



President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

AGENDA ITEMS 9, 10, 11 AND 12

Review and appraisal of the present international situation in the light of the pressing need to achieve substantial progress in the field of disarmament, the continuation of the arms race and the close interrelationship between disarmament, international peace and security and economic development

Adoption of a declaration on disarmament

Adoption of a programme of action on disarmament

Review of the role of the United Nations in disarmament and of the international machinery for negotiations on disarmament, including in particular the question of convening a world disarmament conference

1. Mr. BENSMAIL (Algeria), Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Tenth Special Session: I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the report on the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee relating to agenda items 9, 10, 11 and 12 of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament. The report is contained in document A/S-10/23 and consists of two parts, the first part being a description of the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and the second part the draft final document.

2. The *Ad Hoc* Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution embodying the draft final document.

3. May I be permitted to say that the draft final document which is submitted for the consideration of the General Assembly is the culmination of much hard work and the result of long months of continuous efforts, long deliberations and delicate negotiations. Agreement was finally reached in the *Ad Hoc* Committee early this morning on the so-long-awaited document.

4. When the General Assembly decided, at its thirtieth session, to convene a special session devoted to disarmament in May and June 1978, it was responding to a growing feeling of concern and a sense of desperation at the fact that not enough was being done to slow down the arms race or stop the escalating expenditure on armaments in the world. Despite the realization of the difficulty and complexity of the problem, the international community entertained the hope that a new approach might reverse the trend of the arms race and bring about results that previous efforts had been unable to achieve.

5. Furthermore, the change in the political and socio-economic situation of the world brought to the fore new forces calling for drastic action to alter a situation that threatens to lead the world towards catastrophe.

6. It was against this background that the desire was growing for international action for the achievement of real disarmament. It was against this background that the special session was convened, on the initiative of the non-aligned countries.

7. The report I am introducing today also has a background of a large number of documents, working papers and valuable contributions by delegations. The results of these long months of negotiations and drafting are to be found in this draft final document which, in accordance with the recommendation of the Preparatory Committee, as endorsed by the General Assembly, consists of the following sections: one draft resolution embodying the draft final document, an introduction, a declaration, a programme of action and, finally, a section on machinery.

8. During its meetings, the *Ad Hoc* Committee received some 40 documents and working papers from delegations, containing further proposals to be included in the draft final document. Those documents are listed in paragraph 9 of the report.

9. The *Ad Hoc* Committee also received a number of draft resolutions: one draft resolution sponsored by 33 countries (A/S-10/AC.1/L.1 and Rev.1); one draft resolution submitted by India and also sponsored by Cyprus and Ethiopia (A/S-10/AC.1/L.10) and another by Ethiopia and India (A/S-10/AC.1/L.11); three draft resolutions submitted by France (A/S-10/AC.1/L.14, L.15 and L.16); and, finally, a draft resolution presented by Sri Lanka (A/S-10/AC.1/L.17). At the last meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee it was announced that those draft resolutions would not be pressed to a vote.

10. In the case of draft resolution A/S-10/AC.1/L.1/Rev.1, the sponsors, responding to the appeal of the Chairman, decided not to press it to a vote. Furthermore, the *Ad Hoc* Committee decided to take note of that draft resolution and to transmit it to the plenary Assembly with the recommendation that it be referred for consideration to the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.

11. It was agreed from the beginning that every effort should be made to ensure that the draft final document was adopted by consensus. It was so adopted in the *Ad Hoc* Committee earlier this morning and I hope that the Assembly will adopt it in the same manner.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Ad Hoc Committee.

A/S-10/PV.27

12. The PRESIDENT: I understand that there is general agreement that the Assembly should proceed immediately to the adoption of the recommendation of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, on the understanding that any delegation wishing to do so will be free to make a statement of position or reservation on the subject after the adoption of that recommendation. May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to follow that procedure?

It was so decided.

13. The PRESIDENT: The report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee is contained in document A/S-10/23.

14. In paragraph 26 of the report, reference is made to the financial implications for 1978 of the draft resolution. In this connexion, I have been asked to inform the Assembly that the Secretary-General is seeking the agreement of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to allow him to enter into the necessary commitments initially under the terms of General Assembly resolution 32/214 on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the biennium 1978-1979. The requisite appropriation action will be taken at the thirty-third session of the Assembly, at which time the Assembly will also consider the financial implications of the draft resolution now before us for the second year of the biennium 1978-1979.

15. Before we proceed to a decision on the draft resolution, I call on the representative of Belgium who wishes to make a statement of clarification.

16. Mr. ERNEMANN (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): We have just spent a few moments looking at the French version of document A/S-10/23. We understand the difficult situation in which the Secretariat had to work and we also know that the original of this document was in English. The brief examination which certain French-speaking delegations have made in the few minutes available has brought to light a certain number of errors and omissions. These might have resulted particularly from the fact that the translation seems to have made on the basis of a non-final English version of the document.

17. A glance, for example, at paragraph 58 shows that there are important divergencies between the two versions. Therefore I think that the French-speaking delegations must reserve their right to communicate to the Secretariat any observations they feel they should make. In particular, we would like to express the hope that the Secretariat will be good enough to review the French translation of this document very carefully and issue a revised version. There is no need to emphasize that this makes it necessary for the French-speaking delegations to renounce their right under the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and rely temporarily on the original English text only.

18. The PRESIDENT: In connexion with the statement of the representative of Belgium, I would like to state for the record that the original text of the document before us is English, as clearly stated in the document. All remarks concerning the translation into other languages should be transmitted to the Secretariat, and the members of the Sec-

retariat will take them into account during the final redaction of the texts of the documents in other languages.

19. We shall now proceed to the adoption of the draft resolution recommended in paragraph 28.

20. At the 16th meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, held early this morning, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly also adopts that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution S-10/2).

21. The PRESIDENT: In the final paragraph of document A/S-10/23, the *Ad Hoc* Committee also recommends that the General Assembly should refer to its thirty-third session the consideration of draft resolution A/S-10/AC.1/L.1/Rev.1.

22. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts that recommendation?

The recommendation in paragraph 29 of document A/S-10/23 was adopted (decision S-10/24).

23. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel.

24. Mr. CAHANA (Israel): If this recommendation had been put to the vote, the delegation of Israel would have voted against it.

25. The PRESIDENT: The position stated by the representative of Israel will be reflected in the verbatim record.

26. I now call on the Secretary-General, who would like to make a statement.

27. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: When this Assembly convened on 23 May, I stated that this unprecedented special session would be the largest, most representative meeting ever convened to consider the problem of disarmament. I am now able to add that at this session there has been the most extensive and useful discussion of disarmament on a world-wide basis that has yet been held. The breadth and level of participation in this historic session have been remarkable. This fact has demonstrated clearly that Governments and peoples throughout the world are profoundly aware of the threat posed to their survival by ever-growing armaments and arms technology. As a result of your deliberations, this awareness has been further heightened.

28. Prior to this session, it was increasingly evident that the disarmament problem had become so complex that it had to be dealt with within a comprehensive framework. One of your great achievements has been the construction of such a framework, with agreement on the basic principles and priorities to which we must address ourselves in moving toward the goal of general and complete disarmament.

29. In a relatively short period of time, there has been a thorough-going discussion of all major aspects of disarmament.

ment. New elements, both for study and negotiation, have been introduced and a larger area of consensus among Member States has emerged.

30. These positive results reflect in part the effectiveness of the prior preparations accomplished under the able leadership of Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, to whom we all owe so much for his dedicated efforts throughout this session.

31. The results also reflect the unstinting and untiring efforts of the Chairmen of the working groups and the coordinators, as well as the many delegations which worked day and night to arrive at this agreed outcome.

32. The Assembly has every right to take pride in this accomplishment, and we are all in their debt for the constructive, serious and effective way in which the business of this session has been conducted. I wish to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to all members of the Secretariat who have worked so hard and for such long hours in assisting delegations to achieve this result.

33. It is a source of satisfaction as well that the substantive advances in new ideas, new perspectives and newly broadened areas of consensus have been matched in practical terms by improvements in disarmament machinery. A negotiating forum has now been agreed upon on the basis of the consensus of the United Nations membership. This is a significant move, opening the possibility of participation by all nuclear-weapon States.

34. I should also like to express satisfaction that Member States have continued the active involvement of the United Nations in the disarmament process. A deliberative body of the United Nations, the Disarmament Commission, will follow this up by giving a meaningful role to all Member States in considering, on a continuing basis, the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament.

35. I am particularly gratified at the positive response of Member States to my proposal for the establishment of an advisory board of eminent persons.

36. There has been progress in the direct involvement of peoples as well. An unprecedented role has been accorded to the non-governmental organizations. They have made a very meaningful contribution at this special session, and, through their participation, have stimulated the debate and enriched the exchange of ideas. I very much hope that their commitment to the cause of disarmament will ensure that the momentum that has been created by the special session will be sustained in the future.

37. These are the tangible and specific accomplishments of this session. One senses here a climate of increased political commitment at the highest governmental level to getting on with significant disarmament in the interests of security, in the interests of economic progress and development, and in the interests of human rights and social justice.

38. Mr. President, I cannot conclude my remarks without paying a special tribute to you. It would not be fitting

and proper for this session to close without an expression of the deepest appreciation on the part of the United Nations for your capable and dedicated efforts in guiding the work of this General Assembly. You have established a record of presiding over the largest number of sessions of any president in the history of the United Nations. That we have accomplished so much is in large measure due to your skill as presiding officer and negotiator. You have gained the respect and admiration of all those who have worked with you throughout the many months you have been with us, and before this assembled audience I wish to convey to you my personal gratitude. I am sure that in doing this I am also expressing the sentiments of the entire membership.

39. The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary-General for his statement and particularly for the kind words he addressed to me.

40. I shall now call on those representatives whose names are inscribed on the list of speakers to make statements in explanation of their positions. In view of the great number of speakers—44 up to now—and the limited time at our disposal, I should like to make a personal appeal to all of them to be as brief as possible.

41. Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): At this last meeting of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, when it can be affirmed that the international community has embarked on one of its most ambitious endeavours, namely, that of achieving agreement which will make possible general and complete disarmament, I should like to express my delegation's satisfaction at the work accomplished.

42. Impressions of the session vary, but, although the results were modest in relation to the magnitude of the problem, we cannot fail to acknowledge that a highly promising process has begun. An issue which gave rise to fear and hence seemed always shrouded in mystery, accessible only to the initiated, has now been subjected to discussion.

43. This step has been taken in a spirit of sincerity, despite limitations and the powerful interests at stake, thus revealing that our Organization has reached a high degree of maturity and that it is able to assume great responsibilities when these involve ecumenical interests based on justice and international security.

44. The Bolivian delegation would like to make a few comments, which we hope will be reflected in the voluminous documentation which will remain as testimony of the work of this Assembly and a source for consultation and research for the future.

45. We hope that, when the proposals which have been left pending are again considered, when we are less pressed by time and hence more rested and serene, it will be possible to broaden and deepen the programme of action, so that its aims may be more objective and realistic. Only in this way will it be possible to dispel the anxiety

ety of peoples, who see in general and complete disarmament the most constructive effort to strengthen peace.

46. My delegation regrets that the memorandum dated 8 June 1978 addressed to the Secretariat by the representatives of Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, entitled "Strengthening of the security role of the United Nations in the peaceful settlement of disputes and peace-keeping", in connexion with agenda item 11 [A/S-10/AC.1/26 and Corr.1 and 2] did not play a more important role and was not better reflected in the resolution before us.

47. The ideas expressed in that communication coincide with the Bolivian Government's view that there is a need to consider in due time all situations which might eventually affect international relations and the maintenance of peace before they become disputes or give rise to conflicts. Otherwise, we run the risk of pressures being exerted for an increase in armaments as a precautionary measure.

48. The United Nations should endeavour to establish, and, as far as possible, refine machinery to detect and control potential dangers before they become crises. Thus the ability of the Organization to consider cases which deserve preventive treatment would be strengthened and we would avoid the paradox of countries having to devote a sizeable part of their incomes to the acquisition of military equipment and thus being unable to meet such substantive needs of their peoples as those relating to health, food and education.

49. Paragraph 4 of the memorandum in question contains comments which my delegation fully endorses, especially where it mentions that the United Nations has not yet considered such a "vital issue" as "the question of crisis anticipation or, in the words of the Charter, 'prevention . . . of threats to the peace'".

50. Up to now the Security Council has acted only in cases of flagrant violations of peace and security. It would obviously be unjust not to acknowledge how effectively it has acted in such cases, but we should not forget that there are other situations which, because they have not provoked serious breaches of the peace with acts of violence, have been overlooked. Hence the need to identify latent anomalies and injustices which have the potential to cause conflicts if circumstances bring them into the open.

51. From this derives the effectiveness of preventive action; and it is not so difficult. Often it would be a simple task to diagnose the existence of such situations from the presence of related symptoms, for example, an excessive increase in arms expenditures, news of which filters through the smokescreen of declarations of peace, despite international treaties that are in force. It is impossible to prevent such acquisition of arms from provoking a sense of insecurity caused as much by the action of those who accumulate weapons that will some day have to be used or by the concern of their neighbours who wonder for whom

those weapons are intended and cannot fail to feel their own security endangered.

52. Moreover, the classic concept of the non-revision of treaties becomes controversial when these instruments cease to have logical validity and effectiveness, because time has revealed the anomalies they contain and the occasional injustice of the circumstances that gave rise to them.

53. Sometimes they are no longer consistent with reality or with the ever-growing needs of peoples. To this we should add the need for new approaches arising out of interdependence and the legitimate aspirations of strong nations which cannot develop satisfactorily because they are asphyxiated within historically invalid boundaries which were imposed upon them by force; or the aspirations of peoples whose necessary communication with the world is restricted and whose rights to integration and equal development are diminished by obstacles beyond their control created by situations of injustice, as is the case of Bolivia.

54. For all these reasons, my delegation feels in duty bound, on an occasion as significant as this one, to draw the attention of the international community to the fact, recognized in important international forums, by State dignitaries and, just a few days ago, by the President of the United States of America, Mr. Carter, that the problem of the geographically land-locked situation of Bolivia deserves the attention and consideration of the United Nations.

55. On the basis of our own experience, we feel that this Organization is the only persuasive force which could act as a benevolent mediator to resolve this situation. If we failed to request its co-operation, we would be leaving the decisions to the will of only one of the parties. This would also be the result of returning to direct negotiations without offering alternative solutions or setting time-tables and without providing guarantors or guarantees for both parties on an agreed basis, thus relying on good faith which does not ensure political will for solution and which therefore, in the long run, would only generate new frustrations and greater distrust.

56. It should be repeated once more that Bolivia is a peace-loving country by temperament and by tradition, weak in its military coefficient, but not defenceless, because it is certain of its moral strength as well as of the validity of its fundamental rights.

57. Our demand for free and sovereign access to the sea is not a passing aspiration with purely economic causes, nor is it an emotional reaction or whimsical desire for territorial expansion. The sea is the natural complement of its varied and complex geography, as well as of its status as a contact point. This geopolitical reality has rendered possible the new inter-oceanic channel between the Brazilian port of Santos on the Atlantic and Arica on the Pacific. Here again, as a further demonstration of its moderation and its peace-loving nature, Bolivia is prepared to offer any type of compensation which would not imply the cession of territory. An exchange of territory would be unacceptable for a people which has often seen its territory di-

vided and which none the less has not lost faith and is progressing calmly and with determination towards the future.

58. With regard to the draft resolution adopted this morning and now to be given the verdict of the General Assembly, may I be permitted to make a few preliminary comments.

59. Far be it from my delegation to criticize the vast work accomplished by the staff of the conference and documentation services, but I do feel it is necessary to note the irregular way in which the delegations that do not use English as a working language had to work. We understand that the staff of the general conference services worked with maximum efficiency and selflessness, but none the less we should point out that it is anomalous and risky for many of us to assess the considerations, views and principles that are to commit our leaders in a foreign language of which not all delegations have thorough knowledge.

60. We are aware that this short-coming is not peculiar to this conference. Perhaps it is almost inevitable in a session of this magnitude, which could be called 'a marathon of brackets'. But we cannot gloss over it since it has endangered and obstructed the proper fulfilment of our obligations.

61. Having expressed these reservations, I should also like to state the full agreement of my delegation with the Bolivarian proposal regarding zones of peace. This initiative, which has a well-known precedent in the Treaty of Tlateloloco for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America,¹ was given significant impetus in the Declaration of Ayacucho signed in 1974 and ratified on 22 June of this year by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of eight countries of the southern hemisphere.

62. But the establishment of zones of peace in an inchoate form is only the cornerstone of something which, if it is defined and perfected as a doctrine, would become a forceful contribution on the part of the developing countries to efforts for the consolidation of a new world based on peaceful and harmonious coexistence. The purity of the concept and the hope of reflecting the wishes of a respectable majority to protect America from suspicion and mistrust should be taken very carefully into account.

63. The agreement expressed by eight Latin American Ministers for Foreign Affairs in 1974, as well as a few days ago, pointing out that the subsistence of problems in the international sphere is one of the major causes of the arms race, is explicit recognition of the fact that there is a need to strengthen preventive action since, if the causes of inequality, discrimination or injustice are not rooted out, any action which does not aim to correct them would be mere political speculation or a game of semantics; concealing or hushing up the existence of these causes would create false illusions of peace and security harmful to the very essence of peace.

64. At the same time it should be recalled that the patience of people who suffer injustices has its limits. History abounds in examples. Stretching the limits of prudence and reason can cause a loss of faith in international solidarity and provoke a natural reaction on the part of those who are beset by misery and oppression and feel forgotten by their fellow men.

65. We do not feel that this is our situation. The Declaration signed by the eight Ministers for Foreign Affairs at the recent meeting of the Organization of American States demonstrates clear political will to serve the cause of peace; but not a fragile peace sustained by bayonets or by lyrical statements; rather a genuine, true peace that aims to tackle the latent causes of situations of uncertainty and discouragement that foster the arms race.

66. If the injustices of the past are not redressed, any agreement would merely be temporary. It would be disregarding history, and therefore unable to stand the test of time and to meet the insistent demands of new generations.

67. My delegation regrets the fact that the concept of preventive action has not been more explicitly and forcefully reflected in the document which today has finally been adopted. In all other respects we associate ourselves with the majority view, especially with the decision to continue the study of the question of disarmament either through the First Committee of the General Assembly or through a special committee adequately structured to meet the needs of the situation. We feel that this should be the case and we hope that the task will not be downgraded or passed on to a private committee, as did happen a few years ago when an initial group was reduced in terms of participation and membership until its work became that of a few, fruitless and without effect in regard to its objectives and as far as the rest of the world was concerned.

68. The document which we have adopted is not, nor could it be, perfect, given its highly complex nature and the short time which was available. If it were perfect, this would mean that we had overestimated the magnitude of the problem of disarmament and its vast scope and difficulties, which is not the case. We must accept the fact that the international community is barely beginning to stammer out its condemnation of the arms race that up to now has been a forbidden subject open only to the warlords. But it has faced the situation with courage. We should like to pay a tribute to the fact that the initiative was taken by the countries which are truly peace-loving and which have never benefited from war, since they find sufficient the battle of their daily confrontation with the ills of underdevelopment which afflict them from within and from without.

69. Now, at the conclusion of this first stage and, thanks to it, with renewed hopes, we must see to it that the measures agreed upon are fully implemented. Although the proposal on a moratorium has not really been put into effect, may it remain as a moral obligation, a solemn commitment to the will for peace and co-existence of mankind, which, in the last analysis, is the mandate of this Assembly.

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326.

70. I do not wish to conclude this statement without expressing the sincere appreciation of my delegation to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, for his wisdom and patience in leading and guiding our work. Likewise, we convey our thanks to the Chairmen of working groups A and B and especially to the main co-ordinator, Mr. García Robles, and to the other co-ordinators, to whose zeal, dedication and efforts we owe this resolution which has been adopted by consensus.

71. Mr. ULRICHSEN (Denmark): Speaking on behalf of the nine countries of the European Community I wish to welcome the eleventh—or rather twelfth—hour result of this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

72. First of all I wish to pay tribute to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, and his principal co-ordinator, Mr. García Robles, and the other co-ordinators. They have conducted the negotiations and the informal consultations in an outstanding way. Thanks to them and to the spirit of compromise shown by all delegations we are now able to conclude this special session on a positive note.

73. Our deliberations have once again confirmed the complicated nature of problems of arms control and disarmament. I may refer in this connexion to the statement on behalf of the nine countries of the European Community which was made in the *Ad Hoc* Committee on 26 June [4th meeting], in which we expressed the view that the final document did not in all fields reflect fully the purposes and principles of the Charter.

74. It is a fact that the obligation of all States to refrain from any use of force which is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence, are basic principles embedded in the Charter.

75. In view of the complicated problems confronting us, it is the more remarkable that we have succeeded in hammering out a final document which marks a certain degree of international consensus on these difficult and urgent issues. No doubt many of us feel that the Programme of Action is not fully balanced and does not go so far as many of us would have wished. But it does convey a sense of urgency regarding the dangers of the continuing world-wide arms race, and it does set out certain relevant priorities.

76. During the general debate a number of new and important ideas and proposals emerged. Unfortunately, it has not been possible during the short span of time at our disposal and owing to the complexity of the issues to deal fully with these new initiatives. It is our understanding that these initiatives—many of which emanated from members of the European Community—will be referred to the appropriate bodies for consideration in depth.

77. In the field of machinery agreement has been reached on a new structure which we trust will give a new impetus

to the multilateral negotiating process with an enlarged participation of the members of the international community. This is a significant result of the special session.

78. Let me also stress some other positive aspects of the special session. For all of us, our discussions have contributed to a better understanding of national positions in the field of arms control and disarmament which are closely interrelated with vital national security considerations and which reflect widely differing perspectives and convictions. These discussions have certainly also stimulated public interest in the cause of disarmament.

79. In the view of the nine countries of the European Community the steps taken and initiated at this special session are but a starting point of a process which must and will be pursued on a continuing basis to halt and reverse the international arms race. As the Danish Minister of State, Mrs. Oestergaard, said on behalf of the nine during the general debate on 25 May: "I wish to record the common conviction of the nine that there is an alternative to an unrestrained, costly and potentially destabilizing world-wide arms race. The nine feel strongly that a disarmament process should go hand in hand with a sustained effort to eliminate the sources of tension and injustice in the world." [4th meeting, para. 41.]

80. Mr. THUNBORG (Sweden): The Swedish delegation wishes on this important occasion to express satisfaction that a successful outcome of the special session has been possible. I wish to pay tribute to you, Mr. President, for your wise leadership which undoubtedly played an important role in securing this outcome.

81. The Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, will occupy a very special place in future assessments of the negotiating process during the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament; I wish here to place on record the profound gratitude and admiration of the Swedish delegation for the highly skilful manner in which he conducted the business of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and the intensive informal negotiations.

82. I wish also to express my thanks to Mr. García Robles who played a key role in the difficult final stages of the negotiations. The other co-ordinators and, indeed, the Secretariat also deserve our gratitude for their untiring efforts.

83. The special session on disarmament has provided an opportunity to conduct far-reaching deliberations and consultations on the critical problems of the arms race. Our discussions have covered the whole range of disarmament issues. However, special emphasis has rightly been put on problems relating to nuclear weapons and to the risk of further proliferation of such weapons.

84. Inevitably, expectations in advance of this session varied. Few had expected major break-throughs. After all, disarmament problems are at the same time politically fundamental and technically complex. However, every participant now has a responsibility to continue the work initiated by this, the most representative gathering of States in a session devoted solely to disarmament.

85. We welcome the fact that for the first time all the nuclear-weapon States have taken an active part in the deliberations on disarmament. We have been encouraged by the open exchange of views which has taken place. Whatever differences of opinion and of national interest may continue to exist among nations, such an open exchange of views is a precondition for the emergence of greater mutual understanding. In that context the United Nations continues to fulfil a central role.

86. The final document—which the Assembly has now adopted by consensus—will be valuable as an integral part of that process. It testifies to the fact that progress has been made in some important areas. The machinery of deliberations and negotiations has been modified in a way which satisfies both the clear interests of broader direct participation and the necessity of retaining an efficient instrument for negotiations. It is also important to note that at the special session the Assembly has charted the course for an enlarged programme of studies for further analysis of disarmament problems.

87. We have been encouraged to note the general agreement on the Nordic proposal concerning an in-depth study of the complex relationship between disarmament and development [A/S-10/1, vol. V, document A/AC.187/80]. We are convinced that the study [A/S-10/9] will receive the necessary support among Member States and that it will eventually lead to substantive results—for the benefit not least of the developing countries.

88. Many documents have been presented at this session. In some cases they represent concurring national views and in others conflicting or diverging interests. Evidently, a consensus document will embrace only part of all those proposals; it will reflect the degree of understanding among States which can be reached at this stage of the negotiating process. There is no doubt, however, that a more substantial programme of action in the areas of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation would have better corresponded to the grave situation of the arms race.

89. Suffice it here to note that it was expected at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly that both a draft comprehensive test ban treaty and a new agreement on strategic arms limitation would have been concluded before the special session. The Assembly would then have been able to register substantial results and contribute better to further action-oriented measures. We now look for the drawn-out trilateral negotiations on a comprehensive test ban to be brought to an end without any further delay.

90. The text of a comprehensive test ban in the Programme of Action requires special comment. The Swedish Government considers the comprehensive test ban to have a value in its own right; it would be highly instrumental in the efforts to prevent further qualitative improvements of nuclear weapons and the proliferation of such weapons. An effective comprehensive test ban would not in itself be a disarmament measure, but indeed a substantial contribution to the process of curbing the nuclear arms race.

91. The particular responsibility of the leading nuclear-

weapon Powers for undertaking the measures required to achieve nuclear disarmament is clearly expressed in the Programme of Action. In the Swedish view, concrete measures must be undertaken in the following areas for negotiation: the freezing of the qualitative improvement of existing nuclear weapons and delivery systems; the cessation of the research and development of new types and new systems of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery and guidance; the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and of fissionable material for weapon purposes; the balanced reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and of their delivery systems; and the prevention of the proliferation of such weapons and systems.

92. Sweden has not proposed a time schedule for negotiations; however, substantial results at an early date are necessary. The nuclear build-up accelerates the whole arms race. Furthermore, it undermines the potential of détente, both globally and in sensitive regions.

93. In this context, I wish to make it clear that the necessity of early action does not refer solely to strategic weapons. Great risks are also inherent in a continued development of the large group of non-strategic nuclear weapons not included in strategic arms limitation agreements. Adequate attention must be focused on those weapons in the negotiating process.

94. One of several extremely worrying examples of the development of such non-strategic weapons is the neutron weapon. As we see it, the neutron weapon is a specialized nuclear weapon that might lower the nuclear threshold. That is one of the unacceptable properties of that weapon, and it is the reason why we equate it with the so-called mini-nuclear weapons—to which Sweden has raised strong objections in various forums.

95. The medium-range nuclear missiles are another category of weapons whose further development causes great concern. One example is the mobile missile known as the SS-20. That missile could be employed with great precision and terrible destructive power. The development of cruise missiles and satellite-killers is another example of an arms race actually in progress which raises new obstacles on the road to disarmament.

96. The close link between nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation has characterized the deliberations of the special session. It is of central importance that a basic agreement should be reached on the fact that all States have a national, as well as a common, interest in seeing to it that the number of nuclear-weapon States does not increase.

97. Three years have passed since the first Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons took place [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex]; two years from now the next Review Conference is due to be convened. No efforts should be spared during this time to maintain and strengthen an effective and universally accepted non-proliferation régime.

98. The risk of the proliferation of nuclear weapons is

also closely linked with the peaceful use of nuclear energy. All States have the right to decide how they can best ensure their energy supplies. As regards nuclear power for peaceful purposes, international co-operation and concord are of decisive importance. In order to avoid discrimination all States must, in our view, accept comprehensive and effective international safeguards for all fissionable material in the nuclear fuel cycle. The risks inherent in a rapid and uncontrolled development of nuclear power must be pointed out, and advantage should be taken of the possibilities now provided by alternative energy conservation technologies.

99. The Swedish delegation would like to stress the importance it attaches to the problems relating to the worldwide accumulation of conventional armaments and the international transfer of such arms. As a result of the special session a consensus has been achieved to the effect that the limitation and gradual reduction of such weapons should be resolutely pursued. This is the first time that it has proved possible to consider that important question in a constructive way in the United Nations. The issue has now been firmly established as one of the priority items for the deliberations in the United Nations on disarmament.

100. International action with regard to the issue of particularly inhumane weapons has also been discussed at this session. We take note of the fact that agreement has been reached that such action should be taken to prohibit or restrict, for humanitarian reasons, the use of specific, excessively injurious or indiscriminate conventional weapons. The Swedish delegation appeals to all States—including those which are members of the two major military alliances—to make full use of the opportunity that will be provided by the 1979 United Nations conference on this subject: that is, to bring about agreement on the effective prohibition or restriction of the weapon categories concerned, and to participate actively in the preparatory work for that conference.

101. Each participant in this session knows the importance of the question of openness regarding military budgets as a step on the way to agreed reductions acceptable to all. Achieving such openness would be an important confidence-building measure. In view of the difficulty of the problems involved, it is important to continue deliberations on that subject. The session has established an adequate basis for such deliberations.

102. Every concrete step which would contribute to the prevention of a continuation of the arms race remains highly important. Jointly preserved national and collective security at successively lower levels of armaments remains the overriding goal. The special session has indicated where difficulties lie, what can be achieved at this stage, and which measures should be urgently undertaken. The second agreement on strategic arms limitation and the comprehensive test ban will be the first "touchstones" of the further course of the disarmament process.

103. In future efforts at disarmament, Governments, non-governmental organizations and research institutes

must work, separately and jointly, to open new avenues. It is our conviction that a more active and broadening involvement on the part of non-governmental organizations and the public can make a valuable contribution in this regard.

104. Against the background I have sketched here, I believe it is not unrealistic to finish by striking a note of hope. What we need now is to muster the will for political action and constructive co-operation. Let us all work in such a spirit in the years to come, until we convene here again at the next special session.

105. Mr. BARTON (Canada): Mr. President, may I at the outset congratulate you most warmly for having guided this historic session to a successful conclusion. At times the gravity of the issues involved and the often sharp differences in the positions of many participating countries threatened to be too much for us. But your skilful efforts and the invaluable contributions of the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and his dedicated team of co-ordinators have earned our admiration, respect and gratitude, as all obstacles to progress succumbed one by one to the persistence of their goodwill.

106. Our Final Document, despite many prophecies of doom, has emerged as a consensus in which all of us can take pride. It sums up in quietly compelling language the demand of all mankind that somehow swords must be beaten into ploughshares. It goes beyond, to point the way to concrete steps and practical activities that will serve our shared priorities and goals.

107. For my delegation, and for others who share our views, it is especially gratifying that the main elements of what my Prime Minister described as a strategy of suffocation for resisting the dynamic of the nuclear arms race [*6th meeting*] are explicitly or implicitly covered in the Programme of Action.

108. Of course, no Assembly of this size and momentous concern to the world could ever promise to satisfy in full the bill of particulars of each individual participating country. My country would have preferred to see several questions dealt with differently from the way in which the consensus solutions were worked out in our Final Document. Certainly our deeply held convictions of the necessity of strengthening the international non-proliferation system and for encouraging broader adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons are not reflected in the terms in which we would have drafted them if we had not been loyal to the agreed objective of one document, a consensus document. The fact is, of course, that all of us have had to make significant concessions on many points of special interest to our Governments and peoples. In doing so we have, nevertheless, managed to create a final consensus document that is important, both for what it contains and for the fact that it carries with it the agreement of virtually the whole world.

109. It is hard to believe that the general debate, which attracted so many distinguished world figures and put such a seal of importance on our work, was concluded only a

few short weeks ago. So much has been accomplished in the interim that a full and fair evaluation of the special session on disarmament cannot yet be made. But I can say now that my delegation subscribes without reserve to the conclusions drawn for us by the delegations of Mexico and Sweden and now incorporated in our Final Document.

110. As my Prime Minister suggested in the general debate, a great responsibility has rested on the Assembly at this special session. It has not been our business here to negotiate agreements. That is a task for other forums. But it has been our responsibility to take stock and prescribe. That task has been accomplished—well accomplished. Moreover, we have ensured that the appropriate machinery will be available to help the international community organize better for its newly affirmed determination to halt and reverse the arms race. To that unrelenting effort, my country continues to be unreservedly dedicated.

111. Sir Derick ASHE (United Kingdom): Mr. President, before I make some comments on the conclusion of the work of this session, it gives me great pleasure to associate the British delegation with the tributes which have already been made to you personally, Sir, for your wise conduct of our affairs and, through you, to your Government as the originator of this session.

112. I should also like to pay a tribute to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, particularly for the way in which he has so skilfully piloted us through the difficult waters that we have traversed in the last few days, and to his co-ordinator and conciliator, Mr. García Robles, for the contribution made by his firm and patient negotiation on many intractable matters.

113. The British Government has manifestly accorded great importance to this special session devoted to disarmament. My Prime Minister made a major speech here on 2 June [14th meeting]. Britain was among the sponsors of draft papers for the three sections of the Final Document. We attached particular importance to the Programme of Action, and the Western draft contained a number of significant proposals. We shall continue to pursue these ideas, whether or not they appear now in the session's Final Document.

114. At the outset our hope was that the special session would act as a stimulus to progress towards success in existing negotiations and towards starting new negotiations. We hoped that greater international attention would be attracted to disarmament. We wanted sensible reform in the field of disarmament machinery, particularly to make the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament more representative.

115. What has been achieved? Certainly greater attention has been drawn to disarmament. Certainly many issues have been discussed on a wider basis, perhaps, than ever before. That is positive in itself. We welcome the increasing interest which Governments and peoples alike are taking in disarmament and are very glad to have been able to play some part in bringing the non-governmental organizations and research institutes concerned with disarmament

into closer association with the activities of the special session, recognizing, as we do, their important role in guiding and enlightening public opinion.

116. Progress has also been made at this special session on the question of machinery. In particular we have agreed on a sensible package of changes concerning the negotiating body. It will now be more representative and better structured. We welcome this result and are glad to have played a role in achieving it. We shall continue to play our part as actively as before in the negotiating body, where we look forward to co-operating closely with the new members as well as our old friends.

117. These are the good points in what has happened. As we consider in the coming weeks our over-all assessment of the session, we shall give them due weight. But I cannot conceal that I also feel disappointment at other aspects of the outcome of this first attempt at tackling disarmament by new means. I wish, above all, that we could point to agreement on one or more realistic new ideas launched at the session which might produce specific results to enhance international security. I wish the Final Document and the covering resolution were more balanced in the emphasis they place on conventional and nuclear disarmament and on the measures to prevent nuclear proliferation. Of course, Britain well understands the strength of feeling about nuclear weapons, but we should not forget that the Charter of the United Nations enjoins us, to use its own words, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". Disarmament is a means to that end and must involve parallel progress with regard to weapons of every kind as well as being balanced and verified so as to enhance stability and reduce the risk of conflict.

118. In connexion with the Final Document just adopted, I should like to make the following observations with regard to my Government's positions.

119. We wish to make it clear, with regard to the references in paragraphs 22 and 83 to the limitation of transfers of conventional arms, that the requirement of taking into account the right of peoples to self-determination does not in any way imply our acceptance of the desirability of using force to resolve conflicts arising from the search for self-determination. We have always taken the view that these matters should be resolved by peaceful means.

120. We are glad that in paragraph 50 of the Final Document, in the passage on further measures of nuclear disarmament, it is recognized that negotiation of agreements must take place at appropriate stages of our progress towards the ultimate goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, and with adequate measures of verification.

121. In connexion with paragraph 56 of the Final Document: under the Charter of the United Nations, Member States are, in their international relations, obliged to refrain from the use or threat of use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. The Charter also maintains the right of States to individual or collective self-defence. My Government has made it clear that we will not use nuclear weapons except in self-

defence as provided for in the Charter—that is, in the case of an actual armed attack on the United Kingdom, its dependent territories, its armed forces or its allies. My Government cannot renounce or circumscribe in principle its right to use, if necessary, any of the means available for defence.

122. On the subject of security assurances, which is dealt with in paragraphs 32 and 59 of the Final Document, I should like to recall the statement I made at the 26th plenary meeting. In that statement, I gave, on behalf of my Government, a negative security assurance which effectively assures non-nuclear-weapon States, as appropriate, against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

123. Regarding paragraph 77 of the Final Document, on weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles, the British Government's position remains as set out in General Assembly resolution 32/84 B.

124. Concerning paragraph 120 of the Final Document, it is my Government's understanding that the agreement on the negotiating body was reached on the basis that present members of the negotiating body should, if they so wished, remain members of the Committee on Disarmament.

125. I should like to end my last remarks of the session on a hopeful note. A little progress, although far too little, has been achieved. Many of us here may be disappointed in the Final Document. I must confess that there were times when our discussions on it seemed to me more like the ritual death dance of dying elephants than the greatest and most hopeful gathering of the powers of this earth united in a common search for disarmament and international security. But this is a far cry from saying that our efforts have failed; manifestly, we have some solid achievements to our credit. At an international meeting like this, called to discuss matters of such complexity, matters that touch upon the most vital and fundamental interests of States, it was hardly to be expected that conflicting points of view would not arise or that they could all be reconciled. Let us take encouragement from what we have been able to do and from the knowledge that for the first time ever the whole world has been able to agree on a single document about disarmament.

126. For its part, Britain will continue in all the appropriate forums to strive for progress in disarmament through multilateral, balanced and verified disarmament agreements that lead us towards a safer world. Our immediate and most urgent task is to achieve success in the tripartite negotiations on a comprehensive test ban treaty at Geneva and to maintain the new momentum recently injected into the negotiations at Vienna on mutual and balanced force reductions.

127. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) (*interpretation from French*): Although my delegation participated in the consensus, I must state that the text that has just been adopted does not satisfy us completely. That is so because it does not truly fulfil the hopes that the convening of this special

session had aroused throughout the world. We still face the same problems of substance. It is true that some modest progress has been achieved in certain fields—for example, those related to the deliberating and negotiating bodies—but we must acknowledge that the essential issues and the differences of view remain almost completely intact, just as they were before this special session began.

128. For our part, we have always participated in good faith in the efforts towards general and controlled disarmament. What is more, we have attempted to take in this field initiatives that, although symbolic, are none the less specific. The most recent of these initiatives was taken only some two weeks ago, when my Sovereign announced that \$7 million would be allocated from our defence budget as a contribution towards the implementation of plans related to the International Year of the Child. We hope that such gestures will proliferate everywhere and will thereby contribute to the establishment of an atmosphere conducive to the success of the efforts of the international community.

Mr. N'Dong (Gabon), Vice-President, took the Chair.

129. To revert to this session that is about to conclude, I believe that, despite the disappointments, it has been useful. Indeed, it has made possible a wide-ranging exchange of views and a better understanding of the problems. And if the decisions taken—however modest they may be—are followed up, there can be no doubt that they will facilitate negotiations and discussions.

130. Aware as I am of the enormous difficulties encountered during our work—difficulties illustrated by the innumerable brackets that encumbered our working documents—I cannot conclude without expressing our gratitude to all those whose efforts made possible the achievement of a consensus. We should like to thank above all the President of this session for the admirable way in which he guided our work. We wish, too, to congratulate Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, the Chairman of our *Ad Hoc* Committee, as well as Mr. García Robles and the Chairmen and co-ordinators of the working groups and the drafting groups, who worked day and night to bridge differences of view and to ensure that the very idea of disarmament would not end up by being placed in brackets.

131. Mr. ERNEMANN (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Rarely has a committee chairman played such an important and decisive part as Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee and then of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the tenth special session. We attribute much of the success we have achieved to him. A tribute must be paid also to the members of the Bureau of the *Ad Hoc* Committee; its Rapporteur, Mr. Bensmail; the co-ordinators of the working groups; and, in particular, Mr. García Robles of Mexico. To him, too, we owe in large part the results achieved.

132. The success of our work can be attributed also to the spirit that prevailed. The faithful observance by all of the rule of consensus, both in the small groups and in the *Ad Hoc* Committee itself, is noteworthy. In the General

Assembly, arithmetics can command dominance, and the majority can therefore prevail. But the effect of this would be ephemeral. We should like to see in the practice of consensus the development of the spirit of international co-operation. Consensus is born of tolerance, of respect for the policies and opinions of others. Its practice contributes to increasing the value of the Organization's work. In this regard, we should like to pay a tribute to the sponsors of document A/S-10/AC.1/L.1/Rev.1, and in particular to the Arab countries for having allowed consensus to prevail over particular concerns, in spite of their conviction that such concerns are legitimate and shared.

133. The fact that we have supported the consensus does not mean that we approve of all the thoughts, all the sentences and all the words in the Final Document. We gave our agreement last night in order that a document which existed only in English, incompletely printed and erroneous in part, could be submitted to the General Assembly. Today, again, we have joined in the consensus; yet our authorities have not had the final French text and have not been able to study the scope of each provision. Thus our agreement is above all a reflection of our positive attitude; it does not mean that we agree with all the paragraphs of the document.

134. That leads me to formulate some reservations with regard to the methods of work used—reservations in addition to those expressed at the beginning of this meeting. Rules 51, 56, 78 and 120 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure have not always been respected. The multiplicity of working groups, the fact that they met at the same time, the frequency of their meetings, the small size of the meeting rooms, the failure to publish documents simultaneously in the official languages: all this often made it difficult for everyone to attend all the discussions or to have adequate information about the work going on, or made it impossible to take valid opinions into account in due time. We have to deplore this and to express the hope that this experience will not be allowed to serve as a precedent. This in no way detracts from the satisfaction we have just expressed about the actual conduct of our work.

135. As for the results themselves, our judgement is that they give reasonable satisfaction. The representative of Denmark, the country that holds the chairmanship of the countries of the European Community, stated this on our behalf at the beginning of this meeting.

136. I shall take up, in order and very briefly, the three major headings of the Final Document.

137. The Declaration is a generally valid document. However, we should have preferred a shorter text, more likely to make an impact on public opinion. The introduction would have benefited from being more concise and less polemical.

138. The Programme of Action is the result of a compromise between different points of view and will obviously be assessed in different ways. Some will lay stress on the questions on which it was not possible to reach agreement and will regard them as more important than the few mea-

sures which were unanimously approved. I think, for my part, that a realistic analysis would place the Programme of Action within a context of continuity; and this continuity is particularly reflected in the decision to hold another special session. That is also one of the essential results of our work.

139. Decisions affecting machinery are of vital importance for the future. The arrangement made with regard to the deliberative and negotiating bodies take account of two essential principles: that of universality, which gives every country a right to participate, and that of effectiveness, which imposes a certain limitation on participation in the process of negotiation. The search for a balance between these two contradictory principles led us, at the 16th meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, to attempt to clarify an obscure point affecting the interpretation of paragraph 120 of the Final Document. Belgium is satisfied that Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, on behalf of the Committee, gave the proper interpretation, to the effect that at each periodic review of the composition of the Committee on Disarmament there will be consultation between Member States of the General Assembly and the President of the General Assembly.

140. My country accepted the consensus subject to the general reservation I have mentioned, but at this stage I should like to stress certain points which for us are of particular importance.

141. We are pleased to see the question of conventional arms retained as one of the priorities which should be dealt with at the same time as the question of nuclear arms.

142. We are also pleased to see the extent to which the regional aspect of security problems, and hence of disarmament, grew in importance in the course of the work of the special session and also in the Final Document itself. Belgium will continue to press its proposal for the undertaking of a systematic study of regional disarmament questions, in accordance with resolution 32/87 D adopted at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly. A decision will have to be taken to this effect at the thirty-third session. We shall have to take account of, among other things, national contributions submitted to the Secretary-General, and also the conclusions of the special session. A considerable number of these relate to the possibilities offered by the regional approach.

143. Finally, Belgium would like at this stage to express two specific reservations with regard to the Final Document.

144. First, on the subject of non-proliferation, we regret the inadequate nature of the reference to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We consider that Treaty to be a basic instrument for the non-proliferation régime. We are aware, of course, of its short-comings, but it is and must remain, in our opinion, a universal instrument. This point is not sufficiently stressed, in our view, in paragraph 67 of the Final Document. The result of this is a lack of balance in the part of the Programme of Action which deals with non-proliferation.

145. Secondly, with regard to the non-use of force, which is dealt with in paragraphs 32 and 58, I should like to state that for Belgium any form of recourse to force must be condemned if it occurs in contravention of the prescriptions of the Charter of the United Nations. The non-use of force or of the threat of force is an absolute principle which is not limited to the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, as the language of these two paragraphs might suggest.

146. My country also wishes to reserve its position, until it is better informed, with regard to the preparation of a code of peaceful conduct of States referred to in paragraph 58.

147. This session of the General Assembly will be a landmark on the road to disarmament if the political will which was made manifest in the later phase of our work continues to inspire the international community when the measures advocated in the Final Document are being implemented.

148. Of course, this session marks in practice the end of the mandate which Member States entrusted to Mr. Mojsov, when electing him to the presidency of the General Assembly. I should like to say to him, both on behalf of the Belgian Government and on my own behalf, that our hopes have been more than fulfilled. It is a long time since the General Assembly has been able to work under the auspices of, at the same time, such wisdom and moderation, political sense, firmness and cordiality. We pay a tribute to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and to Mr. Mojsov, whom we thank for his devotion.

149. Mr. CESKA (Austria): As the first special session devoted to disarmament comes to an end, the Austrian delegation, like the delegations of the other Member States, will have to draw conclusions from the results of this huge undertaking—a general mobilization of the combined efforts of all United Nations Member countries to advance the cause of disarmament.

150. I wish to state clearly that, despite all the difficulties encountered, our over-all balance is a positive one. It seems of particular importance to us that all United Nations Members, including all nuclear-weapon States, have participated actively in the work of this special session, thus giving proof of their understanding of the necessity for concrete and significant steps to halt and reverse the arms race.

151. Taking into account the complexity of the task, the results of this first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament as expressed in its Final Document, incomplete as they may appear in some parts, are quite remarkable. They will constitute a good basis for further work. I wish to stress how important it is that we have reached a very large measure of understanding as far as concerns the Introduction and the Declaration, including the principles of disarmament. Substantial agreement has also been reached on important elements of a Programme of Action for disarmament. We hope that in the near future further progress in this field will be possible. To this end it

will be necessary for the nuclear-weapon States, and in particular the two leading nuclear-weapon States, to acknowledge the special responsibilities they bear in the field of disarmament.

152. The decisions of this special session on the future machinery for disarmament efforts are far-reaching. In the opinion of the Austrian delegation it is important that we have all agreed on the necessity of having deliberative as well as negotiating bodies and bodies to carry out the research work indispensable to serious disarmament efforts.

153. Certainly not all our initial hopes and expectations have been met so far. We should have liked to see more far-reaching decisions taken here and now. In this connexion, I should like also to turn briefly to one subject to which my delegation has attached particular importance from the beginning even of the preparatory stages of our work. It is the subject of verification of disarmament. We note with satisfaction that the concept of verification and its relationship with mutual confidence is reflected in the Declaration as well as in the Programme of Action. I should like, in this context, to recall the working paper on this subject submitted by Austria [A/S-10/1, vol. VI, document A/AC.187/101] in which we proposed not only concrete language for the section on principles, but also the carrying out of an expert study on different aspects of this problem.

154. My delegation was gratified by the interest and support which those proposals elicited, in particular from the delegations of Peru, Sweden, the Netherlands, Italy and France and many others. This, as well as many statements during the general debate, the discussions in the drafting groups and also a number of new and very ambitious related proposals, demonstrated very clearly that there is a case for more detailed consideration of different aspects of verification. There is a similar assertion in the background paper produced by the Secretariat [*ibid.*, document A/AC.187/109]. My delegation has already had occasion to thank the Secretariat for the considerable effort involved there.

155. On the other hand, the argument presented by a number of delegations in the course of the discussions, namely, that verification has to be viewed in close conjunction with specific disarmament agreements, cannot be overlooked. This is why my delegation felt that, as a first step, an expert study on all aspects of verification, which necessarily would endeavour to draw some general conclusions, might be premature at this time. We therefore proposed to request the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States on this subject and to transmit the replies to the General Assembly. In particular, views on the following points would be of interest: previous experience with the verification of disarmament agreements, proposals for agreed concepts and definitions, different approaches to verification, the implications of modern technology and its development for verification, and wider international participation, active or passive, in verification procedures, including organizational aspects. The replies on these points would then serve as a useful point of departure for any further discussion.

156. In view of the widespread interest in this issue, we note with particular regret that, owing to the objections of some delegations, a consensus on our proposal so far has not been possible. We would, however, like to add that we intend to pursue this matter further in the appropriate organs of the United Nations.

157. The Final Document before us contains a certain number of points which we have accepted in the spirit of compromise but which do not fully reflect our way of thinking. May I point out some of these texts.

158. Paragraph 1, in the Introduction, states, *inter alia*, that the time has come to abandon the use of force in international relations. This phrase could be misunderstood. I wish to stress the view of my delegation that United Nations Member States have already abandoned the use of force through their commitments under the Charter and that there was never a time when the use of force was appropriate, as the particular phrase I am referring to might suggest.

159. In the Declaration, it is stated in paragraph 41 that, *inter alia*, "all States should . . . refrain from actions which might adversely affect efforts in the field of disarmament. . .". This wording is very general and vague and might be interpreted rather differently by Member States.

160. The third point I want to raise is contained in the Programme of Action where it is stated in paragraph 54 that: "Significant progress in nuclear disarmament would be facilitated both by parallel political or international legal measures to strengthen the security of States. . .". This formulation seems to us rather unclear. What political or international legal measures are meant? We would have preferred thoroughly to discuss and specify these measures during our drafting work, but that was not possible owing to a lack of time.

161. The document which we have before us is the result of the serious consultations and negotiations which were held in the course of the preparatory stage of the special session, as well as during the session itself. Intensive efforts, furthermore, have been made during these last few days and nights to get final agreement on many parts of the document. I should like in particular to thank the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, as well as Mr. García Robles and the co-ordinators of the drafting groups, and all delegations that have been involved in these efforts, for the result that has been transmitted to us today. We believe that the document in its present form constitutes the highest level of consensus that could be reached at this first special session devoted to disarmament.

162. In the course of this session we had to realize that progress in disarmament is even more difficult to achieve and more time-consuming than we had initially expected. We must, however, realize that time is working against us and that we are engaged in a race which we will have to win if we want to survive.

163. Therefore, this first special session on disarmament must be seen as the turning-point towards combined and successful efforts for genuine disarmament. We do hope that early and positive developments in the field of disarmament will soon meet this expectation.

164. I cannot conclude my remarks without paying special tribute to the outstanding guidance and leadership which the President of this Assembly, Mr. Mojsov, has offered to this special session. If we can successfully conclude this session today, it is largely due to his well-known personal commitment to the cause of disarmament.

165. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): The purpose of my statement is to present some comments of the Finnish delegation on the Final Document.

166. On the basis of its active policy of neutrality, Finland has a natural interest in disarmament. This explains my country's long and sustained involvement in disarmament matters and its interest in this special session.

167. I wish to express the satisfaction of my delegation at the fact that the Final Document of this session was adopted by consensus. Indeed, any other result would have been a setback to the efforts of the international community in pursuit of disarmament. In a very real sense, then, the result that we have reached by consensus is the common achievement of us all.

168. We have been aware throughout of the importance of the special session, the first of its kind. We have been aware of the importance of reaching decisions by consensus. Now, consensus inevitably implies compromise. The end-product of the process of bargaining and mutual accommodation can never be one that wholly pleases everyone. The essence of consensus is that everybody can live with it and, at best, without too much difficulty.

169. The most tangible outcome of the special session, and one that can be readily implemented, is the decision on disarmament machinery. It is natural, therefore, that this particular aspect should have been the subject of intensive negotiations. The General Assembly decisions now provide for machinery consisting of two deliberative bodies, the First Committee of the General Assembly and the Disarmament Commission, and a negotiating body with a central position and limited size, the Committee on Disarmament. We are convinced that the new negotiating body will be able to discharge its duties effectively. One of the conditions for its efficiency is that all members, particularly the new members, have the necessary experience and expertise to fulfil their duties.

170. An overwhelming indication of the importance that Governments attach to disarmament is the seriousness of their involvement in the special session and its preparations. Thus the general debate itself was a valuable contribution to disarmament efforts. Both the contents of the debate and the level of representation reflected a sense of urgency. More perhaps than ever before, world public opinion has been focused on the issues of disarmament in

their entirety. Disarmament negotiators should view this as creating both an incentive and an obligation.

171. During the preparatory stage, and in the course of the session itself, a number of delegations put forth well prepared and thoroughly considered proposals. Although some of them cannot be implemented now, and although some of them are not reflected in the Final Document to the extent that their sponsors certainly would have hoped, they will nevertheless, we believe, give fresh impetus to disarmament deliberations and negotiations in future.

172. By refraining from making reservations, my delegation does not wish to imply that the Final Document fully corresponds to the wishes of the Finnish Government. With regard to some issues, we would have preferred seeing Governments assume more explicit obligations. This is particularly true in the case of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. To come to grips with such issues, the international community will have to exert further joint efforts.

173. Many delegations, including my own, had considerable difficulty with the sections on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. In our view, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons remains the best instrument to combat the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We had hoped, therefore, that the Final Document would take due note of the fact that non-proliferation and increased international co-operation in the peaceful use of nuclear energy are not contradictory but complementary. There may be disagreement on specific formulations. Yet, as we see it, the main thrust of non-proliferation action must be towards an international consensus on these questions.

174. The danger posed by nuclear weapons is rightly considered a major threat to international peace and security, to the security of all States. It is natural, therefore, that the non-nuclear-weapon States in particular should expect the nuclear-weapon States to give assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against States that do not possess them. Although the relevant passage in the Programme of Action may be considered far from satisfactory, we hope that discussions on the subject will expedite the process towards the elimination of the use and, eventually, of the existence of nuclear weapons altogether.

175. With regard to nuclear-weapon-free zones—another item of specific interest to my delegation—the language of the Programme of Action reflects a wide measure of agreement on the purposes and modalities of such zones. My delegation hopes that the experience already accrued from existing nuclear-weapon-free zones and the provisions now agreed on will promote the establishment of such zones in various parts of the world, including the region where my country is situated.

176. To my Government's regret, and contrary to the anticipation of the General Assembly, neither the text of a comprehensive test-ban treaty nor an agreement on the second round of talks on strategic arms limitation were ready to be reported at the special session as having been negoti-

ated. We dare to hope for early results from these two negotiations, as indeed called for in the Final Document. A comprehensive test ban and a second agreement on strategic arms limitation would, more than anything else, have a positive impact on disarmament and on relations between the major parties concerned in the negotiations and would thus, we believe, strengthen détente to the benefit of all.

177. My delegation believes that the special session has provided considerable impetus for future disarmament efforts. We also hope that the session has generated the necessary political will to resolve arms control and disarmament questions however complex. In this work, we want to pledge our Government's co-operation in pursuing the course charted by the special session and in its Final Document.

178. I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to convey our gratitude and appreciation to the President of the General Assembly as well as the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, his main co-ordinator, Mr. García Robles, the Chairmen of the two working groups, Mr. Jaroszek and Mr. Templeton and the other co-ordinators. Without their tireless efforts and persistence, we might well not have had a Final Document today, at least not one adopted by consensus.

179. Mr. TAITTINGER (France) (*interpretation from French*): I should like first of all to associate myself with the compliments which have been addressed to the President of this Assembly for the mastery which he has shown in the conduct of our work. I should also like to pay a very warm tribute to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, who during these past weeks has shown both his skill and his talents—and I would say that we have in fact not seen all his talents. This tribute is also directed to those who have helped him in the accomplishment of this task, and I refer to the other officers of the Committee and the co-ordinators. I should like to congratulate especially Mr. García Robles, whose great authority in the field of disarmament was extremely useful for the work being carried out by the co-ordinators. I would not wish to overlook the members of the Secretariat, who carried out their work successfully and made considerable efforts in a very short period of time; we all appreciate the importance of what they did.

180. This tenth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament represents a major event for three reasons: first, because of the magnitude of the tasks which were assigned to it by those who conceived it, namely, to take stock of the results achieved, to draw up a programme of action, to lay the foundations of new bodies and new negotiating procedures; next, the fundamental nature of the questions involved, namely, peace and security, the stages of and the conditions for genuine disarmament; and finally, it must be emphasized, the quality of the debate which has occupied us for a month now. The number of Heads of State and Government who have been present, the level of participation, the diversity and the interest of the proposals made, bear this out.

181. In speaking at the end of this special session, I should first, therefore, like to say how pleased France is that it was able to take place. For years now, endeavours to bring about disarmament, despite certain partial results, have been marking time. This session, by changing the spirit of this undertaking, has provided us with new prospects. Now, disarmament, we believe, is going to seem much more the concern of one and all.

182. At the session which we are going to close today the Assembly has adopted a Final Document. The very first lines of its Introduction state that security "has always been one of the most profound aspirations of humanity". This acknowledgement of the legitimate right of every State to security, a universal right, the same for all and enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, is, as I see it, the essential prerequisite for a concrete and realistic approach to the work of disarmament.

183. The document concludes with the decisions of the General Assembly setting up institutional machinery which will follow up the efforts made at this session. The Assembly has taken a decision on the creation of new forums for negotiation and for deliberation. The Committee on Disarmament, quite obviously more democratic, more open and more closely connected to the United Nations, has been born. The principle of consensus will make for effectiveness in its work. The appointment of a secretary by the Secretary-General of the United Nations will also help to provide the element of co-ordination and action that is required in such a complex field. The possibility of periodically reviewing the composition of the Committee will allow the desirable adjustments to be made at the appropriate time. This Committee on Disarmament should, we believe, permit further progress along the road to disarmament.

184. The French Government, when it has drawn its conclusions regarding the work of this session, will have its word to say on the question of its own participation in this new negotiating body.

185. In actively taking part in the work of the General Assembly, France never lost sight of the purpose of general and complete disarmament under effective international controls. We were guided, however, by the dictates of realism in presenting a new approach to the problems of disarmament, based on a concrete analysis of the world as it now is.

186. We have found particularly that, because of geographical and strategic situations, problems did not appear in the same light for all States. All the regions of the world today in this regard present special features. There are certain areas where the nuclear deterrent is an element making for equilibrium, and others, on the contrary, where the introduction of nuclear weapons would constitute a powerful factor of imbalance. It would be as unrealistic to ignore this as to deny the common responsibilities which we all bear for this reason.

187. Thus, in the light of the practical approach to the problems of disarmament proposed here in this very hall by the President of the French Republic [3rd meeting], I am obliged to state that the document which has been adopted does not really reflect in certain of its sections this desire for realism and equilibrium, which appears to me to be the fundamental prerequisite for any undertakings regarding disarmament.

188. We said yesterday, in our statement at the 16th meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, that we would have to enter reservations on paragraphs 32, 51, 58 and 59 of the Final Document.

189. In connexion with the non-use of nuclear weapons, which is described in the first sentence of paragraph 32 and in paragraph 58 of the Final Document, my delegation has to state its disagreement with texts that are incompatible with the position taken by my Government. These paragraphs make reference in effect to proposals regarding the limitation or the prohibition of nuclear weapons. France's defence strategy has been based on foundations which have frequently been made clear publicly. The French Government therefore could not go along with these two formulations.

190. Furthermore, as regards paragraph 59 concerning assurances of the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States, the delegation of France would recall that France is prepared to give such assurances, in accordance with arrangements to be negotiated, to States which constitute non-nuclear zones.

191. The French delegation does not intend to impede any consensus on the Programme of Action. However, we would like to make it clear that we cannot accept the second sentence of paragraph 51, which, speaking of the cessation of nuclear tests, says: "It would make a significant contribution to the above aim of ending the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the development of new types of such weapons and of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons."

192. France considers that the cessation of nuclear tests should be seen in the context of a genuine disarmament process. We are therefore prepared to go along with the idea expressed in the first sentence of paragraph 51 which advocates: "the cessation of nuclear-weapon testing by all States within the framework of an effective"—and I would like to stress the word "effective"—"nuclear disarmament process". But we consider that it would be erroneous to believe that a halt to testing would in fact produce a qualitative freeze in nuclear weapons. The two most heavily armed Powers have, by means of numerous tests which they have carried out, accumulated data adequate to allow them to make any qualitative improvements they may desire without carrying out new tests. The cessation of tests, therefore, in itself would make no decisive contribution to

preventing the production of new types of weapons or to non-proliferation.

193. For these reasons the French delegation would like to dissociate itself completely from the consensus on this particular passage. We would like to make it clear that the fact that we raised no objection to the over-all consensus should not be construed as signifying that in the framework of that consensus France can accept this particular sentence. It is quite obvious, furthermore, that this position means that we cannot accept the idea which is expressed in the penultimate sentence of paragraph 51 which reads as follows: "In this context, various views were expressed by non-nuclear-weapon States that, pending the conclusion of this treaty, the world community would be encouraged if all the nuclear-weapon States refrained from testing nuclear weapons."

194. This brings me to considerations of a somewhat different order. I would recall that in a spirit of conciliation, the French delegation agreed yesterday, in order not to hinder in any way the consensus which was being arrived at on the draft final document, not to press to the vote its three draft resolutions on the establishment of an international satellite monitoring agency, the setting up of an international disarmament fund for development, and the establishment of an international institute for disarmament research [A/S-10/AC.1/L.14, L.15 and L.16].

195. These three proposals, which my Government continues to regard as being of major importance, are referred to explicitly in the Final Document as proposals which it was not possible for the Assembly to examine in detail at the special session. My Government will therefore reserve its right to submit these proposals to the next regular session of the General Assembly. I have no doubt that the detailed studies which they require will be undertaken by the appropriate bodies of the Organization.

196. Mr. UNGUÍA (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of El Salvador, in the final moments of this special session of the General Assembly devoted exclusively to disarmament, wishes briefly to state its views on the work accomplished in regard to vital questions which have been the subject of arduous negotiations and prolonged debate.

197. The successive draft final documents, from the one which was recommended by the Preparatory Committee in 1978, have been plagued with brackets. This is proof not only of the complexity of the various aspects of disarmament but also the reluctance of some States for it to become a reality. We have heard a plethora of promises and expressions of good wishes; but in negotiations consensus often seemed impossible and brackets continued to disfigure the draft final document. Unexpectedly, the brackets disappeared last night as though someone had waved a magic wand.

198. We believe in the need for consensus. Otherwise there would be no possibility of arriving at conventions or

treaties concerning general and complete disarmament and a balanced arms limitation.

199. Because we are convinced of the need for consensus, we did not deem it appropriate to adopt certain draft resolutions which could not have been adopted in that manner, because conflicting opinions had been expressed here in regard to the contents of those drafts.

200. The Final Document, the text of which was approved by consensus in the *Ad Hoc* Committee when dawn was about to break and was adopted in this final, closing meeting in the same manner, contains sections in respect of which differences of opinion still subsist among delegations, not so much in the Introduction or in the following Declaration but in the Programme of Action and in the final chapter on machinery.

201. Yet withal, this document is of great importance. I shall not comment on it in detail because this has already been done by some speakers, and other speakers on the list will probably also do it—at least some of them. We are sworn enemies of prolixity and repetition, particularly in circumstances such as these when we are all weary and anxious to put an end to these long weeks of activity and uncertainty. Suffice it to say that we are extremely pleased with the establishment of the new disarmament bodies—a deliberative and a negotiating body—to replace the existing disarmament organs.

202. The Final Document is the result of most intense work on questions of vital international policy, the review and solution of which require much patience, much perseverance and much time.

203. In the enormous effort made here, day and night, numerous representatives have participated as negotiators or conciliators, among them two outstanding Latin American diplomats: Mr. Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina and Mr. García Robles of Mexico. To all, we express our deeply felt gratitude and congratulations.

204. The contribution of Latin America to disarmament is manifest not only in the Tlatelolco Treaty and in the Ayacucho Declaration, which are rightly mentioned in the Final Document; it is a matter of public record that the two ambassadors I have mentioned have been unflagging in their endeavours.

205. In the last two paragraphs of the Final Document it is stated that it must be emphasized that the special session of the Assembly marks not the end but rather the beginning of a new phase of the efforts of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, and that the Assembly is convinced that the discussions of the disarmament problems at the special session and its Final Document will attract the attention of all peoples, further mobilize world public opinion and provide a powerful impetus for the cause of disarmament.

206. We completely endorse these ideas. Will they also be endorsed by the various media of the transmission of ideas, or the mass media, as we say nowadays?

207. We believe that there are voices and pens whose owners are knowledgeable about these matters and possess sufficient equanimity to make favourable comments. But gratuitous censure is to be expected.

208. It will be said, perhaps, that the General Assembly has concluded this session with neither pain nor glory. It would be an unfair assessment. This has been no more than a stage in a process. Only dreamers and the starry-eyed could have thought that this session would have brought us close to its completion.

209. But besides the Final Document, which not only reflects a political and diplomatic rapprochement previously lacking among some Members of the United Nations, above all among the most powerful, but also contains positive and valuable decisions, we have accumulated a wealth of information and views, the importance of which can be measured by the understandings reached and which will surely light the way in the future stages of the disarmament process.

210. Mr. FERNANDO (Sri Lanka): It was barely 18 hours ago that we met for the concluding meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee at which we adopted the draft final document that this plenary Assembly has itself just adopted. We have adopted it by consensus, a consensus in which all the non-aligned countries, on whose behalf I speak, are happy to join. For the non-aligned countries, this document and the consensus it received are of more than ordinary significance. I think we should not be wrong in saying that this special session on disarmament was the realization of an initiative by the non-aligned launched as far back as 1961.

211. It is not my wish on a day like this, after having joined in this consensus, to introduce a note of disharmony or a voice of dissent. But silence or a passive acquiescence in all that is contained in this document would amount to a departure from the principles to which the non-aligned movement has long adhered and an abandoning of the goals whose achievement we have urged on questions of disarmament.

212. We have, in the documents placed before the Preparatory Committee, set out our appraisal of the principal causes of the arms race, the unsatisfactory state of disarmament negotiations, the principles which should govern the process of disarmament and an order of priorities. While we do take some satisfaction in the fact that some of our basic positions have been incorporated in the Final Document, we are less than content.

213. In the section on the Declaration we would have preferred to have seen a more accurate appraisal of the present situation, namely, of those dangers resulting from the accumulation of weapons, in particular nuclear weapons; and of the arms race aggravating tensions, intensifying conflicts and impeding détente. Nor could we gain acceptance of the obvious link between the conflicts of national interests, uncertainty and distrust, on the one hand, and the rivalry among major Powers on a global scale, on

the other. Rather than subscribe to a dilution of that basic appraisal, we preferred a total deletion of reference to it.

214. We were able to agree on objectives and an order of priorities and to focus attention on the need for nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war. However, to secure that we accepted as a principle the parallel treatment of nuclear and conventional disarmament. In doing so, we also obtained the adoption of the principle of undiminished security of States and the right of peoples under colonial or foreign domination to self-determination and independence.

215. We wanted to see the United Nations play the primary role in the field of disarmament, but protracted negotiations and the need for consensus obliged us to accept less, both in the area of principles and in the Programme of Action. We believe that, in the last analysis, that is a needless restriction of the principle that has now been acknowledged: that all States have the right to participate in disarmament negotiations and the United Nations is the only body in which all States are represented. We do not deny that a distinction must be drawn between deliberation and negotiation, but the primary role of the United Nations in disarmament is one which could have been accommodated without the deliberative and negotiating functions encroaching on each other.

216. We found the same hesitation in regard to the acceptance of the principle of the interdependence of disarmament and development. While it may appear that in doing so we were seeking to emphasize the impact of that interdependence on the economic development of developing countries, we do not think there could be any doubt about the proposition that the arms race is distorting the economies of the developed world, with consequences for the developing countries, and that disarmament would have both immediate and long-term beneficial impact on the economies of the developed world. In the same context, we were able to secure the reassertion of the right of all countries to develop, acquire and use without discrimination nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

217. It was a matter of particular regret for the non-aligned countries that we could not incorporate the principle of the incompatibility between the maintenance of military bases and the presence of foreign troops in foreign territories, on the one hand, and international peace and security, on the other. There was resistance to that from the major military alliances, but I need not repeat that opposition to military blocs, their bases and the presence of foreign troops has been cardinal to the non-aligned movement from its inception.

218. In the Programme of Action we received only limited satisfaction on the subject of nuclear disarmament. While the steps recommended by the non-aligned countries for halting the arms race, its reversal and the final elimination of nuclear-weapon stockpiles found a place in the Programme, we were resisted to the very end when we asked for urgent negotiations and binding commitments for implementing those necessary measures. It was the same resistance we met with when we asked for a reduction of nu-

clear-weapon stockpiles and their delivery systems, leading to their complete elimination. For the nuclear-weapon States, security was still based on the theory of mutual nuclear deterrence, and the survival of mankind was subordinated to their security. In the same context, at least four of the five nuclear States would not agree to a renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons. We could obtain no binding commitments or assurances from the nuclear-weapon States that they would not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon State. We had to be content with declarations setting out the circumstances and conditions under which such assurances would apply.

219. On the questions of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace, our proposals were incorporated with qualifications that reduced the validity of such measures in the process of disarmament. While those qualifications were entered in regard to the Indian Ocean area, it was particularly regrettable that the proposal to declare the Mediterranean as a zone of peace was summarily rejected—even after the offer of every conceivable qualification.

220. In contrast to all that, the nuclear-weapon States and their allies came out strongest on the subject of non-proliferation. The approach appears to be to impose obligations and restrictions on the non-nuclear-weapon States when they seek to advance their own programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, without the nuclear-weapon States themselves assuming any obligations in the field of nuclear disarmament and the non-use of nuclear weapons.

221. I shall move next to the section on machinery. That is by far the shortest section. But we approached it as an area in which this special session could produce tangible results having a direct and measurable impact on progress in disarmament. There were in effect two main proposals, namely, for the creation of a deliberative body and the reform of the existing negotiating body. While not detracting from the role of the First Committee in disarmament, we could not agree to the First Committee's being the deliberative organ, either in its own capacity or sitting as the Disarmament Commission.

222. We are satisfied that our views prevailed and that the Disarmament Commission is to be established as the deliberative body. Its terms of reference have been formulated. Those terms of reference were a compromise, and it is our hope that they will be interpreted in the spirit of the principle on which we have all agreed: that all States have a duty to contribute to efforts in the field of disarmament and a right to participate in disarmament negotiations. We do not regard the Disarmament Commission as a device for paying mere lip-service to that principle, but rather as a vindication of it.

223. This forum is not the place in which to recount the arduous and protracted negotiations that have taken place in order to bring about a reform, or, may I say, a rebirth of the negotiating body. We do not claim to be competent to do that, since we were not privy to all those negotiations. Nevertheless, the non-aligned countries can claim to have

made some modest contribution to making possible this new negotiating body because the pressures for change originated with and were sustained by the non-aligned countries. It remains to be seen whether, with these two institutional changes, the shortcomings in the field of disarmament will now be rectified.

224. My delegation would like to extend our appreciation to all those delegations which joined us in supporting the proposal of my President, Mr. J. R. Jayewardene, for a world disarmament institution. It was made in the context of a goal which may seem distant but should not be lost sight of: general and complete disarmament. Even though we are preoccupied with the urgent present—the immediate realities, as they are called—some contemplation of the better world we seek should not be beyond our capacity. My delegation remains confident that well before we approach general and complete disarmament the international community would acknowledge the need for a world disarmament institution on the lines of my President's proposal.

225. The comments of other delegations of the non-aligned countries should amplify our views on these and other aspects of the document. My delegation has a last duty. In the early hours of this morning the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, paid an eloquent and well-deserved tribute to colleagues who took charge of working groups and drafting groups. I would like to add our own voice to those sentiments of appreciation, mentioning, in particular, the silent and overworked members of the Secretariat, and Mr. García Robles of Mexico, who toiled for long hours in a cause personally dear to him and his country.

226. There was an unavoidable omission this morning which my delegation must now make good. Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, with typical modesty, adjourned our meeting, preempting any attempts by delegations to thank him. With the Vice-President, Mr. N'Dong, in the Chair, we have that opportunity. My delegation has seen Mr. Ortiz de Rozas working as Chairman of five sessions of the Preparatory Committee and finally in the *Ad Hoc* Committee, the hardest and most difficult times being those devoted to informal consultations. We marvelled at his patience and tact, the leadership he gave and, above all, the courage he showed in difficult times, especially during these last two weeks. This consensus document which we have—the first coming from a special session on disarmament—is an acknowledgement of his personal contribution to this great endeavour. I am confident that the non-aligned group joins me in this tribute.

227. I have to offer a word of appreciation to all our colleagues who participated in this special session. During these last five weeks our exchanges were more in the form of disagreement and there were times when we may have been disagreeable and less than ready to accept compromises. These experiences are inevitable in a task such as this. We had differences of approach, sometimes differences over the short-term objectives; but there was no dispute about our common goal of disarmament. With all its shortcomings, this document is the best we could have

drafted and is the reward for our joint efforts. If we could see beyond the words and implement it in the spirit in which it was undertaken, we should come a little nearer to what we all aspire to—general and complete disarmament.

228. My last remarks are addressed to Mr. Mojsov. His presidency has been one of great events. He has perhaps presided over more special sessions than any of his predecessors in this high office, and each of them has been rewarding. That he has presided over this session on disarmament which produced this consensus Final Document is, we believe, the fulfilment of his hopes and those of his country, Yugoslavia. There is yet work to be done and I shall conclude by congratulating him and wishing him well.

229. Mr. VELLODI (India): Exactly three weeks ago, speaking from this rostrum, my Prime Minister exhorted the Assembly at this special session. He said: "It is for this Assembly, representing the collective wisdom of mankind, to launch a movement in the conscience of men and embark on the great adventure of survival, with a determination not to compromise with truth." [24th meeting, para. 28.] This hope, which was shared by most of the participants in the General Assembly, has only to a limited extent materialized with the decisions and recommendations we have adopted here and which are reflected in the Final Document. We have all of us, and particularly the non-aligned countries, as a result of whose initiative this special session has been held, little reason to be fully satisfied with its results. At the same time, the fact that we succeeded in getting a consensus document, although it admittedly falls far short of our expectations, is indicative not only of the very hard and at times exhausting efforts that all of us, individually and collectively, put in, but also of the genuine desire on the part of all of us to achieve a break-through in what is undoubtedly the most crucial and the most pressing problem that confronts mankind today.

230. The delegation of India has participated in the work of this special session in keeping with the commitment and pledge given by our Prime Minister before this Assembly. Throughout the session, whether in the *Ad Hoc* Committee, the working groups or the drafting groups, we were motivated solely by our deep commitment to solve the problem of disarmament and by our keen desire to make substantial headway in this area, where there has been little or no progress in recent years.

231. On behalf of Mr. Gharekhan of our delegation, who had the privilege of working as one of the co-ordinators, I wish to take this opportunity to thank all of those who have conveyed to him their appreciation of his contribution to the work of this special session.

232. The consensus document we have adopted today has some positive elements. At the same time, it is weak in several areas. Whereas the measures my Prime Minister had referred to in his address with regard to the qualitative and quantitative limitations on nuclear disarmament, the freezing of present stockpiles and the gradual reduction of stockpiles with a view to achieving the total elimination of all nuclear weapons are included in the Final Document,

the document does not at all reflect the sense of urgency and, therefore, the need to formulate a time-bound programme for the implementation of these measures.

233. The document does call for urgent negotiations and agreements in the field of nuclear disarmament, and we expect the nuclear-weapon States to act promptly in this regard.

234. My Government has repeatedly asked for the early conclusion of the comprehensive test ban treaty. We trust that the results of the tripartite negotiations on this subject will be submitted without further delay to the negotiating body for detailed study. It is our firm view that the treaty will be meaningless if it does not cover all weapons tests or if it does not have adequate provisions for safeguards to prevent breaches of the treaty, which safeguards, as our Prime Minister indicated, can be achieved only through independent inspection. In this connexion, my delegation has proposed that, pending conclusion of the treaty, all nuclear-weapon Powers should refrain from further testing of nuclear weapons. We presented a draft resolution on the subject [A/S-10/AC.1/L.10]. However, in keeping with our desire to co-operate fully in the work of the special session, we decided not to press the draft resolution to a vote; but we reserve our right to return to the subject at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, if the nuclear-weapon States do not respond positively to the view held by all the non-nuclear-weapon States, and clearly reflected in paragraph 51 of the Final Document, on the need for an immediate moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons.

235. Similarly, my delegation had pressed for the initiation of measures to achieve the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and thereby ensure that the survival of mankind is not endangered. Here again we agreed, in a spirit of co-operation, not to press our draft resolution to a vote. If, however, no action is taken in response to the recommendation contained in paragraph 58 of the Final Document, which deals with this issue, we intend to reactivate our proposal at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.

236. While the section of the Final Document dealing with the Programme of Action is very inadequate, we are satisfied with the decisions taken with regard to future machinery in the field of disarmament. We are particularly happy with the decision to establish a deliberative forum in the United Nations and thereby enable the Organization to resume the primary responsibility it had in the field of disarmament. We trust that the new negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament, which will not have the inadequacies and the shortcomings of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, will commence its work without delay.

237. Before I conclude I wish to refer to two issues mentioned in paragraphs 63 (e) and 64 of the Final Document. Paragraph 63 (e) refers to the question of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. I should like in this connexion to recall the strong reservation we placed on record regarding this proposal when it was considered

at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly. In his address to the special session, my Prime Minister said that the problem of disarmament, particularly in the nuclear field, "can only be solved in a total manner keeping in view the whole of the globe and not the regions into which, presumably as a matter of political convenience or strategy, some countries seek to compartmentalize the world... We are convinced that there cannot be a limited approach to the question of freedom from nuclear threats and dangers, but that the whole world should be declared a nuclear-free zone." [24th meeting, para. 17.]

238. My delegation is extremely unhappy with the casual and summary manner in which in paragraph 64 the Final Document deals with the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, which continues to be an issue of the greatest importance to the States of the region. The declaration adopted by the United Nations on the subject several years ago [resolution 2832 (XXVI)] is clear and unambiguous with regard to our objective, which is the demilitarization of the Indian Ocean. We shall not depart from this objective. We sincerely hope that the talks between the United States and the Soviet Union, which we note with deep regret remain suspended, will be resumed promptly and that in future negotiations they will abandon the concept of reduction or stabilization and return to their own earlier publicly stated commitment to work for the complete demilitarization of the Indian Ocean.

239. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to place on record our deep gratitude to the President of the special session of the General Assembly, Mr. Mojsov, for the admirable way in which he has guided our deliberations. We should also like to pay a special tribute to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, for the dynamic leadership he provided and for the exemplary manner in which he presided over our deliberations in the Committee and in the formal and informal consultations. We all owe him a debt of deep gratitude. I should also like to express our great appreciation for the very valuable contribution made by the Chairmen of the working groups, and in particular to the co-ordinators, without whose untiring efforts we should not have achieved results which in some measure seek to fulfil the expectations of the world community. Our thanks are also due to the members of the Secretariat, many of whom have spent sleepless nights to assist us in our work. Last but not least, all of us have been deeply impressed and encouraged by the continuing interest and support the non-governmental organizations, which in a sense represent the world community, have provided to the cause of disarmament, as evidenced by their active and at times almost overwhelming participation in our common endeavours during the past five weeks.

240. Mr. PETRIĆ (Yugoslavia): First of all I wish to say that I am in agreement with the statement of the representative of Sri Lanka, who has so ably presented the views of the non-aligned countries. At the same time I wish to pay a warm tribute to all those who have successfully completed the drafting of the Final Document, to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, to Mr. García Robles, to the Chairmen of the working groups, to the five

co-ordinators, and to the Rapporteur, as well as to the members of the Secretariat.

241. May I express the deep conviction of my delegation that the entire work of this session, with the adoption of the Final Document, represents substantial progress towards opening a new phase in the process of disarmament with more direct participation by the world international community. Through the work of the Preparatory Committee and deliberations in the course of the session we have actually initiated a dialogue on all the major issues of disarmament, peace and security. The great importance of this special session is borne out by the very fact that it has taken place and that all States have taken part in its work. The session has fully expressed the keen awareness of all of us that disarmament has become an historical necessity and the only means conducing to the security of all nations and that we no longer have the right to close our eyes to this reality and eschew our inevitable responsibilities.

242. There is no doubt but that the present international situation has imposed limits on our desire fully to express in the Final Document the objective needs of the international community and the expectations of world public opinion. We have taken an important step, but a step that is neither complete nor adequate in scope.

243. The Declaration contains a number of very important and universally accepted assessments, priorities and principles. Therefore, it provides a framework and a basis for our future efforts in the process of disarmament. However, I wish to recall that some substantive principles proposed by the non-aligned countries have not found their place in the Final Document.

244. The non-aligned countries have insisted, above all, on the adoption of a concrete and substantive Programme of Action. But the militarily most powerful States, which have a special responsibility in the process of disarmament, have failed to give proof of sufficient readiness to accept such a programme.

245. Although the primary importance of nuclear disarmament has been generally recognized, the measures that have been taken in this connexion cannot fully satisfy us.

246. Yugoslavia, as a signatory of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and as a non-nuclear-weapon State, cannot but regret the lack of readiness on the part of nuclear-weapon States to offer to non-nuclear-weapon States unequivocal security guarantees concerning the non-use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

247. We believe also that resistance, at this session, to the endeavours of non-aligned countries to ensure the adoption of clearly defined recommendations on the establishment of zones of peace in various regions is an expression of a bloc policy and of the tendency of certain States and military alliances to leave the door open to the policy of spheres of influence. We were particularly surprised by the opposition in the case of the Indian Ocean, since the General Assembly of the United Nations has repeatedly

endorsed and supported the concept of the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. We deplore the fact that the Mediterranean has not been included in the Final Document as a zone of peace. The negative attitude of some delegations towards this demand seems to us quite unconvincing. In this connexion, my Government interprets the provisions of the Final Document on zones of peace as applying to the Mediterranean as well, and therefore as constituting a basis for further efforts that have to be exerted in order to transform that region into a zone of peace.

Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) resumed the Chair.

248. As is well known, Yugoslavia has always attached special importance to the dismantling of all military bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of other States and from Non-Self-Governing Territories. This principle and measure has not been included at all in the Final Document because of the resistance of some major Powers, which seem to wish to perpetuate the maintaining of such bases and foreign troops on the territories even of States and peoples that are resolutely opposed to their continued presence.

249. I welcome the fact that both the request for the dismantling of foreign military bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops, as well as the proposal of the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Colombo in August 1976, concerning the conversion of the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, have been included in the list of proposals to be followed up in the appropriate organs of the General Assembly.

250. The measures in the field of conventional disarmament are significant, but we feel that in their implementation there should always be full respect for the right of all peoples, and of the peoples under colonial rule and liberation movements in particular, to have at their disposal means indispensable to their struggle for freedom and independence.

251. May I express my delegation's gratification that this session has represented an important step forward towards the further active involvement of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. The revival of the work of the Disarmament Commission and its mandate to consider, in particular, the elements of a comprehensive programme on disarmament, together with parallel efforts exerted in other forums on a bilateral or multilateral level under the auspices of the United Nations, make it possible to continue the fruitful dialogue we have started at this session.

252. We also regard as significant the decision relating to the establishment of a new negotiating body—the Committee on Disarmament. May I add that our understanding is that the present members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament are included in the composition of the Committee on Disarmament. With regard to the provision on the openness of this body to nuclear-weapon States, we interpret that provision as applying to the five existing nuclear-weapon States only.

253. The Final Document and other proposals call for further concrete negotiations and actions. What is required, however, is political will on the part of all of us, and in particular on the part of the militarily most powerful States in order to pass from declarations to the achievement of concrete programmes and measures of both nuclear and conventional disarmament. The consistent implementation of the Final Document, under the auspices of the United Nations, will make it possible to achieve that goal.

254. Mr. CORRÊA DA COSTA (Brazil): As we approach the end of this special session, I should like to express our gratitude to you, Mr. President, for your wise guidance throughout the deliberations. My delegation wishes also to express its appreciation for the untiring efforts of the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, as well as to the Chairmen of the working groups and the co-ordinators.

255. Brazil supported from the very beginning the idea of holding this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

256. Hopeful that the session would promote significant progress towards the adoption of effective measures of disarmament, in particular of nuclear disarmament, Brazil sponsored the resolution which set in motion the process of preparation for this session. We contributed actively to the work of the Preparatory Committee which, in the course of its five sessions, established the basis for the achievement of what we felt we had reason to believe would be meaningful and generally acceptable results.

257. We participated in a constructive spirit both in the preparatory work and in the work of this special session, the *Ad Hoc* Committee and the numerous working and drafting groups. We co-operated with all other delegations in efforts to elaborate solutions worthy of approval by consensus. In the course of those negotiations the Brazilian delegation time and again displayed its willingness to consider appropriate compromise formulations on many different and important aspects of the draft final document.

258. In spite of these efforts, in spite of the year and a half of preparations, we were called upon to approve a document 129 paragraphs long which was presented to us in its final form only yesterday evening and which contains a number of formulations on which we had, in fact, been unable to agree and on which we had expressed reservations in the course of our lengthy and painstaking deliberations. What is even more unexpected, the final document also contains changes, omissions and additions which were introduced at the last moment and were not subject to the necessary process of careful examination and discussion.

259. The Brazilian delegation is compelled to state its reservations about the procedures that have been employed in these last days and hours of the session in order hastily to put together certain fundamental sections of the final document. While attaching high importance to its subject matter, we regret that, after a year and a half of preparations, we were confronted with certain provisions that we

were not given the opportunity to consider with the necessary attention.

260. I therefore wish the records of this meeting to indicate clearly the general reservations of the Brazilian delegation on the final document as a whole. We did not stand in the way of the adoption of the document by consensus, but we reserve the right to comment on specific provisions and sections of the Final Document, after our Government has had the chance to consider it carefully, during the forthcoming regular session of the General Assembly or in the new disarmament forums which will emerge as a welcome result of this special session.

261. It may be recalled that during the thirty-second session of the Assembly the Brazilian delegation stated that: "The special session would have more than fulfilled our expectations if it were just to produce a true commitment to nuclear disarmament by the international community, and in particular by the nuclear-weapon States."² Most unfortunately, it has not.

262. We hope, however, that in spite of the shortcomings of its results the special session of the Assembly will have contributed to stimulating the long overdue implementation of effective measures of disarmament, and in particular of nuclear disarmament.

263. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan): My delegation has followed closely and participated in the negotiations during the past weeks to produce a document for adoption at the special session. The fact that the General Assembly has adopted a Declaration and a Programme of Action on disarmament by consensus is a result of the tireless efforts of all concerned and in particular the Chairmen of the working groups and their team of co-ordinators working under the able and dedicated guidance of Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. To all of them we owe a debt of gratitude. Your own guidance and direction of this session, Mr. President, has been invaluable and I want to put on record my delegation's tribute to you.

264. The Pakistan delegation welcomes this consensus, but, like many others, we do so with a sense of disappointment. No one can say that the results of the special session have fulfilled the hopes and aspirations with which it was summoned or that they are commensurate with the months of preparation which preceded its convening. The consensus which enabled the document to be adopted without a vote is only in part the result of genuine compromise and owes not a little to verbal ambiguity, which serves to postpone debate or shift it to other forums.

265. Our disappointment must be tempered, however, by two considerations. One of these is that this is the first meeting held with the participation of all States to deal with the entire spectrum of disarmament issues—issues of extreme complexity, not merely in technological and political terms but also in a psychological sense, since security has an intangible and subjective dimension, that this ses-

sion aroused world-wide interest and that a number of Heads of State or Government made a personal contribution to its deliberations. The association in our work and the efforts of non-governmental organizations and of eminent individuals who have made disarmament their life's work must also be noted, for it served to broaden the horizons of the possible. The Introduction and Declaration of the Final Document express the hopes and aspirations of mankind to live in a world free from the fear of war and the terror of nuclear weapons. This is timely reaffirmation of the direction in which the world must move.

266. Secondly, we have at this session set up new fora for deliberations and negotiations on disarmament issues in the coming years. This is a most worth-while outcome of the session. My delegation hopes that the work of the new negotiating body will be initiated in such a way as to open the door to participation in its work by all militarily significant States, notably the five nuclear-weapon Powers.

267. It is known that the negotiations on the elements of the Programme of Action, particularly the so-called nuclear complex of issues, were most difficult. Many of the differences have been reconciled in the Final Document, but unfortunately only in a textual sense. Behind the differing texts put forward on various questions there are deep underlying differences of philosophy and approach among the various groups and Powers. There are those who, even while they are willing to make efforts to control the arms race and reduce its dangers, view the future essentially in terms of rationalizing the existing strategic balance. This balance is seen as essential to their own security, of course, but they seem to consider that the so-called strategic balance is indispensable also to the security of the world. It is an unfortunate reflection of the state of international relations that in present circumstances there is a grain of truth in this assessment.

268. We are therefore encouraged by the commitment the two major nuclear-weapon Powers have given that the second round of talks on strategic arms limitation will be concluded soon and that it will be followed by a third round. We earnestly hope that progress will be made in these talks between the world's two most powerful nations. However, to achieve a truly universal system of collective international security as well as genuine disarmament, we must look beyond the present balance-of-power relationships, for even a series of agreements on strategic arms limitation will not of itself lead to the goal of disarmament.

269. The Programme of Action adopted at this session quite rightly affirms that the goal of general and complete disarmament must remain the ultimate goal, but realistically it also underlines the fact that the reversal of the nuclear arms race is the first imperative and must be initiated without delay. This objective has become all the more urgent because developments which are taking place in the political and technological fields can change the premises on which the present so-called strategic balance and mutual deterrence are structured and start a new cycle in the vertical as well as in the horizontal arms race.

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second session, First Committee, 23rd meeting.*

270. While acknowledging the reality that nuclear weapons form the major portion of the strategic and tactical arsenals of the leading nuclear-weapons Powers, the Assembly has made it clear that the use of such weapons is indefensible. There is general recognition, above all, that no moral, political or strategic grounds exist which can justify the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. The five nuclear-weapons Powers have made declarations as to the conditions in which they will not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. But not all the nuclear-weapon States are agreed on the manner and circumstances in which such assurances are to be extended. Some of these declarations fall short of what is needed to reassure the non-nuclear States. If these assurances are to have credibility, they must be given in a binding form, within a universal framework and as part of the process of building international confidence in the disarmament process.

271. While the major Powers seem hesitant about accepting even such minimal obligations on the grounds that their strategic interests may be jeopardized, on the other hand, they seek to impose all kinds of restraints and restrictions on the non-nuclear-weapon States. This is justified, in their view, on the grounds of maintaining world peace. Concern is expressed about arms transfers, particularly to the third world, but the mere mention of the need for cutting back the production of arms is rejected. Some nuclear-weapon States wish to prevent or to prohibit, even through coercive and punitive measures, the transfer of nuclear technology, particularly to third-world States. At the same time, they themselves retain the right to produce and stockpile unsafeguarded fissile material and to retain a monopoly over the supplies of nuclear fuel. Energy independence is as important, if not more important, for the developing countries as it is for the industrialized States. Developing nations which are being dissuaded from developing fuel cycle independence cannot ignore the fact that the price of nuclear fuel, which is under the control of a handful of advanced nations, has multiplied eightfold since 1973.

272. It was particularly regrettable to hear our eminent friend and colleague, Mr. Andrew Young of the United States, expressing the fear in the *Ad Hoc* Committee that some of the so-called sensitive technologies may be seized by "irresponsible Governments or terrorists". Leaving aside this question of Governments and terrorists, who is to determine whether a Government is responsible or not? At various moments in history, various Governments have committed actions which history has judged as irresponsible or worse. No individual State, however powerful, can set itself up as judge of the credentials of other sovereign States.

273. It seems that for some countries non-proliferation is becoming an end in itself. In our view, non-proliferation cannot be achieved as an end in itself, but only as part of an interrelated and comprehensive system of measures to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race and to eliminate nuclear arms. It can be promoted only on the basis of mutual responsibilities and obligations. The ultimate sanction of

law is consent, and this is even more true in the field of international relations. The entities in the international field, while sovereign, independent and equal in a formal sense, in reality are very unequal in size and power. The assumption by any State of the right to compel responsible behaviour on the part of another State will only lead to a resurgence, though in another form and for other reasons, of the system of domination and exploitation from which the third world is still seeking to free itself.

274. It is against this background that my delegation is obliged to enter a formal reservation on paragraph 36 of the Final Document which, even while it recognizes the inalienable right of States to acquire and develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, contains language which because of its ambiguity is capable of being used to justify policies of restraint and restriction, deprivation and discrimination.

275. My delegation is pleased that the Programme of Action does acknowledge the necessity of developing an international consensus on universal and non-discriminatory ways and means to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. This provision is based on the assumption that the negative and discriminatory features of the current policies of some States in the field of non-proliferation will be reversed. We earnestly hope that this view will come to prevail over the present policies of some supplier States which, to say the least, are based on subjective considerations.

276. The Final Document of the special session has affirmed that the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world provides an equitable, non-discriminatory and, provided the will is there, practicable way in which the ultimate objective of a world free of nuclear weapons can be approached. Concrete steps have been recommended to promote the creation of such zones in the Middle East, Africa and South Asia, regions where the danger of proliferation is real. The encouraging feature in South Asia is that all States in that region have unilaterally renounced nuclear weapons. It is important now to give these declarations legal form and binding effect.

277. In this context, we have noted with satisfaction the declaration made by the Prime Minister of India at the 24th meeting, that his country will not develop or acquire nuclear weapons even if the rest of the world were to do so, and that it will not carry out any more peaceful nuclear explosions.

278. It seems to my delegation, therefore, that all the necessary conditions exist for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. We are glad that the relevant provision of the Programme of Action supports this view. Consultations have been held among the South Asian States on this subject, and while differences undoubtedly exist, we very much hope that time and patience will enable these States to find ways and means of reaching agreement.

279. The vast majority of the peoples and countries of

the world are convinced that the imperatives of peace do not coincide, in the long term, with the exigencies of maintaining the *status quo* and the present unequal distribution of power and influence in the world. They envision the world as evolving towards a new order in which peace will be maintained through a system of universal collective security instead of a balance of terror; an order which shall be based on equality of all nations and equal opportunity for all to share in the fruits of progress and prosperity.

280. The struggle to establish a new international economic order, which is integral to the endeavour for a new world order, was launched by this Assembly four years ago, but is still a long way from realization. Today, we have embarked on a similar struggle in the arena of disarmament. We have accepted a phased approach to disarmament but only because the final goals are clearly defined, and on the understanding that the initial steps towards these goals will be undertaken without delay. While the achievements of this special session have fallen short of our expectations and, we believe, those of the peoples of the world, the struggle for equity must start somewhere. We can be satisfied that we have made a beginning. The value and impact of the decisions taken today will be judged by the success of efforts to reconcile the different approaches to disarmament and to evolve common premises on which to pursue the goals of peace and security.

281. Mr. CHEN CHU (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, convened on the initiative of the non-aligned countries, is drawing to a close. At this international forum, the numerous third-world and other small and medium-sized countries offered their analysis of the prevailing international situation, condemned super-Power policies of arms expansion and war preparations and aggression and expansion, expressed their unshakable determination to preserve national independence and security as well as international peace, and emphatically voiced the demand that the super-Powers halt the arms race and effect genuine disarmament. This will undoubtedly have a positive effect in alerting the people of the world to the ever-increasing threat of war and in consolidating the struggle to safeguard world peace. This, in our view, is the main accomplishment of the special session.

282. The numerous third-world and other small and medium-sized countries have made a tremendous effort to produce a good document for this session. Now the plenary Assembly of the special session has considered the Final Document submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Committee. I wish to state the views of the Chinese delegation on the text of the said document.

283. We notice that, as a result of the efforts and struggles of the numerous third-world and other small and medium-sized countries, some of their just propositions and reasonable demands are now reflected in the Final Document. For instance, the Document points out that there has been no real progress so far in the field of disarmament, that the arms race continues unabated, that the threat of a

new world war is becoming ever more acute; it stresses the necessity for the total destruction of nuclear weapons in order to remove the threat of a nuclear war and affirms the importance of reducing conventional arms; it provides for the equal right of all countries to participate in disarmament negotiations and specifies that all disarmament measures should ensure the right of States to security; it calls on all the nuclear-weapon States to undertake the commitment not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States and affirms the inalienable right of all countries to peaceful use of nuclear energy; it reiterates the necessity for all countries to abide by the principles of respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of other countries and non-interference in the internal affairs of others; it points to the need for a reform of the existing disarmament machinery, and so on. These positive elements should be endorsed and supported.

284. However, we must point out that, owing to obstructions by the super-Powers at every turn, it has not been possible to incorporate in the Final Document the many reasonable amendments and proposals put forward by the numerous small and medium-sized countries and by the Chinese delegation in the course of drafting the Final Document. On the other hand, some of the specious and spurious formulations of the super-Powers have been included in the text. Therefore, the Chinese delegation deems it necessary to state its position and reservations on a number of questions of principle.

285. First, in the course of the general debate, valid views were expressed by representatives of many countries in their analysis of the present international situation. They pointed out that the developments in the international situation entail grave dangers for the destiny of mankind, including the danger of a new world war, that super-Power confrontation constitutes a serious threat to world peace and security, that the real cause for this spiralling arms race is to be found in the struggle on the part of super-Powers for world hegemony and control over the destiny of others and that the arms race between the super-Powers has been a dominant and disturbing feature of international relations for over 30 years. They denounced all the commitments made by the super-Powers to disarmament as "a dead letter" and stressed the utter futility of trying to secure even partial disarmament through the super-Powers' policy of balancing of forces rooted in mutual suspicion and fear. These heartfelt words tally completely with the reality of the world today.

286. As some representatives have pointed out, effective disarmament is impossible without a clear understanding of the root cause of the arms race. This is quite correct. It is precisely through the distortion of the real nature of the threat of war and the arms race, exaggerating the horror of war, on the one hand, and spreading the illusion of "peace" and "disarmament", on the other, that the super-Powers hope to realize their sinister designs. The Introduction and Declaration of the Final Document have failed to pinpoint the intensifying rivalry between the two super-Powers for world hegemony as the source of a new world war and their stepped-up arms race as a threat to interna-

tional peace and security. Instead, there is only a vague reference to the threat to mankind posed by the arms race among States and the massive accumulation of weapons with the implication that everyone is involved in the arms race and every country is to blame for the threat of war. This will only make it easier for the super-Powers to confuse the issue and escape the blame for intensifying the arms race and creating the threat of war. In the light of the super-Powers' intensified global rivalry and all-out arms expansion and the increasing danger of a new world war, the Final Document should have called on the people of the world to heighten their vigilance, make better preparations, intensify their struggle against hegemonism and the policy of aggression and war of the super-Powers, including the struggle for genuine disarmament, try to postpone the outbreak of a world war and safeguard world peace. The super-Powers must not be allowed to lull the people of the world with such hollow words as "the process of détente", "to establish lasting peace through general and complete disarmament" and "the time has come... to abandon the use of force in international relations and to seek security in disarmament". Moreover, we are of the view that reference to the horror of a nuclear war could only be used by the super-Powers for nuclear blackmail against the people of other countries and would benefit no one else.

287. Secondly, it is the common demand of the numerous small and medium-sized countries that disarmament begin with the reduction of the arms of the two super-Powers. Many representatives have expressed such a view in their statements. They have pointed out that the responsibility for the specific problem of disarmament is solely and exclusively within the competence of the super-Powers, that any meaningful disarmament should begin with them and that the first and foremost objective of any disarmament strategy must remain the reduction of the arsenals of the two super-Powers. The unassailable principle that disarmament must start with the two super-Powers should have been explicitly written into the Final Document and embodied in the relevant sections. However, this was not possible owing to the obstinate obstruction of the super-Powers. On the other hand, in a number of places in the document, "all the States", or "the nuclear-weapon States", or "the permanent members of the Security Council", or "militarily significant States" are called upon without any distinction to take disarmament actions. It is unfair and unreasonable to put the two super-Powers which possess super-arsenals of nuclear weapons, on the same footing with other countries which lag far behind them in armaments. This is unacceptable to us, for it can only facilitate the super-Powers' stalling on truly effective measures of disarmament. The Soviet Union has made every effort to include in the document its so-called disarmament programme "for the purposes of ending completely any further quantitative and qualitative build-up of arms and armed forces of States with a large military potential". This is obviously intended to confuse the issue so as to maintain its military superiority over other countries.

288. It should be transparent to anyone with a discerning eye. The Chinese delegation has on more than one occasion explained that, when we say disarmament should start

with the super-Powers, we do not suggest that other countries should take no disarmament action whatsoever. What we mean is that, given the enormous lead of the two super-Powers over all other countries in both nuclear and conventional armaments, they must take the lead in disarmament. Take, for instance, the question of reducing military budgets to assist the developing countries. We have nothing against it. But, be it reduction in terms of percentage points or absolute figures, let the two super-Powers, whose military spending accounts for two thirds of the total world military expenditure, be the first to take concrete action. We must not ask all countries without distinction to freeze and gradually reduce their military budgets, or put special emphasis on reducing the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council and other militarily significant States. In short, the principle that disarmament should start with the super-Powers is indisputable. The representative of a third-world country has put it aptly: the super-Powers' attempt to shift the responsibility for disarmament to the vast majority of countries which maintain only a minimum level of armaments compatible with defence requirements "would not fail to be interpreted as a subterfuge". The people of the world must not relax their vigilance in this respect.

289. Thirdly, it is understandable that the numerous third-world countries, faced with nuclear threat from the super-Powers, urgently demand nuclear disarmament. However, a perusal of the statements in the general debate reveals that an increasing number of countries have recognized the importance and urgency of reducing the conventional armaments of the super-Powers. A number of representatives stated emphatically that our preoccupation should be with conventional weapons and that negotiations on conventional and nuclear disarmament should be held simultaneously. It is to the credit of the Final Document that it has listed the reduction of both conventional arms and nuclear weapons as priority items for disarmament negotiations and emphasized that nothing should preclude States from conducting negotiations on all priority items concurrently.

290. However, we feel that the document as a whole has failed to lay enough stress on the reduction of the super-Powers' conventional armaments. This leaves a loophole that the super-Powers can easily exploit as a pretext to drag their feet on conventional disarmament, to continue their build-up of conventional weapons, to threaten other countries' independence and security, and to intensify their preparations for a new world war. The document seems to be inadequate in this respect.

291. Fourthly, everyone knows that only by completely prohibiting and thoroughly destroying nuclear weapons can mankind be truly freed from the threat of a nuclear war. But one can hardly speak of reducing the danger of a nuclear war when the two super-Powers have in their possession such an enormous amount of nuclear armaments. We have repeatedly pointed out with ample evidence that the so-called "total prohibition of nuclear tests" and "nuclear non-proliferation" advertised by the super-Powers, as well as the recently unveiled proposal for the so-called "cessation of the production of nuclear weapons", are solely for

the purpose of maintaining and consolidating their nuclear monopoly and nuclear supremacy and tying the hands of the other countries. Such measures cannot reduce in the least their enormous nuclear arsenals or prevent them from launching a nuclear war when they consider it necessary.

292. We hereby reiterate that we will have absolutely no part of the nuclear hoax of the super-Powers. Those parts of the Final Document which contain these measures are totally unacceptable to us. We insist that the two major nuclear Powers take concrete actions to reduce drastically and by stages their nuclear weapons. When major progress has been made by them in both nuclear and conventional disarmament, the other nuclear countries should join them in destroying all nuclear weapons. This would be the correct way to remove the threat of a nuclear war. At the same time, we reiterate that China will not be the first to use nuclear weapons at any time or under any circumstance and that China stands ready to do its part for the realization of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons.

293. Fifthly, facts have proved that the so-called international treaties and agreements on disarmament concocted by the super-Powers do not have the least effect on curbing the arms race or reducing the threat of war. On the contrary, they are nothing more than tools for the super-Powers to cover up their arms expansion and war preparations and to prevent other countries from strengthening their defence capabilities. At the present session, the representatives of many countries have justly denounced some of the existing international treaties and agreements. They have pointed out that not a single weapon has yet been destroyed as a result of any disarmament agreement, that certain treaties did not impose on the nuclear Powers clear-cut obligations to disarm in their area, but that other countries are to be subjected to restrictions and that it was not only discriminatory in principle, but also proved to be so in practice, etc. In these circumstances, what reason is there to ask more countries to accede to these treaties and agreements? We cannot agree to imposing on the other countries the so-called international treaties and agreements on disarmament concocted by the super-Powers.

294. Sixthly, the decision in the final document on the reform of the existing disarmament machinery reflects, to a certain extent, the demand of the small and medium-sized countries to put an end to the manipulation of the disarmament negotiations by the super-Powers. This is something positive. It is clear to everyone how the super-Powers, particularly that super-Power which professes to be the most ardent supporter of disarmament, have resorted to all kinds of tactics to obstruct the reform of the disarmament machinery. On this question, the Chinese delegation has put forward its own proposals during this special session to the effect that:

“The questions of disarmament and international security, which concern the interests of all countries, should be deliberated by an international organ with the participation of all countries under the auspices of the United Nations, and the reduction of the armaments of the super-Powers should be given priority for consider-

ation. The negotiating body for disarmament should truly be free of super-Power control, and it should be organized through consultations by the above-mentioned deliberative organ and should be responsible to the organ. The negotiating body should be composed on a fair and equitable basis, so that it can be fully representative. The specific items and procedures for negotiations should be determined by the aforesaid deliberative organ.” [See A/S-10/AC.1/17.]

295. We believe that a reform of the existing disarmament machinery along the lines of such a proposal would be in conformity with the desire and interests of the majority of countries. It is difficult to ensure that the new negotiating body can further remove and weaken the control and influence of the super-Powers and really accomplish anything, in view of the fact that the decision in the Final Document on the reform of the disarmament machinery has failed to specify explicitly that this new negotiating body be composed on the basis of equitable geographical distribution. Furthermore, the negotiating body is not responsible to the deliberative organ and the specific items for negotiation are not determined by the deliberative organ through consultations. In our opinion, further efforts on the part of the numerous third-world and other small and medium-sized countries will be required to make the new negotiating body on disarmament a better one that satisfies the aforementioned requirements. It is worth noting that in one of his statements in the *Ad Hoc* Committee, the Soviet representative, obviously with ulterior motives, tried his best to peddle the hoax of a world disarmament conference which would brush aside the United Nations. We categorically reject such a proposal.

296. It is earnestness and sincerity that the Chinese delegation participates in the work of this special session. In the course of revising the Final Document, we put forward many positive views and reasonable proposals and consulted with the delegations of other countries. We are certain that more and more people will see through the super-Powers' trick of sham disarmament and real arms expansion. The proceedings of this special session have been an excellent lesson for all of us. Everyone has witnessed the performance of the super-Powers, particularly that super-Power which claims to be more enthusiastic about disarmament than anyone else. On the one hand, they indulge in the rhetoric of “peace” and “disarmament”, producing disarmament programmes of one kind or another: on the other hand, they do their utmost to avoid undertaking any real and meaningful commitment for disarmament, obstructing the adoption by this session of a document of practical significance and resisting a thorough reform of the disarmament machinery. It goes to show how difficult it is to have even a single reasonable proposal of the numerous third-world and other small and medium-sized countries on disarmament accepted by the super-Powers, to say nothing about asking the latter to take real disarmament measures. The struggle for genuine disarmament is an arduous one. Facts have repeatedly shown that the people's struggle for disarmament must be closely linked up with the struggle to defend national independence, State sovereignty and territorial integrity and to oppose and con-

tinuously thwart super-Power hegemonism and aggression, interference, subversion and control. Only thus can it really help to safeguard world peace and postpone the outbreak of a new world war. The Chinese people will, as always, firmly side with the people of the third world and other countries and fight resolutely for the realization of this noble aim.

297. Mr. DATCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The Romanian delegation, which participated in the consensus which has this evening been endorsed by the General Assembly, would like to express its appreciation of the results which have been achieved as a result of intensive efforts made in recent weeks by all delegations.

298. While welcoming the positive results which have been obtained, the Romanian delegation is at the same time aware of the limitations and the gaps in the Final Document, particularly in connexion with the adoption of specific disarmament steps, primarily in the nuclear field.

299. We should like to take this opportunity to reiterate our firm conviction that the adoption of such steps which should be both firm and binding, is one of the essential tasks of the United Nations and one of its prerogatives, as it is the principal task to be carried out by the new bodies which have been established during this session.

300. Romania, which has given great attention to the work of this session, has, as the Assembly knows, presented a programme of specific steps which is capable of halting the arms race, improving the international climate and strengthening international trust; a programme which would make it possible by successive stages to reach agreements which would involve a substantial reduction of armaments in order to attain the final objective: general disarmament and, above all, nuclear disarmament [*see A/S-10/AC.1/23*].

301. These proposals which have been motivated by the constant concern of the Romanian people and the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Mr. Ceausescu, we believe will in the future constitute, together with the proposals which have been made by other States, an important fund of ideas and initiatives for consideration and for use in the disarmament negotiations, a new phase of which has been ushered in by this session.

302. Thus the decisions which we have just taken should, as we see it, be regarded as only the beginning of a fresh approach, an approach which implies our acting, with heightened awareness and a clearer outlook, energetically and resolutely through concerted efforts, to put an end to the serious dangers which the arms race represents for the peace and security of all peoples on earth.

303. For this reason the Romanian delegation attaches particular importance to the decision adopted at this session, in paragraph 125 of the Final Document, that stresses the importance of the active participation of all States in the debate on disarmament and also the need to have a more detailed study of the proposals and initiatives which

have been put forward at this special session devoted to disarmament.

304. Before concluding my brief remarks, I should like warmly to congratulate you, Mr. President, and to express to you and all those who have contributed to bringing about today's consensus our gratitude and admiration for the sustained efforts that you have made.

305. The Romanian delegation wishes to pay a special tribute to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and the Preparatory Committee for this special session, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, who, with his eminent diplomatic qualities and his inexhaustible energy, has played a pre-eminent part in bringing about the results of this session.

306. We should also like to express our appreciation to the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, the Chairmen of the working groups and the co-ordinators; in particular, to Mr. García Robles, a distinguished negotiator and co-ordinator.

307. The very skilful and effective work done by members of the Secretariat and the technical services for long hours, very often during the night, deserves our sincere and warm gratitude.

308. Mr. ABE (Japan): On behalf of the Japanese delegation, may I express to you, Mr. President, to Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee and of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of this special session, to Mr. García Robles, to all the other co-ordinators and the Chairmen of the various working groups the deepest gratitude for the dedicated guidance and the great efforts they made to assist in the adoption of the Final Document by consensus.

309. Never have so many countries gathered and discussed so intensively and comprehensively the problems of arms control and disarmament. It was only natural for the world community to focus its closest attention on the proceedings and the outcome of this special session. It was indeed the indefatigable efforts and spirit of goodwill and co-operation of all the participants which at last made it possible to adopt the Final Document by consensus.

310. As my Foreign Minister, Mr. Sonoda, stated during the general debate at the 9th meeting, Japan, the only country which has experienced the horrors of nuclear weapons, is of the firm belief that progress in negotiations for nuclear disarmament, with the ultimate goal of eliminating all nuclear weapons, is the task to which the highest priority should be given. My delegation has therefore called upon all the nuclear-weapon States urgently to take the necessary steps to halt the nuclear arms race. We are pleased that our appeal was responded to by all the participating countries and was reflected in the Final Document. The concrete and feasible measures that we suggested to achieve nuclear disarmament were made a part of the Programme of Action of the Final Document.

311. Together with nuclear disarmament, Japan has long been advocating that the international community should

take up the question of conventional arms control and disarmament and, in particular, the question of curbing the international transfer of conventional arms. Here we are glad that, with the support of a large number of countries, a consensus has been reached in the Programme of Action of the Final Document, paragraph 85 of which states: "Consultations should be carried out among major arms supplier and recipient countries on the limitation of all types of international transfer of conventional weapons..."

312. It is also gratifying that a consensus was achieved on paragraph 22, in the Declaration which states: "There should also be negotiations on the limitation of international transfer of conventional weapons..."

313. We earnestly hope that those consultations and negotiations will be vigorously pursued effectively to place restraints on the international transfer of conventional weapons.

314. This is the first time that the United Nations has recognized the gravity of this problem and has made a specific recommendation for dealing with it. In so doing, the special session has provided an excellent starting point for further consideration of this matter by the United Nations.

315. One of the positive results of this special session—the one which we hope will have far-reaching salutary consequences for the future—is the establishment of new machinery for deliberations and negotiations on disarmament. My delegation warmly welcomes the fact that at the special session the General Assembly was able to establish one deliberative body open to all States Members of the United Nations and one negotiating forum with limited membership but open to all the nuclear-weapon States.

316. It is indeed an encouraging fact that we have succeeded in producing a consensus text of the Final Document which is entirely without brackets, thanks to the spirit of compromise that has prevailed throughout the special session. That is, I think, an asset for future efforts at disarmament, in the sense that it demonstrates that each and every nation in the world—despite all the differences in viewpoint and in security interests among them—is capable of finding common ground of interest for furthering the disarmament process.

317. It is the fervent wish of my delegation that our common efforts made during the special session may bring about a new and vigorous impetus to further constructive deliberations and negotiations through the new machinery on disarmament, and particularly to further the negotiations whose goal is the abolition of nuclear weapons.

318. Mr. BOATEN (Ghana): Mr. President, at the end of this historic special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament it is only fitting that the Ghana delegation should express its profound gratitude to you for the able manner in which you have steered the affairs of the special session through some of the most difficult moments in the Assembly's history. Our thanks go in equal measure to Mr. Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina, whose diplomatic skill

and positive personality became the guarantee of success for one of the most troubled gatherings of the world body. Similarly, we are indebted to the various co-ordinators of the respective drafting groups, especially Mr. García Robles of Mexico, whose diplomatic experience, assiduity and leadership have determined the quality of our consensus document at the end of the session.

319. The long cherished wish of the non-aligned countries to focus the world body's attention on the biggest threat ever to mankind has now been realized, and, even if we have not achieved general and complete disarmament or committed Member States to a binding reduction of their respective nuclear arsenals, the Ghana delegation is by no means disappointed at the outcome of the special session. Our consensus document articulates in very realistic language our hope for a future for mankind and its civilization such as has never before been achieved. Within the relatively short time at the disposal of the Assembly at the special session, we have been able to adopt a meaningful Declaration and a Programme of Action and establish the machinery for the negotiation of disarmament. From what appeared at the beginning of the session to be irreconcilable views and positions, we have reached a consensus which should give satisfaction and hope to all who are concerned about the future of our planet.

320. It is true that we have not achieved a unanimity of views on several fundamental aspects of disarmament, but perhaps this in itself reflects the complex nature of the subject. Rather than feel despondent, we should encourage ourselves to continue to strive for progress at all future meetings until we save the world unquestionably from the total nuclear holocaust that would be almost certain to consume our planet if we were to remain unconcerned.

321. As a small non-nuclear-weapon State that is none the less concerned with international peace and security, Ghana placed great faith in the prospect of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Although events over the last five weeks have shown that our faith was not misplaced, we cannot fail to note with considerable disappointment the general political backdrop to our strenuous efforts at this session. In our view, it was unfortunate that during this session there were reports of the worsening of relations between two leading nuclear Powers, of nuclear tests and of the show of other nuclear might, which could not constitute the best atmosphere for our negotiations or help in promoting international détente. Indeed, these events detracted from a consolidation of international détente and peace which, it was our common wish, should rather have been strengthened at this time. It is our hope that the international political atmosphere will have improved considerably by the time we reconvene, in the near future, to continue our efforts in pursuit of disarmament.

322. It will be recalled that my delegation drew particular attention, during the general debate, to the nuclear collaboration between some Member States of the United Nations and South Africa [15th meeting]. We did so because this partnership constitutes a horrific threat to the peace and security of our continent, as well as to the interna-

tional community as a whole. This concern was further reflected in the views we expressed at the various stages of the negotiations during the session. Although the form of words agreed upon to convey that concern does not completely meet our wishes in this regard, the Ghana delegation is pleased that the international community has been able to accept the formulations in our consensus document. It is our earnest hope that the views expressed in the Final Document will be translated into practical action that will remove the serious threat to our security in Africa as well as help in liquidating the unacceptable *apartheid* policy of the South African Government.

323. Perhaps one of the most difficult areas of our negotiations has been that concerned with machinery for the future conduct of negotiations on disarmament. However, we are not daunted by the substantial lack of agreement between Member States on this issue. The Ghana delegation would therefore like to state at this point that, whilst we are in agreement with the arrangement made to expand and reorientate the negotiating body to reflect the universal concern for the arms race, we are all of the view that the margin of expansion in the Committee on Disarmament does not meet the need to make the Committee more representational, nor does it do justice to the anxieties and possible contribution of the non-nuclear countries. In as much as the increased number represents a compromise of opposing views, we accept the present decision, but hope that it can be altered in the not too distant future to reflect the justice and equity which the non-nuclear world is entitled to.

324. Finally, the Ghana delegation is of the view that the special session has provided the political impetus that should propel the international community on to make the necessary arrangements to make the world a happier and safer place for all. We are all committed to this goal and it is our view that the nuclear Powers as well as the militarily significant countries have a special responsibility in this regard. If we all can cast away our parochial prejudices and fears, we may be able to enter the twenty-first century without the threat of nuclear extinction. If we fail, however, we will almost certainly condemn the human race to perdition. As human beings we are endowed with reason and understanding that should guide us in our choice. As far as Ghana is concerned, we shall remain true to our history and conviction by offering our total support for the salvation of humanity.

325. Mr. HARMON (Liberia): The Liberian delegation rises to make an appropriate statement in the light of the draft resolution we presented in the First Committee at the thirty-first regular session of the General Assembly.³ That resolution, submitted on 29 November 1976, reflected the statement we made in the 24th meeting of that Committee's general debate on disarmament. The essence of that draft was circulated as an official document [A/S-10/AC.1/35] on 23 June, during this tenth special session. Both of those initiatives were taken by order of our President, Mr. Tolbert, under the title "Declaration of a new philosophy on disarmament".

326. To refer to this briefly: it was President Tolbert's conclusion, after much pondering with almost a sense of despair on the fatal direction taken over many years of an expanding armaments race, that a new beginning must be made, a new approach fashioned to mobilize the peoples of the world in a radically new and more effective endeavour to reverse the fatal armaments madness.

327. As delegations will recall, our submission was favourably received by a Committee already weary and despondent over three decades of United Nations failure to meet the disarmament challenge. For us, therefore, that day marks an historic turning-point in the United Nations long disarmament history.

328. If we recall these developments it is to emphasize a point that needs emphasizing for the future, and one that has become an axiom at this session: that the solution of the vast problem we have dealt with here can no longer be the exclusive monopoly of the major military Powers, that important ideas can be contributed by the smaller nations as well, particularly since they are not bogged down by the self-serving possession of huge accumulations of military hardware.

329. On this question of democratization, if this session has any significance at all it is that for the first time in the long history of disarmament this has been a gathering of the almost total universality of 149 nations and, I might add, the creative ideas it has produced, regardless of the last-minute bickering over words, are not the kind that come out of the barrel of a gun.

330. Another important point we wish to underscore is that the idea of the session itself constitutes a new approach to the now vast and complicated disarmament problem. Our esteemed Secretary-General, who made the keynote speech at the 1st meeting of this session, stated with inspired simplicity that we need a strategy for disarmament. At the same time, when we begin to study the concepts, ideas, formulations and interpretations embodied in the many high-level statements made in the general debate, the most striking impression my delegation gets is that of a veritable thought explosion of many new concepts of the whole issue of disarmament, ranging from new relativity concepts, such as the linkage of disarmament with the whole United Nations range of new economic and social problems, to a new political relationship among nations, and especially to the relaxation of tensions among nations euphemistically called *détente*. It was a proliferation of ideas in which we think the special session has opened up an entirely new book that will confront the scholars of the world, who, we would submit, have not given the arms problem its rightful place in the profundity of their political science, their educational and political activities.

331. Arms have become a fetish romanticized as a tool of the hero. Nations will not get rid of them by exposing their villainy, their wickedness or even their astronomical cost. My delegation is of the belief that nations are more likely to discredit arms by exposing their purported value as the agents of national security rather than by exposing them as the enemies of life itself, capable of annihilating the human race.

³ Document A/C.1/31/L.28.

332. While my delegation may have experienced disappointment at the adverse developments in the various working groups of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, we feel that this session was already a success when it was conceived and executed. The session has successfully been able to develop a world-wide spirit and an awareness of the nature of the crisis man has created in his quest for an albeit warped sense of security.

333. After many hard weeks of difficult discussions and negotiations, this special session has been able to reach a consensus on the Declaration on disarmament and the Programme of Action on disarmament, as my delegation had anticipated. We are gratified to have achieved such results in such circumstances. Even though agreement has been reached, we make an appeal for the realization of our earnest hope that all efforts will be made to prevent the text from becoming a welter of contradictory decisions and vain commitments. The measure of success we have been able to achieve should be retained, implemented and followed up. Let us be unrelenting in our duties and responsibilities in urging our Governments, and our peoples in particular, the world over to press harder for the goals we have envisaged in the field of disarmament. The problem of disarmament was not to negotiate even a single item on the ladder to complete and general disarmament but to develop a world-wide spirit and awareness of the nature of the crisis man has created in his quest for security.

334. Happily, a new spirit has been born here, within these walls. It is an undeniable lesson of history that, when a new spirit sweeps the world, everything is possible.

335. Therefore, in concluding this statement, the Liberian delegation wishes to state that if we were to catalogue the positive results of this special session, we would use the formula put forward by the Secretary-General—that is, “an effort of totally new dimensions”. As the Secretary-General said, this effort “must encompass a broader and longer-range perspective than any previous effort; it must be more deeply rooted in the democratic involvement of peoples and nations—all nations—than any effort that has gone before; and it must rally an unprecedented measure of the world’s reserves of talents and resources to the task”. [1st meeting, para. 49.]

336. As we see it, the magic force exerted by this session has been such that, as we hope, there will be a positive answer in the near future.

337. Finally, we, the members of the Liberian delegation, could not allow this opportunity to pass without giving very high marks and great credit to you, Mr. President, for your efficient leadership and the important role you have played during this session. We are grateful to you and through you to your Government for what you have been able to accomplish in this historic special session. We should like to express appreciation also to our esteemed and dedicated Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, whose keynote speech to this session set us off to a good start. We should like to compliment all his able assistants in the Secretariat and all the members of the General Committee.

338. We wish to pay a special tribute to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas, who by his acts has demonstrated to us that he is an astute diplomat worthy of the highest respect.

339. We wish to pay a tribute, too, to the Chairmen of the various working groups and to the co-ordinators, as well as to the dedicated and efficient men and women of the Secretariat who have worked so energetically to make this special session a signal one.

340. Mr. PALMA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would have expected from this special session of the General Assembly two basic achievements, at least: a general express condemnation of the use of nuclear weapons as being contrary to the spirit and the principles of the Charter and a crime against mankind; and a specific guarantee that non-nuclear-weapon States would not be attacked with nuclear weapons. We regret also the absence of a specific and final commitment to channel to development some of the enormous funds now devoted to the arms race. By that we do not mean to overlook the advances made in other areas, the most important of which is perhaps the re-democratization implied by the reorganization of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Nor have we any intention of denigrating the intense efforts towards conciliation made principally by Mr. Ortiz de Rozas and Mr. García Robles, who, working under your auspices and with your encouragement, Mr. President, earned our great appreciation.

341. For the Latin American countries what has been particularly encouraging has been the recognition of the historic and exemplary initiatives represented by the Treaty of Tlatelolco, now being strengthened and perfected, and the Ayacucho Declaration, now open to all countries of the region as a result of the declaration which was signed by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the signatory countries on 22 June and which was circulated on 23 June as Assembly document A/S-10/AC.1/34. In that context, my delegation regards the document we have approved here as a first step in a process which, as all mankind hopes and demands, will acquire a pace and a dynamism in keeping with mankind’s aspirations to peace and security. Accordingly, we reiterate our firm intention, along with the other countries that advocated the convening of this special session of the General Assembly, to redouble our rigorous efforts to ensure that in the next stages of this process which is now only beginning the objectives that we have set for ourselves will be achieved.

342. Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): All those who participated constructively in the negotiation of the Final Document deserve the warmest praise. Few of us who were engaged in that task would have believed, at the end of last week, that we would find it possible to wind up our labours with a consensus text which covers the full range of issues without significant gaps.

343. Many have contributed to this happy result, and tributes were paid to all of them by the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee when its work came to an end in the early hours of this morning—but not, of course, to the one per-

son to whom we owe the most: Mr. Ortiz de Rozas himself. To one who had the opportunity of observing it at close quarters, his chairmanship was not only a triumph of diplomatic virtuosity, but also a feat of physical and mental endurance which few athletes could emulate. His achievement is one in which he and the people of Argentina may rightly take pride.

344. Any consensus requires compromise. In the case of this document, compromise on some of the most important issues was achieved only in the last few hours by very tired representatives working under the pressure of the clock. Because of this time factor many delegations did not have the opportunity to review the final compromise formulations before they were incorporated in the document we now have before us. It is thus understandable that reservations are expressed about this or that paragraph or sentence in the document both by delegations which took part in the negotiations and by some which did not. These reservations do not, in our view, undermine in any way the genuineness of the consensus. In a number of respects my own delegation finds the document less than fully satisfactory. I shall enumerate only the more important of these.

Mr. Scheltema (Netherlands), Vice-President, took the Chair.

345. New Zealand has consistently been in the forefront in urging the earliest possible conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We regard it as an essential first step in the direction of nuclear disarmament. The first sentence of paragraph 51 of the Final Document might have been differently worded to make it clear that the entry into effect of a comprehensive test ban is not dependent on agreement concerning later steps; but that, in any event, is how we would interpret the paragraph as a whole. We are glad, however, that the second sentence, to which one delegation had taken exception, was eventually retained as part of the consensus. We regard this sentence as an essential component of the paragraph, highlighting as it does the value a comprehensive test ban would have in inhibiting both vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. The third sentence, emphasizing the urgency of completing a comprehensive test-ban treaty, reflects the corresponding sense of urgency evident in the discussions on this issue at the thirty-second session of the Assembly.

346. It has been a considerable disappointment to us, therefore, that a draft treaty has not yet reached the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, still less the Assembly, as contemplated in resolution 32/78, to which the negotiating nuclear-weapon States and 123 other countries subscribed in December last. In our view the urgent conclusion of an agreement is a matter of the highest priority. We would therefore have greatly preferred paragraph 51 of the Final Document to call for submission of a draft treaty "to the thirty-third regular session of the General Assembly" rather than contain the much vaguer phrase "at the earliest possible date". We have accepted this latter wording in the interest of consensus, but we urge the three nuclear-weapon States to conclude their negotiations speedily so that the Assembly may, in fact, be able to consider a draft treaty this year.

347. We are glad that paragraph 51 contains a reference to the desirability of a moratorium. Although, regrettably, not all the nuclear-weapon States agree, there is no doubt that an overwhelming majority of States would wish them to refrain from further testing until a comprehensive test-ban treaty can be brought into effect.

348. I should like to add a few words on the question of machinery. The positive decisions we have reached offer a great opportunity. I fully agree with the statement in paragraph 113 that the existing machinery has not produced adequate results. It is an understatement. I agree also on the need to revitalize the machinery and give it a more representative character.

349. The reconstitution of the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body with universal membership is potentially an important step. It offers all Member States the opportunity to participate actively in debate on current disarmament issues outside the regular Assembly sessions at a time when those very issues may be under negotiation in the Committee on Disarmament. I hope all will take advantage of it.

350. The negotiating body is also to be reformed, but the reforms do not go far enough. New Zealand wholeheartedly shares the view expressed by the President of France that disarmament is not exclusive to a few countries but is the business of everyone; that the possibility must be created for all States to take part in the bodies in which disarmament is discussed [3rd meeting]. In our view this means the negotiating body as well as the deliberative body. At the same time, the membership of the negotiating body must be kept within reasonable limits. Therefore, to give all those States which wish to do so a periodic opportunity to participate directly in disarmament negotiations, there must be some rotation of membership.

351. This idea did not attract a wide measure of support at this session, but it has a logic which is difficult to refute. We believe it will attract a wider measure of support when those States which are desirous of joining the Committee on Disarmament—and they do not at present include New Zealand—discover that the current enlargement will permit only a minority to satisfy their legitimate ambition.

352. We are therefore pleased that there is provision for you, Mr. President, to be consulted in the selection of the members of the Committee on Disarmament, and for the membership of the Committee to be reviewed at regular intervals. Equally, we should expect that review to be conducted in consultation with your successors. We hope that before the session ends some more precision may be given to the expression "at regular intervals". We would consider it appropriate for the first review to be put in hand before the second special session on disarmament begins, and to be completed at that session.

353. Finally, I welcome the inclusion in the document of paragraph 116, which affirms that draft disarmament multilateral conventions should be subjected to the normal procedures applicable in the law of treaties. We believe that all the potential parties to such treaties should have a say

in their formulation before they are opened for signature. We believe that the Assembly has treaty-making powers. It may be that those powers could be further examined and defined, but in our view they are extensive. At any rate, the Assembly should have the power to review the content of multilateral disarmament treaties and should not be asked to rubber-stamp them.

354. I believe that the immediate prospects for progress on disarmament should be viewed with a blend of optimism and caution. There is no doubt that the special session has stimulated public awareness of the need for more active efforts by Governments, and that Governments may be expected to react to this concern by trying harder to reach agreements that really mean disarmament. But experience teaches caution. It is salutary to recall that, despite all the efforts so far made either within the United Nations or elsewhere, no multilateral agreement which would effectively reduce either nuclear or conventional armaments has been concluded. In the interval between now and the second special session on disarmament we must surely do better.

355. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I wish in the first place to commend the work of this special session. It is important to be to a great extent indulgent about what has been achieved, because this is the first special session on disarmament that has been held. After a long period of years in which there was inactivity in efforts towards disarmament, after that period of passivity in which nothing was done, we could not expect to get more than we have. There are many merits in the results of this special session, first and foremost the fact that there has been a consensus Final Document, and particularly that it was achieved in the last days. This was really a great achievement and credit is due to those who brought it about. All the brackets have been eliminated and there is now a very good Introduction and a splendid Declaration; the Programme of Action and the section on machinery are not so good, but anyway it is a praiseworthy achievement that there has been a spirit of mutual understanding and co-operation. The very fact of consensus means a move forward towards co-operation, and that is important; it is already an achievement. We must hope that this spirit will prevail in all disarmament negotiations so that there will at last be fruitful results, because so far there has been none. We must not forget that nothing has been achieved really. It had been expected that we would at least have had a comprehensive test-ban treaty or some important progress in the strategic arms limitation talks. But never mind; as I said, in the circumstances we could not expect more.

356. However, I wish on this occasion to pay a tribute to all those who have had a vital part in the success of the special session, particularly those who were protagonists in bringing about the required agreement on disarmament measures, that is, the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, who has shown extraordinary talent and skill in his difficult task; and the co-ordinator, Mr. García Robles, who has equal ability and who has shown great concern in this matter. Both of them have given generously of their time and energy in providing constructive leadership for the achievement against all adversity—and

there was much adversity—and at the last moment, the positive outcome of consensus. This was achieved after long deliberations for weeks on end at this special session.

357. I wish on this occasion to place on record our profound admiration for the President of the General Assembly, Mr. Mojsov, who with such signal success has presided over four consecutive sessions of the General Assembly with exemplary calm and detachment and with a spirit of positiveness which has been instrumental in bringing about mutual accommodation on all that was to be discussed. It is important to note that it is not merely a question of skill. It is a question of Mr. Mojsov's humanity and his innate sense of justice which have a positive influence and lead to the success that we have witnessed. Herein lies the secret of wise leadership. It lies really in the moral content of that leadership. This tallies well with the role of his country, Yugoslavia, for Yugoslavia is the best conceivable bridge between East and West and embodies the concept of non-alignment born at Belgrade in 1961. Indeed, it may be said that this special session had its roots in the first conference of the non-aligned countries in 1961.

358. As I said before, among the merits of this session is the fact that it resulted in consensus. But there are other merits also and these are very important. It has brought widespread awareness that the arms race is the main cause of the threatening situation in our world of today and halting it should be the main target of any international conferences on disarmament. It has been stressed here that arms are no longer a source of security but the very reverse. So, we now find ourselves in a different world.

359. Furthermore, among the merits of the session is the fact that a new disarmament negotiating forum has been established with France participating and soon, we hope, China—a great improvement.

360. Another aspect is that the session enhanced the role in disarmament affairs of non-governmental organizations; those organizations represent a section of public opinion and, therefore, it is important to make them aware of the necessity of disarmament. They have shown an extraordinarily sound approach to the problem and they have displayed imagination regarding the problems of disarmament.

361. Perhaps most vital of all, this session has made clear to the Members of the United Nations the inseparable link between disarmament and international security. In this session a preliminary study was made of this relationship. It originated in a draft resolution submitted on the initiative of Cyprus, with 10 non-aligned countries as co-sponsors, a resolution that was adopted by consensus during the thirty-second session of the General Assembly [*resolution 32/87 C*]. A very sound, important and useful study has been presented showing the linkage between the two [*A/S-10/7 and Corr.1*], which was not so clearly in the minds of the Member States when the session began. The importance of this linkage appeared during the work of the session. Not only has the study brought it out; the study also helps as a means of transition, for this relationship of

international security and disarmament means a revolution in the old concept of security through power and domination, through military alliances and so on. Here, we come to a new concept of national security achieved by co-operative, collective security through the United Nations in place of an antagonistic security achieved by armaments which has resulted in the grave threat of the escalating arms race.

362. Therefore, the only way to halt the arms race, is to provide its antidote, which is international security. You can never stop the arms race by trying to reduce existing armaments. The trouble in our world is not so much that there is an excessive quantity of arms. The real trouble is that there is an escalating arms race and it is that escalating arms race that causes the drainage of resources; it is that escalating arms race that prevents the international community from developing peaceful coexistence and the relaxation of tension.

363. Paragraph 12 of the Final Document states:

“The arms race . . . runs counter to efforts to achieve further relaxation of international tension . . . based on peaceful coexistence”.

It continues to accuse the arms race:

“The arms race impedes the realization of the purposes, and is incompatible with the principles, of the Charter . . . especially respect for sovereignty . . . territorial integrity” and the non-use of force.

And in paragraph 13 it says:

“Enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence or doctrines of strategic superiority. Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations”.

364. The great achievement of this special session is that it has brought a realization of the importance of establishing international security if we aim at all at disarmament. To think that we can disarm in a world of insecurity is Utopian. No nation can disarm in a vacuum. As long as there is no international security as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, there will necessarily be an arms race. We know from this document that the arms race spells the destruction of humanity.

365. Therefore, the logical sequence is that we have to stop the arms race; not merely try to resolve the technicalities of reducing armaments, which is impossible with an escalating arms race, but go more logically, more practically, more rationally towards eliminating the causes of the arms race. The causes are there before us. The causes are in the outdated concept of the balance of power—which now has become the balance of weapons—as the means of assuring the security of nations.

366. That is a fallacy that this special session has recognized in the Declaration, which very clearly states that security no longer lies in weaponry, that there must be genuine international security. What is astonishing is that this Declaration has not been followed up by dealing in the Programme of Action with the means to achieve international security. It is inconsistent with the Declaration to proceed in any other manner than by taking steps to put an immediate end to the arms race. In other respects, this session has been a success, it has been a success as far as its Declaration is concerned, but only if this Declaration is eventually followed up by the implementation of its provisions.

367. Furthermore, the Declaration states that it is vital for the success of disarmament that “all States should strictly abide by the provisions of the Charter”. So we have it in the Declaration that all States must abide by the provisions of the Charter. Can we not see that we are not abiding by the provisions of the Charter if we violate its basic provision, that dealing with international security? The Declaration states that we have to increase and enhance the role of the United Nations, which has “a central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament”. What does the Charter say? Article 11 states: “The General Assembly may consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament . . .”. It makes disarmament directly dependent upon international security. The Declaration states that we must comply with the Charter. Therefore, in complying with the Charter we have to establish the responsibility of the Member States for international security through the United Nations Charter and its provisions, if we want to have disarmament. The Charter clearly provides in Article 2, paragraph 4 that: “All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State . . .”. That is repeated in the Declaration, but the Programme of Action has not taken into account that this provision does not stand alone but is followed by paragraph 5 of Article 2, which specifically spells out that: “All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in . . . preventive or enforcement action”.

368. Therefore, it follows directly that, if we wish no use or threat of the use of force, we must have preventive or enforcement action under the Charter—and such action is provided for in subsequent Articles: Articles 39, 41 and 42.

369. I say this because, in accordance with its own Declaration, this session should have proceeded to define the means of stopping the arms race through compliance with the essential provisions of the Charter. But, as I said, this is not so vital at this session because it is the first special session devoted to disarmament, and I have no doubt that the second such special session will proceed, in accordance with the Declaration of this special session, with the implementation of the provisions of the Charter which ensure international security and legal order in the world.

370. With reference to the study on the interrelationship

between disarmament and international security, the decision of the session for its continuation in depth will facilitate the success of the next special session devoted to disarmament.

371. I wish now to mention the proposal made by the President of Cyprus, Mr. Kyprianou, for the total demilitarization and disarmament of the Republic of Cyprus. This proposal is in keeping with the spirit of the special session and is, moreover, an initiative taken by a small State in keeping with the purposes of disarmament. President Kyprianou expressed it in the following terms during the general debate of the special session: "I propose total demilitarization and disarmament of the Republic of Cyprus and implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations" [2nd meeting, para. 145].

372. That proposal was repeated in the *Ad Hoc* Committee and also submitted to the Secretary-General. As a result, it is officially listed among the proposals which form an integral part of the work of this session as deserving of further study. We believe that there is a positive and constructive spirit in this proposal. It aims at the abandonment of armaments in Cyprus—a trouble spot—to be replaced by genuine security through the United Nations and the Charter, thus facilitating an atmosphere of conciliation, mutual understanding and peace within the principles of the Charter and United Nations resolutions on the subject will lead small countries to set the example in being the first to pave the way for demilitarization and disarmament and that will also represent a constructive contribution.

373. In the context of the work of this session, the delegation of Cyprus proposed that, in view of the close link between disarmament and international security and the dependence of disarmament on international security, in accordance with Article 11 of the Charter, the next special session on disarmament be named special session on disarmament and international security. This proposal was noted by the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and referred in writing to the co-ordinators. It is now pending for consideration when the time for the next special session is decided. Our hope is that the next session will provide the opportunity for progress in disarmament through international security and legal order.

374. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like first of all to express to the President, Mr. Mojsov, my delegation's appreciation of the expertise and zeal with which he has guided the work of this special session. Our appreciation also goes to Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas and Mr. Alfonso García Robles, who have done praiseworthy work in their respective capacities as Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and co-ordinator-general, as well as to the other co-ordinators, who made such great efforts so that our task might be concluded successfully.

375. The Cuban delegation considers that the Final Document prepared by this Assembly reflects such results as could be achieved at this stage. As was to be expected, it does not satisfy the aspirations of the vast majority of the

peoples of the world regarding the solution of the dramatic dilemma of peace or war and the prevention of the threat of a world thermonuclear war—far from it.

376. In our opinion the document omits matters of vital importance. Nothing is said about the true causes of the arms race. No reference is made to the legitimate demand of the vast majority of the nations Members of the Organization that military bases be removed from foreign territories.

377. An attempt was even made not to mention the right of peoples to use every means within their power to achieve and defend their independence, and no more than a mild reference was made to the urgent question of preventing racist régimes from continuing to arm and from acquiring or expanding a nuclear capability so as to be able to occupy and exploit the countries in southern Africa and in the Middle East.

378. Non-nuclear countries and others in which there are no nuclear bases are still under the threat of a possible nuclear attack.

379. Endless debates have been held on the use or the threat of the use of force, including nuclear weapons—as though the right of peoples to live free from the fear of foreign aggression could be questioned.

380. Obviously, the tenacious opposition of a handful of capitalist countries, those who lack the political will needed to face squarely the task of general and complete disarmament and really get down to it, prevented this Assembly from taking decisive steps in the discharge of its duty. This makes it all the more necessary to convene a world disarmament conference in the near future, with universal representation and full powers to adopt the solutions which our peoples demand.

381. It is not yet possible to assess the scope of the results obtained at this special session, but its limitations and omissions are glaringly obvious. No doubt, our peoples will evaluate what we have done, will arrive at their own conclusions and assign responsibility.

382. Without anticipating their judgement, I should like to reiterate here the firm conviction, which was already expressed 18 years ago at this same rostrum by President Fidel Castro⁴: that only when the philosophy of exploitation is abandoned will the philosophy of war also cease to prevail.

383. Cuba will continue to participate resolutely in all international bodies and forums in the urgent struggle for general and complete disarmament, for détente and for ensuring a just and lasting peace throughout the world.

384. Mr. OYONO (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): The Cameroonian delegation supported the draft resolution containing the Final Document on disarmament that has just been adopted by the Assembly. It did so because, despite its ambiguities and imbalances, this document provides a substantial basis for the

⁴ Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Plenary Meetings, 872nd meeting.

implementation of a process of general and complete disarmament acceptable to all States.

385. That is why it is a pleasant duty for us to express our gratitude to the President, Mr. Mojsov, for the dynamic impetus that he constantly gave to our negotiations. I wish also to pay a tribute to Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, together with all the Chairmen of the working groups and all the co-ordinators, for the really superhuman efforts they have made, day and night, in order that our work should be successful.

386. However, my delegation, like most of those of the non-aligned countries, is wondering about the applicability, the impact and the real scope of this document, many of whose provisions are still the subject of strong reservations, despite all efforts made and the intensive negotiations carried out to dispel all the hesitations and mental reservations of some nuclear-weapon States.

387. When I spoke in the general debate [23rd meeting], I had the opportunity to describe at length the aims and objectives which in the opinion of the Cameroonian delegation and that of the very large majority of States represented here were to be defined by this session and the ways and means to attain them.

388. Our concerns, which, as has been shown by the very great interest caused by our discussions, are also those of the other peoples in the world as a whole, unfortunately do not seem to have been capable of engendering among Governments, particularly those of countries with large military arsenals, sufficient political will to make a practical and determined start on the process of general and complete disarmament.

389. We in the United Republic of Cameroon regret in particular that we have not received from all the nuclear-weapon States, as we requested, clear and unambiguous guarantees that they would refrain from the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States.

390. Also, we denounce the scandalous disproportion between the vast resources devoted to undertakings of destruction and the pittances set aside for the alleviation of poverty, since we had hoped that during this session the countries of military importance would demonstrate by specific, albeit symbolic, acts their willingness to reduce their military expenditure in favour of social and economic development.

391. In this respect and in my capacity as Chairman of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund, I have addressed to the General Assembly at this special session a message, contained in document A/S-10/AC.1/5, drawing attention to the particularly precarious and disquieting situation of more than 400 million children throughout the world.

392. We welcome the fact that at least one State replied to our appeal by announcing its intention to earmark from its military budget an amount of \$7 million for the Interna-

tional Year of the Child. We earnestly hope that this initiative will be followed by other countries and that the richer countries will give the example, so as to make of this session, which is coming to an end, the beginning of a new era based no longer on confrontation but on solidarity.

393. I cannot fail to welcome the broadening of the negotiating machinery at Geneva. It is quite proper that the new Committee on Disarmament, which will replace the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, should be more representative and reflect the features of contemporary international society, which is characterized by universality, the interdependence of States and the fact that all nations share a common destiny.

394. The United Republic of Cameroon feels that this measure, which will enable all States to take an active part in the important deliberations and decisions in this high-priority field of common security, should be based on a system of rotation of membership, with terms of one or two years at most, in order to ensure an effective chance of participation for all States at reasonable intervals.

395. Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania): During the general debate of the tenth special session the delegation of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania expressed the position and the view of its Government on the issue of disarmament [22nd meeting]. Now that the session is drawing to a close, the Albanian delegation would like to explain briefly its position with regard to the Final Document and to the consensus by which it has been said this document was adopted—if there really was any consensus at all.

396. In our view, the Final Document represents in many ways an amalgam of ideas, viewpoints and concepts, the main bulk of which are contradictory and give rise to opposite interpretations. The Final Document does not reveal, nor does it touch upon, the real causes of the arms build-up and the armaments race. It also fails to pinpoint the true factors which hamper genuine disarmament.

397. The Albanian delegation deems it necessary to state that it does not approve of many parts of the document, that it is against a number of formulations contained in it and that it has reservations as regards some of its formulas for reasons we made clear in our statement in the general debate, some points of which we are reiterating at this juncture.

398. We think that the Final Document, like the proceedings of this session, has shown that the tenth special session devoted to disarmament has failed to achieve any concrete results. Once again it can be seen clearly that the opponents of genuine disarmament—the imperialist Powers, primarily the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union—are trying by all ways and means to make the disarmament issue ever more complicated and the goal of real disarmament an unattainable goal.

399. As in the past, at present, too, the imperialist super-Powers intend to use the various debates and discussions on this issue in international forums to impose their views on others, to deceive and hoodwink peoples, to justify and

to mask their own armaments and the armaments race between them, together with their war preparations.

400. The whole of this session has been clear evidence of their ambitions and the tactics they used to introduce into the Final Document their deceptive ideas and slogans, their worn-out concepts, through which they aim at creating illusions and spreading confusion. The two super-Powers have used and continue to use far and wide their slogans about so-called détente, international security and military balance, about the need to strengthen the military blocs, about the horrors of nuclear war and other such stuff, to deceive people and to frighten them so that they will give up the struggle for their own rights.

401. The two imperialist super-Powers always advertise the talks they conduct and the bargains they strike as steps towards disarmament. They make a big fuss about their agreements on the so-called limitation of their arms and the armaments race, about the nuclear tests and the production of nuclear weapons. In fact, they have increased and continue to increase ceaselessly their armaments, the armaments race, their military budgets and war preparations.

402. It was in the same vein that the imperialist Powers insisted that their dangerous concepts and theses be incorporated in the Final Document of this session. In their formulations we can see clearly the ambition to secure for themselves the role of the arbiter in the world and to keep the freedom-loving peoples and countries under the constant threat of their classical and nuclear weapons.

403. The United States imperialists, precisely when the discussion on disarmament was taking place, came up with a request for the creation of a permanent United Nations reserve force which would be used whenever the Security Council would so require. It is not difficult to tell what purposes such an international gendarmerie would serve. The hitherto bitter experience with the various United Nations forces should serve as a warning lesson. That is why we are resolutely opposed to such a dangerous idea.

404. We are similarly resolutely opposed to the efforts made by the Soviet socialist imperialists to exploit documents adopted by the United Nations for propagating their deceptive proposals, such as those on the conclusion of a so-called treaty on the non-use of force and on the convening of a world disarmament conference, through which they intend to cover up their aggressive policies.

405. As in its statement in the general debate, at present too, the Albanian delegation wishes to point out that forums and organs for disarmament have not been lacking. On the contrary, there are many of them, within and outside the United Nations framework. Moreover, a great abundance of documents and resolutions have been produced and adopted. But the truth is that none of these has been any obstacle to the arms build-up and the armaments race. The fact is that they have not contributed to the cause of real disarmament. We hold that even at present it cannot be expected that there will be any change in this direction or that the negotiating machinery, whether in the present form or when reformed, will produce any better results.

406. The strategic arms limitation talks, the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of forces in central Europe and other negotiations of this kind are exploited by the two super-Powers to programme their own arms race and to legalize the presence of their military forces and bases in Europe and in other regions.

407. As in many other documents adopted in the past, mention is made in the Final Document of nuclear-free-zones or zones of peace. The Albanian delegation wishes to reiterate its view that the so-called zones of peace or nuclear-free-zones in various regions do not make the danger of war and of weapons a distant thing. The fact that the imperialist super-Powers express their support for or even encourage the creation of such zones goes to show that in this way they intend to lull to sleep the peoples' vigilance.

408. In conclusion we should like to emphasize that it is of great importance not to allow the imperialist Powers and other opponents of disarmament to speculate with the aspirations of the peoples. It is important that the peoples be spoken to openly, that they be told the truth as it is, something which in our view the Final Document fails to do.

409. Having explained some of the reasons why the Albanian delegation cannot accept the Final Document, we should like to state that our delegation does not join in the consensus.

410. Mr. CU DINH BA (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam participated in the consensus because the Final Document, in spite of its gaps, does reflect the constructive efforts made by the majority of delegations within the Preparatory Committee and also during this tenth special session of the General Assembly.

411. The document contains a number of provisions which reflect one of the most deeply felt aspirations of mankind, that is, opposition to the arms race and a desire to live in peace and security. Nevertheless, my delegation would like to make the following comments.

412. First of all, any measure for disarmament will be positive only if it marks progress towards general and complete disarmament and does not seek the supremacy of imperialist and reactionary forces and so long as it does not tie the hands of peoples in their struggle to defend themselves and their struggle for national liberation with a view to peaceful construction and development. The close link between disarmament, the relaxation of international tension, respect of the right to self-determination and independence of peoples, the peaceful settlement of disputes in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations and the strengthening of international peace and security is well known. We have to make a clear distinction between arms possessed by the forces of aggression and those held by patriots struggling to free themselves from the colonial and racist yoke or to safeguard their national independence.

413. Accordingly, the Vietnamese delegation has a formal reservation concerning paragraph 1 of the Final Document.

414. Secondly, so far as the establishment of a zone of peace in South-East Asia is concerned, the Vietnamese delegation is happy to say that delegations of countries in that region present at this session share the view that the establishment of such a zone of peace is a desirable thing. When it is established, all aspects of such a zone should be clearly defined by agreement among the countries of the region, without interference from countries outside it.

415. Mr. PAPOULIAS (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): The Greek delegation welcomes the successful outcome of the work of the special session devoted to disarmament and would like to express its deeply felt appreciation and congratulations to the President of the General Assembly, Mr. Lazar Mojsov, to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, to Mr. García Robles and to all those who have made their contribution to this important result that was attained by consensus.

416. We hope that this outcome will provide a solid foundation on which we may progress towards general, complete and effective disarmament and strengthen international peace and security and co-operation among the peoples for their common well-being.

417. So that it can be reflected in the record, my delegation would like to clarify its position concerning the negotiating body established in paragraph 120 of the Final Document. That paragraph states that: "the membership of the Committee on Disarmament will be reviewed at regular intervals". Our interpretation of that wording is that generally accepted for the principal organs of the United Nations. Accordingly, the "regular intervals" referred to in that paragraph cannot be longer than three-year intervals, even while taking into account the important role that the nuclear countries are called upon to play.

418. It is quite natural that all interested countries, Greece among them, should have an opportunity to participate, at a subsequent stage, in that negotiating body, since disarmament and international security are a cause common to all Members of the Organization without any distinction.

419. I should also add that my delegation has taken note of the clarification made by the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee at the 16th meeting of the Committee, according to which the procedure for choosing the members of the Committee on Disarmament in consultation with the President of the General Assembly will also be applied to the rotation of the members of the Committee in future. That is in keeping with our conviction that there is a link between the General Assembly and the Committee on Disarmament.

420. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): The Algerian delegation welcomes the adoption by consensus of the draft document submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the General Assembly. We welcome it particularly because this is the first time that the General Assembly has devoted a special session to disarmament. This is certainly a very important phase in the work of the United Nations in promoting general and complete

disarmament. It was not easy to reach this outcome. The Algerian delegation, which participated actively in all the stages of the drafting of the Final Document, wishes now to pay a tribute to the tireless work of the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, the Chairmen of the working groups, the co-ordinators of the drafting groups and, lastly, Mr. García Robles, whose devotion to disarmament is now well known to us all.

421. The consensus we have reached was made possible only because all delegations, anxious to avert a danger that threatens us all, were able, individually, to make the necessary concessions and agree that the Final Document would not in every case reflect exactly the concerns of each and all of us. Of course that is how a consensus is reached, each delegation being able to make any specific comments which it deems useful. The representative of Sri Lanka, as the current Chairman of the non-aligned group of countries, expressed the general views of our countries. My delegation fully shares those views, but we should like to make a few additional comments.

422. In the text of the Declaration, the section which dealt with the principal causes of the arms race was deleted at the last moment. Not only does my delegation feel that that section could have been retained as it stood originally in the version proposed by the non-aligned countries, we also feel that another equally important factor in the arms race should have been mentioned, namely, neo-colonialist and imperialist designs, particularly in Africa. This is a particularly important factor in that it is tragically relevant today. We were not able to reach a consensus on the question of military bases. My delegation would recall here that the dismantling of foreign military bases is a fundamental principle of the movement of the non-aligned countries and should have been reflected in a document of this nature, particularly since today we are witnessing a reactivation of those bases for aggressive purposes. Non-proliferation is dealt with in the Declaration and also in the Programme of Action. However, we feel that that problem, which is one of extreme importance, was not dealt with in the most satisfactory way.

Mr. Ulrichsen (Denmark), Vice-President, took the Chair.

423. On the one hand, the attainment of the objective of non-proliferation requires the establishment of a system of adequate safeguards of security based on the principle, affirmed unambiguously and without restriction, of nuclear Powers not using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against States which do not possess such weapons. On the other hand, as far as access to nuclear technology is concerned, we cannot accept the idea that the objective of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons will automatically be compromised by the dissemination of nuclear technology or allow this to serve as a pretext for restrictions on the transfer of that technology. The inalienable right to have free access to nuclear technology must be solemnly recognized and guaranteed for each and every country. Above and beyond the affirmation of that right, concrete measures must be taken to make access to nuclear technology effective and to facilitate such access for the developing countries.

424. Lastly, my delegation does not fully understand the opposition which has prevented us from attaining a consensus on a declaration of intent concerning the establishment of a zone of peace in the Mediterranean. We remain convinced that such a declaration, which would have reflected the desire of the coastal States to co-operate to promote common interests, would not have jeopardized the disarmament cause, in fact quite the contrary.

425. Mr. VINCI (Italy): The current President of the European Community has already eloquently expressed the views of its nine members. While we fully share and support your statement on their behalf, I should like to add a few comments, on behalf of the Italian delegation, with regard to the Final Document submitted to this special session.

426. But before doing so, I should like to join previous speakers in conveying once more to our President, Mr. Mojsov, the deep gratitude of my delegation, together with the expression of my personal admiration for the way he has presided over this special session on disarmament.

427. Thanks to his strong leadership, we have had in him a stabilizing centre around which all operations have revolved during this memorable session. He has been, from the beginning, our lucky star, lighting the way and giving all of us a sense of direction. And we have been fortunate enough to have as his associates two outstanding personalities: the former Chairman of the Preparatory Committee and subsequent Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, and Mr. Alfonso García Robles, who has been the main co-ordinator in the final, decisive stage of our work. To sum up what I would call their miraculous achievement during these last incredible days and nights, I have to resort to ancient mythology. I saw them in action as Castor and Pollux, directing our navigation and, by a final titanic effort, guiding us through rough seas into the peaceful harbour of consensus. In short, our fortune was so great that instead of one leader we had three, together functioning literally as the *deus ex machina* of the classic drama. All three deserve, with our gratitude, comfortable places at the summit of Mount Parnassus.

428. We are also grateful to the Chairmen of the two working groups of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Templeton of New Zealand and Mr. Jaroszek of Poland, as well as to the co-ordinators of the drafting groups.

429. Our appreciation goes equally to the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Sytenko, to all the members of the Secretariat—it would take too long to name each of them—those we see and those we do not see, who have carried out silently but efficiently, their duties and, in this case, their night tasks.

430. I must add, coming back to earth, that the main prerequisite for such a successful operation was the goodwill of all delegations. This goodwill has been present and able to rise to the occasion, except perhaps in a few cases. And we take it, indeed, as a good omen for the future that the Final Document of this first special session devoted to disarmament has been adopted by consensus.

431. Although the document before us does not contain all the elements we would have liked to see in it, we believe that it reflects the highest possible common denominator of consensus which could be reached in this first world-wide gathering devoted to disarmament.

432. With your permission, I should like now to submit a few comments of the Italian delegation on this point. I refer in particular to the chapter of the Programme of Action devoted to the comprehensive programme for disarmament. I wish to express, in this regard, our satisfaction at the inclusion of this chapter in the document, and to convey our gratitude to the delegations of Mexico and Yugoslavia for joining us in preparing its text. I also thank the United Kingdom delegation for its important contribution, which served to bridge the gap existing at the last stage between us and some other delegations on this chapter.

433. The crucial chapter to which I have just referred sets forth our original and deepest conviction, which is that intense negotiations must be pursued towards the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, and that to this end the negotiating body—the Committee on Disarmament—should undertake, with fresh impetus, the elaboration of a comprehensive programme for disarmament. We are gratified by the widespread support evoked by our approach, which maintains that even in a Programme of Action contemplating short-term measures, the long-term perspective must be borne in mind in order that these short-term efforts may be infused with a sense of purpose and direction.

434. The chapter stresses, moreover, in detail, the necessity for progress in the field of disarmament to be accompanied by measures designed to strengthen institutions for maintaining peace and for settling international disputes by peaceful means. We are encouraged anew by the inclusion of these concepts, since we have for many years expressed our deep belief that, in order to make effective progress on the road to disarmament, every concrete disarmament measure should be accompanied by the parallel adoption of adequate procedures for collective security so that all countries may feel truly and adequately protected.

435. In other words, each stage of disarmament should be accompanied by progress in seeking methods for the peaceful settlement of disputes, in peace-building and in organizing international security forces. At first sight, this last-mentioned objective, set forth in Article 43 of the Charter, seemed to some delegations to constitute the culmination of a fairly advanced stage in the process of disarmament and in the establishment of a new international order more suited to the needs of our times. We have always, however, expressed the opinion that it would not be superfluous to start work now on this aspect of the problem, since any rapprochement of our respective viewpoints would make it easier to solve the basic issues with which we are faced.

436. As I said earlier, we are most gratified that these basic concepts have finally been included in a consensus document.

437. Allow me to turn now to another part of the Programme of Action, namely, the section concerning measures to be adopted in order to halt nuclear-weapons proliferation. We are fully aware, of course—all the more so since we participated actively in the elaboration of the Final Document—that it was necessary to adopt a number of compromise formulas in order to arrive at a generally acceptable wording. However, this part does not fully satisfy the Italian delegation. It does not satisfy us since it does not recognize, as would have been appropriate in our view, the central role that can be played by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, especially if fully and correctly implemented, in the efforts of the international community to halt vertical and horizontal proliferation. It is well known that more than 100 countries have already signed the Treaty, whose fundamental importance and necessity Italy has always upheld, especially since we participated in its elaboration from the very beginning. We feel strongly that this gathering of the international community should have encouraged much more emphatically universal adherence to the Treaty in the interests of all mankind.

438. It was not easy for a country like mine to make the choice it made in adhering to this Treaty. It was an act of faith in the future. We can hardly understand how, on the one hand, some great Powers that were the strongest supporters of the Treaty and, on the other hand, several countries that have less to lose than us, have apparently shown less confidence in the potential further impact of this international instrument.

439. I should like to use this occasion to express our gratitude to those delegations that have supported us during the consideration of other Italian proposals. In this connexion, I am pleased to thank the delegations of Austria and Sweden, which have, since the preparatory stage of the special session, supported our efforts to introduce a recommendation concerning the prevention of an arms race in outer space. I should also like to thank the delegation of France for its support in the discussion of our proposal concerning the role of the Security Council in the field of disarmament in accordance with Article 26 of the Charter. We are happy to note that this proposal will be sent to the appropriate negotiating body for further consideration.

440. Finally, I should like to refer to the part of the Final Document dealing with machinery, in particular the paragraphs concerning the newly constituted negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament. I should like to express our confidence that now and in future reviews of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament full account will be taken of the uninterrupted, unceasing and dedicated contribution to the cause of disarmament made by countries such as Italy ever since international efforts first began in this field.

441. I shall conclude my remarks by confirming the strong commitment of my Government to the full and timely implementation of the proposals and measures recommended at this special session devoted to disarmament.

442. Mr. BOTERO (Colombia) (*interpretation from*

Spanish): I wish to express our appreciation to all delegations present for the efforts made in these five weeks of hard work. I particularly wish to mention the work of the President, Mr. Mojsov, the officers of the Assembly, the Chairman and officers of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and the co-ordinators of the various groups. Day after day and night after night, dedication, talent, wisdom and intelligence have been brought to bear in an attempt to achieve the consensus we have today formalized.

443. All in all, we should analyse our own work. Disarmament is a difficult objective and can be attained only after overcoming innumerable obstacles. The modest progress made in these meetings is a step towards the objective we are seeking. This Assembly has worked under the expectant gaze of the world's people who were and are anxious to know the outcome. The entire world north and south of the Equator, east and west, wants peace and tranquillity, security and progress. Therefore I think we are in no wise mistaken in saying that the expectations raised by the convening of this special session of the Assembly were, sad to say, greater than its meagre results. We have gone along with the consensus because any step towards disarmament deserves our complete support. We established our position in this field in the statement made in the general debate in this hall [*12th meeting*], and we shall not repeat ourselves. What we were hoping for was more positive and courageous action towards disarmament by the countries with the most advanced weaponry, by the most highly armed countries, by those with the highest military budgets, and by those which produce and sell arms. We were hoping for less mistrust and, above all, we believed that the convening of this session presupposed international political will in favour of détente. All in all we noted, to our surprise, a simultaneous resurgence of the cold war and increased tension in various parts of the world, precisely when we were meeting to talk about disarmament. We cannot disguise our concern at this contrast. We had faith that the Assembly would unconditionally condemn nuclear war and nuclear tests without exception as to country or environment. We also hoped to see embodied in the Final Document precise rules for limitation of the international transfer of arms of all kinds and a denunciation of those international consortia which benefit from warfare. Finally, we were hoping to see the establishment of sure guidelines concerning the transfer of resources now earmarked for the arms race to the development of peoples. Unfortunately, that has not been achieved. On the contrary, we are leaving the Assembly noting that some international relations are more fraught with ominous presages and that confrontations and balance-of-power games have intensified in recent days.

444. We are sure that the agreements achieved in this Assembly, though dilatory to a large extent, will allow the proposed machinery for deliberation and negotiation to continue with increased effectiveness the work on real and sincere disarmament that has been begun. My delegation has not lost the hope it felt when it came to this session; it is still hopeful about the results to come.

445. Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria): On behalf of several socialist countries, I should like to take this opportunity to

extend to you, Mr. President, and to the President of this special session of the General Assembly our congratulations on the successful completion of the work of the special session. We also express our appreciation for the most valuable contribution to the positive outcome of our deliberations made by the Chairman and the other officers of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

446. In this connexion, I should like to express our particular gratitude to Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, to the Chairmen of the two working groups, Mr. Templeton of New Zealand and Mr. Jaroszek of Poland, to the main co-ordinator, Mr. García Robles of Mexico, and to the co-ordinators of the drafting groups, for their exemplary devotion, persistence and competence in conducting the negotiations in connexion with the drafting of the Final Document.

447. We are most pleased to note that despite the complexities of the problems under consideration and the differing views on many outstanding issues, goodwill and mutual accommodation have prevailed and have provided the atmosphere favourable to the adoption of the Final Document by consensus. That is the most convincing evidence of the common concern about the danger of catastrophic military confrontation and the outbreak of nuclear war, and of the strong desire for peace and security among the nations of the world.

448. Disarmament, and in the first place nuclear disarmament, has acquired a most imperative and urgent character. We fully agree with the assertion contained in the Final Document adopted by this session that the continuing arms race leads to a growing threat to international peace and security and that, as stated in paragraph 3 thereof:

“The dynamic development of détente, encompassing all spheres of international relations in all regions of the world, with the participation of all countries, would create conditions conducive to the efforts of States to end the arms race, which has engulfed the world . . .”.

449. In our view, a positive feature that emerged from the general debate and is reflected in the Final Document is the fundamental perception that disarmament, détente, international security and development are closely interrelated and complement each other.

450. I need not say that the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the other socialist countries have always considered that the halting of the arms race and the adoption of effective measures in the field of disarmament have been and will continue to be among the main objectives of their foreign policy. At this special session the Soviet Union and the other socialist States have once again come out with a constructive and comprehensive programme of practical measures and have proposed a number of urgent steps towards halting the arms race and paving the way to the ultimate goal in the field of disarmament: general and complete disarmament under effective international control. We are pleased to note that most of these measures are affirmed in the Final Document—measures such as the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons, the

cessation of the production of, and prohibition of, all other types of weapons of mass destruction, the cessation of the development of new types of conventional armaments of great destructive capability, the reduction of conventional armaments and the implementation of other measures in the field of nuclear and conventional disarmament, the enhancing of the universality and effectiveness of international agreements in the field of disarmament and the implementation of such agreements by all States.

451. We are in general agreement with the basic principles and priorities for action and the guidelines for future negotiations to be undertaken at the global, regional and bilateral levels. In our view, an important stage in the over-all strategy of disarmament would be a world disarmament conference, which would combine the deliberating and negotiating functions with the competence to take legally binding decisions and to acquire treaty-making functions. The earliest convening of such a conference may contribute to the further promotion of the disarmament efforts.

452. While expressing in general terms our positive assessment of the final results and the great political significance of this special session—we should like to point out that, like some other delegations, we would have preferred on some substantive issues more precise and more far-reaching solutions which could be conducive to the acceleration of the efforts towards real disarmament. However, I should like to conclude this brief statement on a positive and optimistic note. What matters now, in our view, is to proceed from general statements to the implementation of the practical measures to achieve our common goals: to halt the arms race, to eliminate the threat of military confrontation, to move farther down the road to real disarmament and international understanding and co-operation.

453. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): On this auspicious occasion my delegation wishes once again to congratulate Mr. Mojsov of Yugoslavia on his record performance and to commend Mr. Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina and his colleagues on the Bureau for their dedication in directing the important work of this special session.

454. We are pleased that the initiative and constant striving of the non-aligned countries have been crowned with success. To have removed all the square brackets that faced us in the draft text at the beginning of this session was no mean feat. As a result, the aspirations of mankind to disarmament have for the first time surfaced in a consolidated text.

455. But in the marathon process of removing the square brackets, and under the constraints of time, we must honestly admit that the content of the Final Document as agreed to by consensus has been deprived of much of its substance, clarity and determination. It will not have a sufficiently dramatic impact on public opinion. It is not the clarion call to effective disarmament efforts that an impatient world has the right to expect. A survey of newspapers over the past six weeks during the course of this session only confirms the lethargy of the news media on disarmament issues, and the Final Document by itself is not likely

to change this. Moreover, the contorted compromise formulations will also inevitably lead to unilateral interpretations in our future work as negotiations resume.

456. It is also pertinent to observe, unfortunately, that there were instances in which, on issues of fundamental importance to many countries, little or no effort was made to negotiate in the spirit of mutual understanding and co-operation without which it is impossible to achieve positive results. There was a hesitancy, an unyielding reluctance, on the part of members of military alliances even to consider concepts of peaceful change, with the inevitable result that significant matters have been left out of the Final Document. For small unarmed countries this was a big disappointment. Where situations are obviously fraught with danger, concerted political action to improve the situation, or at least not to allow further deterioration, is indispensable and indifference to the need for it cannot be admitted. No such agreed formulation was permitted to appear in the Programme of Action in regard to one of the most turbulent regions of the world, the Mediterranean. For my delegation this is not only unacceptable but rather alarming. We ourselves, with our friends, remain determined to bring about the lessening of tension and peaceful co-operation, and our efforts will not cease. But obviously we must act in concert with others. As I said in my opening statement [7th meeting], we wish to exclude none with a positive contribution to make, and we will seek this co-operation.

457. Despite such serious, even ominous, deficiencies in the Final Document, a consolidated approach towards disarmament cannot but commend itself to our sympathy. My delegation, therefore, will not stand in the way of progress even though progress can apparently only be achieved in such small doses, is far less than is really required and a stark contrast to the rapidity of technological advances in lethal weapons systems. We are already losing the race, but this apparently was the extent of the progress allowed by those countries which want us to believe that all is well and under control; that the present methods should automatically be projected into the future, perhaps in smaller doses, and that those countries and they alone are to determine what change may be possible, if any.

458. This is the challenge we still have to overcome. The balance sheet of the past is not very encouraging, but at least now we have laid the consolidated foundations for a new approach. On this occasion we may have the plausible excuse that it is our first comprehensive attempt; next time, when we meet in a follow-up, we shall not have that same excuse. By that time we shall have had all the studies we need; by that time we shall have had a sufficient period for the impact of improved machinery and an alerted public opinion to be felt and for declared intentions and results of bilateral negotiations to be translated into action. We are prepared to wait for a review until 1981; there is always a chance that a better political climate will by then be prevalent and that real progress can be registered in the intervening period.

459. After all, we are trying to grapple only with the symptoms of a disease. Unless we are prepared resolutely

and objectively to tackle the root causes, and unless we have the determination to succeed, the best-prepared programmes of action and the most intricate machinery will just be in future what they have proved to be in the past—a platform for immobility or a scapegoat for failure. This session has remedied the administrative lacunae which it was necessary to rectify. It has also given an unmistakable signal of what needs to be done. From now on, the major Powers have a particularly heavy responsibility. We have done all the talking that is necessary. Now is the time for action. The question before us is whether we shall succeed through conviction and effort or collapse in chaotic self-annihilation.

460. Mr. HARRY (Australia): The Australian delegation is pleased to associate itself fully with the consensus on the Final Document that has been achieved at this special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. Working together, we have overcome many obstacles to achieve this result.

461. Australia does not wish to enter any formal reservations on the text that we have adopted. Of course, no delegation can be completely satisfied with the result. I should like, however, to comment briefly on those paragraphs of the Declaration and the Programme of Action which deal with the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Australian Government has long made clear the importance which it attaches to this issue, most recently in our Prime Minister's address to this special session [16th meeting].

462. My delegation welcomes the recognition that has been given at the special session to the interrelationship among all aspects of nuclear-arms control and disarmament and to the need to identify the conditions that can generate a well-founded confidence between nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States and among the nuclear States themselves. This is a positive achievement. At the same time we had hoped that this session might have extended the basis for agreement on measures to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

463. There are some matters on which these hopes of my Government have not been fully realized in the Final Document.

464. First, it does not give explicit recognition to the fact that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is the only comprehensive international instrument directed against the proliferation of nuclear weapons, or to the fact that it is accepted by a substantial majority of the international community.

465. Secondly, the document does not, in the view of my delegation, make sufficiently clear that the right of all nations to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes calls for a reciprocal obligation, indeed a binding commitment, not to develop or acquire nuclear weapons.

466. Thirdly, the document does not make it explicit that arrangements for international safeguards may need to be strengthened to provide the necessary climate of confi-

dence that will foster stable nuclear trade and closer international co-operation in the peaceful development of nuclear energy.

467. The text we have adopted goes some way to meeting our concerns on the above matters, but we wanted the record to reflect the full extent of those concerns.

468. This is the last time I shall speak in this forum. It was 32 years ago that I first took part in a debate on disarmament, on the first resolution of the General Assembly which established the Atomic Energy Commission.

469. I should like tonight to convey my thanks and admiration to the President, the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and the co-ordinators of the final negotiations. In the words of the Declaration we have adopted: "Removing the threat of a world war—a nuclear war—is the most acute and urgent task of the present day".

470. This special session shows that mankind has made the choice. We shall halt the arms race. We shall proceed to disarmament. We have rejected annihilation and have set out on the road of peaceful co-operation.

471. Mr. CAHANA (Israel): The delegation of Israel participates in the general sense of gratification at the fact that the General Assembly has been able to conclude on a note of consensus regarding a Final Document which marks a significant contribution to the search for disarmament. Although we share with other delegations certain misgivings and apprehensions regarding different issues and formulations included in the Final Document, this does not detract from the tribute we pay to all those who endeavoured to make it possible. We are particularly satisfied to see a document containing principles that if earnestly respected and put into practice, for example, in the Middle East, would take us a considerable way towards security and peace.

472. Among other things, Israel attaches great importance to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and considers that this would be a desirable step toward a just and durable peace in the region. In view of the language of the Final Document on this matter, as well as the deliberations in the special session of the Assembly touching upon this subject, our position is reaffirmed that an indispensable requirement for the establishment of this zone would be negotiations among all the States of the region leading to a formal, contractual, multilateral convention along the lines of such a notable precedent as the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America.

473. Out of a willingness to co-operate in facilitating the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, my delegation refrained last night from pronouncing itself on the procedural problem concerning the Iraqi draft resolution. As I explained at a preceding meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, the introduction of that draft had been, and remained, a completely unwarranted act of political warfare against Israel, in utter contradiction of the principles and ideas advocated in this special session. In an impartial and unprejudiced examina-

tion, such a document would surely be dismissed and rejected.

474. Obviously, as I noted earlier in this session, my delegation cannot be a party to a recommendation which takes note of that draft resolution and refers it to the next session of the General Assembly.

475. This special session of the General Assembly has brought out both dark and bright aspects of the international reality and endeavour. May we hope to work together for a brighter continuation of the quest for security and peace for all nations.

476. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Iraq on a point of order.

477. Mr. KUBBA (Iraq): This is the second time that the General Assembly has experienced an unfortunate and unwarranted intervention by the Zionist representative. As all representatives are fully aware, the understanding reached in the *Ad Hoc* Committee and the comments of the President of this august body expressed only a few hours ago, made it clear that there should be no debate on this question. It is obvious that the Zionist representative is trying to disrupt the work of this session and the result achieved by tremendous effort.

478. I would have liked these destructive manoeuvres to be halted.

479. Mr. SHAMMA (Jordan): Mr. President, I should like to express my delegation's warm and sincere gratitude for your efforts and the efforts of all, present and absent, who have made it possible to bring this special session on disarmament to a successful conclusion. During the past five weeks we have been working on a very vital principle, that of the continued preservation of the human race on this planet. My delegation believes that we have succeeded in this endeavour, and this Final Document stands witness to this achievement. We succeeded because we had the backing of our Governments and our people and, most of all, because we have the will to remove all obstacles which stand in the way of our survival.

480. This document contains the principles and mechanism for removing the dangers leading to the extinction of mankind. We all witnessed the hardship involved in producing this document. It was a great challenge to us and we can be proud of the results of our work. But the greatest challenge of all will be translating these principles into reality and putting the mechanism contained in this Final Document into action.

481. I do not wish to give the impression that this document is without fault, intentional or otherwise, for in many instances it falls short and fails to deal with certain issues which, in our view, are vital to the well-being of the people of the Middle East region.

482. First, this document deals with the issues of disarmament but fails to deal with the causes leading to nuclear and conventional armaments. In our belief, once these

causes are dealt with—especially the causes of conflict in the Middle East—and eventually removed, it will be a great step leading to the process of disarmament in all fields, and a great contribution to world peace.

483. Secondly, while we are happy to know that some nuclear Powers have lately given assurances that they will not wage a nuclear war or attack non-nuclear States that are parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, this, in our view, falls short of the expectations of the non-nuclear States in our area. In view of the nuclear activities of Israel in the Middle East in collaboration with a State in Africa, namely, South Africa, we feel that this document failed to call upon the nuclear Powers to give non-nuclear States which are parties to the Treaty in the Middle East and Africa assured guarantees against nuclear attacks by a third party. I say this because we in the Middle East and in Africa are very much worried about our survival, just as much as the nuclear Powers and their allies are worried about theirs.

484. Thirdly, the world spends \$400 thousand million a year on armaments, and that means taking that many dollars' worth of food out of the mouths of the hungry and the deprived all over the world, not to mention the waste of raw materials and resources. Listening last night to the figures allocated for disarmament, we find that they amount to a little over half a million dollars. I do not wish to make any comparison between these two figures. But in principle I would like to say that we spend a huge amount of money on armaments and yet we are in the process of beginning to spend more money on disarmament, which means taking more food out of the mouths of the hungry all over the world.

485. The process of disarming should be a self-imposed process carried out by the existing bodies of the United Nations at no extra cost.

486. We believe that this special session has set the course leading mankind to an era of peace and prosperity. We also believe that, as long as nuclear weapons are with us, the danger of mankind's extinction will continue to hang over our heads. Therefore, we had hoped that the Final Document would have provided for a continuous process of dealing with the de-escalation of the arms race—nuclear and conventional. But the provisions of this document have fallen short of our hopes.

487. Finally, I do not wish to sound unhopeful nor do I mean that this Final Document did not contain very essential elements that will contribute to international disarmament and peace. Rather, I wish to place on record my delegation's view that, as the explosion of the first nuclear device marked the beginning of the nuclear age, we hope that, for the sake of human survival on this planet, this special session will mark the beginning of the age of nuclear and conventional disarmament.

488. Mr. TÜRKMEN (Turkey): The Turkish delegation is gratified at the positive outcome of this special session devoted to disarmament. I should like to pay a tribute to the President of the General Assembly, Mr. Mojsov, for

his dedicated leadership and diligence in guiding the deliberations to a reasonable and balanced conclusion. I should also like to say how much we are indebted to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, and the coordinators for their vital contributions to the result achieved. We should like equally to thank the members of the Secretariat for their untiring efforts.

489. During the deliberations of the Preparatory Committee as well as those of the General Assembly, my delegation repeatedly stated the need to ensure a greater and more flexible participation in the negotiating body, which will henceforth be called the Committee on Disarmament. To this end, we advocated a system of rotation on a regional basis in a way which would take into account the need for adequate continuity as well as the special responsibilities of certain Members in the field of disarmament.

490. The Final Document just adopted by the General Assembly enlarges the membership of the negotiating body. We welcome this development, which, we hope, will give new impetus to disarmament negotiations in the light of the Final Document. Turkey for its part is greatly interested in becoming a member of the Committee on Disarmament.

491. The Final Document, in paragraph 120, provides for a system of review of the Committee's membership at regular intervals. It is our view that this review process should be carried out regularly at intervals not exceeding three years.

492. I wish also to draw the General Assembly's attention to a procedural point in connexion with the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, contained in part one of document A/S-10/23. Paragraph 9 of the report enumerates the documents which the *Ad Hoc* Committee had before it. It includes also a reference to a letter dated 29 June 1978 from the representative of the Greek-Cypriot community addressed to the Secretary-General, contained in document A/S-10/AC.1/39.

493. The reference to this letter in the report is not in conformity with established procedure. Indeed, the letter had not been communicated to the *Ad Hoc* Committee before it concluded its work. Up to this evening the document had not been circulated and nobody knew its contents. It was only upon request that we were provided with a copy of it by the Secretariat at 6 p.m. yesterday.

494. The letter from Mr. Rossides refers to the statement made by Mr. Kyprianou in the general debate, at the 2nd meeting, which included a proposal for the total demilitarization and disarmament of the Republic of Cyprus. Since this letter, as I have already underlined, has been mentioned in the *Ad Hoc* Committee's report in a way incompatible with orderly procedure, and since Mr. Rossides returned to the subject, I am compelled to deal briefly with the substance of the issue.

495. Even if we stretch our imagination to the utmost, it is impossible to see how the proposal of Mr. Kyprianou regarding the demilitarization of Cyprus can be related to

disarmament issues. The demilitarization and disarmament of Cyprus can be decided only by the people of that country, as is the case for all countries of the world. There is no need for the consideration of this issue by the General Assembly within the framework of its deliberations on disarmament.

496. Mr. Kyprianou is not in any way entitled to make a statement concerning the demilitarization of Cyprus, as he cannot represent Cyprus as a whole. He represents only the Greek community of Cyprus. Any decision affecting the island will require the concurrence of the Turkish community. Mr. Denktash, the leader of the Turkish community, has clearly stated in the Security Council that, although he was ready to consider the idea of demilitarization favourably, this issue could only be decided upon by the two communities, either during the negotiations on the future of the island or at a later stage when the Republic has been constituted on a bicomunal basis.

497. Furthermore, the statement of Mr. Kyprianou is misleading. If the demilitarization of Cyprus is to have any significance on a regional or global basis, it will have to encompass the foreign military bases which operate on the territory of the island. Mr. Kyprianou, however, carefully excludes these bases from his concept of demilitarization. He is using the expression "the Republic of Cyprus", which clearly excludes the foreign bases situated on the island.

498. The reference to the letter from Mr. Rossides in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee is therefore not only a procedural irregularity but also totally irrelevant to the subject of disarmament.

499. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America): We have come together today for the final meeting of the largest gathering of States to discuss and deliberate on disarmament in the history of our small planet. We came together with many differing viewpoints reflecting the inevitable and healthy variety that results when 149 States attempt to address themselves to a subject as complicated and important as disarmament. Our meeting together at this session has itself been an important event. Our consensus agreement on a Final Document is, in the view of many here, a miracle—and not a small miracle.

500. That the effort to achieve consensus was successful is due to the sincere efforts made by all delegations and the seriousness with which the world community today takes the subject of disarmament.

501. As must be the case in any consensus document, the text does not in some cases have the wording that individual States would have preferred. That applies to the United States delegation as well, and I shall comment on a few instances of this nature.

502. The United States supports the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones under appropriate circumstances and, at this very time, is proceeding to the ratification of Additional Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco. In this connection, the Programme of Action calls upon the nuclear-

weapon States to give undertakings with respect to such zones, the modalities of which are to be negotiated with the competent authorities of the respective zones. I wish to note our understanding that the term "modalities" refers to both the substantive provisions and the procedures to be included in such undertakings.

503. The United States also supports the general proposition that the establishment of an appropriately defined zone of peace, freely determined by all States concerned wherever situated, can be a way to promote international peace and security, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations. The United States considers that the establishment of zones of peace must be consistent with, and cannot abridge, the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence guaranteed in the Charter or other rights recognized under international law, including the right of innocent passage and historical high-seas freedoms. The United States position on the creation of any particular zone of peace will depend on its characteristics.

504. In addition, I should like to address myself to an aspect of the vital question of non-proliferation which is of concern to many States.

505. We recognize the right of any State to peaceful nuclear development and the United States will continue strongly to support international co-operation in this area. This was further evidenced during this special session by our announcement of a programme designed to strengthen our peaceful nuclear assistance programmes, particularly through the International Atomic Energy Agency. Any such co-operation, however, must be carried out in the realization that we all share in the responsibility for the safe utilization of nuclear power. It is essential that each nation plan its peaceful nuclear programme with full consideration for non-proliferation concerns. In the long run, this is the best insurance that all nations will be able to realize the substantial benefits of nuclear energy without increasing the risk of catastrophic nuclear conflict, and with assurance that the prospects for nuclear disarmament will not be endangered.

506. Regarding nuclear testing, the United States Government fully shares the desire, expressed by an overwhelming majority of the participants in this special session, for an early suspension of all nuclear tests. This objective has occupied a central place in our approach to arms control and disarmament, and has guided our efforts in the trilateral negotiations currently under way at Geneva. We should like, however, to explain the reasons why an immediate moratorium on nuclear testing, which we recognize is strongly desired by many nations, does not seem to us to be a good idea.

507. We have strongly and consistently held the view that a comprehensive test ban, in order to promote stability and mutual confidence among its participants, must be based on adequate measures of verification. At this moment, we are engaged in the detailed and technically complex process of elaborating such measures. We have made steady progress in these efforts and we are confident that effective and mutually acceptable solutions can be

achieved before long. But an immediate cessation of nuclear testing could seriously complicate these efforts. Therefore, while we understand the motivations of those who have called for a moratorium, and indeed we sympathize with them, we believe that the surest way of arriving at our common goal—that is, the earliest possible achievement of a comprehensive test ban that can truly promote confidence among the parties—is through the negotiations at Geneva. And we can assure the Assembly that the United States Government will make every effort to bring these negotiations to a prompt and satisfactory conclusion.

508. I also wish to say a word about the question of the reduction of military budgets. This session has correctly noted the excessive amount of resources devoted to national military capabilities. The limitation or reduction of military budgets holds promise of benefits for all. Therefore, we regret that it was not possible to reach a consensus on language identifying the essential first steps—standardized measurement and reporting, the development of techniques for international comparison and verification—which must be taken if we are to advance toward negotiated reductions. My government continues to attach importance to this subject and it is our hope that the General Assembly, at its thirty-third session, will be able to return to it in a constructive manner.

509. I should also like to make a brief comment on a procedural matter. My delegation does not at this stage object to the procedures suggested concerning the financial implications of proposals adopted by the Assembly at this session. The growing frequency of special sessions and the significance of the financial implications of this special session, however, suggest that in the future both the Secretariat and delegations should plan the scheduling and organization of special sessions so that sufficient time is allocated to permit full compliance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure.

510. These few comments I have made are in no way intended to reflect on the high significance our delegation attaches to the document we have just adopted, or on the importance of the fact that it has been adopted by consensus.

511. With regard to disarmament machinery and particularly the negotiating body, we have achieved a significant break-through in having agreed on a somewhat enlarged negotiating body open to all nuclear-weapon States. The United States welcomes the return to active participation in negotiations of our old friend and ally, France. We look forward to participation at an early date of the People's Republic of China. I should note that there is an understanding that those members of the current negotiating body who so wish will be members of the Committee on Disarmament.

512. One of the significant results of this session has been the stimulation it has given to public interest and participation in our common efforts. Thus, however important our Final Document is, it may be that much of the significance of this session will in the long run lie in the public area.

513. This was one of the objectives of the non-aligned nations in calling for this session. In that, as in the achievement of other objectives, they have succeeded, and we wish to commend them for their efforts.

514. There are many in fact who deserve credit for the success of this session. Mr. Mojsov, of course, is one of them, and we are grateful to him for his leadership.

515. To the distinguished Chairman of the Preparatory Committee and the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, whose skill, patience and devotion to his task leave us all in his debt, we can only say thank you, and we are sorry that we made his task so difficult. For that admirable man, of whom we are all so fond, and who has brought his tremendous human and professional skills to our labours, Mr. García Robles, we know that the reward is in the results he has so greatly helped to bring about. To all the co-ordinators, we are all deeply indebted.

516. I note in closing, on behalf of the United States, that we have been very pleased to see this special session convened here at United Nations Headquarters in New York City. We have been proud once again to serve as host country to the United Nations, and in this case to the first but not the last convening of the international disarmament community.

517. The United States expresses its appreciation for their presence, our hope for still further positive contributions to the causes of humanity and the fulfilment of the Charter, and our best wishes of Godspeed and good fortune.

518. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I already had the opportunity in the general debate, when our deliberations had scarcely begun, to pay a tribute of sincere gratitude to the President, Mr. Mojsov, for his inestimable contribution to the success of this first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I also had occasion to express the great appreciation we have for the Secretary-General. It would be superfluous to enlarge on what I said then.

519. Neither do I wish to repeat what the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee said so appropriately when winding up the work of that Committee in the early hours of yesterday morning. They were sentiments which I share concerning the praiseworthy efforts of the Rapporteur, the other officers of the Committee, the Chairmen of the two working groups, my four colleagues, who were given the title of "co-ordinators", a job of recent invention but of undeniable effectiveness. Neither do I believe it necessary, since everyone is familiar with it, to repeat my appreciation for the valuable and inimitable co-operation of all members of the Secretariat of the United Nations.

520. But I do indeed want for the record here to speak of the masterly way in which Mr. Ortiz de Rozas conducted the work of the Preparatory Committee through its five sessions, and thereafter the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Tenth Special Session for something more than five weeks of our labour. I am convinced that his impeccable

impartiality, what might be defined as his energetic suavity, his imperturbable calm and his inventive mind always ready with conciliatory solutions were a decisive factor in the success of this session.

521. As for the results of the session, my delegation feels that any observer who, without being idealistic, has a clear idea of the reality of the world in which we live and the limitations imposed on our efforts, would say that we had derived everything that could be derived from our efforts here, particularly if we take into account certain circumstances which are scarcely favourable in the current international situation.

522. Among the main results of the session we should mention the establishment of a deliberative body—a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly—the Disarmament Commission, in which all Members of the United Nations will take part. Thanks to another decision of the General Assembly there will be a negotiating body as well, the Committee on Disarmament, whose membership will be slightly larger than that of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which has been functioning since 1962. The co-chairmanship system, which Mexico has been criticizing for some 10 years, will disappear and there will be a rotating chairmanship. Its meetings will be public, there will be participation by non-Member States in its work, and there will be changes in other aspects of its procedure. All of this will provide conditions which we hope will make it possible for the Committee, which has been expressly made open to all the nuclear-weapon States, soon to count on the active participation of France and China.

Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) resumed the Chair.

523. The Assembly has had a general debate in which 126 representatives appeared on the podium; more than 20 being Heads of State or Government and about 50 being Ministers for Foreign Affairs. We have heard here a message from His Holiness Pope Paul VI. The Government of Switzerland, high-ranking officials of the specialized agencies and other institutions and programmes within the United Nations system, together with the spokesmen of 25 non-governmental organizations and six disarmament research institutions made a valuable contribution to the work of the special session.

524. For the first time in a long while, France took an active part, playing a major role in the discussions on disarmament, discussions in which China, also for the first time since it took its right and proper place in the Organization in 1971, took part, although to a lesser extent perhaps.

525. A Final Document has been adopted by consensus. It comprises four sections which define fundamental principles, objectives, priorities and methods for channelling and furthering the efforts of all countries to eradicate the threat of a nuclear war, put an end to the arms race and draw up a comprehensive programme for disarmament which will make use of all possible means in order that the

objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control may become a reality, in a world in which peace and international security may prevail and in which the new international economic order will be strengthened and consolidated.

526. At the request of the Preparatory Committee, the United Nations Centre for Disarmament prepared more than a dozen working papers which will be useful instruments for research workers. The official documents of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which will include, in addition to those contained in the seven volumes of the report of the Preparatory Committee and their annexes, all the records and proposals of the plenary Assembly and the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Assembly will, without doubt, form a valuable source of documentation for Governments and for future studies in universities and research institutes in this field.

527. I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to express my gratitude to the very many representatives who have been most generous in their comments on my modest contribution to the work of this session of the Assembly. As someone so rightly said here a few moments ago, the results of the session, together with the comments I have heard here, are for me my best reward.

528. About 15 years ago, on 27 November 1963, when the Assembly had just adopted resolution 1911 (XVIII) on what was then called the "Denuclearization of Latin America", it was my privilege to outline from this same podium how Mexico envisaged undertaking the task that was before us. I closed that statement with words that I feel it opportune to recall now:

"We do not intend to act rashly or hastily. We shall follow the advice of the wise Latin adage and make haste slowly, but we shall make haste.

"Today, with the historic resolution adopted by this Assembly, Latin America starts along the road to denuclearization. We are convinced that sooner or later we shall achieve that goal, for we can count upon the unre-served and enthusiastic support of all our peoples."⁵

529. Developments since then have fully justified our optimism, and the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, has been perhaps the most highly praised international treaty in the debates at this session. Similarly, we wish to restate here that the Final Document that we have adopted, whatever its short-comings and lacunae, is in our opinion a solid basis on which to build a new strategy for disarmament, the precepts of which are well defined in the Introduction and the Declaration. We may feel justifiably optimistic that this will be so, particularly if we take into account the fact that this session of the General Assembly that we are closing today is only the beginning of a new stage in United Nations efforts at disarmament, as is demonstrated by the fact that, as of now, we have endorsed the convening of a second special session devoted to disarmament.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Eighteenth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1265th meeting, paras. 90 and 91.

530. We may be justifiably optimistic, I repeat, because we believe that the instinct of preservation is very deeply rooted in mankind, and that disarmament is the most critical and urgent job of our time, since, as has been stated in one of our conclusions, mankind is facing a dilemma: we have to halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament, or face annihilation.

531. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): As we approach the closing minutes of this historic session, my delegation would like to express its general satisfaction that the session has succeeded in ending on a note of consensus.

532. A critical appraisal of the Final Document would no doubt lead various observers—just as it would various representatives—to various conclusions. However, all representatives who have participated in the elaboration of the Final Document and all observers who have followed our work with interest would agree on one thing, that is, that a constructive spirit was at work among all delegations at the crucial time in our deliberations which led to the achievement of the consensus.

533. It should not be surprising that the consensus emerged only after long and arduous negotiations. A subject as complex and sensitive as disarmament cannot but cause countries to take strong stands, particularly those which have come to believe in a security achieved through being armed to the teeth, as the expression goes. Yet those who watch the great majority of the world's population eke out an unedifying existence while such huge resources are being wasted on armaments cannot but take an equally strong stand in favour of the promotion of security through disarmament and the diversion of the world's material and human resources entirely to economic and social development.

534. Thus, if the spokesman of the non-aligned countries, the representative of Sri Lanka, expressed a certain disappointment with the Final Document, he truly reflected the expectations of those countries, which had initiated the idea of convening this special session. Let us remember that in the opening sentences of the Declaration in the Final Document it is stated that:

“Mankind today is confronted with an unprecedented threat of self-extinction arising from the massive and competitive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced. Existing arsenals of nuclear weapons alone are more than sufficient to destroy all life on earth.”

535. Needless to say, the formulations in the Programme of Action do not seem to reflect the urgency of nuclear disarmament, which the Declaration from which I have quoted seems to imply. To say, as the Programme of Action does in paragraph 45, that “Priorities in disarmament negotiations shall be: nuclear weapons; other weapons of mass destruction . . . ; conventional weapons . . . ” is to put nuclear-weapons disarmament on the same footing as that of conventional weapons. This, in the view of my delegation, does not reflect the urgency which most

people in the world attach to the question of nuclear disarmament.

536. In spite of this, however, it is the hope of my delegation that the process of nuclear disarmament will, in practice, be treated with the urgency and priority which it deserves.

537. If the Programme of Action which we have adopted in the Final Document falls short of what many Members had expected, this should not in any way make us underestimate the importance of that Programme or the importance of the consensus which was reached in its adoption.

538. We should bear in mind that the international community will ultimately judge the success or failure of this first special session devoted to disarmament by the manner in which even the modest Programme which we have adopted is implemented. Fortunately, our decisions on machinery will provide us not only the wherewithal to pursue the implementation of the Programme through the negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament, but also the means to monitor and follow up through the new deliberative body, the Disarmament Commission.

539. The Nigerian delegation has for several years joined others within the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to press for changes to reflect present-day realities and make that negotiating organ a more effective instrument on questions of disarmament. We are happy, therefore, that at this special session the Assembly has now taken steps to ensure that the Committee on Disarmament will not inherit the anachronistic structure of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which for years has been the subject of criticism, even within that organ itself.

540. We hope that as a result of the decision of the special session on machinery—particularly the negotiating machinery—all the nuclear-weapon States will now be able to take their rightful places in the Committee on Disarmament. Indeed, we demand it of them.

541. Whatever success this special session has achieved has been due in no small measure to your wise guidance, Mr. President, as well as to the skilful leadership of the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, ably assisted by Mr. García Robles, whose energy is a source of inspiration to many of us.

542. May I also refer in this context to the valuable assistance which the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee received from the Chairmen of the working groups, as well as from my colleagues in the group of co-ordinators.

543. In the preparation for this special session, the Nigerian delegation noticed the none too broad participation in the Preparatory Committee from which many countries were absent. We think that if the United Nations is to assume its central role in the area of disarmament, then its members must be enabled to make informed contributions to the necessary deliberations, something that is envisaged through the creation of the new deliberative organ.

544. This conviction inspired the Nigerian proposal for a programme of United Nations fellowships on disarmament [see A/S-10/AC.1/11]. My delegation is most gratified that our proposal received unanimous support and has been adopted at this special session, as reflected in paragraph 108 of the Final Document.

545. As a result, the General Assembly has at this special session decided to establish a United Nations Programme of 20 annual fellowships on disarmament. We are convinced that this programme will help in no small measure to promote an awareness of the issues of disarmament in more countries. The constructive role which public opinion in many countries can play is reflected in the participation of the non-governmental organizations in this special session.

546. We hope that as a result of this programme the next special session of the General Assembly will reflect a wider representation of the developing countries in the composition of delegations of non-governmental organizations.

547. My delegation wishes to convey its gratitude to all delegations for supporting this initiative, which, we are convinced, may well turn out to be one of the more immediately fruitful decisions of this special session.

548. Mr. MESHARRAFA (Egypt): Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with those who have preceded me in congratulating you on your wise leadership which has guided our deliberations to a successful conclusion.

549. My appreciation also goes to Mr. Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina and Mr. García Robles of Mexico, for their skilful and dedicated work, as well as to the two Chairmen of the working groups and to the co-ordinators of the drafting groups for their strenuous efforts.

550. Turning briefly to the document before us, the Final Document of the tenth special session, I should like to point out that, while it is not perfect or complete, and while many essential points in the field of disarmament have not, in our view, been adequately dealt with, the delegation of Egypt welcomes the consensus reached and calls upon all countries to consider it a cogent point of departure—or, rather, of resumption of serious work—towards the achievement of substantial progress in the field of disarmament.

551. We welcome the constructive awareness of the necessity of achieving disarmament; we welcome the dynamic developments generated by this session in this connexion. We agree with the solid framework in which the whole concept of negotiation and measures in the field of disarmament is being placed—namely, the reaffirmation by all States of their full commitment to the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and to the obligation to observe its principles and the principles of international law relating to international peace and security.

552. In this connexion, in the Final Document emphasis was given to refraining from the threat of the use or the

use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of States or against the right of peoples struggling for their self-determination. We underline the emphasis put on the primary role and responsibility of the United Nations in disarmament and on the imperative need to keep it informed of all steps in the field of disarmament, whether unilateral, bilateral, regional or multilateral. The delegation of Egypt further believes that the United Nations has a decided responsibility to intervene through its principal organ, the Security Council, when excessive armament by certain States condemned by their disrespect for and flouting of the principles of the Charter becomes a threat to international peace and security—especially, for example, if this comes about through collaboration between certain racist régimes in the nuclear field. We also underline the emphasis placed in the document on the role of the Security Council in connexion with the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in Africa and in the Middle East. Egypt attaches the utmost importance to the question of the establishment of zones of peace in various other parts of the world, especially in South-East Asia and the Indian Ocean.

553. Egypt believes that halting the spread of nuclear weapons is a principal goal of the international community and a basic responsibility of the Organization. At the same time we believe that the non-proliferation measures should not jeopardize the right of all States to the peaceful use of nuclear energy for economic and social development. On the other hand, let us not forget that no practical results have emerged and that perhaps there will be none because of the wide gaps that separate the different positions of many countries. However, we sincerely hope that very soon the world will witness the successful conclusion of the long-awaited agreement resulting from the second series of strategic arms limitation talks and that the international efforts to achieve a comprehensive test-ban treaty will bear fruit in the very near future.

554. Finally, as a member of the existing Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, Egypt expresses its deep awareness of the continuing need for a single multilateral disarmament negotiation forum of adequate size and, therefore, welcomes the newly established body.

555. In conclusion I should like to state that the delegation of Egypt had had the intention of putting on record its reservations regarding certain omissions or the dilution of some paragraphs—for example, the paragraphs on safeguards. However, we refrained from making any reservations bearing in mind the circumstances in which our deliberations and negotiations were conducted.

556. Mr. PIZA-ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee (A/S-10/23, first part), mention of the note verbale of 28 June addressed to the Secretary-General by the representative of Costa Rica has been omitted. Its purpose was to introduce the proposal which figures in document A/S-10/AC.1/37, paragraph 142, as part of subsection F, "Disarmament and development" of the Programme of Action.

557. This proposal was made by the delegation of Costa Rica, first to reaffirm the resolutions already adopted, and the proposals submitted, calling for an immediate reduction in military budgets and the establishment of an additional fund to assist the developing countries, and, secondly, specifically to request that a substantial portion of the resources saved as a result of the reduction in military expenditure be set aside to compensate nations reducing their military budgets to below a given percentage, to be established, of their national budgets or their national products, without taking into account their development level and as a direct and effective incentive for disarmament.

558. Our proposal did not meet with a favourable reception in the *Ad Hoc* Committee or in the appropriate working group, and our efforts to change or modify the language in a fruitless effort to achieve consensus were of no avail. A curious situation arose in which, while some representatives objected to our text as being too specific, others complained that it was too general and that its form was rather ineffective, as a result of its having been worded to accommodate objections that had been put forward. There was even a tremendous semantic discussion just on the way in which our proposal had been translated into English, perhaps without its being noted that the original text, which is the only one for which I can accept responsibility, had been submitted in Spanish, on the understanding that Spanish is still one of the official languages of the United Nations and has the same status as the other official languages.

559. In these circumstances we were in a dilemma. Either our proposal had to remain in square brackets and consequently not appear in the final draft resolution or, to please the opposition, it had to undergo a series of amendments both linguistic and substantive in nature and thus the resolution would become useless and superficial.

560. We opted for the first solution, and consequently requested that our original text should be maintained, since it was even then weaker and more general in nature than the first draft we had wanted to introduce. This implied at least that it would be included among the working papers for future consideration by the appropriate negotiating bodies.

561. The Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee promised us that that would be done. We therefore presume that the omission of our document from the final text is due to a simple oversight that will be remedied by the Secretariat so that it can be included in the official documentation of this session.

562. Despite the foregoing, I wish to associate myself with what has been said by the Secretary-General and the representatives who have already spoken, and to express my satisfaction and that of my Government at the fact that it has been possible to hold this tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted specifically to disarmament; and also at the fact that it has been possible, despite everything, to obtain some positive results. Among those results

are, in our view, the following two. First, all the States Members of the United Nations, through their heads of State or Government, their ministers for foreign affairs or their ambassadors, have concurred at least in expressing the urgent and vital need rapidly to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Secondly, the great Powers, the nuclear Powers, the countries producing and exporting arms have agreed that this item on disarmament should be dealt with in this world forum, and they have taken part in the discussions, with respect for the equality of all the Member States.

563. The impatient—and at times I include myself among them—will surely feel that much has been said and very little has been done. That is true, particularly in terms of immediately effective, specific achievements. But I believe that, despite these reservations, much that is important and positive has been said. Perhaps these have been mere words, but I think, as I said during the general debate, that in the final analysis the ability to speak is essentially what sets the human being apart and, throughout the centuries, it has been the driving force of history.

564. Here I wish to digress a moment to say how proud I am as a Latin American of the important participation in the debates of the community to which I belong—through the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, and his colleague Mr. García Robles.

565. As a Costa Rican I am very proud of Latin America's role in the adoption and entry into force of the first agreement to prohibit nuclear weapons in our region: the Treaty of Tlatelolco. I am proud also of the fact that the Final Document includes an essential reference to the Declaration of Ayacucho. These are two pieces of evidence of our good faith and positive contribution to the task of disarmament, with very specific reference to the problem of the prohibition of conventional weapons, which is one of the most immediate and dangerous features involved in the insane arms race.

566. In conclusion, I repeat my appeal to all the nuclear-weapon States to undertake, unreservedly and unconditionally, not to use nuclear weapons except in legitimate defence against a nuclear attack; to all States in general to heed the voice of their peoples and of all the peoples of the world, who are clamouring for peace, and, as an immediate guarantee of such peace, to achieve general and complete disarmament as soon as possible; to people everywhere to join with us in replacing distrust by good faith, fear by hope, and hate by love.

567. I have the right to make that appeal because I represent one of the only two or three disarmed nations of the earth. I have the right to do so, above all, because of my status as a human being, a member of the human race that is threatened with annihilation because of the insane arms race.

568. Mr. Andrew CONTEH (Sierra Leone): The Sierra Leone delegation would like to associate itself with the very warm words of felicitation expressed to you, Mr.

President, by our Secretary-General and by other representatives who have preceded us to this rostrum.

569. We should like also to thank most warmly the able Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and the co-ordinators of the drafting groups on work well done.

570. We fully appreciate that in a forum such as this one, in which an important and fundamental issue such as disarmament—an issue vital to the maintenance of international peace and security as a whole, and in particular to the interests of nations—has been discussed, our negotiations were bound to have been tedious and complex. Be that as it may, we have emerged with an historic document on disarmament.

571. If the document appears weak in some areas and not exhaustive in others, that is a clear indication of the state of affairs existing in the world today—that is, the unwillingness or inability of States to disarm. However, we feel sure that this should not deter us from our efforts and our determination to achieve the goal of universal and complete disarmament. We say this because we believe that this is the beginning of a long and protracted march that will eventually lead us to our desired goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

572. The fact that our negotiations have resulted in the adoption by consensus of a declaration on disarmament should in no way minimize their importance. We submit that in the practice of the United Nations a declaration is an official and solemn undertaking by Member States which they cannot wantonly disregard. We therefore allow ourselves to hope that this document will form the basis of an obligation to disarm.

573. We feel constrained, however, to end these brief remarks on a somewhat sombre note. We are referring to the lack of adequate provisions in the declaration on the question of the strengthening of international peace and confidence among States.

574. We are also of the view that sufficient attention has not been devoted to the issue of disarmament and economic development in the light of the new international economic order, despite the acknowledgement by all the participants in the general debate of the interdependence between disarmament and development.

575. Finally, we should like to place on record our sincere thanks and appreciation to the members of the Secretariat for the tremendous work that has been done during this entire session.

576. Mr. MUSSA (Somalia): I should like to associate my delegation with the well-deserved tribute to you, Mr. President, by all speakers and to express our gratitude to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and all the other officers. I wish also to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General.

577. My delegation wishes to address itself to paragraph

26 of the Final Document and specifically to the words “inviolability of international frontiers”. It is the understanding of the Somali delegation that those words pertain only to international frontiers which have been legally established and/or accepted by the parties concerned. I desire that the record of this session reflect the stand of my delegation on these words.

578. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker on the list.

579. I call on the representative of Cyprus, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

580. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I am sorry that it should be necessary, at the end of this positive session on disarmament, to reply to a most negative statement, but I propose to speak in a positive sense in the hope that positiveness may prevail over negativeness, conciliation over aggressiveness and peace in Cyprus over aggressive occupation by a foreign country.

581. The question of Cyprus is not an internal problem; it is an international problem. It is an international problem resulting from Turkey's continued aggressive occupation of Cyprus after it expelled the Greek-Cypriot majority population of the island in order to change the demography of Cyprus, which is a violation of the Charter and of the repeated resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

582. Of course, we cannot expect the representative of Turkey to come here and welcome the proposals for demilitarization of the island and peaceful development and conciliation. The policy of Turkey all along has been—for the purpose of changing the demography of and partitioning the island—to sever the good relations between the Greeks and the Turks of Cyprus. I quite understand what the representative of Turkey is doing, and I do not blame him; he is following the policy of his country. But I want to correct something that he said which is completely untrue.

583. He said that the submission of our letter to the Secretary-General is not in conformity with established procedure, that the content had not been communicated to the *Ad Hoc* Committee before it concluded its work and that up to this evening the document in question had not been circulated—in fact, that he knew nothing about it and only learned of it at 6 p.m. But the fact is that the very content of the letter was contained in my statement in the 13th meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on 23 June when the proposal was made verbatim. He ought to have been present because the whole membership of the United Nations was represented in the Committee, and he certainly ought to have known about it. So it is not ignorance of the matter that affects him, it is the substance of it—that it is positive for peace, conciliation, demilitarization. And of course demilitarization would mean that Turkey, since it is occupying Cyprus aggressively, would be involved.

584. First, however, I must correct another thing he said, that the demilitarization of Cyprus would involve the British bases. I would say to that that in the statement, demili-

tarization is confined to the Republic of Cyprus, therefore that part of what he said is not correct. Before he makes remarks he should try to be at least elementarily correct in what he says. That is the negative side. But we should look at the positive side, in spite of the fact that part of Cyprus is treated by Turkey as already annexed and is called the District of Mersin, the residents in their letters are forbidden to use the name of Cyprus and must write instead: Mersin, Turkey, and must use Turkish stamps. It is treated as completely annexed, to all intents and purposes, and of course the representative of Turkey does not want to have that annexed part connected with demilitarization.

585. As for all this about the consent of Denktash—Denktash is merely the instrument of Ankara. It is really a travesty but we do not want to end on this note; we want to end in a positive sense.

586. Therefore I should like to conclude by emphasizing the constructiveness of this special session as a first global step towards international security and disarmament. It promises much for the future, particularly having regard to the excellent declaration which came out of it, a document which is consistent with the Charter in every respect and gives a promise that the next special session on disarmament will deal with its implementation in an effective way through the assurance of international security.

587. The PRESIDENT: That concludes our consideration of agenda items 9 to 12.

588. We are now coming to the end of the tenth special session of the General Assembly. I should like to inform the Assembly that the Chairmen of the regional groups and the representative of the host country have agreed to dispense with the traditional statements at the closing of the session. For this I am most grateful.

Closing statement by the President

589. The PRESIDENT: The tenth special session of the General Assembly is drawing to a close. This has been the first such session devoted to disarmament in the eventful history of the United Nations, a history replete with a diversity of problems and emergencies. When we glance back over the road we have traversed, when we review the discussions and examine the barriers that we have surmounted while initiating and preparing this special session, and when we look back on the highly complex work performed during these five weeks we are impelled to ask ourselves such questions as: What have we accomplished? Have all these efforts produced results? Have we fulfilled all the expectations and hopes?

590. In retrospect, I think we can, with a sense of confidence, give positive replies to these questions. Not all of us may be fully satisfied with the deliberations and results of this special session. Although we may have expected more and may have wished to see more substantive results, this simply illustrates the fact that we have come to grips with one of the most complex issues in contemporary in-

ternational relations. Those relations are otherwise so very complicated and controversial that it is next to impossible to make a break-through and bring mankind into a state of full security and safety in a single special session of the General Assembly.

591. We have, nevertheless, achieved much on the road to creating a better and more secure world. This actually has been, first of all, the most representative gathering ever in the history of international relations devoted exclusively to questions of halting the arms race and opening new avenues for more active and effective negotiations on disarmament.

592. Furthermore, we have had a very important and productive general debate, which was held at the highest level ever of the international dialogue on disarmament. We have heard the full range of arguments and many invaluable proposals and suggestions about how and why the present untenable situation in the arms race should be ended, about the growing military expenditures and about keeping our footing on the dangerous brink of a global cataclysm, which, in terms of its frightening consequences, would have no comparison at all in the history of human civilization.

593. Our work, our debates and our negotiations have been followed with keen interest by people all over the world, especially by the many non-governmental organizations and movements that have rendered a great contribution to having the spiralling arms race in the world portrayed in its true light to the peoples of all countries. Tens of millions of persons have signed their names to appeals addressed to the United Nations, demanding effective action to ban this unpredictable and suicidal arms race. These petitions, which are deposited in the archives of the United Nations, illustrate in themselves the role which the United Nations plays in our times and the confidence which millions of ordinary people throughout the world have in the Organization.

594. With this special session we have once again returned the disarmament issues to the United Nations. The role of the United Nations in dealing with such a crucial problem has become irreplaceable. It has been demonstrated that the United Nations is the only forum in which, in spite of all difficulties of a political and negotiating nature, it is possible, on a footing of equality and with the participation of all concerned, to examine problems of great importance to some Powers with a special role and responsibility. These problems cannot be successfully solved only within the narrow circle of those Powers, a circle which is more often than not a vicious circle of rivalry, of distrust and, consequently, of increased stockpiling of weaponry.

595. The past weeks, especially these last days, have seen not only debate and discussion of new ideas and proposals but also intensive negotiations on all aspects of the present situation within the context of the arms race and its consequences. If to this we add the five sessions of the Preparatory Committee, then the tenth special session of the General Assembly represents the most intensive negoti-

ations ever held on disarmament, even though at the session itself it was not intended to reach international treaties or firm agreements. The whole process of preparing and holding this session has led to the most detailed assessment of the present situation and of the major course of action taken within the United Nations for the purpose of finding solutions to problems that have accumulated within the complex area of disarmament.

596. We have today adopted the Final Document, which is the product of very patient and, at times, arduous negotiations. In the process we have seen the most varied approaches presented with mutual respect for the positions of all the participants in this intensive process of accommodation. In the given situation, the document we have just adopted represents the broadest possible platform for further work and for additional efforts by the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

597. As is evident from the statements and the explanations given during today's and tonight's meeting of the General Assembly, all are not—nor can they be—satisfied with every section and paragraph of the Final Document. It was not possible to adopt a text that presented a clearer or more pertinent appraisal of the problems or more concrete proposals and recommendations, because of various objections or the accepted method of our work here, which is characterized by patient harmonization and decisions by consensus. Necessary and important concessions, especially during last-minute negotiations, were made by many participants in what I am impelled to describe as a truly monumental task.

598. I should like to thank from this rostrum all of those who, although defending their positions and often their own interests, made possible, in a spirit of mutual understanding, the adoption of this important document. It will, I am confident, represent a new chapter in the history of the work and activities of the world Organization.

599. I wish also to express my thanks to the sponsors of draft resolutions, especially to the 33 Powers that have submitted a draft resolution [A/S-10/AC.1/L.1/Rev.1] expressing the grave concern of this large group of countries over the problem they have presented for consideration, for not insisting on a vote. By acting thus, they have made an important contribution towards having the tenth special session end in an atmosphere of unanimity. This reflects the serious preoccupation of the entire international community with the crucial phase of the arms race and the indispensability of undertaking effective negotiations with a view to limiting and curbing it.

600. The assessments, measures and proposals contained in the 129 paragraphs of the Final Document represent, especially in some aspects, important new positions that have been harmonized in the United Nations. At the time when the initiative for convening the tenth special session was approved, and in the early phases of the preparations for it, there were certain elements in the international situation, especially in the relations between the great Powers, which offered great prospects for optimism and increased our expectations as to the ultimate outcome of the special

session. But neither the expected bilateral nor the multilateral agreements, which have been the subject of protracted negotiations, have been concluded. We had also expected to see the resumption of certain unilateral measures on the part of some countries, great Powers in particular, with respect to freezing and reducing military budgets, to halting the development and deployment of specific types of arms or the further refinement of highly destructive weapons, as well as certain action with respect to confidence-building measures among individual countries in sensitive aspects of the arms race. The deterioration in the international atmosphere which emerged could not but also affect adversely the results of this special session devoted exclusively to disarmament. This is especially so because the complex issue of disarmament is inseparable not only from the over-all situation in international relations but also from each particular international problem. Therefore, we hope that the tenth special session will also help in the surmounting of the present difficulties encountered in negotiations between individual Powers and that it will inject new life into the negotiation mechanism.

601. If it was not possible to conclude a second agreement on strategic arms limitation and the comprehensive test-ban treaty prior to the convening of the tenth special session, I am confident that these agreements will be concluded in the coming months, in the light of the major debate here and in the atmosphere of accommodation and negotiation which has characterized this session. These will undoubtedly represent additional important results of the great international dialogue in which we have all been participants here from 23 May to this early morning.

602. The strengthening of the machinery, and especially of a negotiating body which will facilitate further deliberation, harmonization and the conclusion of a number of measures aimed at disarmament, was the central focus of this session. The focus was evident in statements made by many distinguished world statesmen. It is obvious that only through negotiations will it be possible in the coming years to make a more significant and substantial breakthrough in all aspects of the complex problem of disarmament which appeared on our agenda. There is no doubt that the decisions in the Final Document relating to this matter represent very important and, I may say, historic achievements of this session. The role of the United Nations and of the General Assembly in dealing with disarmament problems has been strengthened. The United Nations Disarmament Commission, a deliberative body, will make possible the continuation in the future of the dialogue initiated at this special session. In a few years from now we shall have another special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, a session that will bring new decisions and measures. A negotiating body has been established which will work in the spirit of the proposals submitted during this session. The negotiating process will thus continue. Negotiations will be conducted on a number of measures in conformity with the decisions of the current session, and this negotiating body will become even more closely linked with the United Nations and its procedures. With respect to the agreement reached on the future of the negotiating body, I should like to state

for the record that it was reached on the understanding that the members of the existing negotiating body are members of the Committee on Disarmament.

603. Many proposals submitted to this special session on which it was not possible to agree for various reasons will be the subject of further deliberations and decision-making within the framework of the United Nations and the bodies established for this purpose at this special session.

604. All that we have achieved merits the full attention of the international community. If we have not lived up to the most optimistic expectations, and if we have not achieved even more important results, this should not be taken as a reason for disillusionment or disappointment. We did not, obviously, make a major break-through towards halting the arms race. We were not able to agree on new and meaningful disarmament measures. What we have not accomplished now, we shall accomplish later. What we have done is finally to chart a new course and open new channels for further negotiations.

605. All that we have done and achieved is due to the merit of all delegations that have worked with diligence towards the final success of this special session. We are especially indebted to the indefatigable Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, to all the officers of the Committee and, in particular, to the Chairman of working group A, Mr. Templeton of New Zealand, the Chairman of working group B, Mr. Jaroszek of Poland, as well as to the co-ordinator of the working groups, Mr. García Robles of Mexico. They have all made invaluable contributions to the successful harmonization of the Final Document and thereby to the successful conclusion of the special session.

606. I should also like to extend my thanks to all the Vice-Presidents of the General Assembly who shared with me the responsibilities in guiding this highly important but difficult session of the General Assembly.

607. The role, activity and dedicated work of the Secre-

tary-General, Mr. Waldheim, during this session is well known and appreciated by all of us. He has once again demonstrated his dynamism and dedication to the objectives of the world Organization. My thanks go to the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Buffum, and to all the other staff members of the Secretariat for their exemplary services during this session. I am especially indebted to the interpreters and other staff members who have facilitated the smooth running of the session, a session during which so many meetings of the working groups and other consultative bodies were held.

608. In a short time we shall part and assume new duties and engage in new activities. I hope that the experience that we have shared during the tenth special session will serve as an incentive to greater efforts and successes during the future sessions and activities of the United Nations. I wish you all *bon voyage* and a well-deserved vacation.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Minute of silent prayer or meditation

609. The PRESIDENT: I now invite representatives to stand and observe one minute of silent prayer or meditation.

The representatives stood in silence.

Closure of the tenth special session

610. The PRESIDENT: I declare closed the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose on Saturday, 1 July, at 2.30 a.m.