



Saturday, 10 July 1982,
at 10.40 a.m.

President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEMS 9 TO 14

*Tribute to the memory of Mr. Silvestre Antonio Guzmán
Fernández, President of the Dominican Republic*

1. The PRESIDENT: We have learned with sorrow of the recent tragic death of the President of the Dominican Republic, Mr. Silvestre Antonio Guzmán Fernández. On behalf of the General Assembly, I request the representative of the Dominican Republic to convey our condolences to the Government and the people of the Dominican Republic and to the bereaved family.

2. I invite members of the Assembly to stand and observe a minute's silence in tribute to the memory of President Guzmán Fernández.

The representatives, standing, observed a minute of silence.

3. Mr. DEL ROSARIO (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, on behalf of my Government and the Dominican people and on my own behalf, I should like to thank you for the condolences you have just kindly expressed on the death of our dear President, don Antonio Guzmán Fernández.

4. My people, united as one in the face of this tragic event, feels deep sorrow at the passing away of a man who devoted his life to his work, to his family and to the struggle to raise the standard of living of his countrymen.

5. In his public life he obtained the highest office of the nation in free elections in 1978, and in his capacity as President he continuously struggled to strengthen the democratic institutions of my country. Today, after his death, leaders of all political parties of the most varied ideological trends, business leaders, workers, farmers, students and the man in the street all agree that Antonio Guzmán Fernández will go down in my country's history as one of the greatest Presidents that we have ever had.

6. In this very painful time in the life of my country, the teachings of President Guzmán are bearing fruit, and constitutional continuity has been fully respected by the military and civilian leaders.

7. Sir, I shall convey your expressions of condolences to my Government and to the Guzmán family. We shall always be grateful to you for them.

8. May the Almighty receive the soul of the man who in his life was President Antonio Guzmán Fernández.

Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session:

- (a) Status of negotiations on disarmament as contained in the Programme of Action and bearing in mind the priorities set out in the Programme;
- (b) Consideration of the report of the Committee on Disarmament, in particular of any draft instruments transmitted by the Committee;
- (c) Consideration of the report of the Disarmament Commission;
- (d) Consideration of the implementation of resolutions of the General Assembly on specific tasks, in particular studies aimed at the realization of the Final Document and their follow-up

Consideration and adoption of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament

Implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade and consideration of the initiatives and proposals of Member States

Enhancement of the effectiveness of machinery in the field of disarmament and strengthening of the role of the United Nations in this field, including the possible convening of a World Disarmament Conference

Measures to mobilize world public opinion in favour of disarmament:

- (a) Disarmament education, seminars and training (United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament);
- (b) World Disarmament Campaign;
- (c) Other public information activities

Adoption, in an appropriate format, of the documents of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly

9. The PRESIDENT: I invite the Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Twelfth Special Session, Mr. Ömer Ersun of Turkey, to present the Committee's report.

10. Mr. ERSUN (Turkey), Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Twelfth Special Session: I have the duty and the honour to present to the General Assembly the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, contained in document A/S-12/32. I must confess that in so doing I have mixed feelings of disappointment and hope, a certain blend of pessimism and optimism.

11. Unfortunately, the *Ad Hoc* Committee was not able to finalize a comprehensive programme of disarmament to be submitted for the approval of the

General Assembly at this special session, and I am sure I echo the common feeling of us all in expressing regret in that regard. Nor was the Committee able to reach agreement on the majority of other items on its agenda, despite dedicated and intensive work by all delegations. Thus the report contains mainly a factual description of our work during this special session.

12. Fortunately, however, the Committee has been able to agree on two texts: one on the World Disarmament Campaign and the other on the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament. The two texts appear in the annex to the report, and I submit them to the General Assembly for appropriate action.

13. The most important thing which gives me hope for the future is that the multilateral negotiating process of disarmament is being kept alive at the conclusion of this session. We indeed still have a long way to go, but as long as the process continues we have every reason to be optimistic for the future and to maintain our hopes.

14. The report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee consists of three sections: the introduction, a section on the work of the Committee, and its conclusions.

15. Once established, the *Ad Hoc* Committee organized itself in three main Working Groups, which later set up subsidiary bodies as needed. The Working Groups and the drafting and contact groups worked incessantly, beginning on 14 June; some of them worked until the late hours of 8 July to complete the tasks assigned them.

16. Working Group I was entrusted with the elaboration of the comprehensive programme of disarmament. Mr. García Robles served as chairman of that Working Group, and he spared no effort to achieve a final text of the comprehensive programme.

17. Four subgroups were established to deal with various sections of the comprehensive programme, under the chairmanship of Mr. François de la Gorce of France, Mr. Anatoly Nikitich Sheldov of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mr. Mansur Ahmad of Pakistan, and Mr. Curt Lidgard of Sweden.

18. Working Group II, entrusted with drafting a document on the review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, was presided over by Mr. David Sadleir of Australia. Two drafting groups were set up to carry out parts of the Working Group's mandate, under the chairmanship of Mr. A. T. Jayakoddy of Sri Lanka and Mr. Nana S. Sutresna of Indonesia.

19. Working Group III was entrusted with items 11 and 13. Mr. Gerhard Herder of the German Democratic Republic served as chairman. That Group was later assisted by contact groups which were set up as needed to deal with various parts of the mandate.

20. Section III of the report, entitled "Conclusions", reflects the consensus text on which we agreed after long negotiations.

21. I think that the report speaks for itself. The Secretariat has spared no effort to present it in its entirety.

22. In conclusion, I should like to make specific reference to the tireless efforts exerted prior to and

during the course of the session by the dedicated personnel of the Centre for Disarmament in particular and all the members of the Secretariat in general.

23. The PRESIDENT: I propose that the General Assembly proceed immediately to the approval of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, on the understanding that delegations wishing to do so will be free to make statements of position or reservation after the report is approved. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that it is the Assembly's wish to follow that procedure.

It was so decided.

24. The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the General Assembly approves the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee contained in document A/S-12/32 as the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly?

25. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): During its 12th meeting, as the *Ad Hoc* Committee considered its provisional report, a number of amendments and suggestions for changes were proposed. However, owing to the pressure of time, the wording of some paragraphs is perhaps not entirely satisfactory. Purely stylistic changes are not so important; but when it is a question of substance, and particularly a question of substance that can be corrected by adding or deleting something, I think that that should be done.

26. In this connexion I should like to refer to paragraph 60 of the provisional report, the third and fourth sentences of which read:

"The past four years have witnessed increasing recourse to the use or threat of use of force against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, military intervention, occupation, annexation and interference in the internal affairs of States and denial of the inalienable right to self-determination and independence of peoples under colonial or foreign domination. The period has also witnessed actions by States contrary to the Final Document."

27. The text would imply that this entire series of actions are not contrary to the Final Document. That would obviously be a false interpretation, and for that reason I suggest that we insert the adjective "other" between the words "witnessed" and "actions", so that the fourth sentence would read: "The period has also witnessed other actions by States contrary to the Final Document."

28. That would make it entirely clear that all the actions listed were contrary to the Final Document, but that other actions were also contrary to that Document. That is my modest proposal.

29. The PRESIDENT: The statement of the representative of Mexico was very clear. His proposal is to insert the word "other" before "actions by States contrary to the Final Document", and he has explained his reasons for making it. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to that addition.

It was so decided.

30. The PRESIDENT: With that change, may I take it that the General Assembly approves the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee contained in document A/S-12/

32 as the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly?

It was so decided (decision S-12/24).

31. The PRESIDENT: First, I should like to express to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and to the Committee's officers and to all the representatives here my deepest appreciation for the conscientious, dedicated and tireless efforts they have made to advance the cause of disarmament. I should also like to thank the Secretariat staff for its helpful and able assistance in our endeavours.

32. In appraising the work of this session we must all, of course, candidly recognize the fact that it has failed to advance the areas of agreement on disarmament. From this point of view we must admit that, despite all our preparations and efforts, this session has not been a success. Our hopes and aspirations, together with those of countless millions, remain far from fulfilment.

33. While we must all share this sense of failure, the amount of energy and effort extended by those represented here can only be commended. The cause of our inability to advance the areas of consensus must be found elsewhere. It lies in the sad state of the world in which we live. We would be ignoring reality if we failed to note that this session took place during one of the most disturbing junctures in international relations. Mistrust, conflict, a growing sense of insecurity and resort to force continue to prevail. It would be an illusion to expect the United Nations to insulate itself from the general climate and fabric of relations among Member States and produce miracles. Nations cannot repeatedly ignore the rule of law, bypass the United Nations, have continued recourse to the use of force and then turn around and expect this institution, which they have weakened and damaged by their actions, to function effectively in solving problems and aid in the creation of a disarmed and tranquil world living in peace with justice.

34. Having said that, I believe there are some positive developments to which we can point. The very fact that so many prominent world leaders chose to address this forum is a response to the increasing concern manifest in world public opinion about the need to relieve humanity of the fear and danger of universal annihilation. This concern has also been demonstrated by the extensive and welcome participation of thousands of representatives from non-governmental organizations all over the world. It is my profound hope that the World Disarmament Campaign which we have launched will reinforce that level of public conscience which, I believe, we at this session have helped to extend and strengthen.

35. Indeed, if there is any countervailing force in modern history which gives hope for mankind, given the gloomy picture of the behaviour of nation-States which I have just described, it is the sense of rationality and the quest for peace with justice which, I am convinced, animate men and women from every walk of life, in every part of the world. The problem clearly lies in the gap between what people the world over want and need, and what their Governments are willing to do.

36. In conclusion, then, let us try to keep in historical perspective what we have done in the Assembly and must continue to do in the future. We cannot be proud of our achievements here; they are too few and too insubstantial. But we must not despair and, even more important, we must not give up. We must never relent in the effort to seek a safer and saner world. There is no room in this human institution for despair or complacency. This is, after all, the one nearly universal forum where the noblest aspirations of mankind can be articulated and pursued. So I would ask members to temper their justified feelings of disappointment and frustration with a sense of re-dedication to the continuing need to prevail upon our Governments to follow policies that will enhance rather than threaten the security of nations and peoples. Governments must learn to stop seeking temporary gains but to seek instead the only type of victory which will be enduring for prosperity: the victory of co-operation, reason, mutual trust and sanity which alone can ensure the survival and progress of mankind.

37. Mr. RAEYMAECKERS (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): I address the Assembly on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community. This statement will be the last one made by the Belgian Chairman of the Community, since our partners and friends from Denmark will be filling that post during the second half of 1982.

38. We are concluding this special session without its having yielded the desired results. Our countries have attached the highest importance to this session; this was demonstrated particularly by the level at which they were represented, by their participation in the work of the Assembly and by the fact that they made proposals likely to meet with agreement on all sides. The disappointment which we may feel today should not, however, lead us to feel simply resigned. There can be no doubt that the specific results that we have achieved are very limited and fall well short of our expectations. This, however, in no way jeopardizes our common will to strive to re-establish confidence and to give new impetus to the task of disarmament.

39. These very limited results oblige us to draw lessons from them for the future.

40. International meetings such as those we have just held require meticulous preparations. Despite the numerous preparatory meetings, we were unable to reconcile viewpoints sufficiently to make it possible for the special session to reach agreement on essential topics—first and foremost, the comprehensive programme of disarmament, which was the main task of this session. The breakdown of negotiations aimed at the consideration and adoption of such a programme to a large extent compromised, in turn, the results of the entire session. It is our hope, nevertheless, that the eventual elaboration of a comprehensive programme will make it possible for us to fulfil our common will and achieve disarmament.

41. Furthermore, attempts have been made to shift the center of gravity at this session towards matters whose unbalanced treatment was not likely to win consensus.

42. Important agenda items relating, for example, to studies, to improving the effectiveness of institu-

tional disarmament machinery and to fresh initiatives could not be taken up in any substantial manner.

43. Bearing in mind these lessons we have learned and the major trends that have emerged, particularly during the general debate, we should be able to create conditions favourable to the success of our future work.

44. While not conclusive, this session will not have been in vain. It has communicated important messages of which we should be more mindful in the future. The international community, through its most eminent representatives, has expressed its grave concern at the deterioration in the international situation and at the impact of that situation on disarmament efforts. It has also expressed its concern at the continuous stockpiling of armaments throughout the world, and has recalled that any progress in disarmament would greatly contribute to the reduction of tensions. The close link between disarmament and international security has been reaffirmed.

45. Dismay at present conflicts and at violations of international law was expressed by many speakers. The need for strict respect for international commitments and, above all, for the Charter of the United Nations, was emphasized. War in all its forms, particularly nuclear war, must be averted.

46. The importance of adequate verification of disarmament agreements seems today to be better understood. Even those who have always had a very restrictive attitude on this matter have let it be known that their position might change. We have taken note of this.

47. From the beginning of this session the 10 countries of the European Community have reaffirmed the complete validity and unique value of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session [*resolution S-10/2*].

48. We should like to conclude by reaffirming today the great importance we attach to the multilateral process of disarmament. The institutions with which we are provided also remain completely valid. The interest of the States of the European Community in participating in the work of these various bodies bears witness to that.

49. While supporting United Nations action in this field, we should like also to recall the great hopes we place in the successful completion of bilateral and regional talks now in progress. All those efforts should be mutually supportive.

50. In that spirit, our 10 countries are firmly resolved to move forward in the coming period.

51. I should like now to say a few words in my capacity as the representative of Belgium.

52. When the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Belgium spoke before the General Assembly on behalf of my country he emphasized two points which I should like to recall as this session ends. The first is that rather than dwelling on the symptoms we must seek out the causes. The stockpiling of arms is a dangerous phenomenon, but the cause of it is the feeling of insecurity of nations. The second point, which is linked to the first, concerns the setting aside of the notions of conciliation and arbitration which form the basis of

the system of security and the international order established by the Charter. At a time when the world is shaken by serious crises we must consider the causes of this decline and return to the principles on which the nations of the world agreed, following a world conflict, in order to avoid the recurrence of such a conflict.

53. Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil): It is a matter of profound regret to my delegation that this second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has been unable to agree on questions of the deepest concern to all mankind. I must say, however, that this development constitutes no surprise for those who have been watching the unfolding of events since the first special session on disarmament in 1978.

54. On that occasion four years ago, the Final Document was hailed as an international charter for the conduct of disarmament negotiations. But it took only a few months for a disquieting trend towards the negation of its principles, objectives and priorities to appear, first in the deeds and later even in the stated policies of nuclear-weapon Powers. Basic tenets agreed upon by consensus were disregarded and brushed aside; the machinery structured for conducting multilateral negotiations on specific priority objectives was systematically prevented from discharging its responsibilities. During this four-year period the world witnessed the most formidable military buildup by the super-Powers and their allies, together with the appearance of explicit doctrines designed to justify and render acceptable to the public at large the possession, accumulation, continuous improvement and prospective utilization of weapons of mass destruction far beyond any reasonable defence needs. The search for absolute security through the possession of and the stated will to make use of such weapons have engendered a situation in which both those that fuel the arms race and those that will be the victims of a nuclear confrontation have lost any feeling of security. Absolute security for a few means, in practice, absolute insecurity for all.

55. Since the adoption by consensus of the Final Document, nuclear-weapon Powers have backtracked from that consensus. From the situation of inaction which has prevailed for the past four years, the community of nations is now being urged to move away from agreed tenets designed to enhance security for all nations through concrete measures of disarmament acceptable to all. To the negation of the solemn commitments undertaken in the Final Document we must now add the overt or tacit denial of obligations contained in binding international treaties formally undertaken before the whole community of nations.

56. The cessation of nuclear-weapon testing is a case in point. The Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, signed in Moscow in 1963, clearly and unmistakably places upon the nuclear-weapon Powers which have adhered to it and which were the main proponents of such an instrument the obligation to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time and to continue negotiations to this end. Yet officially stated policies and declarations 20 years later point progressively in a diametrically opposite direction. From being an immediate, first-priority objective, the achievement of a comprehensive test-

ban treaty is now considered to be a long-term goal. Are the indications which we have received from the nuclear-weapon Powers during this special session a sign that commitments undertaken in the 1963 Moscow Treaty are being forgotten?

57. In another international treaty, which the super-Powers and their allies insist on presenting as the main accomplishment in the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, obligations were also formally undertaken with regard to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and with regard to nuclear disarmament. Instead, by refusing to implement such obligations, the nuclear-weapon Powers have in fact interpreted that instrument as a licence to continue the proliferation in quantity and quality of their nuclear arsenals. It is no wonder that an increasing number of non-nuclear-weapon parties to the 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty are questioning the value of that instrument and the solidity of the obligation assumed by the nuclear-weapon Powers.

58. The community of nations assembled at this second special session on disarmament has a legitimate right to demand the confirmation of obligations undertaken in the Final Document and in those earlier and legally binding instruments. If the policies of confrontation and of the search for ultimate military superiority have made it impossible to move forward in the quest for equitable and non-discriminatory measures of disarmament, let us at least not move backwards. At this session the Assembly must face squarely the political challenge of our time, in which a handful of nations cling to the illusion of exclusive and absolute power in utter disregard of the vital interests of all nations. Such is the sad reality of the present day; this session may, after all, have been successful in revealing such a stark reality for the whole world to judge and to draw from it the inescapable conclusions.

59. Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden): We have just approved the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, which has thus become the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session. I want to use this occasion to extend the warmest thanks of the Swedish delegation to the officers and the Secretary of the Committee, but, of course, particularly to its Chairman, Mr. Adeniji. Thanks to his skill, patience and perseverance we managed yesterday evening to conclude the work of the Committee in an honourable way and to agree on a set of conclusions that provides us with guidelines for our continued efforts.

60. This special session of the General Assembly should be remembered because it has been a catalyst for one of the most impressive manifestations of free popular movements ever witnessed, not only in this city but wherever free opinion can be expressed. The session has also benefited from the presence and the activities of the representatives of a great number of non-governmental organizations. This is a manifestation of the active and increasingly strong involvement of peoples in the pursuit of peace and security through disarmament. Ordinary people all over the world demand a stop to the madness of the arms race. They demand a reversal of this dangerous development and the initiation of a process of real disarmament. I am confident that the present popular movement will continue to grow and will have a

decisive impact on the future work of Governments in the field of disarmament.

61. The peoples of the world place great hopes in the United Nations for progress towards disarmament. They realize that time is running out, that the nuclear threat increases with every lost year, with every lost opportunity. The infinitesimal result of this session is a great disappointment. This is true not only for most of the Governments represented here but also for public opinion. It is regrettable that most of the leading Powers, and especially the super-Powers, have again not shown themselves to be prepared to make use of the United Nations as an instrument for genuine disarmament efforts. This is a fact which the overwhelming majority of countries deplore today. The leading military Powers will themselves deplore it tomorrow. Disarmament is the concern of all countries and all peoples. It is short-sighted to overlook this in a world that is becoming increasingly multipolarized and increasingly militarized.

62. The international political climate is much more severe today than it was in 1978. We have in recent times witnessed several bloody and senseless wars and other conflicts with international repercussions. It was therefore to be expected that consensus would be difficult to achieve on many points at this session. The fact that the international situation is serious must, however, not be taken as a pretext for not co-operating in the efforts to reach agreement whenever possible. But it is a fact that our work has been impeded by unnecessary squabbles over procedure and organization.

63. In spite of what seems to be an unco-operative attitude on the part of the super-Powers towards multilateral negotiations, such negotiations are a necessity. The United Nations has a central role to play in this context. It is important to continue these negotiations and to keep the channels open, but they are not an aim in themselves. We cannot accept the lack of concrete results in the quest for disarmament, in which so many years of hard work have been invested.

64. We must now look forward. The validity of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session has been unanimously and categorically confirmed, and there is a general commitment to continuing the disarmament efforts. In the short perspective many countries, including Sweden, will continue to pursue their proposals at the thirty-seventh session this autumn. In the longer perspective we must ask ourselves how best to prepare for the next special session which has been decided upon in principle at this session. In view of the dismal outcome of this session, we must not only prepare well for a new special session but also ask ourselves how long the international community can put up with a situation in which the efforts of the overwhelming majority of States are frustrated by the lack of co-operation from a small minority of countries.

65. In looking forward we must also take into account what is happening in other forums. It is to be hoped, nay it is to be urged, that the super-Powers make progress in their bilateral negotiations on the reduction of nuclear weapons. We note with satisfaction the new initiatives taken during this session by some

of the nuclear-weapon Powers regarding nuclear and other matters. We must also keep in mind the less dramatic but nevertheless important work that is being done or is about to start—for instance, in the Committee on Disarmament. Nor must we forget the progress manifested in the increasing adherence to international agreements in the field of arms limitation and disarmament. In this context it gives me pleasure to mention that on Wednesday, 7 July, my country deposited the instruments of ratification of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. This Convention, negotiated and concluded under the auspices of the United Nations, is one positive result which has been achieved in this field since the first special session.

66. Increased armaments lead not to increased but to diminished security. Security has many dimensions. It can be achieved only in co-operation between the parties. There is therefore no alternative to negotiations in good faith in this field.

67. The dangers are increasing, but there is still time. Governments and public opinion must not let their disappointment over the lack of progress at this session diminish their resolve to bring about a change of direction. We may be disappointed, but we must not be discouraged. We must redouble our efforts. Reason must prevail.

68. Mr. SUTRESNA (Indonesia): First of all, I would avail myself of this opportunity to express on behalf of my delegation our condolences on the sad occasion of the passing of the President of the Dominican Republic, Mr. Antonio Guzmán Fernández. May his soul rest in peace and God the Almighty provide the bereaved family with strength.

69. For each and every one of us who came here to attend the special session on disarmament with the sole wish and determination to make it succeed in revitalizing the search for peace through disarmament and in restoring the confidence lost owing to continued non-implementation of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, the inability of this session to produce meaningful results is, needless to say, a source of bitter disappointment. It is not the intention of my delegation to apportion blame to certain States or groups of States for the present situation. However, in all sincerity, it is our solemn duty to assess the implications of the unsuccessful efforts at this session and to ask ourselves candidly whether the world will be more secure and safer for present and future generations.

70. To those who have closely followed the deliberations at this session it has been obvious that many delegations have clearly demonstrated the seriousness with which they view the adoption of the comprehensive programme of disarmament as the most substantive aspect and accomplishment of this session of the General Assembly. Most regrettably, three years of labour in drafting that programme have not resulted in its adoption by this important body of the international community. Efforts were exerted by some States to turn upside-down the priority measures already agreed upon in the Final Document. Those efforts were further augmented by insistence on a mere

listing of measures, with no sign of their implementation in sight. Such an approach was undoubtedly tantamount to backtracking on the steps that were taken in 1978 and to going back on the solemn commitments contained in the Final Document. It should be clear to all that the comprehensive programme of disarmament was in no way intended to tie the hands of certain States in the negotiating process. After all, the programme is only a means to attaining the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

71. It has also not been possible to reach agreement on a document on the review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted at the first special session devoted to disarmament, which was also expected to come out of this session. Some might argue—rightly, I believe—that this failure was due to the fact that adequate time was not allotted to the substantive elaboration of the document in the two drafting groups. On the other hand, it has to be stated that it was precisely the political bickering among delegations that prevented an early initiation of the work of the Working Group on the review. Even the results that were achieved in narrowing the differences during the last few days could not be made available because of the interdependence of the work on the assessment and the forward-looking aspect of other items under consideration. It is only in Working Group III that certain concrete results have been achieved, modest though they may be—namely, an increase from 20 to 25 fellowships on disarmament and the text on the World Disarmament Campaign. Discussions on other more important items on the agenda have been inconclusive owing to our inability to reconcile viewpoints based upon conflicting security perceptions.

72. What seems to be most transparently clear to my delegation during our deliberations over more than a month is the re-emergence of outdated concepts, as a result of which the cause of disarmament has again become an important casualty of the present climate of mistrust and suspicion, which of late has been exacerbated by international tension and confrontation. My delegation cannot but hold the view that those delegations which seem to have followed this path have in essence shown a disregard of their own commitment to existing agreements and of the challenge to the most cherished concept of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, to which Indonesia also adheres.

73. Most, if not all, delegations of non-aligned, neutral and developing countries that have come to this session with the aim of reversing this dangerous trend have at the end of this session been forced to accept that for the present this seems to be an impossible task. Their efforts to make progress in the field of disarmament in order to contribute to the relaxing of international tensions have time and again been frustrated. The irony is that this has happened at a time when the growing demand for the prevention of nuclear war and for disarmament, which must be regarded as a motivation and moral obligation incumbent upon all of us, has been manifested more vocally and more clearly than ever before.

74. The apparently sombre tone of my delegation's submission in this forum should not, however, be

construed to mean that Indonesia would not be prepared, like other non-aligned countries, to seek further, by feasible means, to restore the confidence in the cause of disarmament that seems to have been rudely shattered. Let the unsuccessful outcome of this session stimulate us to adopt a more genuine and sincere approach to solving the problems confronting us. Since the stakes involved are so critical to the very survival of mankind, my delegation wants to echo its appeal that this approach gain acceptance by all other States in the interest of the achievement of the objectives to which we are all committed.

75. Mr. VAN DONGEN (Netherlands): Following the statements made by the presidency of the European Communities, to which, of course, my delegation entirely subscribes, I can afford to be brief.

76. I believe that most of us are a little sad. After all the efforts made, after the penetrating statements made in plenary meeting at the highest level, after the expressions of deep concern about the arms race—in particular, its nuclear aspects—and the shared recognition of the need to prevent war, whether nuclear or conventional, it is indeed a cause for deep regret that this special session could not come to any tangible conclusions. How do we explain this to our people, who are justifiably impatient to see real results rather than speeches?

77. Let us face it: politically, the world is in poor shape. Confidence has been eroded and little is left of the détente that marked the early 1970s. In these circumstances we might well ask whether it was reasonable to expect this special session of the General Assembly to perform miracles. Have we not been too ambitious in trying to achieve between so large a number of countries a comprehensive programme of disarmament encompassing a wide spectrum of very specific, highly complicated bilateral, multilateral and regional negotiations? Four years ago we performed a near-miracle when we adopted an extensive Final Document at the first special session on disarmament. Did we not overreach ourselves this time by trying to do even better than that?

78. We all agree that specific measures requiring concrete negotiations are called for in the field of disarmament. We continue to believe that this can be done. At Geneva, serious negotiations have started between the two major Powers on intermediate-range nuclear forces and on significant reductions in strategic weapons. Yesterday at Vienna, in the talks on mutual and balanced force reductions in central Europe, the Western countries introduced a draft treaty with the aim of reducing force levels to an equal and lower level in the most heavily armed area of the world.

79. We look forward to further discussion in the Committee on Disarmament on the banning of chemical weapons and the verification of a comprehensive test ban. This is the type of realistic negotiations we are looking for, to be pursued in a Committee on Disarmament better geared to the performance of its task. At this session my delegation made proposals to organize the Committee on Disarmament in such a manner that it would be better able to cope with its increasing workload and the complexities of the issues under consideration. We expect the Committee on

Disarmament to look carefully into those proposals which received a heartening degree of support.

80. We also hope that progress in the bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States will clear the way for other important measures in the field of arms control and disarmament and will have a positive effect on the multilateral negotiations.

81. The weightiest issue at this session was the nuclear-arms race and consequently the prevention of the outbreak of nuclear war. Together with the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan, we introduced in Working Group III serious proposals on this vital issue. We underlined that, besides the ongoing arms race, many other aspects are relevant to efforts to prevent a nuclear war. We underlined the importance of non-proliferation. We stressed that the major nuclear Powers should discuss with each other their respective strategies in order to avoid strategic instabilities that could lead to nuclear war. We re-introduced proposals made earlier by the President of the United States to decrease the risk of misunderstandings that could lead to nuclear war. We were willing to pursue those efforts up to the very last moment of the session. But apparently this thought was not shared by everyone, and the delegations that took this initiative are deeply disappointed that their tenacious efforts to achieve agreement did not meet with a corresponding response in some quarters.

82. But let us not despair. My country—and I hope all of us—will do its best to revitalize negotiations. Interesting proposals have been made, for instance, by the Soviet Union on the vital question of verification, and by the United States concerning a conference on military budgets. Valuable suggestions have been made in other fields.

83. Our own ideas about an international disarmament organization involved in the verification and implementation of future disarmament agreements found a response in similar ideas expressed by others. I am sure that we can build on these new proposals, study them carefully and select those that can usefully be pursued in the Committee on Disarmament, at the next session of the General Assembly, or elsewhere.

84. To sum up, my delegation is dissatisfied but not dejected. We would regard the result of the second special session on disarmament, or rather the lack of result, as a temporary setback, but not as cause for losing confidence in the multilateral disarmament negotiation process. We are encouraged by the unanimous reaffirmation of the validity of the Final Document and the commitment of all States to carry out the Programme of Action embodied in it. We hope that future negotiations will be conducted with new vigour and creativity on the basis of the understanding that no rational alternative exists for eradicating the scourge of war and for raising the living standards of all those who inhabit our planet.

85. Mr. JAYAKODDY (Sri Lanka): As I speak today, I cannot help but recall briefly the sentiments expressed by my delegation at the conclusion of the first special session on disarmament [27th meeting] in June 1978. After five weeks of negotiations, which were no less arduous than those that have now come to an end, we had a consensus document which we thought fell short of what we had then hoped for.

In each of the main areas—principles, the assessment of disarmament negotiations, the Programme of Action, and even the machinery for disarmament—we felt we should have done better. In retrospect, notwithstanding what may have seemed shortcomings in our eyes, that Final Document of the Tenth Special Session was indeed historic, and not only because it was a consensus document.

86. Today, four years later and after another five weeks of negotiation, we should be less than true to ourselves if we did not admit that we have failed. We met to assess the progress of disarmament during the past four years and to chart our course for the future on the basis of the Final Document. To my delegation, the hopes held out and the commitments undertaken in the Final Document to advance the process of disarmament have not been fulfilled. This is what became clear during the course of our deliberations over these past weeks. We could not agree on culpability for this state of affairs and we shall not attempt to pronounce on that today. But even those who could not agree with us on the extent of the fulfilment of commitments could at best only say that there was only some progress. We for our part cannot agree that there has been any progress. What distresses us even more is that the attitude of some to the consensus document now is that they believe they gave too much in 1978, and they seek to retract commitments then undertaken.

87. The conclusions that we have adopted have not come anywhere near what my delegation had hoped for. But in the circumstances of today, in the present political environment, this is perhaps as far as we could go and get a consensus. For my delegation, what is stated in the conclusions in well-formulated, balanced phrases is far from what prevails in reality in the world today.

88. My delegation does not wish to be thought of as attaching undue importance to consensus on all occasions, but at a special session on disarmament—I repeat on disarmament—we will go along with this modest consensus, for the reason that in it at least we have all reaffirmed our commitment to the Final Document.

89. There might be some among us who believe that they have gained something tangible in the result we have achieved in these five weeks. If that be so, it is no more than a Pyrrhic victory. There have been no winners; we are all losers, and the greatest loss is to the process of disarmament. For what was an opportunity to respond to mankind's continuous search for peace and to pave the way for a world free of wars and poverty has now turned out to be yet another missed opportunity. But we are not entirely discouraged, nor will we be deflected from the course we have chosen. The years between special sessions on disarmament, in our view, are not years of hibernation. They are the period in which constructive action and genuine negotiations should take place. My delegation looks forward to the new opportunities that will emerge for all Member States to prove that their actions will match the solemnity of their commitments.

90. My delegation would like to pay tribute to the thousands of women, men and children across the globe who individually and through their organizations gave

a new dimension to our endeavours. Their dedication, concern and effort are greatly appreciated by my delegation. Their sense of loss and disillusionment is perhaps greater than that which we here have to accept. We must assure them that we value their work and continue to rely on them in our future efforts.

91. For the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Adeniji, my delegation has a special word of thanks. It is we who must assume responsibility for what he was prevented from accomplishing.

92. Finally, Sir, my delegation would like once again to associate itself with the many words of appreciation which have been expressed to you while you have been presiding over this special session.

93. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): This second special session on disarmament was convened with great expectation and was preceded by careful preparation. The task assigned to the special session sounded simple yet ambitious: review of the implementation of the decision of the first special session and adoption of guidelines for further action, including a comprehensive programme of disarmament. If intensive work over the past five weeks has not led to consensus in the form of a substantive document, it is certainly not for lack of trying.

94. The reason lies elsewhere. Disarmament cannot be viewed in isolation; it is an integral part of international politics and as such is subject to the same forces and influences as international politics in general. The prevailing climate of armed conflict and political confrontation is not congenial to disarmament. Sustained effort and hard work cannot overcome underlying political realities, which are not susceptible to resolution by verbal compromise. Even so, a more substantive outcome of the work of the special session was expected. This is particularly true of the increasingly active public opinion in many countries, including mine, anxious about the danger of nuclear war. The public's feeling of deep disappointment is understandable and justified.

95. When one assesses the special session on disarmament, however, the following considerations should also be taken into account.

96. First, a review of the implementation of the decisions of the first special session was in fact carried out. While substantive conclusions were not reached, the situation was fully discussed. There was a full and detailed exchange of views on all fields.

97. Secondly, the work of the special session has confirmed the value of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session. Its principles and priorities and in particular its Programme of Action were reaffirmed. It was emphasized that nothing should be done to detract from the commitments contained in it.

98. Thirdly, like the first session, this session gave rise to a great number of new ideas, suggestions and proposals concerning various fields of disarmament. It is to be hoped that in due course the General Assembly will take action on a number of them.

99. Fourthly, the special session was designed to give impetus to disarmament negotiations conducted in other forums. Discussions have in fact dealt with the entire range of disarmament negotiations, whether those currently under way or those expected to begin

in the future. Thus negotiations on nuclear weapons in Europe, the commencement of talks on strategic nuclear weapons and questions pertaining to disarmament in Europe and the process connected with the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe were extensively discussed.

100. Fifthly, the general debate provided an opportunity for all States to express their views and aspirations about disarmament. The participation in the general debate of many world leaders is a recognition of the crucial importance of disarmament in the world today.

101. Sixthly, and not least, the special session generated an unprecedented degree of public attention and interest. This should be viewed as both an incentive and an obligation. The presence of a multitude of non-governmental organizations at this session shows the depth and the universality of world public opinion. Non-governmental organizations are in fact invaluable in channelling the weight of public opinion on disarmament questions. The World Disarmament Campaign launched at the beginning of the session is designed to sustain that effort. Finland, for its part, has pledged its support, including financial, to the Campaign.

102. As my Prime Minister pointed out in his statement in the general debate [7th meeting], Finland, as a neutral country, has a vital interest in promoting the development of a peaceful and rational world order envisaged by the Charter of the United Nations. Disarmament and arms control are a basic requisite for such an order: we therefore consider activity which promotes international disarmament efforts to be activity which also promotes the interest of our own security. This is a course that Finland intends to pursue, whether at the General Assembly, the Committee on Disarmament or the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. As we have announced, we maintain our candidacy for membership of the Committee on Disarmament in order to contribute more effectively to that work.

103. I should be remiss in my duties if I did not take this opportunity to convey, on behalf of the Finnish delegation, our gratitude and appreciation to you, Mr. President, for the way you have conducted the work of this session as well as to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Adeniji, and to the chairmen of the three Working Groups, Mr. García Robles, Mr. Sadleir and Mr. Herder, who have all guided our work very well.

104. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The second special session devoted to disarmament is coming to a close. It was preceded by lengthy and strenuous preparations that took place against a background of a worsening international situation and a widespread anti-war movement which swept across all continents. It is quite natural that in current conditions, when the threat of nuclear war is looming so large, the peoples of the world should have pinned on this session their hopes for an end to the arms race, for the elimination of the military danger and for the adoption of concrete and tangible disarmament measures. That is why the session has had the major

significance which the peoples and international world public opinion have attached to it.

105. In his message to this special session, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, L. I. Brezhnev, pointed out the following in this connexion:

“The session faces great and responsible tasks. Its agenda includes a number of items of the first importance. But if we are to single out the most important, the most urgent, the one now worrying people in every corner of the globe and preoccupying the minds of statesmen and public figures in many countries of the world, it is concern for halting the endless buildup of ever more destructive types of weapons, ensuring a breakthrough in the improvement of international relations and averting a nuclear disaster.” [12th meeting, para. 73]

106. To take concrete measures in order to prevent nuclear war has indeed been the central task of this session, dictated by the very facts of life. And it is no accident that precisely this topic has been the key subject in both the general debate and the work of the session as a whole.

107. The proposals of the Soviet Union and every effort of the Soviet delegation here in New York have been aimed at achieving that main task of the session. It is from that viewpoint that we evaluate the results of this session's work.

108. For its part, the Soviet Union has done its utmost to ensure that the session would live up to what was expected of it by the peoples of the world. That was graphically demonstrated by the message of the head of the Soviet State, L. I. Brezhnev, to the special session, which stated the fundamental approach of the Soviet Union to the most urgent problems on the agenda of the session and announced another important step on the part of our State, namely, the solemn commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. That obligation has been assumed unilaterally by the Soviet Union. Its great significance and timeliness have been highly acclaimed by an overwhelming majority of the States participating in the special session.

109. L. I. Brezhnev's message also contains the following very important provision:

“The idea of a mutual freeze of nuclear arsenals, as a first step towards their reduction and, eventually, their complete elimination, is close to the Soviet point of view. Moreover, our country has been the initiator of concrete proposals aimed at stopping the nuclear arms race in its quantitative and qualitative aspects.” [*Ibid.*]

110. Such concrete proposals, which encompass the whole range of top-priority issues relating to the curbing of the arms race—the nuclear disarmament programme, the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests, and so on—were described in the memorandum entitled “Averting the growing nuclear threat and curbing the arms race” [A/S-12/AC.1/111 and Corr.1], submitted by the Soviet Union to this special session. That memorandum constitutes the Soviet platform in the field of disarmament in its most urgent aspects.

111. Another major initiative launched by the Soviet Union at the special session relates to the draft basic provisions of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction [A/S-12/AC.1/12 and Corr.1]. Like many other States, the Soviet Union regards the preparation of an international convention banning and eliminating chemical weapons as one of the most urgent issues. In our view, such a convention must, of course, provide for appropriate verification, which, together with the use of national facilities, would also include international procedures, including on-site inspection on an agreed basis.

112. During the session the Soviet Union and other socialist countries put forward a number of other specific proposals. We believe that if they were considered in detail in the future and put into effect they would contribute to progress in the field of disarmament.

113. The constructive approach of the delegations of the socialist countries and their assessment of the results of the session are contained in their joint statement.

114. At this session the socialist States have taken positions that accord with the aspirations of the overwhelming majority of the States and peoples of the world. This has been proved by the irrefutable fact, corroborated by the session's entire proceedings, that on the key issues of the struggle for disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war the positions of socialist and non-aligned States are close or identical.

115. Thus, a broad-based front among the forces of peace was formed during the session, actively working for the adoption by the session of timely measures to eliminate the threat of war and to end the arms race.

116. A powerful mass movement for disarmament involving the broadest sections of world public opinion has closely aligned itself with that approach. The impressive demonstrations against nuclear war and in favour of a nuclear weapons freeze which gained fresh momentum throughout the world on the eve of and during the session were convincing proof that the peoples have grown weary of living on mountains of weapons under the constant threat of nuclear annihilation.

117. What, then, are the obstacles that the solution of the pressing problems of disarmament has encountered? Why is it that the arms race continues to escalate and has become critically dangerous? Representatives of Member States as well as representatives of the world public who addressed the session raised, and indeed could not fail to raise, these disturbing questions.

118. The session's proceedings and results have provided an unambiguous reply to those questions: it is the fault of the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] bloc that the demands of the peoples, proposed programmes in the field of disarmament and the decisions previously adopted by the United Nations on this subject are being blocked and remain unimplemented.

119. It was as if to establish some sort of a "tradition" of marking major United Nations disarmament

meetings by further steps to build up the military threat that those countries timed their summit meeting at Bonn to coincide with the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. At that meeting they reaffirmed their militaristic policy and mapped out a comprehensive armaments programme. In word and in deed the representatives of some of those countries, who arrived in New York fresh from the NATO Council session, attempted mostly to justify a further arms build-up in the pursuit of military superiority. Those States came to this disarmament forum virtually empty-handed. At the session, they failed to submit a single specific proposal dealing with the major issues of concern to the peoples of the world today.

120. Washington prefers to go on escalating the arms race. The deliberate aggravation of tensions in the world, continuously introducing new elements of confrontation into international relations, thinking in terms of nuclear war and taking an obstructionist approach to the tasks of disarmament—this constitutes the policy pursued by bellicose circles in the United States. It is this policy that has obstructed the fulfilment of the tasks faced by this session and that is precisely the reason why the General Assembly has not been able to reach solutions designed to avert nuclear war, curb the arms race and strengthen universal peace.

121. Yet we have every reason to state that this will not blunt the resolve of peace-loving States and peoples to work even more persistently to remove the threat of nuclear catastrophe which looms over mankind.

122. As for the Soviet Union, it will continue to do all in its power to eliminate the threat of nuclear war, to achieve a decisive breakthrough in arms limitation and disarmament, and to ensure a peaceful future for mankind.

123. In conclusion, may I, on behalf of my delegation, express our gratitude to you, Mr. President, for the way in which you have handled this session; to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Adeniji; to the officers of the Committee; and to our Secretariat colleagues, who have done a great deal of useful work during the course of the session.

124. Mr. FISCHER (Austria): As the second special session on disarmament draws to a close, the Austrian delegation shares the general mood of disappointment. Not only have we not accomplished the task we set for ourselves, but we have also failed to fulfil the expectations that people around the world had in our undertaking.

125. We strongly believe that a thorough analysis of the reasons for the unsatisfactory outcome of this special session is called for, not in order to ascribe the blame to others but rather to gain, ourselves, an understanding of the situation and to draw the necessary conclusions for the future. Such an examination will take time and effort. At this stage we can only offer a few tentative thoughts.

126. Austria attaches great importance to the comprehensive programme of disarmament, which could provide a valuable strategy for and an integrated approach to the disarmament process in future

years. At the same time, we recognize that the elaboration of the programme as envisaged in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session is a very ambitious project and an enormously complex task. Even in optimal conditions, in an excellent international climate, it would have been difficult to adopt such a document. In the present state of international relations, against the background of an accelerating arms race and rising tensions and mistrust, it is really not surprising that we could not reach our goal by the appointed time. It would be wrong, however, to adopt a totally negative attitude. A lot of work has been accomplished in the past five weeks which will serve as a good basis for the future negotiations on the programme. Sometimes even a confrontation of views can facilitate the eventual emergence of a consensus.

127. The Austrian delegation regrets that it was not possible to reach agreement on a document concerning the review and assessment of the disarmament process since the first special session. The difference of approach of the various groups of States and the close relationship between this work and the negotiations on the comprehensive programme prevented a successful conclusion of our intensive efforts in this regard.

128. I would conclude my remarks with a reference to the positive elements of the balance sheet of the second special session.

129. The agreement on the guidelines for the World Disarmament Campaign provides an excellent basis for an undertaking which can in the long run contribute greatly to the promotion of the disarmament process. The decision on the continuation and enlargement of the fellowship programme is, similarly, a modest but undoubtedly valuable achievement of this session.

130. The Austrian delegation has further noted with great satisfaction that all delegations have reaffirmed the validity of the Final Document and their commitment to it. As the most authoritative statement of the international community on disarmament questions, the Final Document thus remains the fundamental basis of all future efforts in the field of disarmament.

131. Finally, the convening of the special session itself, the participation of statesmen from all regions and the great interest and involvement shown by the public all over the world will, we hope, provide an impetus to Governments to increase their efforts in the cause of disarmament and for the strengthening of international peace and security.

132. I should not like to conclude, Mr. President, without paying a tribute to you and to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Adeniji, and without thanking all the officers of this special session for their dedication and for the enormous efforts they made in the accomplishment of their task.

133. Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): My remarks are not intended as more than an amplification of what the representative of Belgium has already said on behalf of all the member States of the European Community. We fully subscribe to that statement.

134. It is too early to attempt a detailed evaluation now of what has been achieved and what has not been

achieved at this session, but some things can and should be said.

135. The importance which my Government has attached to this session was shown by the fact that my Prime Minister came, for the first time, to address a General Assembly session [24th meeting]. Her speech contained a clear and carefully considered outline of the British Government's policy for the preservation of peace with freedom and justice. She explained Britain's view of the role that measures of arms control and disarmament can play in the pursuit of this goal.

136. An impressively large number of other heads of State and Government and foreign ministers contributed to the importance of the session by coming to New York personally to present their views. But what their statements clearly showed was that we would face major difficulties in reconciling the differences of approach on questions of security and disarmament. This was even more clearly illustrated when we got down to detailed work and we discovered that we could not even agree on a description of the course of events since the first special session.

137. A comprehensive programme of disarmament was to be the central feature of the detailed work of this special session, and my delegation had been actively involved in the negotiations on a comprehensive programme on disarmament since the earliest days. We knew from our experience of the negotiations at Geneva that we would not have an easy task here in New York. We had hoped, in common with other delegations, that the stimulus provided by the special session would enable us to achieve a greater degree of consensus than had previously been possible.

138. My delegation shares the disappointment that has already been expressed that, in spite of the intensive work in which all shared, and the efforts which all delegations made, a more positive result was not possible.

139. One of the major issues at this special session has been the contention that the world is faced by a growing threat of nuclear war. In the general debate the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union stated that his country would not be the first to use nuclear weapons and that this was an important step in preventing the outbreak of nuclear war [12th meeting]. My Government does not take the view that there is a greater danger of the outbreak of nuclear war than there has been in the past. My Prime Minister addressed this question when she said that while nuclear war is indeed a terrible threat, conventional war is a terrible reality. She went on to say that our key need is not for promises against the first use of this or that kind of military weapon; such promises can never be dependable amid the stresses of war. We need a credible assurance, if such can ever be obtained, against starting military action at all. She drew attention to the solemn undertaking of States in the North Atlantic alliance that none of their weapons would ever be used except in response to attack.

140. Our failure to agree on a consensus text on the prevention of war, conventional or nuclear, despite the efforts of delegations from every group of opinion represented in the Assembly, is yet further evidence of the wide differences in the way in which Member States approach disarmament questions. The approach

of my own country has been, and still is, to seek specific, balanced and verifiable arms control and disarmament agreements which either conserve or enhance existing levels of security. We believe that simple declarations of good intentions have little value. A more significant contribution to world peace would undoubtedly be made if States demonstrated by their actions their willingness to live up to their existing commitments under the United Nations Charter.

141. At the first meeting of this special session, Mr. President, you solemnly launched the World Disarmament Campaign. My country has always believed that it is important to encourage well-informed and freely expressed debate on subjects of public concern. My delegation is therefore very pleased that we have reached agreement on guidelines for the Campaign which recognize the need for it to be universal in application and to allow unimpeded access for all sectors of the public to a broad range of information and opinions. We look forward to receiving from the Secretary-General, at the thirty-seventh regular session, the specific details of the programme for the Campaign.

142. Undoubtedly, one of the significant aspects of the session is the way in which it has acted as a focus for world public opinion. We believe that it will have made a contribution to a wider public understanding of the issues at stake and of the reality of the differences in the security concerns of Member States, which have made agreement so hard to achieve.

143. In the light of this, my delegation has very much welcomed the attendance at this session of large numbers of representatives of international non-governmental organizations, including a prominent and dedicated group from Britain.

144. After this special session we need to pause for reflection and to study what has been said and written here. We need to spend more time in trying to understand one another's positions and draw lessons from our experience during these weeks in New York so that we can benefit from them. At the same time, we must not let the disappointments of the session lessen our resolve to achieve progress in the specific negotiations on arms control currently under way at Geneva, Vienna and elsewhere. We continue to believe that the patient negotiation of militarily significant, balanced and verifiable agreements will lead to success, even if we have not yet achieved results on the broader scale.

145. Mr. FEULNER (United States of America): Mr. President, I should like to express to you the admiration of my delegation for the way in which you have presided over our deliberations and, through you, to express our sincere and deeply felt appreciation to Mr. Adeniji, who guided the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee with sensitivity, dedication and wisdom.

146. My delegation has been an active participant in these vital discussions. We believe that the words that come out of this session should be considered soberly—and not merely as another rhetorical exchange. It was because of our commitment to this session that President Reagan addressed this body on 17 June [16th meeting], and that our delegation was composed of Senators and Congressmen from both political parties and representatives from other sectors

of American life. It was because we wanted to reach an enduring consensus on these critical questions of war and peace that we—along with many other delegations—laboured long into the night.

147. Sadly, we were unable to achieve that full consensus we all so ardently hoped for. But we shall continue to work in this forum, as well as in others, in search of the goal of a lasting peace.

148. As we look back over these past weeks, we must look at both our successes and our failures and carefully consider the tasks that lie ahead. But first we must review the lessons of the past.

149. In 1978 the first special session on disarmament produced a Final Document which embodied many of the aspirations of the world community. But why have we not at this session been able to come to a consensus on the implementation of that Document?

150. Let us look at the historical record. Shortly after the first special session on disarmament, one major Power violated the most fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and invaded its non-aligned neighbour. It continues to occupy that hapless country. A war of aggression continues in South-East Asia; other regional conflicts rage unceasingly; subversion is being exported to Central America, Africa and other areas; and the quest for freedom is still suppressed in Eastern Europe. In short, the world increasingly lives in fear. Small wonder then that the implementation of the lofty goals of the Final Document has remained a distant and illusive dream.

151. Given their transgressions against the most sacred tenets of the Charter of the United Nations since the first special session, it is not surprising that some nations argued against language recounting the history of the past four years.

152. But we must now look to the future. The major project before this special session was, as President Reagan noted, "to chart a course of realistic and effective measures in the quest of peace" [*ibid.*, para. 49]: a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Progress was made, but the task remains unfinished. We have all reaffirmed the validity of the Final Document and pledged ourselves to renewed efforts towards disarmament. Let me restate that pledge today for the United States.

153. The United States is proud of its record in disarmament. President Reagan has outlined a clear programme to deal with the most pressing and dangerous problems. We have called for real and militarily significant arms reduction, particularly in the field of nuclear weapons. We have called for a one-third reduction in strategic ballistic missile warheads, the elimination of all land-based intermediate-range missiles and new safeguards to eliminate the risk of accidental war. Moreover, just two days ago the United States and its allies introduced a comprehensive draft treaty in the mutual and balanced force reduction talks at Vienna. That proposal calls for a substantial reduction of ground forces on both sides and the implementation of a package of associated confidence-building and verification measures. In all these negotiations we have offered neither unverifiable measures

nor meaningless rhetoric, but rather concrete proposals for major reductions in the arms and armed forces of the United States and of the Soviet Union.

154. Make no mistake; we are not satisfied with the current international situation, and we intend to do our part for peace and stability on this small planet.

155. At this special session we have been considering the most important issue facing mankind: how to prevent war, or, to put it in a more positive sense, how to establish a secure peace. Regrettably, there is no major formula or instant panacea to attain that peace we all so fervently desire; it cannot be mandated by committees or by resolutions.

156. We have heard again today the reiteration of the Soviet "no first use of nuclear weapons" pledge. Our policy goes far beyond that pledge. The Soviet representative attempted to denigrate the policy of NATO, but he cannot. As the leaders of NATO declared at their recent summit, "None of our weapons will ever be used except in response to an attack". That is our pledge and our policy.

157. But we believe there is a better way, and we shall continue to seek it as we have done at this session. During the past weeks we have offered concrete proposals and initiatives on a wide range of issues.

158. We are dedicated to a real World Disarmament Campaign. We believe that the open and universal availability of information on disarmament matters is vital. Excessive secrecy can only create mistrust and misunderstanding among the peoples of this world; such secrecy is a true enemy of peaceful relations among nations. The United States, as an open society, publicly makes available vast amounts of information on the momentous issues of war and peace.

159. We have no illusions as to the serious obstacles which have frustrated the objective of a free flow of information in the past. We are all well aware that, while hundreds of thousands demonstrated openly and peacefully for disarmament in the streets of New York and other cities of the world, seven people who dared unfurl a banner calling for bread, life and disarmament in Moscow were arrested. It is a sad commentary that to some societies these words are considered anti-State when used domestically but are considered State policy when used internationally.

160. It is in the spirit of open discussion that President Reagan has offered President Brezhnev the opportunity to address the American people on our television on the vital questions of peace and disarmament in return for a chance to address the Soviet people. At this session we have offered specific proposals for similar multilateral discussions and regional seminars throughout the world.

161. In addition to our proposals regarding the World Disarmament Campaign we have offered other concrete initiatives at this session. During the past several years disturbing reports have reached the outside world that toxins and other lethal chemical weapons are being used in conflicts against people in remote regions of the world. Unfortunately the borders of these regions remain sealed to the world community. We have therefore urged that the General Assembly call on the Soviet Government, as well as the Governments of Laos and Viet Nam, to grant full and free

access to areas where chemical attacks have been reported so that the Group of Experts to Investigate Reports on the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons can conduct an impartial investigation.

162. We have also called for the convening of an international conference on military expenditures. Such a conference would build on past United Nations efforts calling for universal adherence to a common reporting and accounting system on military expenditures. Sadly, while my country has provided and will continue to provide a full accounting of our military expenditures, others have opposed all United Nations efforts in this field. The frightening reality of vastly increased military budgets has been documented by recognized centres for disarmament throughout the world. Yet for the past 10 years one super-Power has provided the world community with a manifestly ridiculous figure for its military budget. This single universally discredited figure underscores the need for an international conference on military expenditures.

163. As we conclude our work at this second special session on disarmament I am again struck by the awesome task before us. Never have so few been responsible for the fate of so many. Let us not forget or shirk this responsibility as we continue our search for a true and lasting peace.

164. Mr. BAYTOK (Turkey): Conscious of the substantial influence on the positive evolvement of the international situation which this special session could have, the Turkish delegation had great expectations at its outset. In that spirit we have attentively followed the meetings at every stage of this session and we have spared no effort in contributing whenever we deemed it essential and appropriate.

165. In spite of the occurrence in certain regions of the world of events greatly detrimental to whatever is left of peace and stability, this special session has been conducted, in the opinion of my delegation, in a business-like manner. We have invariably witnessed serious and well meant efforts on the part of all delegations. We have also observed with satisfaction the solution of at least some of the complications intrinsic in the nature of the subject matter and the elimination of certain divergencies in the perceptions of different delegations.

166. The adoption of commonly accepted texts on the World Disarmament Campaign and the fellowships programme, the bringing together of views on the basic items of the comprehensive programme of disarmament and the achievement of general agreement on the reasonable expansion of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament could be mentioned as examples of this rather limited but important achievement. In no way do I wish to imply that the progress achieved has been fully satisfactory. Like many others, my delegation wishes we could have adopted a universally acceptable document on a comprehensive programme of disarmament, or that we could have reached a common understanding on issues such as the prevention of war, in particular nuclear war. We do not wish to interpret the lack of such points of understanding as an irreparable failure. Such an interpretation and the disappointment it would create in public opinion

would eventually have an adverse influence on the general image of disarmament efforts.

167. This session should not be construed as an isolated event. It has formed a certain link in the long chain of events within the context of the disarmament process. The fact that the progress achieved at this session falls short of our sincere expectations should amply provide the stimulus needed to further our future efforts aimed at achieving the indispensable goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

168. In the course of this session the Turkish delegation has striven, as members are aware, for a formula whereby it would be accorded full membership in the Committee on Disarmament and hence the opportunity to contribute on an equal footing to the process of disarmament. In the light of the discussions that have taken place on this question at the special session, and in conformity with paragraphs 55 and 62 of the Concluding Document of the session, my delegation is confident that in its report to the next session of the General Assembly the Committee will be able to recommend the modalities of the expansion of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament, thus allowing interested countries, including my own, to participate fully in its work.

169. Mr. DORR (Ireland): Ireland approached this special session on disarmament not with optimism but with moderate hopes. I wish it were possible to say that even these modest hopes had been realized.

170. We did not expect a miracle or an overnight change in the hard realities of international life. But we did believe that after one month of intensive work here we would have moved forward. We thought that as representatives of Governments we would have found a way to give an expression in practice and in detail to the feeling and emotion of our peoples and to the speeches of our leaders. With deep regret I must now say that this is not the case.

171. When he spoke here on 11 June [8th meeting], the Prime Minister of Ireland, Mr. Haughey, stressed the need to use the special session to make a new beginning at last towards real disarmament. He saw four points as basic in setting us on this path: first, a new commitment to the goal of disarmament; secondly, a coherent comprehensive programme to get us there; thirdly, some practical first steps to give reality and substance to that programme; and, fourthly, a commitment to strengthen and use the United Nations to help to resolve conflict, ease mistrust and build a rule of law among States. How much of this can we now honestly say we have achieved?

172. First, have we shown a new commitment to the goal of disarmament, or even to talking about disarmament? There is little practical evidence that we have. A good final document in itself would still not have been enough without the political will to implement it. But after five weeks we have not even demonstrated the will to produce such a substantive document. It is true that the continuing validity of the Final Document adopted at the tenth special session has been upheld and reaffirmed. That in itself must be counted as something of an achievement. But it is a sad reflection on the state of our negotiations here

that the simple preservation of what was agreed on four years ago should now be counted as a positive result.

173. What of the second objective mentioned by the Prime Minister—the need for a comprehensive programme of disarmament? This too has not been achieved. Ireland deeply regrets this. Disarmament negotiations are now virtually deadlocked. The immediate prospect ahead is one of increased competition in arms build-up among the major Powers, coupled with argument about who is really ahead. We can also expect to see more proposals designed more to compete for the attention of world public opinion than to achieve real results.

174. It would be too much to expect that agreement on a comprehensive programme of disarmament would have immediately brightened this dismal prospect. But such a programme could at least have brought coherence to different disarmament negotiations already under way; it could have given them a sense of common direction; it could have set realistic objectives; and it could have provided a yardstick by which to measure progress. As of now we have no such programme, and we must count our inability to agree on it at this session as a serious setback. Nevertheless, Ireland believes that the work simply must continue until agreement is reached on a comprehensive programme.

175. Where do we stand on the third point—the agreement on limited, practical first steps which might give substance and reality to such a programme? Here too the outlook is gloomy. There is little sign of any progress.

176. In particular we regret that a ban on all nuclear tests through a comprehensive test-ban treaty seems to be as far away as ever. Such a treaty is badly needed.

177. We can, however, welcome the fact that some valuable proposals at least were made at this session. I would emphasize particularly the various proposals for some kind of nuclear freeze. This is indeed an idea whose time has come. It must now be given effect. Ireland put forward one such freeze proposal which we considered reasonable, practical and realistic. Speaking here, the Prime Minister of my country suggested that the main nuclear Powers should agree not to add to their existing strategic nuclear warheads or delivery vehicles for an initial two-year period while serious negotiations on reductions get under way. This initial moratorium could later be extended further. Our aim was to see such a moratorium introduced immediately, leaving it to the nuclear Powers themselves to define the exact scope of its application at the outset. This could, of course, be expanded later. Ideally we should like to see much more than this, but we hope that this proposal for a limited freeze or moratorium—precisely because it is limited and immediately practicable—will be taken up and put into effect by those to whom it is addressed.

178. The fourth point stressed by the Prime Minister of Ireland was the need for a renewed commitment to use the United Nations system to the fullest and to strengthen it and make it more effective. Here too the record of recent weeks is discouraging, not to say dismal. Of course one could not expect to see much

direct positive evidence of such a commitment over the five short weeks of the special session. But, instead, even in that short period we have seen the contrary. Not only do several international conflicts continue, but the authority and credibility of the United Nations system in dealing with them are being steadily weakened and eroded, most obviously and graphically at this very moment by the disregard for resolutions unanimously adopted by the Security Council in regard to Lebanon.

179. It will be clear from all that I have said that we have many reasons for saying that our assessment of the outcome of this session cannot be very positive. Let us be frank about it. An important opportunity has been missed; high hopes have been disappointed. The thoughts that many of us take away from here are therefore pessimistic. This pessimism is increased by the fear that the relative stability of the nuclear stalemate, such as it is, may now come under greater threat as new technology and new doctrines are introduced.

180. These five weeks show in the clearest way the reciprocal relationship between the growth of international tension and the buildup of armaments. Tensions lead to arms increases, and arms in turn increase tensions. It may therefore have been too much to hope for that at a time when international tensions are so obviously increasing we could have made much real progress on disarmament questions. I confess, however, that we had hoped for much more than we have achieved in working on that side of the equation.

181. But, disappointed as we are, we cannot abdicate our responsibility to continue. This special session was never seen as an isolated event, but as part of a process. We must try by every means open to us to breathe new life into that process. The work we have been engaged in here with such limited success so far simply must be pursued. If half or one quarter of what we have heard here in this hall in recent weeks is true, then the peril to humanity is greater than ever in human history. In the face of that, we have no other choice but to continue our efforts.

182. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): During these closing hours of the session, my delegation has no desire to disturb the solemnity of our proceedings or the sense of common destiny that binds us all together in the United Nations. We live in an interdependent world. No nation, however powerful or weak, large or small, can today insulate its individual destiny from the collective fate of our planet. There is no corner of the world in this atomic age that is free of the shadow of an all-out nuclear war, a war that could well mean the end of mankind and civilization as we know it. We may be divided over everything else—politics, ideology, economics and culture—but we must be united in our common will to survive if we are to have a future in this era of nuclear weapons.

183. It was our hope and belief when we came here that, faced with this pressing danger and urged on by our peoples to remove the threat of a nuclear holocaust, the United Nations would become the vehicle for fulfilling the hopes and aspirations of all mankind. It is therefore with a sense of deep sorrow and anguish that we have witnessed the complete failure

of the session to fulfil any of the substantive tasks on its agenda. We must express still greater sorrow that the Concluding Document—I refer to section III entitled “Conclusions”—fails to do even minimal justice to the depth of concern and anxiety felt by people all over the world at the prospect of the growing danger of a nuclear war.

184. The Concluding Document gives no indication that the session has taken seriously the hopes and aspirations of the vast majority of countries and peoples of the world. On the contrary, it has merely provided a fig leaf to cover its failure to address in a sober and forward-looking manner the real issues facing us. We do not wish to engage here in recriminations or to apportion blame. But let us at least be honest with ourselves and, more importantly, with those whose interests we claim to serve.

185. We have failed because even that highest of priorities—the survival of mankind—has been a casualty in the interplay of the narrow approach adopted by the powerful nations amongst us. We have failed because for these States the privilege that military power brings is dearer than the special responsibility incumbent upon them to ensure world peace and security. And, above all, we have failed because in our weakness we preferred to paper over our differences rather than admit our divergences and seek ways and means of working together to find new and more meaningful common ground. The tragedy of this exercise in futility is that having fooled ourselves we are now trying to fool the world. But cosmetics cannot hide the reality that lies behind. Perhaps the ancient Greeks were right when they declared that “Those whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad”.

186. India has consistently stood for the noble purposes for which the United Nations was established. The foremost aim of the Organization is to rid the world of the scourge of war. Today, man faces an unprecedented new threat to his very existence. Yet not one single concrete measure, however modest, has been taken to avert the danger of nuclear war. What explanation can we give to our peoples, whose interests we claim to represent? Should we tell them that we were prepared to trade their stake in survival merely to obtain a consensus report? Can this apparent harmony in words bring relief and hope to those who are filled with profound disquiet over the danger that present and succeeding generations face from the ever-increasing accumulation of nuclear weapons? Yet there were those at the special session bent on giving equal status, if not priority, to the threat they perceived from conventional wars while strangely refusing to accept even modest and non-controversial proposals to permit the international community to come to grips with the pressing problem of preventing a nuclear war. We say this not in anger but with a sense of grave disappointment.

187. We are in real danger of reducing ourselves to irrelevance in the eyes of the peoples of the world. It is for this reason that we are compelled to dissociate ourselves from the conclusions contained in section III of the Concluding Document adopted at this session. We are convinced that we could not in good conscience go to our own people and claim that, by accepting such a consensus text, we had in fact either

served their genuine interests or responded to their urgent concerns. Needless to add, India's commitment to the cause of peace and disarmament remains unshaken. However, we believe also that in these difficult and dangerous times conviction and principle are more important than consensus.

188. Mr. MENZIES (Canada): This second special session on disarmament is not ending with the ringing documents that we had hoped would carry forward the achievements of the first special session that were so eloquently expressed in its Final Document.

189. At the outset of this concluding statement I wish to offer the warm thanks of the Canadian delegation to all the officers who have presided over the meetings of this special session: to you, Mr. President; to Mr. Adeniji, who presided over the *Ad Hoc* Committee and strove so valiantly in contact groups and in personal meetings to try to obtain a positive outcome; and to the chairmen of the Working Groups and Drafting Groups. I also wish to recognize the support of all those in the Secretariat who have assisted us in our work.

190. This second session has taken place with great expectations, but at an unpromising time in international relations. Even as we sit, a number of conflicts are in progress. Disputes and conflicts in several areas of the world have deepened as we have talked about disarmament. Beyond these conference halls, many of our Governments are weighing perceived threats to their security and how best to deal with them. It is important, therefore, that we should have come together at this special session to consider the ways in which arms limitation, arms control, arms reduction and associated measures can contribute to international stabilization and the security of all.

191. In closer perspective, I suggest that the achievements of the international community at this second special session on disarmament rest on three pillars.

192. First, this session has reaffirmed the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, which in itself is an important act. Many have seen a decline in international order and the rule of law as posing the danger that there could be a retreat from the moral commitments so solemnly given in 1978. Instead, in these more difficult times, those commitments have been reaffirmed.

193. Secondly, we have recognized the importance of the disarmament negotiating process. Its importance and significance were underlined by the participation of so many world leaders and by the tremendous public interest in this session.

194. Thirdly, the second session has reaffirmed the keen interest of all countries that the United Nations should provide the global forum for the expression of the varied concerns of the 157 Member States and for the addressing of global arms control and disarmament issues. The United Nations role will assuredly continue and, with the experience of this session behind us, it will perhaps do so with a greater appreciation of what the Organization can achieve in expressing and pressing the concerns of all nations and all people for a more rational management of armaments.

195. For these reasons, Canada looks to such future gatherings with hope. We cannot but be disappointed

that there are no ringing concluding documents. The debates often included exchanges of accusations and the results were often inconclusive. The seriousness with which all delegations brought their concerns to this international forum has increased our understanding of national viewpoints. Progress made toward resolving differences will help further discussions. Negotiations must be pressed forward because, as Prime Minister Trudeau said here on 18 June, "The nuclear arms build-up is causing anguish to many people in many parts of the world." [18th meeting, para. 71.]

196. The Canadian delegation has felt encouraged by the wide public interest in Canada in this special session. Many Canadians took part in a lively disarmament debate, as well as in events associated with the session, all with a sense of deep concern over the issues involved. Their number is a sign of the confidence placed in the ability of the United Nations to deal with these matters, and that many Canadians marched in New York last month is symbolic of that confidence. The Canadian Parliament held two important debates on security and disarmament issues before this special session. The Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence held extensive hearings and submitted a report to Parliament. Indeed, the Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee followed the session attentively and is with us today. Other parliamentarians from all parties, as well as a cross-section of concerned Canadians, have been active in the Canadian delegation. Taken together, they show the desire reflected by all Canadians that the process of which the second special session is a part—the process of peace—should continue.

197. This, I believe, is the sense of the second special session on disarmament. Many tasks are uncompleted, but that our common efforts should continue, and that our goals are indeed shared, is beyond doubt. In this there is encouragement and hope.

198. Mr. ALESSI (Italy) (*interpretation from French*): The Italian delegation feels that its position is fully reflected in the statement made by the representative of Belgium on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community. I shall therefore confine myself to adding a few brief comments.

199. The special session opened and continued at a very difficult time in international relations. As was said by the Prime Minister of Italy in his statement on 15 June last, disarmament negotiations must be undertaken "... with a maximum effort of solidarity among peoples and with a global strategy based not on military balances . . . but on the strengthening of mutual trust and on a vast network of co-operation". [12th meeting, para. 17]

200. Despite the profound disappointment which we feel today with the results, which are well below our expectations, we are convinced that in the course of this session Member States have made every effort that could realistically have been expected in present circumstances. Indeed, the session has proved the will of the participants to pursue vigorously the disarmament process.

201. It should be recognized that some, although insufficient, progress has been made, for instance in the field of the comprehensive programme of disar-

mament, the complexity and difficulty of which are clear to all. We are also encouraged by the consensus that has been achieved on the text concerning the World Disarmament Campaign. We note with satisfaction the role that well-informed public opinion can play, if it enjoys freedom of expression.

202. The maintenance of the rule of consensus throughout the session is also particularly significant. Indeed it is a necessary condition for reaching agreements in the field of disarmament which are likely to have positive effects.

203. As regards the comprehensive programme of disarmament in particular, results must be assessed in the light of the extent of the task. Although our efforts have not been successful, we have nevertheless had extremely important negotiations. Nowhere else have we had such an opportunity to undertake collectively such a detailed examination of all the aspects of the disarmament process and of the various measures which should form part of it. Our understanding of the questions under consideration and our knowledge of the respective positions have benefited considerably. The documents which emerge from this painstaking task are proof of this. The adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament must remain a major goal of the international community. The negotiation process must go on and reach a successful outcome within the time-limits we have laid down.

204. The prevention of war, particularly nuclear war, has of course once again been the focal point of our deliberations. It is precisely because we are living in a nuclear environment that we must strive to prevent not only a nuclear war but war itself. Conflicts waged with conventional weapons can lead to nuclear escalation. The best way to avoid nuclear war is to avoid all conflicts, through respect for the fundamental principles of international law, the strengthening of the United Nations machinery in the area of security and the peaceful settlement of disputes, and general and complete disarmament. In this context, the unanimous and categorical reaffirmation of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session acquires special importance.

205. I do not wish to conclude without expressing the gratitude of my delegation to you, Sir, who have presided over this session, to Mr. Adeniji, for the exemplary manner in which he guided the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and to all the co-ordinators of the Working Groups.

206. Mr. OKAWA (Japan): On behalf of my delegation I wish to express our deep appreciation to you, Mr. President, for the distinguished guidance with which you have provided us during this session. I also wish to pay the highest tribute to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Adeniji, and to the chairmen and co-ordinators of the various Working Groups and Drafting Groups for their painstaking efforts in trying to bring the second special session to a successful conclusion.

207. The people of Japan, and indeed the people of the entire world, had hoped and expected that this session would prove to be a constructive forum for the promotion of new international efforts for disarmament and that it would be able to produce fruit-

ful results through our common efforts. In the hope that the session would be able to respond to those expectations, my delegation, along with other delegations, has been actively and seriously participating in the deliberations.

208. We cannot but express our deep regret at the fact that, despite the efforts of all delegations, the session has not been able to adopt a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

209. Nevertheless, it is worth while noting that the validity of the Final Document adopted at the first special session on disarmament has been reaffirmed and that every delegation has expressed its firm determination to continue the disarmament process on the basis of the Final Document.

210. My delegation attaches great value to the fact that many heads of State and Government and a great many other dignitaries, including the Prime Minister of Japan, participated in this session and pledged to do their utmost for the promotion of disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament.

211. The Government of Japan hopes that this session will provide a new and positive momentum to negotiations in the various forums; those between the United States and the Soviet Union on strategic arms reduction and on intermediate-range nuclear forces, as well as negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament on such matters of the highest priority as a comprehensive test ban and the prohibition of chemical weapons.

212. During this session a large number of members of parliament and representatives of non-governmental organizations and of peace and disarmament research institutions, as well as countless private citizens from all over the world, including Japan, have come to New York. The number of such visitors from all countries has far exceeded that of those who came to New York on the occasion of the first special session four years ago. This is a clear indication of the widespread interest among the peoples of the world in the need to establish and preserve peace through disarmament. This interest was generated by this second special session and my delegation hopes that it will continue to grow and contribute to the promotion of disarmament.

213. On this last day of the session, my delegation wishes to restate Japan's basic position on disarmament, as enunciated by the Prime Minister of Japan, Mr. Zenko Suzuki, on 9 June [5th meeting].

214. The promotion of world disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, is a goal shared by all the peoples of the world in their aspiration for international peace and security.

215. Contrary to this common aspiration, threats to peace have been augmenting and the preoccupations of the peoples of the world have been increasing owing to the tense international situation prevailing today and the continuing build-up of arsenals, both nuclear and conventional. In order to reverse the present international trend and prevent the outbreak of nuclear war, disarmament must now be recognized as an axiom for the very survival of mankind. It goes without saying that for the achievement of any effective disarmament measure it is essential that due con-

sideration be given to the security requirements of every State.

216. On behalf of the Japanese delegation, I wish to make the following solemn appeal to all representatives attending the second special session devoted to disarmament: first, for the survival and prosperity of mankind, the calamity of a nuclear holocaust must never be repeated; secondly, effective measures must be taken to achieve nuclear disarmament, with a view to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons in the context of general and complete disarmament, so that nuclear weapons will never be used again; thirdly, the human and physical resources released

as a result of disarmament must be utilized in an effective manner to alleviate poverty and social instability which hinder efforts to achieve peace; fourthly, the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations must be strengthened, in order to create a climate of international security that will facilitate the promotion of disarmament.

217. The Government of Japan remains committed to the cause of disarmament and will spare no effort to advance that cause.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.