could be fixed only after some time had elapsed and a clear picture of its results had been gained. Therefore, paragraph 119 of the Final Document stated that the General Assembly should decide on a date at its thirty-third session.

During the debate of the past days in this Committee, different opinions about the timing of that session have become apparent. In fact it is not an easy decision at all. We have various factors in mind which should be taken into account when a decision is made on the date for the second special session, and I shall sum them up.

The reformed disarmament machinery will unfold its full capacity only after some time; this time should be given to it. In this context, we expect valuable contributions from the new Committee on Disarmament which will start its work in 1979, and from the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

The special session devoted to disarmament has generated a momentum which should be allowed to come to full fruition.

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal Republic of Germany)

Following the decisions taken by the special session devoted to disarmament, studies have to be carried out which will form the basis for further deliberations. And then, the calendar for the coming two years already contains a number of important disarmament conferences, the results of which should be taken into consideration in the preparations for the next special session on disarmament. I have in mind in particular the Bacteriological Weapons and the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conferences in 1980 which require one or more preparatory conferences in 1979. I have further in mind the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions and Restrictions of Certain Conventional Weapons in the summer of 1979 with its preceding second preparatory conference. The outcome of those conferences will also be important for the next special session devoted to disarmament.

Last, but not least, the new special session devoted to disarmament will itself also need time for its careful preparation. As representatives will remember, five sessions of the Preparatory Committee were necessary to prepare the first special session devoted to disarmament.

Taking all these points into consideration, we are inclined to think that the next special session devoted to disarmament should be held in 1982.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to announce that the Syrian Arab Republic has asked to be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/33/L.2, A/C.1/33/L.3 and A/C.1/33/L.5 and the delegations of Cuba and Somalia have asked to be included among the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.5.

Members of the Committee will remember that the Committee held a meeting to inaugurate Disarmament Week. At the time the representative of the Dominican Republic, which is the current Chairman of the Latin American Group, was unable to attend and make a statement. The delegation of the Dominican Republic has requested therefore that the statement it should have made on that occasion be presented as a First Committee document. If the Committee has no objection, the necessary measures will be taken to that end.

(The Chairman)

The representative of Israel has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I should like to remind delegations that statements in exercise of the right of reply must be limited to ten minutes.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): Several delegations in the course of their statements today on the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, have reverted to the sterile acrimony against Israel that all of us have come to expect whenever some of these delegations address themselves to any of the 132 items on the agenda of the General Assembly. The delegation of Israel has no wish to respond in kind or enter into a debate which would take this Committee into matters that have no bearing on the subject under discussion. There must, however, be some link between the state of affairs in the world and what is being said here. I am obliged, therefore, to respond to the statement of the representative of Syria and I shall be extremely brief.

For a representative of a country which only two weeks ago was bombarding hospitals, refugee camps, schools and civilian dwellings in Beirut to appear in this Committee to champion the cause of disarmament represents a unique form of blatant ridicule of everything this Organization is supposed to stand for. My suggestion to the representative of Syria is that he should publish his pious support for the principles of disarmament in the streets of Beirut. There his words would resound with a mocking echo among the rubble, the decaying corpses and the charred remains of what once was a proud city. Yes, let him first speak peace in Beirut and then come to preach disarmament in the First Committee.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.