



Saturday, 10 July 1982,  
at 3.15 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

**AGENDA ITEMS 9 TO 14**

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

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

**Consideration and adoption of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament (concluded)**

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

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

**Measures to mobilize world public opinion in favour of disarmament (concluded):**

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

**Adoption, in an appropriate format, of the documents of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly (concluded)**

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): This afternoon the Assembly will continue to hear statements by representatives who wish to explain their positions or express reservations concerning the items before the Assembly.

2. Mr. RACZ (Hungary): It is my honour at this time to speak on behalf of a group of socialist countries.

3. On the occasion of the completion of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to

disarmament, the delegations of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics deem it necessary to make the following statement.

4. The joint approach of the socialist countries to the central tasks of the second special session is based on their conviction that it is necessary to adopt decisions which will, in practice, lead to the elimination of the threat of nuclear war and to a shift towards ending the arms race and towards disarmament, and can give a further impulse to negotiations on those questions.

5. In 1978, at the first special session on disarmament, the socialist countries contributed constructively to the elaboration and adoption of the objectives, principles and priorities of disarmament negotiations as well as a programme of action in the field of disarmament, as contained in the Final Document of that session [resolution S-10/2]. Over the last four years they have lived up to their commitments. In their preparations for the second special session, and at the session, the socialist countries continued to work for and contribute to the success of the session on the basis of the Final Document. They believed that the special session would offer a good opportunity for all States, regardless of size, military potential or geographical situation, to contribute actively to solving the problems of arms limitation and disarmament.

6. Given the deterioration of the international situation as a consequence of the escalation of the arms race by imperialist forces striving to achieve military superiority and the enunciation of the doctrine of a "limited nuclear war" and of other doctrines predicated on the use of nuclear weapons, the special session was faced with particularly urgent and important tasks, first and foremost, the task of adopting very urgent measures to prevent nuclear war.

7. The proposals with which the socialist countries came to the session were designed to achieve that particular task. The statement of the Soviet Union, contained in the message from the head of the Soviet State, L. I. Brezhnev [12th meeting], concerning the Soviet Union's unilateral commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, reflected its profound concern for the destiny of the world and the survival of civilization as well as its high sense of responsibility for ensuring lasting peace on earth. The socialist countries believe that the Soviet Union's decision should be followed by reciprocal steps by the other nuclear-weapon States. They are convinced that the acceptance by the other nuclear-weapon States of a

commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons would, in practice, be tantamount to a total ban on the use of nuclear weapons.

8. At this special session, the socialist countries submitted a set of constructive proposals aimed at strengthening peace, preserving détente, ending the arms race and promoting international co-operation. Their initiatives cover a wide range of top-priority issues relating to the curbing of the arms race and to disarmament, such as a nuclear disarmament programme, a ban on all nuclear-weapon tests, the prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon and the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. In that context the socialist countries have proposed a number of important new elements which take into account the views of other States and are aimed at achieving mutually acceptable agreements as soon as possible.

9. The socialist countries have strongly supported the intensification of the work in all international forums where negotiations on arms limitation and disarmament are or should be conducted. They have declared the interest of their Governments in resuming all the negotiations which have been broken off and their willingness to promote the successful completion of all such negotiations.

10. At this session, the socialist countries have advocated positions which respond to the aspirations of the overwhelming majority of countries. Throughout the session it has been confirmed that on the question of the prevention of nuclear war and on other key issues of disarmament, the positions of the socialist and non-aligned countries are identical or similar.

11. The session has shown that the question of the prevention of nuclear war is the focal point of attention of the General Assembly. It was considered extensively both in the general debate and in practically all the Working Groups, above all the special group established on the initiative of the socialist countries. There has been wide recognition of the need for urgent measures to remove the threat of nuclear war as well as to freeze and reduce nuclear arsenals and eventually eliminate them for good. Expressing the profound concern of the peoples of the world at the increased danger of nuclear war, the General Assembly has reaffirmed that the prevention of nuclear war remains the most acute and urgent task of the present time and urged all States to consider as soon as possible the proposals submitted during the session, designed to avoid nuclear catastrophe.

12. It has been impossible to take action on concrete measures of nuclear disarmament and other important matters because of the obstructionist position of the United States and some other countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*] which have blocked the adoption of decisions in sheer disregard of the demands of the peoples. The special session has proved that those countries have been guided not by concern for peace and the achievement of disarmament but by their intention to block decisions which would impede their policy aimed at a further arms buildup in order that they may be able to impose their wills on other countries and peoples from a position of superior military strength. They did not

make a single concrete proposal on the major questions of concern to the peoples of the world today. On the contrary, they tried everything to hinder business-like deliberations. That attitude, which is fraught with danger for the cause of peace, has been disavowed at this session by the overwhelming majority of delegations.

13. In present conditions, the cohesion and co-operation of all peace-loving forces assume ever greater importance. The socialist countries express their full solidarity with the anti-war movement of the popular masses which acquired unprecedented dimensions on the eve and during the course of the special session. That movement is a powerful force against the attempts of imperialist forces, which are bound to bring the world closer to a nuclear catastrophe. The unity of all peace-loving forces is a mighty factor for the triumph of the cause of peace.

14. The socialist countries are convinced that today the most urgent task is to stop the arms race immediately and to proceed without delay to measures of real disarmament, nuclear disarmament first of all. That task must be completed if military confrontation and the danger of war are to be eliminated, if the process of détente is to be maintained and strengthened, and if co-operation among countries is to be developed.

15. The socialist countries reaffirm once again their invariable willingness to enter into agreements for the limitation, reduction or prohibition of weapons of any kind on a just and reciprocal basis. This applies not only to nuclear weapons and all weapons of mass destruction but also to conventional armaments. They declare their full readiness to co-operate with every other country and with every people of goodwill in the world-wide struggle for peace and security.

16. That ends the joint statement of the countries I listed earlier.

17. I shall now speak briefly on behalf of the Hungarian delegation.

18. First of all, I take this opportunity to extend to the President, Mr. Kittani, our congratulations on the completion of the work of this special session. We also express our appreciation of the most valuable contributions to our deliberations made by Mr. Adeniji, Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee; by the chairmen of the three Working Groups, Mr. García Robles of Mexico, Mr. Sadleir of Australia and Mr. Herder of the German Democratic Republic; as well as by the co-ordinators of the drafting groups. Our appreciation goes equally to Mr. Ustinov, Under-Secretary-General of the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs; to Mr. Martenson, Assistant Secretary-General of the Centre for Disarmament; to Mr. Csillag, Secretary of the *Ad Hoc* Committee; and to all the members of the Secretariat who carried out their duties so efficiently at this special session.

19. The people of my country, having suffered the horrors of two world wars and having the strong wish to live in peace and security, fully recognize the most important task of our time—the avoidance of a nuclear war. This recognition has been formulated in the message which the Hungarian Peace Movement addressed to the special session:

“In our days the possibility of the outbreak of a nuclear war, the most devastating ever, looms over the peoples of our globe as a spectre of final destruction. At one with other peoples, we Hungarians want to prevent this from happening.” [A/S-12/AC.1/5, annex I.]

20. It was against that background that the Hungarian delegation, together with the delegations of the other socialist countries, approached the major issues of this special session. It was against that background that almost all delegations, as well as the representatives of non-governmental organizations—among them, Hungarians—and world public opinion welcomed the solemn commitment of the Soviet Union concerning the non-first-use of nuclear weapons.

21. The Hungarian delegation, like the great majority of delegations participating in this special session, spared no effort to bring about the necessary change in the present unfortunate trend of international affairs. It is very sad—indeed, it is highly alarming—that certain delegations have obstinately defied the wish and determination of the majority and even the popular masses of their own countries and stubbornly blocked every effort aimed at reaching agreement on the most burning questions. They may have succeeded in preventing this session from reaching any tangible results, but they will not, and they cannot, succeed in escaping world-wide criticism and condemnation for the role they have played. The power of those who stand for peace and disarmament will certainly prevail.

22. Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): After the joint statement made on behalf of the socialist countries, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic wishes to make the following statement.

23. The second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was an event in which the peoples of the world had placed great expectations on account of the deterioration in the international state of affairs. The demands of the world-wide peace movement have made an imprint on the session's discussions. During those discussions it became clear that the overwhelming majority of States were deeply concerned about world peace and therefore defined the elimination of the danger of nuclear war as the key issue of the present time and the main task of this special session. Numerous constructive proposals and concrete initiatives have outlined the road towards the elimination of the danger of nuclear war and the halting of the nuclear-arms race. In this way, distinct criteria have been established, against which the attitudes of each and every State towards the vital issues of mankind must be measured.

24. Like many other delegations, we deplore the fact that this session has not been able to agree upon a document stipulating concrete measures that would have answered the challenges of our time.

25. In a way, this session has been like a watershed, with the endeavours of the peace-loving peoples and States on the one side and the imperialist policies of confrontation and arms buildup, aggression and boycott on the other. When the results of this session are assessed, this must be spelt out with all sobriety and clarity: Simultaneously with this session, NATO convened a summit meeting at Bonn, capital of the

Federal Republic of Germany, to adopt new decisions accelerating NATO's long-term armaments programme, extending NATO's sphere of activities and endorsing the deployment of new United States medium-range missiles in Western Europe. A crusade was proclaimed against socialism and social progress in the world. It is self-evident that that course is in gross contradiction to the building of confidence among nations. At the same time, a military budget that has no precedent in history was adopted by the United States. The world knows of the decisions taken by that country's Administration to establish a special command for outer-space warfare and to aggravate the ongoing trade war against other States. It was during our deliberations here that Israel, with the direct support of the United States, sprang the fifth Middle East war and is now committing genocide against the Palestinian people. Is there anybody who does not see the direct connexion between those events and the obdurate resistance of the representatives of the United States and other NATO members by frustrating the consideration and preparation of and agreement on concrete measures to eliminate the danger of nuclear war, to halt the arms race and to achieve disarmament? What they were guided by were not the historic decisions of the first special session on disarmament but the doctrines of so-called nuclear deterrence and nuclear first strike, and their craving for military superiority. It is no wonder, therefore, that the representatives of those States prevented this session from adopting forward-oriented decisions.

26. The course of this session has re-emphasized that the peoples' struggle will continue to centre on the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war. Also, the required steps and measures to achieve that goal have already been outlined.

27. The pledge made by the Soviet Union under international law not to be the first to use nuclear weapons is undoubtedly the outstanding result of this special session. What we must achieve now is a similar commitment by all nuclear-weapon States.

28. The possibility and the task of working out a programme of nuclear disarmament have been emphasized by the memorandum of the Soviet Union entitled “Averting the growing nuclear threat and curbing the arms race” [A/S-12/AC.1/11 and Corr.1]. The new proposals by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics show the possibility of a breakthrough in the negotiations on the comprehensive prohibition of chemical weapons. Further concrete proposals to preserve peace and to halt the arms race have been submitted by other socialist countries, including the German Democratic Republic. The valuable proposals and initiatives that have been put forward by non-aligned countries testify to their authors' commitment to, and vital interest in, tangible actions for disarmament.

29. The work of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic at this session has been determined by the responsibility that my State derives from its history and geography. The German peace policy is never to allow another war to be unleashed from German soil. Europe and the world at large must not be allowed to perish in a nuclear holocaust. With that in mind, the German Democratic Republic has made efforts to contribute to the second special session on disarmament.

30. I should like to recall here the proposals and initiatives that have been put forward by the German Democratic Republic.

31. The message of Erich Honecker, Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, to the General Assembly at this session [A/S-12/AC.1/6] drew attention to the imperative necessity of halting the nuclear-arms race. We have proposed that negotiations be commenced without delay on the prohibition of the neutron weapon. We have reaffirmed our proposal to discontinue immediately the qualitative improvement of chemical weapons. This, specifically, means stopping the production, stockpiling and stationing of binary and other new types of chemical weapons. A further initiative of the German Democratic Republic has highlighted the pre-eminent responsibility and duty of all States to conduct, without pre-conditions, serious negotiations in good faith on arms limitation and disarmament.

32. From the rostrum at this session, my delegation wishes to reiterate its assurance that the foreign policy of the German Democratic Republic will continue to be devoted to the resolution of these urgent issues.

33. In conclusion, I wish to extend to the President the thanks and appreciation of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic for his able guidance of this second special session. We also wish to thank Mr. Adeniji, Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, for his dedicated work, as well as the chairmen of the Working Groups and their subsidiary bodies and all the staff of the Secretariat.

34. Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan): The second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is concluding on a sombre note. It is clear that the high hopes entertained by the peoples of the world have not been fulfilled. We have not succeeded in securing agreement on ways and means to enhance international security and to promote the vital goals of disarmament.

35. The Pakistan delegation participated actively and, we would like to think, constructively in the proceedings of this session. We were deeply committed to its success. We have to recognize with feelings of profound regret the failure of the session to live up to our expectations.

36. There can be no denying that the grave and deteriorating international situation has eroded the prospects of progress in the disarmament process. We cannot overlook the fact that the proceedings of this session coincided with the brazen Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the brutal suppression of the Palestinian liberation struggle. It must be stated again that the relentless pursuit by some great Powers of their strategic ambitions, manifested in their policies of intervention, occupation and hegemonism, places in doubt their overt commitment to the goals of peace, disarmament and a world order based on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Small and medium-sized countries like Pakistan have a vital stake in the establishment of such a world order.

37. This session has served as the focal point for the widespread expression of public concern about the arms race, and particularly about the danger of the

use of nuclear weapons. We hope that the massive public support for disarmament demonstrated all over the world in recent months will have an impact on policy makers, especially those of the major Powers. We have no doubt that the World Disarmament Campaign, launched at this session, will help to generate in all countries informed public opinion about the issues involved in the difficult search for disarmament.

38. In the present atmosphere of international crisis and confrontation it was fitting that concern about the danger of nuclear war should be expressed so widely and unequivocally at this session. The proposals for a complete prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, for a freeze of their development and production and for a comprehensive nuclear test ban, as elaborated in the draft resolutions submitted by India, Mexico and Sweden, reflect world public opinion. Pakistan would have liked to see the endorsement of these proposals by the General Assembly, as well as the two initiatives supported by non-aligned countries, that is, joint or individual declarations by the nuclear Powers not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and immediate and unconditional assurances to the non-aligned and other developing countries outside the major military alliances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

39. While our primary concern about the danger posed by nuclear weapons remains, there is also the growing accumulation of conventional arms, which act as the vehicle of the powerful States to advance their strategic ambitions and which continue to inflict tragedy and travail on vast sections of humanity. The enormous resources consumed in the accumulation of these means of death and destruction are also a grim reality that we cannot afford to ignore if we desire peace and progress.

40. Pakistan welcomes the unanimous reaffirmation by all States of their commitment to the priorities and provisions of the Final Document. The international disarmament strategy endorsed in the Final Document must be used to stimulate progress in the disarmament negotiations which are under way and in those which, it is hoped, will commence in the future.

41. It is important that all States, and especially the two leading Powers, enable the Committee on Disarmament, the single multilateral negotiating body, to discharge its responsibilities fully. We must resolve to open immediate and serious negotiations on a nuclear test-ban treaty in the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of the Committee that was established earlier this year. We must renew our endeavour in the Committee to reach early agreement on a comprehensive programme for disarmament. There is also the universal demand that the bilateral talks between the Soviet Union and the United States should be pursued in good faith and with a sense of urgency, and that they should lead to meaningful limitation and significant reductions in the strategic, intermediate and other nuclear weapons systems of the two countries.

42. In this nuclear age, disarmament is the pre-condition of survival. We must not allow despondency over our present differences to weaken our resolve to achieve the ultimate goal which we all accept. We are confident that, sooner rather than later, political,

economic and moral imperatives will compel all nations, large and small, to seek security through disarmament.

43. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): The Bulgarian delegation fully agrees with the statement just made by the representative of Hungary, as Chairman of the group of Eastern European States for the current month.

44. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria believes that this closing meeting must answer the question of whether the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has succeeded in carrying out its mandate, in helping to strengthen international peace and security through disarmament, first and foremost through measures designed to prevent the danger of a nuclear catastrophe.

45. This session has even greater importance because of the seriousness of the present international situation. Through their many spontaneous demonstrations the peoples of the world have categorically expressed their determination to support practical and effective efforts for peace and disarmament. The overwhelming majority of delegations, as well as the representatives of dozens of non-governmental organizations, have come out firmly in favour of urgent positive action to that end. Obviously, all that gave rise to great hope that the results of the session would meet the legitimate aspirations of peoples of the world. Hence the disappointment with the final results is even greater. It is entirely logical to wonder why such an important opportunity to strengthen international peace and security has been missed; why, on all sorts of pretexts, certain countries have made it impossible to take positive measures to ensure the cessation of the arms race and genuine disarmament, especially in the nuclear sphere.

46. The Bulgarian delegation, like the delegations from the other socialist countries, came to this session with a sincere desire to make a constructive contribution to the drafting of documents of substance.

47. The commitment entered into from this lofty rostrum by the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons [*12th meeting*] is a historic act which, unfortunately, has not been followed by similar acts by other nuclear Powers.

48. Among the initiatives of the socialist countries pride of place goes to the constructive ideas and proposals set out in the Soviet memorandum entitled "Averting the growing nuclear threat and curbing the arms race" [*A/S-12/AC.1/11 and Corr.1*]. Halting the arms race and strengthening peace: this was the goal of the proposals submitted by the countries of the socialist community. The proposals of several non-aligned countries had the same aim.

49. Unfortunately, the accomplishment of this rich and substantive programme of work was obstructed by those who found their policy on the power of nuclear weapons and whose military doctrines, based on the admissibility of the first use of nuclear weapons in a so-called limited nuclear war, threaten mankind with total nuclear conflagration. Full responsibility for the unsatisfactory results of the session falls on the shoulders of the leading circles in the

United States and their closest allies in NATO, who feel that the success of the session would prevent them from carrying out their policy of confrontation and over-armament for which they have opted, in order to ensure for themselves military superiority and world supremacy. They have not hesitated to strip the work of this session of its positive and practical value.

50. The results of this session highlight once again the urgent need to speed up the struggle for peace through disarmament and to hold serious negotiations aimed at developing real measures in this regard. At the present time special importance must be attached to the fact that the General Assembly has reaffirmed the validity of the Final Document of 1978 as well as the commitment entered into by all countries to ensure its practical implementation.

51. Acts and not words will now decide whether efforts aimed at reversing the trend towards confrontation and an unbridled arms race threatening international peace and security will be crowned with success. The People's Republic of Bulgaria, along with the other socialist countries and with all peace-loving States, will continue in the future to make every effort to help to strengthen international peace and security through disarmament.

52. Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh): On 17 June, Mr. Hussain Muhammad Ershad, head of the Government of Bangladesh, in his address to the General Assembly [*17th meeting*], expressed the hope that this special session would adopt a programme of action which, *inter alia*, would include a complete prohibition of the use and threat of use of force as a means of settling disputes and a joint or individual declaration by the nuclear-weapon States not to use nuclear weapons. He also called upon all nuclear-weapon States to refrain from the testing of nuclear weapons pending the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, and to provide the non-nuclear-weapon States and the neutral countries with negative security guarantees. My head of Government also called upon States to suspend the production, deployment and development of new chemical weapons pending the conclusion of a chemical-weapon treaty.

53. The policy of Bangladesh on disarmament is based on its Constitution, which commits it to the concept of general and complete disarmament. We came to this session prepared to take all possible concrete and tangible actions. It is unfortunate that despite all efforts the second special session has ended inconclusively.

54. We deeply regret that the second special session on disarmament could not take any final decision on the comprehensive programme of disarmament. While this is a time to take stock, and a time for some reflection with the benefit of hindsight, we should like to urge strongly all nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States to set out immediately to chart a concrete and definitive future course of action so as to ensure the early conclusion of the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

55. Simultaneously, we should make every effort to arrest the conventional arms race and promote the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and the meaningful implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. In this regard, the supportive role of non-

governmental organizations and research institutes is considered by my delegation to be a positive service.

56. We strongly believe that there should be checks on the indiscriminate sale of arms. The deleterious impact of the arms race on the world economy is all too well known. The close and organic relationship between disarmament and development is recognized by all. The economic and social consequences of the arms race are detrimental, and its continuation is totally incompatible with the implementation of the new international economic order. The resources released as a result of disarmament measures should be used for the improvement of the economic condition of all countries of the world, particularly the developing countries.

57. In order that the entire world community could play an active role in the disarmament process, all efforts should be made to strengthen the role of the United Nations and the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, including the multilateral disarmament machinery. As a mark of our continued and positive interest in disarmament matters, we have sought membership in the expanded Committee on Disarmament.

58. I am pleased to inform the Assembly that my country has decided to make a token contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign. We are making this pledge in view of the Secretary-General's report which emphasizes that the Campaign must be carried out in all regions of the world [A/S-12/27]. We should like the Secretary-General to launch a public-relations campaign in order to apprise the world of the deleterious impact of the unrestricted arms race.

59. The historic consensus embodied in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session was rooted, as has been rightly said, in the common and universal awareness that the unrestricted arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, constitutes a grave threat to the survival of mankind. The time has now come when all nations of the world, big and small, their political persuasion and identity notwithstanding, should join hands to ensure the survival of mankind and our good earth.

60. Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): Representing a country which genuinely cares about the fate of the world and mankind, my delegation intervenes to offer its assessment of this second special session on disarmament and of prospects for future success with disarmament.

61. It may be said that, in the final analysis, the first special session on disarmament and its Final Document were a declaration of intent and of the requirements for a disarmed world. This second special session on disarmament should be seen as an attempt to move from declaratory pronouncements to practical, concrete steps for disarmament at every level: national, regional, bloc and global.

62. This exercise has forced the United Nations to grapple with reality. Yet my delegation is compelled to observe that there is a reluctance on the part of Member States to face this reality squarely and fully. My delegation wishes to emphasize this indictment, because the degree to which each State represented here commits itself to a full and honest recognition

of this reality determines the ultimate and lasting success of the proceedings of this session and of related disarmament efforts in other forums.

63. What is this reality? In my delegation's view, this reality is characterized by three essential, inter-related aspects. The first is the political stance of militarily significant States and of those aspiring to be which regard the consequences—economic and humanitarian—of arms possession, trade and use as of less practical and immediate importance than the gains they have accrued or hope to accrue from continuing their politico-military policies. The second is the reaction and stance—primarily in the realm of verbal demands and exhortations—of the majority, that is, the non-militarily significant States, concerning the policies and actions of the minority, that is, the militarily significant States. The third and final aspect is the present division of the major actors in the quest for a disarmed world which pits the super-Power and nuclear-weapon States against the non-aligned and neutral States—a somewhat false division, in the view of my delegation, which masks the more significant dichotomy and divergence of interests for a disarmed world, that is, militarily significant versus non-militarily significant States.

64. My delegation holds this view because, owing to the recognized and immediate power and leverage which the status of "militarily significant" gives a State, any blurring of this view of military significance and of the attendant responsibilities for contributing to a disarmed world will seal the negative fate of effective disarmament undertakings. Therefore, my delegation submits that until States, particularly the majority, the non-militarily significant States, recognize and accept this truth and desist from a *de facto* policy of general acquiescence to the policies of the minority, the militarily significant States, there will be no genuine acts of disarmament.

65. Let me emphasize here that my delegation is not advocating any abandonment of achievements so far, especially that enshrined in the Final Document; rather, it appeals to and challenges all States to truly shoulder their responsibilities for disarmament without recourse to lame excuses, blame-casting or delaying tactics.

66. To be a little more specific, while the priorities established in the Final Document should not and must not be disregarded, there ought to be complementary concrete efforts at solving concomitant problems and differences regarding the process of disarmament which have been re-emphasized at this session, particularly among the nuclear-weapon States and militarily significant States.

67. For example, together with negotiations on nuclear disarmament measures, there should be time-limited negotiations for the limitation and gradual reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons within the framework of progress towards general and complete disarmament, bearing in mind that States with the largest military arsenals have a special responsibility in pursuing the process of conventional-armament reductions.

68. Additionally, and no less important, non-militarily significant States have a role to play in that, at the same time, they should be actively exploring

initiatives—and I say here that the Charter of the United Nations provides ample mechanisms and procedures—to ensure that the lowest possible level of armaments will characterize not only their national defence systems but also those of their regions. Such action by non-militarily significant States is no longer an option; it is an imperative. For it is only by such complementary action and commitment by non-militarily significant States that militarily significant States, blinkered and bound by their individual and collective vested interests, will think twice about maintaining the political doctrines which inflate their legitimate security needs and, in turn, lead to arms escalation, arms transferrals and use and threat of use of arms, all of which increase international tensions and, in many instances, influence decisions to engage in and exacerbate international conflicts.

69. As a first concrete step in the direction of significant modalities for genuine disarmament, “political balance” in the membership of the Committee on Disarmament should be reinterpreted as a balance within the framework of equitable geographical distribution between “militarily significant” and “non-militarily significant” States, instead of what seems to be the present composition: “nuclear-weapon”, “militarily significant”, “non-aligned” and “neutral-balance”.

70. My delegation makes that proposal because, as indicated, nuclear-weapon States, in particular, and militarily significant States have become victims of their own security and political strategies. It appears that unwittingly they have exchanged immediate power and influential gains for future powerlessness, as there is always the risk, owing to the fact of possession, that their carefully planned checks and balances—against the use of nuclear arsenals, in particular—will fail.

71. Thus, the real challenge of disarmament is to the non-militarily significant States, which at present, by and large, have less to lose from renouncing arms, particularly nuclear arms, and all to gain for themselves and for militarily significant States by so doing. That is the assessment of my delegation of the exercise we have just completed, and of its contributions to what it considers to be the indispensable elements for future success in this very critical endeavour which we all here are undertaking on behalf of the peoples of the world.

72. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The Romanian delegation shares the sentiments of deep disappointment expressed by a great number of delegations over the outcome of this special session.

73. As we stated at the beginning, the Assembly was called upon to make an effective contribution at this session towards averting the particularly serious danger that the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, poses to world peace and security and to the very existence of human civilization, and an effective contribution to the elimination of the increasingly heavy burden imposed upon all States by gigantic military expenditures.

74. The fact that this special session was unable to complete and adopt a comprehensive programme of

disarmament means that it has failed to achieve the central objective for which we gathered together here. My country has always considered that such a programme—which should encompass all the measures to be negotiated within the framework of a sustained disarmament process, carried out with foresight and leading finally to general and complete disarmament—would make it possible to co-ordinate the efforts of all States to reduce and eliminate the tools of nuclear war and of war in general, thus responding to the vital interests of all States, nuclear and non-nuclear, large and small, developed and developing.

75. Unfortunately, the sustained efforts of numerous delegations, particularly the non-aligned and other small and medium-sized countries, to formulate a generally acceptable substantive programme have not yielded the positive results demanded by the seriousness of the current international situation, and to keep pace with the hopes with which the peoples of the world awaited and followed the proceedings of this special session.

76. The large demonstrations that took place throughout the world before and during the special session, the participation of representatives of world public opinion in the discussions at this session, and the numerous messages and appeals addressed to the session have all demonstrated what the people of the world expect from their leaders and Governments. Faced with the fundamental choice of our time—between the path of co-operation and international understanding and the path of weapons—peoples of all countries have resolutely opted for a policy of peace, disarmament and strict respect by all States for the fundamental principles of the United Nations.

77. That is why the basic objective of this session—putting an end to the arms race and effecting real progress towards disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament—remains an ever more pressing issue on our agenda. It is made essential by the very facts of international life. Now more than ever, the crucial problem for mankind is peace or war. Now more than ever, the solution of this problem requires firm, concerted action on the part of all States and all political factions.

78. In that connexion, primary responsibility falls upon nuclear-weapon and other heavily armed States. As the head of the Romanian delegation stated during the general debate [22nd meeting], the most urgent requirement of our time is to unite the efforts of all nations in order to halt the dangerous developments towards confrontation and war, to renounce completely the use and threat of force and to support a policy of détente and respect for national sovereignty and independence, as well as to evince political will and contribute constructively to the immediate cessation of the arms race and to the intensification of negotiations aimed at achieving concrete and meaningful disarmament measures.

79. The large number of proposals that have been submitted to this session of the General Assembly underscore the profound interest of the international community in effecting a radical change in the international situation in that direction. The debates have overwhelmingly confirmed the general opinion that the continued accumulation of weapons—particularly

nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction—will not lead to true security or to the establishment of a climate of mutual trust which is indispensable for world peace. Quite the contrary, the perpetuation of fierce military competition, far from serving the security interests of States, can only further damage the international situation, increase the dangers of war—in particular, nuclear war—and make any serious negotiations on disarmament even more difficult.

80. The Romanian delegation would like to join the delegations of other countries which have stated their determination to act to ensure the implementation of the objectives and priorities set out in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session and the strengthening of the central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

81. As has been stressed in the document entitled "Considerations of the Grand National Assembly, of the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae Ceaușescu" [A/S-12/AC.1/24, annex], which has been circulated as an official document of this session—and which expresses the firm determination of the Romanian people, a determination also manifested by the millions of signatures affixed to the Appeal addressed to the Assembly at this session [A/S-12/AC.1/14, annex]—we consider that to achieve these objectives it is necessary first of all to stop the production of nuclear weapons and to start the gradual reduction of the existing stockpiles till their complete liquidation, and to ban for ever all nuclear weapons, as well as the other weapons of mass destruction. Of particular importance would be the undertaking by all nuclear-weapon States of the firm commitment not to be the first to use such weapons.

82. It is imperative that we proceed, through the common efforts of all States, to the freeze and reduction of the gigantic military expenditures, to the adoption of effective measures for the substantial reduction of conventional weapons, to confidence-building and disarmament measures, above all in Europe, to the complete renunciation of all acts of force and threats of force, and to the settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means exclusively.

83. The report that we have adopted today, as well as the agreement reached on the World Disarmament Campaign—an agreement to which the Romanian delegation, along with other delegations, made an active contribution—provides a basis for the continuation and, above all, the intensification of efforts aimed at halting the dangerous arms race and at negotiating effective measures for disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament.

84. We express the hope that because of this session all countries will step up their efforts so that such measures can be negotiated without further delay.

85. We hope that a new spirit of co-operation will prevail in the coming disarmament negotiations, and I should like to reaffirm my country's determination to make an active contribution to efforts to achieve real progress towards a world without weapons and to safeguard man's fundamental right to peace, life and freedom.

86. In conclusion, I should like to express our thanks to Mr. Adeniji, to the chairmen of all the Working

Groups, and to all those who have assisted us in our work.

87. Mr. MARTYNENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): As the General Assembly takes stock of its work at this final meeting of the second special session devoted to disarmament, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR would like to point out that the overwhelming majority of delegations and of the representatives of the world public have expressed, from this rostrum, very serious concern and alarm over the prospects for peace in conditions of growing international tension and given the increasing threat of nuclear war and the continuing arms race.

88. That concern and alarm reflect as never before the basic truth that in the present situation there is no more important and urgent task for States than the elaboration and adoption of specific and effective measures aimed at preventing nuclear war, curbing the arms race and strengthening international peace and security for all peoples.

89. In our view—and not in our view alone—this session should have given a new impetus to the search for a solution to this important and urgent problem. The events of the session have shown that the overwhelming majority of delegations and the representatives of non-governmental organizations have worked actively for the adoption at this session of urgent measures to eliminate the threat of nuclear war and to end the arms race.

90. The delegations of socialist and developing countries made every effort to enable the session to achieve tangible results, to be a step forward in comparison with the first special session on disarmament and to adopt documents containing specific recommendations on substantive items of disarmament. They put forward a whole range of ideas and constructive proposals designed to improve the international climate, to curtail the arms race and to reduce the threat of nuclear war.

91. That was precisely the purpose of the message sent by L. I. Brezhnev to the Assembly at this session [12th meeting], which contained a statement on the non-first-use by the Soviet Union of nuclear weapons. It was emphasized by many that this unilateral undertaking by the Soviet Union was an extremely important step aimed at preventing a nuclear catastrophe and at strengthening trust and relations among States. We continue to hope that other nuclear Powers will respond to that display of goodwill by the Soviet Union and will follow its example.

92. Important and concrete proposals are also to be found in the memorandum entitled "Averting the growing nuclear threat and curbing the arms race" [A/S-12/AC.1/11 and Corr.1, annex], which proposes specific steps for maintaining peace on earth and amounts to a broad, stage-by-stage programme of disarmament.

93. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR has always emphasized, and feels compelled to emphasize today, that one of the most vital and urgent issues is the prohibition of chemical weapons. The Soviet Union submitted a draft international convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction

[A/S-12/AC.1/12 and Corr.1, annex]. The draft convention contains concrete proposals aimed at the elimination of that weapon of mass destruction and could form a good basis for negotiations.

94. The delegations of the socialist States have been extremely active in the drafting of generally acceptable documents at this session. We have been guided in our work by the idea that the documents of this session should contain provisions with their primary emphasis on the most important and urgent key issues of disarmament. This could be a catalyst for further efforts by States in the cause of disarmament.

5. However, in spite of the efforts made by delegations truly interested in this session's becoming a new landmark in the effort to halt the arms race and to achieve disarmament, the session, as we must note with regret, has not managed to achieve the expected results. We fully share the concern and alarm expressed in this connexion by representatives of non-aligned countries.

96. The reason for this state of affairs is the position taken by a number of countries. Those countries have from the very outset based their attitudes on well-known doctrines regarding the use of nuclear weapons. They have attempted to revise the priorities agreed on at the first special session. They have attempted to deflect this session from the solution of the most urgent problems and to focus its attention on secondary issues. Those States are well known: they are the United States and its allies in NATO. They clearly did not wish to show political will to achieve an agreement. Furthermore, they have caused the blocking of proposed measures in the field of disarmament; their obstructionist approach made it impossible for this session to achieve mutually acceptable solutions to substantive disarmament issues.

97. The statement made today by the representative of the United States of America showed this once again. It was just another attempt to justify Washington's policy of confrontation and of a spiralling arms race.

98. Nevertheless, we should like to express the hope that the efforts of the socialist and non-aligned countries made at this session, along with their initiatives and concrete proposals, will still have a positive impact on the arms limitation and disarmament process, and that they will help to reverse the arms race and to achieve solutions to the most important problems of our time, eliminating the threat of nuclear war and ensuring peace.

99. We also hope that all States will adopt a constructive attitude towards the contents of the report adopted today [A/S-12/32], that is, the appeal by the General Assembly to consider on an urgent basis existing proposals designed to prevent a nuclear war.

100. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): We all share a profound feeling of sorrow at the failure of the second special session on disarmament to meet the hopes that had been pinned on it, and particularly at the failure to agree on a comprehensive programme of disarmament that would serve as the cornerstone of the global endeavour and commitment to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

101. However, the phase through which the world has been passing and the strained international situation resulting from constant disregard of international order inevitably led us to this deplorable outcome. It is true that the strained international situation makes it necessary now more than ever before to achieve concrete progress in the field of disarmament. Meanwhile, however, agreement on disarmament measures requires confidence, which is lacking, and an international situation that provides the proper framework for that purpose.

102. Notwithstanding this failure and the present international situation, we must consider matters objectively on the following basis. First, despair regarding any aspect of international endeavour must be avoided. Let us start afresh. May the current efforts be continued. The path of disarmament is long and wide.

103. Secondly, the role of the United Nations must be promoted by enhancing the negotiating functions of the Committee on Disarmament and the deliberative functions of the Disarmament Commission and the First Committee of the General Assembly, as well as the scientific role of the groups of experts and the coordinating role of the Centre for Disarmament.

104. Thirdly, the comprehensive programme of disarmament must remain on our agenda. The Committee on Disarmament should therefore continue its consideration of this item in the light of the amendments, additions and viewpoints put forward at this session, so that it may present to the General Assembly a programme for adoption at its thirty-eighth session. When that has been done, immediate steps for the implementation of the programme must follow.

105. Fourthly, there must be support for the ongoing negotiations between the two super-Powers on the reduction of their nuclear arsenals and for the negotiations regarding the military situation in Europe.

106. Fifthly, an appeal must be made to all States and peoples, especially the nuclear Powers, to recognize that if the immediate and long-term disarmament objectives are to be achieved, every State must bear in mind the impact its policy may have on world peace and security. This entails a commitment not to use force in international relations by means of either conventional or nuclear weapons. This must be a general commitment that cannot be used by one party to the detriment of another.

*The President took the Chair.*

107. In conclusion I wish to pay tribute to all those who have contributed to the efforts made during the session: the representatives, the Secretariat and the governmental and non-governmental organizations. The spirit that has prevailed throughout this session is a glowing landmark on the path of international endeavour for disarmament. This gives cause for optimism and we hope that general and complete disarmament will be achieved in the near future.

108. Mr. KANG Maozhao (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The second special session on disarmament is drawing to a close.

109. Just over four weeks ago we gathered here amidst the high expectations of the peoples of the world. Our task was to exchange views on the question

of disarmament, which is of common concern to all, and to explore seriously ways and means to disarmament so as to make our due contribution to progress on this major international question. Though we have held many meetings of the Assembly and the Special Committee, it is regrettable that we have failed to produce any comprehensive disarmament programme which was acceptable to all. We have even failed to reach a consensus in our review of the implementation of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session.

110. The Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session, which was produced with tremendous difficulties, is more a reflection of the highly complex and difficult situation faced by disarmament than of any modest progress on this matter. That is because this Document before us is far less comprehensive and explicit than the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session. One has reason to be dissatisfied and disappointed with this result. What is the main cause of such a situation? This is something one must consider seriously.

111. A clear trend emerged in the course of the general debate and the extensive consultations in the Working Groups during this session, and that is that an increasing number of countries have underscored more than ever before the point that States possessing the largest military arsenals bear a special responsibility for disarmament and should assume an obligation to take the lead in substantially reducing their armaments. Contrary to this, however, one has seen that the States possessing the largest arsenals have resorted to every possible means inside and outside the session to dodge their responsibility and have raised extraneous issues to obstruct the necessary agreement. Some countries are clearly going all out in a massive arms race, yet they try to convince us that this is necessary and justified. Some countries are extremely sensitive to words like aggression, intervention and occupation, and would like no reference made to them in the document, although they cannot deny their actual deeds. In order to conceal their misdeeds, they have even tried hard to skip certain points and words in the document which they had accepted in previous documents. This therefore is the underlying reason why disarmament could not make headway and the current session has failed to achieve any substantive result.

112. The outcome of this session has once again proved that disarmament and international security are inseparable. Since the first special session on disarmament, the arms race has been intensified, the international situation has deteriorated and the danger of nuclear war has increased. Several wars of aggression by conventional arms have taken place. This change in the international situation certainly has an impact on and creates resistance to disarmament. In the past few years we have often heard debate as to whether disarmament enhances international security or international security promotes disarmament—very much like the debate about which came first, the chicken or the egg. It should be clear by now that disarmament can hardly make progress in circumstances in which international security is constantly breached and the hegemonists and aggressors refuse to renounce their designs.

113. The Chinese delegation came here in good faith. In his address at this session [8th meeting], our Foreign Minister, Mr. Huang Hua, expounded the position of principle of the Chinese Government and put forward concrete proposals for disarmament. China is a nuclear State, but we declared as far back as 18 years ago that China would never be the first to use nuclear weapons and would not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States in any circumstances. We hold that the States possessing the biggest nuclear arsenals should take the lead in reducing their nuclear weapons. We are ready to assume appropriate obligations with other nuclear States through negotiations. China's intention and position regarding disarmament are consistent, irrespective of the result of international disarmament conferences. Although the task of disarmament is a difficult one, we are willing to work unceasingly towards this end with other countries and peoples of the world.

114. In conclusion, I wish to extend our thanks to you, Mr. President, and to the members of the Secretariat for the meticulous arrangements made for the session. I also wish to pay a richly deserved tribute to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Adeniji, and his colleagues, who have worked so diligently and exerted their utmost efforts under very difficult conditions. We are impressed by their enthusiasm for disarmament and their untiring spirit in constantly overcoming obstacles and pressing forward along a bumpy path.

115. Mr. DE LA GORCE (France) (*interpretation from French*): Since the representative of Belgium spoke on behalf of the countries of the European Community, he expressed views which are shared by the French delegation. We should merely like to add a few brief comments.

116. The French delegation undoubtedly shares the feeling of disappointment which many among us have expressed. However, it is not really surprised by the obviously limited results of our session. Their inadequacy has various causes which should be carefully studied if, as we earnestly hope, we all wish to ensure that future special sessions of the General Assembly have a better chance of success and that we make progress towards disarmament under the auspices of the United Nations.

117. First of all, as has been frequently repeated, the circumstances were not the most favourable. The international situation has certainly deteriorated since 1978; the sense of security and the confidence necessary for any progress in the sphere of disarmament have obviously been affected. The anxiety we feel and the disappointing results recorded in negotiations have influenced our discussions.

118. Moreover, the necessary conditions certainly did not exist for any decisions on the comprehensive programme of disarmament, the chief objective of the session for many of us. We lacked the time and also perhaps the will to find and agree to formulas flexible enough to offer certain options. Experience has once again shown that it is impossible to set a deadline for the conclusion of negotiations.

119. It has also shown that as far as disarmament is concerned it is impossible to make progress without

taking into consideration the security needs of States. Those among them that are called to enter into negotiations, within the context of the long-term programme that we wish to establish, cannot be bound to accept within the context of that programme provisions that run counter to those needs, because it is they, and not others, that bear the responsibility for the commitments they enter into.

120. We were also to draw up a balance sheet of the efforts made to implement the recommendations in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session. We were unable to reach agreement on the terms of a document. In order to do so it would have been necessary to continue our consideration on the dual bases of the Programme of Action adopted in 1978, on the one hand, and the results achieved, on the other.

121. We could not go beyond that and introduce at this time principles and objectives which had not been previously agreed and which might affect the balance of the Final Document and the comprehensive approach embodied in it.

122. Even before we had to resign ourselves to not being able to agree on the two principal items on our agenda, the chances of success seemed doubtful. There was therefore a temptation to change the focus of the session and to give it as a priority, if indeed not a unique topic, the prevention of nuclear war. In our view, this objective cannot be isolated or dissociated from other objectives that are naturally connected with it—the prevention of war itself and the maintenance of security and the balances which in some situations must guarantee it. In this connexion, a commitment concerning the non-use of nuclear weapons would constitute a factor of destabilization in one region of the world and hence a serious threat to security and, in the final analysis, to peace.

123. In spite of the failures I have just described, this session had some positive aspects. The general debate was of outstanding quality and the statements made, often by heads of State or Government or ministers for foreign affairs, were an extremely interesting contribution to the consideration of disarmament and security problems. They expressed with great authority the concerns and the hopes of nations.

124. Furthermore, in the course of this session, and in difficult circumstances, we have been able to maintain and to preserve the achievements inherited from the first special session: the Final Document of 1978, which was solemnly reaffirmed; the institutional system embodied in it; and, in particular, the General Assembly, at its special sessions on disarmament, deciding by consensus—which is indeed the very condition of their authority.

125. Finally, we have reaffirmed our determination to pursue the endeavour begun four years ago. In this connexion, the prospects are good: the resumption of bilateral talks on nuclear questions; the resumption of negotiations at Madrid on the mandate for a conference on confidence-building measures and disarmament in Europe; the resumption of its work by the Committee on Disarmament, with the hope that progress will be achieved, in particular with regard to chemical weapons.

126. My country will contribute whole-heartedly to those efforts. Our delegation submitted several proposals here designed to strengthen United Nations action, particularly in the institutional sphere and in the area of verification. It will revert to those proposals at the Assembly's forthcoming session.

127. My country will resolutely continue the work begun four years ago, for that work will go forward if we are all able to learn from the difficult experience we have just shared.

128. I should not like to conclude without expressing the French delegation's thanks to Mr. Adeniji, who has made a particularly valuable contribution to our work and has guided our efforts towards an honourable and acceptable outcome of our discussions. I should, of course, also like to express our gratitude to all those who, throughout this special session, have contributed to our efforts.

129. Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): I can be brief, since the representative of Belgium has already expressed the views of the 10 member States of the European Community, including my own. It gives me great pleasure to express my Government's gratitude to Mr. Adeniji, who, under your leadership, Mr. President, presided over our deliberations in the *Ad Hoc* Committee. We have all benefited from his calm, his sense of realism and his wisdom. Without his great experience and dedication, we would have been unable to complete the report of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly.

130. My Government joins the consensus on this report, although we had hoped for a more substantial and concrete outcome of this session. The report rightly dwells upon the close relationship between the international situation and progress in disarmament, and it makes reference to the inalienable right to self-determination and independence of peoples. In the view of my Government, Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations endows this right with a universal character, making it applicable to all peoples. The reference in paragraph 60 of the report cannot, therefore, be construed as a restriction of this right.

131. We realize that the expectations we have brought to this session have in large measure remained unfulfilled. We set our sights high, and we now know that we were too ambitious. Time was too short to cope with the vast array of issues. But we cannot allow resignation and disappointment to determine the outcome of this special session. We must—and I know we will—continue to work for the achievement of the objectives that have brought us together for the last five weeks.

132. All of us have learned more about each other's security perceptions and about each other's hopes for disarmament and arms control. We have built upon and confirmed the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, and we have ensured the continuity of the dialogue between ourselves. We must now look to the future.

133. The report of this session underlines the fact that peace is our highest aspiration and that the prevention of war is the most fundamental objective of disarmament and arms control. Our countries and our Governments must dedicate themselves to the

prevention of war in all its aspects, conventional and nuclear. We must ensure that none of our weapons will ever be used except in defence against armed attack.

134. In his speech before this session [10th meeting], Chancellor Schmidt reported on the results of the meeting held at Bonn of the heads of State and Government of NATO and called attention to the arms-control elements contained in the programme for peace and freedom adopted by the Bonn conference. We note with deep satisfaction that the strategic arms reduction talks began on 29 June, that negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces [INF] are under way at Geneva, and that two days ago a new Western initiative was presented at the mutual and balanced force reduction talks at Vienna.

135. With respect to the INF negotiations, we hope that the objective pursued by the United States, namely, the total elimination of the land-based longer-range INF missiles of the Soviet Union and the United States, can be achieved. In November of this year, at the follow-up meeting at Madrid of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, efforts will resume to reach agreement, as an integral part of a balanced outcome, on a mandate for a conference on confidence- and security-building measures covering all of Europe. These negotiations cover all aspects of the military relationship between West and East. We are confident that every effort will be made to achieve concrete results. We have reason to hope that we have now set the stage for the achievement of a stable military balance at the lowest possible level.

136. In his speech Chancellor Schmidt also outlined the principles that, in the view of my Government, should govern global disarmament and arms control. He stressed the need for more openness and calculability of military potentials and actions, for concrete confidence-building measures and for verification. In an effort to promote those goals, my delegation submitted to this session working papers on confidence-building measures and on the problem of verification of a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons. We hope that those papers will, with others, prove to be useful to future deliberations in the United Nations and to negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament. In this context, Chancellor Schmidt has announced as a practical contribution to disarmament and arms control the holding of two conferences, the first, a seminar on confidence-building measures, and the other, a second international workshop on verification in connexion with a chemical-weapons ban, both scheduled to take place in 1983 in the Federal Republic of Germany. Invitations to those events will be sent out shortly.

137. It is of the greatest importance that we do not leave this session in disappointment and frustration. The goodwill and moral inspiration that have been brought to this session must not be lost. We are all asked to contribute to the cause of disarmament and arms control and to the achievement of substantial agreements in this field, in a concrete and constructive manner, and thus to do our share in the process of strengthening peace and security in our respective regions and in the world as a whole.

138. Mr. SADLEIR (Australia): The second special session on disarmament ends today with little in the way of tangible achievement. The hopes held for this session since a date was set for it nearly four years ago remain unfulfilled. Compared with 1978 the world is more heavily armed and a more risky place in which to live. It is not least for that reason that the Australian delegation regrets very much that the efforts of so many delegations at disarmament diplomacy and negotiation have produced so few results. We should not, however, in any end-of-session chagrin, be unduly despondent. Thus it is that in this short statement I seek to draw from our experience of the last few weeks.

139. It is, first, self-evident that disarmament does not operate in a political vacuum. All delegations have addressed their task at this session sharply conscious of the situation in the world around us. Four years ago something of a peak in international confidence existed. That confidence has since been severely shaken. On all sides the will to negotiate has become hesitant. A major casualty of these changes has been disarmament. That is inevitable since it goes to the heart of the national security of States. Recognition of this fact is essential if progress in disarmament is to be made. The root causes of the problem need to be addressed and a climate of confidence restored.

140. Secondly, the institutional framework so essential to the process of confidence-building already exists. The United Nations, with its Charter and its subsidiary bodies, can and must continue to play a central role in disarmament matters. We have failed the United Nations in several ways in recent years. It has not, contrary I suspect to widely held views, failed us. We need to support and strengthen the United Nations as a body in every possible way. It is the essential bridge between the hopes of States and of the peoples of the world and the realization of those hopes.

141. Thirdly, the process of restoring confidence and turning our hopes for disarmament into actual measures requires a hard-headed, calculated and practical approach. There is a role for rhetoric in general debate which can lift our eyes to the horizon, but it is a limited role. The path to disarmament must be trod, step by heavy step. There is no other way. There are no short cuts. It will not help, for example, if we promote draft resolutions which stand no chance of success. It does not help, for example, if we make political point-scoring a first priority or if we forgo partial measures in the hope that general and complete disarmament is at hand.

142. In practical terms let me translate this into some recommendations. In the area of nuclear disarmament, we should give full support to the various bilateral talks between the super-Powers. The Committee on Disarmament needs to have a good hard look, at an early date, at what it should foster in the area of nuclear disarmament. On a nuclear-test ban, the Committee on Disarmament should seize with both hands the opportunity presented by the agreement to set up a working group. As to a ban on chemical weapons, I see no reason why this cannot become a success for the Committee on Disarmament. As to radiological weapons, we have no doubt that a treaty

is achievable, though new approaches may be needed. These should be soberly examined. The issue of negative security assurances may need to be temporarily downgraded in the Committee's priorities.

143. The comprehensive programme of disarmament should be carefully reviewed now that the pressure of the second special session has been lifted. The concept of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, I should stress, remains fully valid. On outer space, the opportunities for serious multilateral work remain. Conventional disarmament is an area that calls for much more serious attention than it has so far been given.

144. The international disarmament agenda needs careful scrutiny. The annual inflation rate in the First Committee must be halted and reversed. The principle of consensus as a basis for real disarmament needs to be reaffirmed and enhanced. Voting, which highlights division, should as a matter of principle be condemned as harmful.

145. The disarmament institutions, including both the Committee on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission, should be strengthened. This may involve budgetary questions, but most of all it involves political will.

146. It is on that note that I come to an end. It cannot be denied that in recent years the political will to make disarmament work has been lacking. We must develop and nurture such a will. Knowing what we know and fully appreciating the political context, the validity of the institutions, the difficulty of the task and the practical issues on our agenda that call for attention, we should neither lose heart nor oversimplify, but move forward with firm commitment and deep determination. The disarmament process will require and deserves no less.

147. Mr. President, I cannot leave this session without thanking you for the leadership you have given us and without paying a tribute to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Adeniji, especially for his dedicated and skilful guidance, and to all of those in the Secretariat who have with energy and generous commitment helped and supported us in our task.

148. Mr. ABADA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): This second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, patiently awaited and painstakingly prepared, quite rightly captured the attention of the international community and nourished our peoples' hope that general and complete disarmament would become a reality, thus establishing for future generations a universal era of peace, security and progress.

149. This session has been accompanied by a remarkable popular movement which has given abundant proof that disarmament can no longer be considered a matter for the Powers but, on the contrary, is a concern of all the peoples. Meeting as we are, four years after a historic session of the Assembly gave a significant impetus to the efforts of the international community on the road leading to disarmament, our present deliberations were naturally intended to include a critical and rigorous evaluation of the results achieved and to draw up a real disarmament strategy. Therefore, this session was seen as a special oppor-

tunity to establish, with lucidity and responsibility, a fundamental need and to begin the long desired collective action to launch an irreversible process of disarmament.

150. The many indications of a worsening crisis in international relations show every day the pressing need for such action and, since it involves our survival, the absolute need to overcome the present circumstances and at last turn the tide of history towards well-being, progress and hope.

151. In the general debate with which this session opened we heard the most authoritative voices of Member States and the anxious voices of non-governmental organizations unite in demanding general and complete disarmament. The non-aligned countries duly echoed that demand, which they translated into proposals designed above all to ensure the success of our work.

152. That readiness has not flagged. For five weeks our countries have shown the full extent of their constructive spirit and their desire for a successful outcome. Whether in the evaluation of the implementation of the 1978 Final Document or in the negotiations on the comprehensive programme of disarmament, the non-aligned countries have gone a long way towards meeting the positions of their partners, several of which have shown a spirit of co-operation which we acknowledge. Nevertheless, the absence of the political will on the part of others has led our work to an impasse.

153. When the technique of non-negotiation takes precedence over the painstaking search for agreement, when the procedural resources are used to challenge agreed principles and priorities and when policies designed precisely to impede the implementation of the Final Document persist in this body, it is inevitable that all efforts and energies founder before the strong established positions.

154. It is a matter of great concern that, in a constantly deteriorating international situation, the current session has not been able to achieve even a minimum of significant results and to translate into texts a real will to solve the problems which face the international community in the field of disarmament. In such a situation, those who have blocked the achievement of the smallest concrete result by adopting rigid stands and advancing deliberately uncompromising arguments should be fully aware of the responsibility they bear for the failure of the session.

155. Nevertheless, the fact that this session has not yielded concrete results only strengthens our devotion to the historical validity of the Final Document. The comprehensive programme of disarmament prescribed therein is more necessary than ever. The obvious failure only adds to the determination of the non-aligned countries and all those working for disarmament to redouble their efforts to ensure the success of this greatest of all tasks and meet the expectations of the peoples. In the present world situation we have no alternative but to repulse death and unhappiness and establish one day true peace and the security all need. Disarmament remains the linchpin of that peace and security.

156. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I feel it is not necessary for me

to convey to you, Sir, the satisfaction that I feel at attending a special international meeting such as this under your enlightened presidency. Since this is not the first time that this has occurred, I am convinced that you are well aware of my feelings. Similarly, I should like to express my appreciation to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of this special session, Mr. Adeniji.

157. We are nearing the end of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in conditions very different from those that existed on a similar occasion in the last hours of the first special session devoted to disarmament four years ago.

158. The Assembly can undoubtedly say that it has achieved unanimous agreement on the fundamental objectives and essential aspects of the content, modalities and financing of one of the items on its agenda, which surely can have incalculable consequences, the World Disarmament Campaign, the beginning of which was solemnly announced by the President of the General Assembly at the inaugural meeting on 7 June last. For my delegation, this is a matter of particular satisfaction, as Mexico had the privilege of submitting the proposal to establish this Campaign during the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

159. In addition to this achievement, it can undoubtedly be considered a positive result that the Assembly has encouraged and strengthened to an extraordinary degree the active interest of all the peoples of the world in the promotion of peace and disarmament. This interest was unquestionably shown in this very city, New York, when nearly 1 million human beings gathered in Central Park to proclaim it.

160. However, this should not make us lose sight of the fact that as far as the basic item on the agenda is concerned—the adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament that would correspond to what was explicitly requested by the Assembly in paragraph 109 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session [*resolution S-10/2*], the draft of which was worked on for two years in the Committee on Disarmament—the Assembly has failed. How can we explain this failure if, as we read in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, which was approved yesterday by consensus, the States participating in this session have unanimously and categorically reaffirmed the validity of the Final Document and their solemn commitment to implement it? We must keep very clearly in mind that, among other fundamental principles and conclusions, the following appear in that Final Document:

“The attainment of the objective of security, which is an inseparable element of peace, has always been one of the most profound aspirations of humanity . . . Yet the accumulation of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, today constitutes much more a threat than a protection for the future of mankind. The time has therefore come to put an end to this situation, to abandon the use of force in international relations and to seek security in disarmament [*ibid.*, para. 1].

“While the final objective of the efforts of all States should continue to be general and complete

disarmament under effective international control, the immediate goal is that of the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war [*ibid.*, para. 8].

“Existing arsenals of nuclear weapons alone are more than sufficient to destroy all life on earth . . . The increase in weapons, especially nuclear weapons, far from helping to strengthen international security, on the contrary weakens it. [*ibid.*, para. 11.]

“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. [*ibid.*, para. 13.]

“Removing the threat of a world war—a nuclear war—is the most acute and urgent task of the present day. [*ibid.*, para. 18.]

“The most effective guarantee against the danger of nuclear war and the use of nuclear weapons is nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.” [*ibid.*, para. 56.]

161. There are two possible replies to the question that I asked a few moments ago. The first is that there is frequently a great difference between words and deeds. The second is that the commitment to observe and implement the Final Document should be understood as something that—thanks, perhaps, to a ray of light such as that which caused the sudden conversion of Saul on the road to Damascus—could only be effective once it has been proclaimed in the *Ad Hoc* Committee. However that may be, I firmly believe that the members of the group that is known in Geneva as the Group of 21, which includes Mexico and all the member States of the Committee on Disarmament that do not belong to either of the two military alliances, can indeed have a very clear conscience.

162. The working documents that the Group submitted to the Committee on Disarmament to make a contribution to the drafting of a comprehensive programme fully comply with the provisions of the Final Document. Moreover, I doubt whether in the history of multilateral disarmament negotiations there is any case in which one of the parties has made so many and such far-reaching concessions as those made by the Group of 21 during the short four weeks since the work of the Working Groups and the Drafting Groups began. It was agreed that the provisional hypothesis of a three-stage programme would finally become fact. It was agreed that there would be no deadlines for any of the stages but a deadline for the achievement of the programme as a whole. It was also agreed that, to define the commitments that States would be ready to enter into in that connexion, terminology similar to that accepted by consensus in the General Assembly resolution on the Second Disarmament Decade would be used. A new structure was established for the first part of the chapter on measures which would deal with nuclear weapons, very carefully taking into account objections put forward concerning the structure of the original draft.

163. As far as the nuclear Powers are concerned—in particular, the two which last year by their vetoes prevented the Committee on Disarmament from establishing an *ad hoc* working group to deal with the

negotiations on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests—we should like to believe that the second of the two hypothetical replies I suggested earlier was the correct one. This would mean that they would in future be ready to consider seriously the provisions of paragraph 51 of the Final Document, by virtue of which negotiations on the drafting of a nuclear-test-ban treaty

“... should be concluded urgently and the result submitted for full consideration by the multilateral negotiating body with a view to the submission of a draft treaty to the General Assembly at the earliest possible date.”

164. I indeed hope that such is the case, because I am convinced, as I stated in October 1981 in the First Committee, and as I repeated on 2 February 1982 at the opening meeting of the session of the Committee on Disarmament this year, one of the indispensable conditions of the comprehensive programme becoming a reality is that it contain nothing, either in letter or in spirit, that could be interpreted as a step backwards as far as the Final Document is concerned.

165. Meanwhile, we shall have to envisage adopting at least some isolated measures of particular urgency, such as an immediate freeze on the nuclear weapons of the two super-Powers, regarding which the delegations of Mexico and Sweden submitted a draft resolution to this special session, which, at their explicit request, is to be transmitted by the Secretary-General to the forthcoming thirty-seventh session of the Assembly.

166. Finally, I should like to recall, as an additional example of that kind of measure, that the Secretary for External Relations of Mexico, Mr. Jorge Castañeda, in a speech which he delivered in this Hall on 9 June [4th meeting], invited the four nuclear-weapon States which had not yet done so to agree not to be the first to use those abominable weapons of mass destruction. One can appreciate, therefore, the gratification with which we received the announcement, also made in this Hall on 15 June [12th meeting] by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. Andrei Gromyko, that the head of State of his country, Mr. L. I. Brezhnev, wished to communicate to the General Assembly the commitment of the Soviet State not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. In view of the fact that China had made a similar statement previously, there remain only three nuclear Powers—in alphabetical order, France, the United Kingdom and the United States—to which the General Assembly should appeal at one of its forthcoming meetings to adopt a similar policy and make a declaration of identical scope.

167. Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): There is no simpler word than “disappointing” to define the outcome of the second special session on disarmament. The expectation of achieving specific measures to avoid nuclear war; the adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, with its principles, objectives, measures and machinery, within a reasonable period of time; and the assessment of the outcome of the first special session—all this has been frustrated by the unchanging rhetorical and chauvinistic positions of those who have built

their political careers on the basis of threat, blackmail and disregard of the fundamental interests of peace and disarmament and the legitimate interests of developing countries.

168. At the Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Havana from 31 May to 4 June 1982, only a few days before the start of this session, attention was drawn to the mass movement which has sprung up throughout the world against the production, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons, and it was stressed that no doctrine for the use of nuclear weapons could be justified.

169. My delegation deeply regrets that certain nuclear-weapon States and their allies have prevented the special session from taking a concrete decision on this question. What is more, they have elaborated doctrines for the use of nuclear weapons in clear defiance of public opinion and the international community.

170. The foreign ministers meeting at Havana called upon the Assembly at this session to adopt urgent measures for the prevention of nuclear war. My delegation again expresses regret that those very States not only constantly resorted to procedural questions to prevent the establishment of a working group to consider that item, but did not accept the suggestion that they should make a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and opposed the adoption of concrete measures to that effect submitted by many countries.

171. The foreign ministers placed particular importance on the adoption at this session of a comprehensive programme of disarmament for the implementation of effective disarmament measures in accordance with the priorities set out in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, within a suitable time frame, so as to ensure the achievement of the objectives of general and complete disarmament.

172. It is a secret to no one, however, that this session was unable to adopt the comprehensive programme because those same countries, in disgraceful defiance of public opinion and the international community, questioned the objectives, principles and priorities which seemed to have been accepted by consensus during the first special session on disarmament. What is more, items of such priority importance as the drafting of a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests—which has had its own dynamic for many years and to which the highest priority has been attached—were on the verge of being excluded from our agenda and from all possible disarmament negotiations when some claimed that they could be placed—inadequately—within the framework of nuclear disarmament measures. We cannot forget that similar attempts were made in the Committee on Disarmament, but you certainly cannot fool all of the people for a very long time.

173. My delegation regrets that those same States have made the most brazen use of force in an attempt to turn the Final Document into a dead letter. When it is not a change of President it is the international situation; when it is not a lack of instructions or communication problems it is intervention and interference in the internal affairs of some State. In short, one

never knows where one stands, because the lack of political will to negotiate seriously and constructively is so great that no attention is paid to the recommendations of the General Assembly or to the appeals of non-governmental organizations, including the survivors of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki massacres, who, along with hundreds of thousands of others, marched a few days ago before the United Nations Headquarters.

174. They have talked a lot about reports and "transparency" with regard to military expenditures, but they do not admit to the recent astronomical increases in their own budgets. They have talked a lot about disarmament machinery, but they do not admit that it was they themselves who prevented the Committee on Disarmament from discharging its functions by not permitting agreement on a question of machinery. They have talked a lot about disarmament studies, but they do not admit that they have quantitatively and qualitatively increased their nuclear weapons and that in some of those very studies the danger of their nuclear tests is pointed out. They have talked about the use of chemical weapons as alleged in press reports, but they refuse to pay compensation for the damage they themselves caused by their use of chemical weapons in Viet Nam; nor have they commented on the use of poison gas by Israeli troops against the Palestinian people in Lebanon—and we know the origin of those weapons. They have talked about respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations while they continue to collaborate in the nuclear sphere with Israel and South Africa and, in the Security Council, to veto the application of the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of that same Charter against their South African and Israeli allies.

175. My delegation had hoped, as had many other delegations, that the Assembly would recommend at this session the adoption of urgent measures to prevent nuclear war and promote disarmament negotiations. Among such measures are: a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons; individual or collective declarations on the part of nuclear-weapon States that they will not be the first to use such weapons; the beginning without further delay of negotiations on the attainment of a treaty on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests; a complete freeze on the development, manufacture and deployment of nuclear weapons by all States which possess such weapons; and the prohibition of the manufacture and deployment of new systems of chemical weapons. Those hopes have not been met.

176. Today we are closing this special session devoted to disarmament, but there can be no doubt that it was condemned to failure from the moment we heard two significant statements at the meetings held on the mornings of 17 and 23 June.

177. In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to express my delegation's gratitude for the efforts you made, along with Mr. Adeniji, Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, to achieve a successful result at this session. I should like also to congratulate the chairmen of the other groups and sub-groups.

178. In spite of the final result of this special session devoted to disarmament, we shall pursue our efforts

to ensure peace and general and complete disarmament.

179. Mr. SILOVIC (Yugoslavia): I should like at the outset to avail myself of this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Adeniji and to express our appreciation for the great devotion, skill and dedication which have marked his efforts. We owe him and all the chairmen of the Working Groups and sub-groups our gratitude.

180. Our expectations—the justified and reasonable expectations of the broadest range of the international public—have been betrayed. We must note with regret that the absence of substantial results at this session runs counter to the unequivocal and urgent need for effective measures to overcome outstanding crises in international relations, an integral part of which is the unabated arms race.

181. In our view, there is no doubt that the basic causes of the present adverse international situation and of the arms race are to be found in the policy and practices which are contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in the policy of the threat or use of force, the outstanding instrument of which is the arms race.

182. Big-Power rivalry and the bloc policy have brought the world into a state of neither peace nor war, into a situation of ever more direct threat of the outbreak of wars of the widest proportions, including the threat of nuclear war, with all its devastating consequences.

183. An integral part and consequence of such a situation is the obstruction and hindering of the work of the process of multilateral negotiations on disarmament. There is a tendency to hamper the efficacy and the central role of the United Nations and of the Committee on Disarmament. We are also witnessing attempts to circumvent the United Nations and the multilateral negotiating mechanism for solving crucial international problems, which are of the most direct concern for the security of the whole international community. The absence of political will to reach consensus at this session is in itself a reflection of such tendencies. That is why renewed endeavours are needed, endeavours aimed not only at reaffirming but also at strengthening the role of the United Nations in the process of disarmament and at creating conditions leading to more efficient use of the existing mechanism.

184. The adoption of the comprehensive programme of disarmament would, *inter alia*, make possible the harmonization of various efforts at different levels in the field of disarmament. By placing the emphasis on the significant and irreplaceable role of the multilateral mechanism we do not wish to deny the importance of bilateral negotiations within the framework of overall efforts aimed at disarmament and at the strengthening of international security. But in our view, such negotiations can make a full contribution and acquire full significance only if they do not run counter to the accepted goals of disarmament in general.

185. Deep contradictions on substantial issues concerning the prevention of war have been expressed at this session more than ever before. We consider that the international community should not accept posi-

tions based on unilateral perceptions and interests propagating a kind of hierarchy of wars, that is, their classification according to the category of weapons used in them. In this connexion we want to emphasize that we share the awareness of the urgent and immediate need to prevent the gravest danger overshadowing the world, nuclear war, but also, and on the same level of urgency, conventional wars, which so directly and ever more frequently jeopardize the freedom of States and the independence of countries throughout the world, and which could even lead to a nuclear cataclysm.

186. The outcome of this session is doubtless a warning signal for the international community to increase its efforts aimed at overcoming difficulties and controversies that have been spoken of here and to find roads leading to consensus on the content and character of concrete measures and obligations to be contained in the comprehensive programme of disarmament. We consider it positive that this session has reconfirmed the concept of this programme and has made arrangements for further negotiations leading to its early elaboration and adoption.

187. This session has reaffirmed the significance and the lasting value of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session and has thus given new impetus to the obligation to continue all negotiations on multilateral, regional and bilateral levels on all open issues of disarmament. In this context we attach particular importance to more effective action by the United Nations and the Committee on Disarmament. We also consider that the success of efforts at the regional level, and among them, particularly, the first steps in launching the process of European disarmament, may significantly improve the international climate and bring about consensus on the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

188. Only if political will and readiness to proceed from words to deeds are shown can we expect the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament to promote substantially the cause of disarmament and strengthen international security. I should like to express the determination and readiness of Yugoslavia to make its full contribution to that end.

189. Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): The second special session on disarmament opened five weeks ago in the shadow of armed regional conflicts. Since the first special session, four years ago, we have lived through a period of international tension and conflicts. We have witnessed an increasing trend to resort to force in the settlement of international disputes. The relationship between the major power alignments has become more strained.

190. This worsening of the international political climate, coupled with an increasing awareness of the destructive power of modern weapons, has created concern and anxiety in large sections of the public. International negotiations on disarmament and arms control have become more difficult. We have seen how the international conflicts of the last two years negatively influenced the preparations for this special session.

191. Nevertheless, some developments indicate that the international climate may be improving. We find it particularly welcome that the bilateral talks between

the United States and the Soviet Union on intermediate and strategic nuclear weapons have started. New proposals have just been introduced in the talks at Vienna on mutual and balanced force reductions.

192. There were therefore considerable hope and expectations by the public that the second special session would carry even further the process initiated by the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session. We must confess that we have not managed to meet these expectations. They were probably too ambitious in relation to what this session could realistically accomplish during the time we have had at our disposal. The Norwegian Government shares the disappointment voiced by other delegations that we have not succeeded in agreeing on how to follow up the goals laid down in the Final Document.

193. But our genuine regret at not having been able to advance further in the area of disarmament should not lead to despair, nor should it undermine our common efforts vigorously to pursue negotiations towards disarmament and arms control. Any frustration arising from the lack of progress at this session should be transformed into a strong determination to obtain results. Nor should we underrate the results which we have been able to achieve in spite of the heavy odds against us. Above all, my delegation would like to emphasize that we have reaffirmed the validity of the Final Document and pledged to respect the priorities in its Programme of Action.

194. Furthermore, we consider it significant that we have obtained a consensus report of this session. In itself consensus does not satisfy the many different aspirations and wishes of Governments. Consensus embodies compromise, which necessarily means that not all Governments, my own included, see all their positions reflected in the final report. But in our view, consensus is a necessary prerequisite for the continuation of the process of negotiations and deliberations in the field of disarmament and arms control inside the United Nations system.

195. Only in this way can the United Nations and its special session on disarmament influence the disarmament negotiations taking place in various forums. It is to be hoped that the deliberations carried out during this session and the different proposals that have been advanced will have a positive impact on the negotiations that have already been initiated.

196. Nor should we underrate the importance of the preparatory work carried out by Governments, by the Centre for Disarmament and by numerous non-governmental organizations prior to this session. This has helped to focus attention on the vital question of arms control and disarmament. We hope that these valuable efforts and the results obtained at this special session will strengthen the commitment to obtain positive results in the ongoing negotiations.

197. Like many other nations, Norway expected the second special session on disarmament to be an opportunity for increasing the membership of the Committee on Disarmament. On the basis of the agreement reached at this session, my delegation is looking forward to receiving the report of the Committee on Disarmament to this effect at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly. For its part, Norway will continue its efforts to become a full member of

the Committee on Disarmament. Regardless of the result, however, we intend to participate actively in the Committee's work as an observer, as we have done in the past.

198. The problems confronting this session concern the common destiny of mankind. The halting of the arms race is not the responsibility of the major Powers alone, but should be seen as the responsibility of all States. This responsibility should be exercised, *inter alia*, through the United Nations, which consequently has a very important role to play in the field of disarmament.

199. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament is drawing to a close. As is well known, the international community, or at any rate its overwhelming majority, awaited this session with hope and with confidence that it would encourage progress in solving the most important problems confronting mankind at the moment—preventing a nuclear catastrophe and carrying out real disarmament. The convening of the second special session on disarmament was preceded by significant preparations in which we played an active part. A host of decisions taken at the regular sessions of the General Assembly and adopted on the initiative of the States of the socialist community and of the non-aligned group were part and parcel of this preparation process. Many efforts to that end were undertaken by the Committee on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission and special committees, not to speak of the work of the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament.

200. World public opinion, which was displayed just before and during this session in a mass anti-war movement under the slogans of preventing nuclear war and freezing and eliminating nuclear arsenals, also waited hopefully and demanded positive results. This unprecedented concern and alarm on the part of world public opinion was reflected in almost all the statements made by representatives of non-governmental organizations from this rostrum. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR expresses its gratitude for their important contribution to the work of this special session.

201. The current special session of the General Assembly will go down in history if only because at this session the Soviet Union unilaterally undertook the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, as stated in a message from the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev [*12th meeting*]. This is a great step towards the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, a step on the path that could lead to a solution of this problem if the example of the Soviet Union is followed by other nuclear Powers.

202. The Soviet Union, in documents submitted at this session, presented a broad range of concrete and constructive proposals aimed at eliminating the growing threat of nuclear war, curbing and reversing the race in nuclear and other armaments and pre-

venting and eliminating chemical weapons. It was stated once again at this most important rostrum that there is no type of weapon which the Soviet Union would not be prepared to limit or ban on a reciprocal basis; that the Soviet Union is prepared to consider and discuss any constructive proposals in this sphere—whoever they may come from—based on the principle of parity and equal security. Delegations of States from the socialist community have at all stages and in all bodies during this session shown a spirit of constructive co-operation in the quest for mutually acceptable solutions and a readiness for well-thought-out and meaningful compromises.

203. The non-aligned States, taking a responsible approach to the tasks of this session and making significant efforts towards ensuring its success, have made important proposals to prevent nuclear war, for the non-use of nuclear weapons and for a freeze on arsenals and other proposals.

204. We note the positive significance of a number of conclusions that we were able to adopt at this session as a result of the persistent joint efforts of the forces of peace and progress.

205. However, through the fault of the forces of imperialism and reaction, which dream of military superiority and world domination, this session has not, most unfortunately, responded to the hopes of peoples of the world. The position of the United States and of some other States members of NATO, regardless of what their representatives here have said—resorting from time to time to worn-out stereotypes and open slander—boils down to this: despite their ritual prattling about so-called preparedness to take steps in the sphere of disarmament, they have in fact blocked the work of the session. Furthermore, by not allowing the adoption of new decisions, those delegations *de facto* are rejecting previous understandings, taken with their participation, on such important items as nuclear disarmament, strengthening of international security, and so forth. Those States openly acknowledge that their military doctrine not only does not exclude the possibility of their being the first to use nuclear weapons, but is virtually based on this dangerous premise. The policy of achieving military superiority which they have adopted is without a doubt incompatible with the goals of arms limitation and disarmament, as was clearly shown during the current session. In fact it is symptomatic that before this session the NATO bloc approved a comprehensive programme for an arms race, and near the end of the session the United States scheduled military exercises with a view to a detailed elaboration of a series of steps which would be undertaken in a prolonged nuclear war.

206. This special session on disarmament is drawing to a close. Humankind is still waiting for the threat of nuclear war to be removed and for the arms race to end in order to turn to practical steps to bring about disarmament. We are convinced that the peoples of the world will subvert the criminal schemes of militarists and aggressors and that they will have their say in favour of preventing a nuclear catastrophe and thwarting the arms race, especially the nuclear-arms race, and of achieving mutually acceptable agreements on measures for true disarmament.

207. An appraisal of the outcome of this session and our view of it is set forth in the joint statement on behalf of the delegations of the socialist States, including the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, that was made today by the representative of the Hungarian People's Republic.

208. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I come to this rostrum with a spirit of optimism, notwithstanding the facts we are forced to face when we consider the failure of this special session. The tenth special session of the General Assembly and its Final Document were regarded as a great success, and yet no part of that Final Document has been implemented and the world situation has since that time gravely deteriorated. What difference can it make if this special session fails to adopt a final document, seeing that the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session has been so completely ignored? Yet there is an old Greek proverb that says that there is no evil without some beneficial side. We must therefore attempt to see the beneficial side of this failure of the present special session.

209. First and foremost, this session has provided us with the opportunity to hear the voice of people from all over the world who have been alerted to the dangers of an approaching nuclear conflagration and who have expressed themselves in emphatic terms against the continuation of the arms race. Representatives of the world-wide movement in favour of a nuclear freeze and representatives of non-governmental organizations have expressed themselves here with dedication and determination, and they represent the will of the people.

210. We want the cessation of the arms race. But the arms race is only a consequence of the original error—one might even call it a sin—of establishing the United Nations impeded in its ability to achieve its main purpose, its very *raison d'être*, by denying to the Security Council the availability of a United Nations force to give effect and validity to its decisions. When that was done, the Council was reduced to the status of a mere debating society whose decisions would be without consequence. The system of international security envisaged in the Charter has therefore remained inoperative. In its Declaration, the Final Document referred to the fact that "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 and the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces" [*resolution S-10/2, para. 13*].

211. If this session has failed, therefore, it is because nothing has been done since the first special session to comply with the Final Document and its main directive to implement the Charter system of international security through the United Nations, concurrently with efforts towards disarmament.

212. Some efforts towards disarmament have been made. There have been very devoted efforts in the Disarmament Commission. We are grateful to the Group of 21 for what it has been trying so hard to accomplish. The fact remains, however, that, for unknown reasons, no efforts have been made in the Disarmament Commission towards the system of international security, as urged in the Final Document. I do not know why and I do not ask. Yet, the fact

remains that the question of international security has been put off to some time in the distant future, but it must be considered concurrently with efforts towards disarmament. The result is that the Disarmament Commission, after so many years of efforts under various denominations, has not achieved any reduction in armaments or any regulation of armaments, and the arms race has been accelerating by leaps and bounds. What can mankind hope for in this situation?

213. I said at the outset that I came here with a spirit of optimism. I believe we must remedy this situation. It is our duty to do so by turning to a consideration of international security. In the Charter and in the Final Document we give the United Nations a central role and primary responsibility for disarmament. Do we want to give that primary responsibility to an ineffective United Nations, one whose main purpose has been truncated? Why do we not try to make the United Nations effective and see whether an effective United Nations can make a difference in the present situation? For surely it would make a great difference, indeed a tremendous difference. We cannot function when the United Nations is a lame duck.

214. Let me re-emphasize this point and say that the next special session of the General Assembly should be a special session on international security. I had earlier proposed that this special session should be devoted to disarmament and international security, but that suggestion was not taken up. Had it been, things might have been different. I am therefore now proposing that the next special session deal with the subject of international security.

215. We live, I fear, in a world of pretence. We attempt to ignore stark realities. Inspired by an obsolete past, we automatically bring forth our faded clichés and shut our ears to the voice of reason. Our behaviour towards the United Nations is a blatant reflection of that pretence. We treat the Organization as though it were a functioning one, and we make no attempt to make it function. But we must face realities. The first reality is that we cannot proceed to agreements on disarmament without first halting the arms race. The second is that we cannot halt the arms race without providing a security alternative to armaments and arms competition through an effective United Nations collective security system as required by the Charter.

216. If we bear these realities in mind, we shall see that disarmament efforts will not be in vain. The disarmament efforts can and should become productive through international security, not otherwise.

217. Mr. ULRICHSEN (Denmark): My delegation adheres fully to the statement made by the representative of Belgium on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community.

218. On behalf of the Danish delegation I should like to add the following observations. There can be no doubt that the outcome of our work will be judged unsatisfactory by the majority of people. But, as you said, Mr. President, disappointment must not lead to despair. I think we all realize that the report of the Committee on Disarmament gave us few guidelines for solving the essential disarmament questions, and we have not been able to do much better. We must

also recognize that the special session took place at a time when the international climate was not propitious for working out a future disarmament programme, which necessitates the participation and the active co-operation of the whole United Nations family.

219. All who have taken part in the deliberations of the last five weeks would render a service to the cause of disarmament by re-evaluating the course of events. Even if our work did not result in a comprehensive programme of disarmament, our discussions were held in a calm atmosphere and often with a serious approach, corresponding to the desire of our people. We could not realize our ambitious projects, yet some foundation for future disarmament initiatives was laid.

220. It is premature to draw a final conclusion from this special session. However, it seems to us that much time has been used to discuss minor issues, disregarding the problems vital to humanity. The session has shown that there is a need to be less versatile and more concrete, and that would be our advice to the Committee on Disarmament when it resumes its consideration of this matter. Many fruitful ideas have been put forward and I am sure that they can contribute to promoting the disarmament process.

221. In his statement in the general debate [11th meeting], the Danish Prime Minister, Mr. Anker Jorgensen, said that the international climate was a basis for disarmament, and nobody can deny that fact. We must all, not only in words but primarily in deed, do our utmost to bring about this prerequisite for future disarmament measures.

222. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): On 22 June, during its statement in the general debate [22nd meeting], my delegation expressed its views on the situation in the world. It stressed the correlation between that situation and the arms race. It stated the hopes it placed in this special session and outlined the results that it felt should be expected.

223. Today, at the time when we are getting ready to close this session, my delegation cannot keep silent on its regret and disappointment. We regret to note, first, that the members of the international community, gathered here of their own free will, have been unable to find even the least common denominator in terms of language to describe the situation we are facing today, a situation which severely puts to the test the most sacred principles in which all of us believe and for the defence of which the Organization was founded.

224. Our disappointment stems from the realization that the international community has not been able at this juncture to take even the smallest step to ward off the threat of war that hovers over us. Our disappointment is all the deeper because of the failure of our attempts to arrive at an agreement banning for ever the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, which we all agree would lead to the annihilation of all mankind.

225. The fact that those embarking on the preparations for a nuclear holocaust do not yet appreciate the danger in which they place the world, and therefore themselves, shows, in our view, their utmost insensitivity or irresponsibility.

226. Our frustration and our bitterness stem from the fact that the death and desolation being suffered today by innocent peoples all over the world and in particular in the Middle East, on Lebanese soil, have not made sufficient impact to dictate the measures required to halt the race for over-armament.

227. It is indeed an edifying example of the possible use of immense arsenals of weapons, particularly when they are put into the hands of irresponsible men. What will it be like when those same irresponsible individuals are ready to press the nuclear-weapon button?

228. The report this session is adopting as a kind of conclusion implicitly acknowledges that the international community, gathered here, has been unable to meet the demands of the situation prevailing in the world or to respond to the profound aspirations of our peoples.

229. Could it be otherwise—and to us this seems clear at the end of this session—when the political will necessary to reach any kind of agreement is lacking among those possessing the biggest arsenals of weapons of destruction? Could it be otherwise when the concern of the big Powers is confined to ensuring their own security without worrying unduly about international peace and security?

230. Although this session has been unable properly to fulfil its mandate, this does not mean we can renounce our responsibilities. We should like to believe that reason and the general interest will prevail. We appeal therefore to those who are not yet ready to do so to make the necessary effort to join in the will of the vast majority, voiced here by the non-aligned countries, in order to prevent a nuclear catastrophe and achieve general and complete disarmament, and to devote themselves exclusively to economic and social development, in international peace and security.

231. We dare to hope that the Committee on Disarmament, to which has been transferred the priority task of working out the comprehensive programme of disarmament, will be able to fulfil the new mandate entrusted to it by the deadline set.

232. I cannot conclude, Mr. President, without paying a tribute to you and to Mr. Adeniji, the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, who showed throughout our session authority, dedication and devotion worthy of our most sincere praise.

233. Mr. SUJA (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): The second special session devoted to disarmament had a great, responsible task, that is, to determine practical ways for bringing to an end the increasing growth of ever more destructive types of weapons, primarily nuclear weapons.

234. The position of Czechoslovakia and of the other socialist countries on these matters of principle affecting today's world cannot be in any doubt. In co-operation with many other countries, including countries of the non-aligned movement, we have done our utmost to secure the adoption of effective measures and decisions to avert the threat of nuclear war which hangs over all mankind. It is perfectly fitting that—as can be seen from the statements of the overwhelming majority of representatives of States

and non-governmental and other organizations in the general debate—it is precisely that question that has become the primordial topic of the entire session.

235. The prevention of a nuclear disaster has become an integral part of the work of this session and of international relations as a whole. In recent years in particular this has been the result of the feverish efforts to increase the sophistication and to accumulate the most destructive types of nuclear weapons, including neutron weapons and their means of delivery, in combination with well-known doctrines of the possibility of their use in a limited or even a winnable nuclear war, and similar inhumane theories. That is the prime cause for the aggravation of international relations.

236. Czechoslovakia, which is situated in a region with the greatest concentration of armed forces and armaments in the world, has more than one reason to share the prime concern of the world community about this development. Quite near our western borders several thousands of warheads of NATO are located. The flight of nuclear-tipped missiles, including nearly 600 United States medium-range nuclear missiles, the deployment of which is being prepared just west of our boundaries, is to be measured not in minutes but in seconds. That is why we attach primary significance to the appeal for all nuclear-weapon States to respond to the commitment of the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons by undertaking a similar obligation. That would without any doubt constitute a reliable barrier against the danger of the unleashing of a nuclear conflict and would certainly facilitate subsequent negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

237. We feel that all the other constructive proposals and initiatives in this direction submitted at this session, in particular by the non-aligned countries, are also important and timely. We advocate thorough and constructive consideration of them. We highly value the proposals of India, Mexico and a number of other countries of the non-aligned movement which give evidence of the highly responsible and active approach taken by those countries to the most important aspects of the work of this special session and to disarmament matters in general. We take a similarly constructive approach to a number of other initiatives and proposals on the most important aspects of disarmament.

238. This session has shown, *inter alia*, the urgent need for the conclusion of a convention on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of their stockpiles; a draft of such a convention has been submitted by the Soviet Union [A/S-12/AC.1/12 and Corr.1, annex]. We feel that this draft must constitute the basis for further negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament.

239. While a number of new initiatives and proposals submitted at this session could play a positive part in averting nuclear war and bringing about disarmament, that cannot conceal the fact that the results of the session are not commensurate with the magnitude of the tasks that faced it or with the expectations of world public opinion, which has rightly demanded effective measures and concrete actions towards disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. Responsibility for

this outcome of the session lies wholly on the shoulders of the delegations of those countries which, as in the past, have avoided constructive, businesslike negotiations and have striven to divert our negotiations. And all of that has been done in an attempt to justify the further accumulation of nuclear weapons and to shift the balance of forces in the world in their favour, as well as to act from a position of strength. Moreover, they have even been talking about the "usefulness", indeed about the "peace-making" role, of nuclear weapons. At a time when in the United Nations there are discussions about the prevention of nuclear war, the comprehensive programme of disarmament and other major problems involved in reversing the arms race, in the NATO headquarters, under the leadership of the United States, doctrines of first nuclear strike and long-term programmes for the accumulation and further sophistication of weapons are being elaborated. This policy, however it may be camouflaged, radically contradicts the interests of all peoples and obstructs the preservation of peace. It is not possible to hide the fact that it is that policy and nothing else which has led to the general aggravation of the international atmosphere, the growth of tension in the world and, in the final analysis, to the exacerbation of the danger of nuclear war.

240. We believe that all the constructive and useful elements of the session should be put to use. In the spirit of the Declaration on International Cooperation for Disarmament, adopted on our initiative, we are prepared to make further constructive efforts, together with other countries, to secure the implementation of the aims of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly and, on the basis of mutual interest and undiminished security, to reach agreement on the limitation, reduction and elimination of any kind of weapons. Only by the joint efforts of the States Members of the United Nations, based on political goodwill, will it be possible to reach a substantial turning-point in the solution of pressing disarmament problems.

241. Lastly, let me thank you, Mr. President, for your skilled leadership of this session; and Mr. Adeniji, the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, the chairmen of the Working and Drafting Groups, and the officials and other personnel of the United Nations for their personal contributions and inestimable assistance.

242. Mr. KRYSOSIK (Poland): Long weeks of hard work are almost over. Soon the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will be closed. As we approach that moment one cannot but express a feeling of deep disappointment and regret that it has not been possible to achieve our goals and to live up to the expectations.

243. Our point of view has been reflected in detail in the joint statement of the socialist countries made by the representative of Hungary. Now my delegation wishes briefly to stress that it was with appreciation that my Government welcomed the decision to convene this session. We came to it with a belief that its outcome would meet the needs and hopes of nations, and to the best of our abilities we tried to contribute to its work and results.

244. From the very beginning we have emphasized our feeling of concern, as we realized that it would not

be easy to succeed. We pointed to a number of negative phenomena which have accumulated in the political, military and economic spheres, and which continue to cast a long and ominous shadow on international relations. Among these are: the constant quantitative and qualitative growth of armaments; the use of force and the threat of use of force in international relations; persistent and dangerous conflicts; the development of intervention forces; theories concerning carrying out and winning a limited nuclear war; and plans to deploy Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western Europe, stemming from the dangerous evolution in the policy of some NATO countries.

245. In view of the awareness of these growing dangers, we believed that the present session would mark an important stage in the efforts to reverse these ominous trends, efforts which would help to overcome the obstacles and barriers to the disarmament dialogue. We considered that at this session it would be possible to reaffirm fully the programme of action in the field of disarmament and to adopt the comprehensive programme of disarmament. We thought that it would be possible to find common ways and to work out the necessary yet mutually acceptable solutions.

246. Unfortunately, this session has proved the lack of the necessary political will on the part of those countries which are mainly responsible for the arms race and for the exacerbation of the international situation. This session has not been able to adopt the decisions which in practice would lead to the elimination of the threat of nuclear war and to a halting of the accelerated arms race.

247. This session, however, has forcefully manifested that there is grave concern among nations about the continuing arms race, that the prevention of nuclear catastrophe remains the most acute and urgent task of the present day, and that the redoubled efforts to ensure disarmament should be continued.

248. In his statement in the general debate the Foreign Minister of Poland, Jozef Czyrek, said:

“Unswervingly linking its future and development with the building of international security based on détente, disarmament and co-operation among nations, Poland, together with its allies, is ready to do its utmost to ensure that the prospects of a lasting peace for the world will, as a result of this session, become a reality.” [10th meeting, para. 201.]

249. Today, now that we have adopted the report and know the outcome of the session, as well as the reasons which played the decisive role in this respect, we wish once again to emphasize that, regardless of difficulties and obstacles, Poland will continue to work consistently for the cause of disarmament, which is the urgent imperative of our time, and for the consolidation of peace and international security.

250. Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): May I express my appreciation to you, Sir, for the manner in which you have presided over this special session of the Assembly, to the officers of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and the chairmen of the Working Groups for their efforts, and in particular to Mr. Adeniji for the skilful

and tireless manner in which he carried out his duties as Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

251. The New Zealand delegation shares the disappointment expressed by all speakers today that the special session has been able to report so little progress towards the goals it set for itself. That disappointment will be felt not only by the Governments we represent but by the many ordinary citizens around the world who looked to this session to give a new impetus to disarmament efforts.

252. It was to be expected that the goals would be difficult to achieve. We met during a period of conflict and international tension and at a time when Governments in many parts of the world appear to have concluded that the security of their countries can be preserved only by building up their military strength.

253. This session was looking to other ways of enhancing national and international security—in particular, by providing direction to future negotiations on all aspects of disarmament and a standard by which future progress could be measured. That was a particularly ambitious goal. Deliberations over the past month have shown, as you, Mr. President, have observed, that this body cannot insulate itself from the climate of the day.

254. If the results of this session have for that reason been disappointing and its achievements limited, it has nevertheless served a number of useful purposes. It has provided an opportunity for all delegations to improve their understanding of the security perceptions of others. It has helped stimulate public consciousness of the need for genuine and substantial measures of disarmament and provided a forum in which non-governmental organizations could express the profound concern of people all over the world to be freed from the danger and burden of armaments. Member States have reaffirmed the validity of the Final Document and committed themselves to the goals and priorities it embodies. In addition, Member States have reaffirmed the central role of the United Nations in disarmament and their determination to ensure that the multilateral processes of disarmament will continue here and in the Committee on Disarmament.

255. Those are important achievements, even if against the goals of the session they are relatively limited ones. The Assembly did not complete its task at this session. Though its results were meagre and discouraging, that is no reason to despair. The work that began with the first special session still remains to be done, and the effort will be continued. That it could not be completed here is only a more compelling reason to continue the task and to rethink our approaches to the issues. There is much to be learned from the discussions of the past five weeks. Many ideas and indications of possible new approaches have been put forward, some by representatives of the non-governmental organizations that shared in the deliberations of the Assembly. They all need to be considered carefully and with an open mind.

256. New Zealand, for its part, is ready and willing to do whatever it can in this process and to make its contributions whenever it finds opportunities to do so. We see this as a time not for despondency but rather for determination and for a renewed effort that

will demonstrate that public confidence in the Organization has not been misplaced.

### AGENDA ITEM 3

**Credentials of representatives to the twelfth special session of the General Assembly (concluded):**

#### (b) Report of the Credentials Committee

257. The PRESIDENT: I invite representatives to turn their attention to the draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee in paragraph 16 of its report [A/S-12/28].

258. In the Credentials Committee the draft resolution was adopted without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

*The draft resolution was adopted (resolution S-12/1).*

259. The PRESIDENT: I shall call now on those representatives who have asked to speak in explanation of their positions on the resolution just adopted.

260. Mr. RACZ (Hungary): I have asked to speak on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Soviet Union and the Ukrainian SSR.

261. With regard to the report of the Credentials Committee, the above-mentioned delegations wish to point out that the recommendation of the Committee totally disregards the real situation in Kampuchea and ignores the relevant provisions of contemporary international law as well as common sense. At previous sessions of the General Assembly, our countries have repeatedly and clearly stated their position on this question: the seat of Kampuchea in the United Nations belongs to the legitimate Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

262. The delegations on whose behalf I am speaking most resolutely reject the illegal participation of representatives of so-called Democratic Kampuchea in the work of the General Assembly. We consider their presence at this special session devoted to disarmament to be a gross insult to the millions of victims of the genocidal Pol Pot régime and a violation of the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

263. The question of the representation of Kampuchea is obviously part of the designs of those whose only goal is to bring about the reinstatement of the Pol Pot clique, which has been condemned throughout the world, and to maintain tension and instability in South-East Asia. Our delegations note with regret that certain other countries have been misled by fallacious propaganda, the aim of which is to maintain the illusion of so-called Democratic Kampuchea through the illegal occupation of the seat of that country in the Organization.

264. We should like to emphasize that, despite all the efforts to impede the policy of reconstruction and all the attempts to undermine the international authority of the People's Republic of Kampuchea and its legitimate Government, the country is continuing to make progress and to consolidate the achievements of 1979, which was a turning-point in its history. No

one can prevent the Khmer people from continuing those activities.

265. Although our delegations do not object to the approval of the report of the Credentials Committee since it refers to the credentials of a great number of delegations of Member States, we feel that it should be put on record in the most unambiguous way that approval of the report in no way connotes any measure of agreement on the part of our delegations with the presence in the United Nations of the so-called representatives of the Pol Pot clique.

266. Mr. SRITHIRATH (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): While joining in the consensus on the adoption of the report of the Credentials Committee on the credentials of delegations to the second special session devoted to disarmament, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, together with the delegations of non-aligned countries which recognize the People's Republic of Kampuchea as the sole authentic and legal Government of Kampuchea, wishes to place on record its firm and formal objection to the presence of those persons who claim to represent so-called Democratic Kampuchea, which does not exist on the political map of the world.

267. My delegation expressly requests that this statement be duly reflected in the records of the General Assembly.

268. Mr. KOR BUN HENG (Democratic Kampuchea) (*interpretation from French*): Following the adoption of the report of the Credentials Committee, the delegation of Democratic Kampuchea wishes to state its serious reservations with regard to the participation of the delegation of Viet Nam in this second special session devoted to disarmament, for the following reasons:

269. First, since 25 December 1978, six months after the adoption of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, Viet Nam has been waging a war of aggression and invasion against Democratic Kampuchea. This Vietnamese aggression constitutes a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of international law and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

270. Secondly, at present 300,000 Vietnamese soldiers and administrative officials are putting my country to the torch and to the sword. The famine they have deliberately created has already killed several hundreds of thousands of Kampuchean. Conventional weapons of all kinds have already massacred several hundreds of thousands more. In their foul crimes aimed at exterminating the people of Kampuchea the Vietnamese invaders have also used chemical and bacteriological weapons, which have caused the death of several thousand Kampuchean and pose a grave threat to the human and ecological environment. At the same time they have driven Kampuchean peasants off their land and have sent in nearly a million Vietnamese to establish settlements in Kampuchea.

271. Thirdly, this Vietnamese war of aggression in Kampuchea has created a flood of refugees, which not only causes indescribable suffering to hundreds of thousands of Kampuchean and Vietnamese but also

constitutes a heavy burden for the countries of first asylum in the South-East Asian region, especially Thailand, as well as for the countries that accept the refugees and those that give humanitarian assistance.

272. Fourthly, this war of aggression and genocide waged for more than three years by Viet Nam could not have come about or continued without the assistance of the Soviet Union, which now amounts to \$6 million a day.

273. All these facts show that Viet Nam constitutes the major and most direct threat to peace, security and stability in South-East Asia. As stated in the joint communiqué issued on 16 June 1982 by the Foreign Ministers of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, and distributed as an official document of the General Assembly:

“The Foreign Ministers expressed their grave concern over the situation in Kampuchea. They stressed that the continued Vietnamese military occupation of Kampuchea constitutes a serious threat to peace and stability in the whole South-East Asian region. They reaffirmed their strong conviction that the continued occupation of Kampuchea by Viet Nam represents a serious violation of international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter.”<sup>1</sup>

What Viet Nam has been doing manifestly runs counter to the letter and spirit of the Final Document and to the spirit of this session.

274. For all those reasons my delegation feels that Viet Nam has no proper place here so long as it has not ended its aggression against and occupation of Kampuchea and totally and unconditionally withdrawn its forces of aggression from Kampuchea in accordance with United Nations resolutions and the Declaration of the International Conference on Kampuchea.

275. My delegation wishes to take this opportunity to inform the Assembly that on 22 June last, at Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, the three Kampuchean parties signed a Declaration on the Formation of the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea, with Samdech Norodom Sihanouk as President, Mr. Khieu Samphan as Vice-President in charge of Foreign Affairs and Mr. Son Sann as Prime Minister.

276. The objectives of the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea are:

“To mobilize all efforts in the common struggle to liberate Kampuchea from the Vietnamese aggressors with a view to restoring the motherland as a sovereign and independent country;

“To bring about the implementation of the Declaration of the International Conference on Kampuchea and other relevant United Nations General Assembly resolutions.”<sup>2</sup>

277. The Kampuchean people as a whole hails this coalition whole-heartedly and with national pride. Peace- and justice-loving peoples the world over welcome its establishment. Hanoi and Moscow, on the other hand, are enraged over this coalition. Why such rage? For the simple reason that they have failed in their treacherous manoeuvres to split the patriotic Kampuchean forces and to keep them from forming this coalition. This only unmask still further the true expansionist nature of Hanoi and Moscow.

278. Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan): My delegation wishes to place on record its formal reservation to the credentials of the Kabul delegation present at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

279. The delegation of Pakistan shares the position reflected in this regard in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the report of the Credentials Committee. This position is consistent with the principled stand taken by Pakistan in international forums.

280. Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My country wishes once again to reaffirm its position of recognizing as the sole and legitimate representatives of the Kampuchean people those individuals who make up the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea. We have no objection to the adoption of the report, but that in no way signifies recognition of the representatives of the Pol Pot régime.

## AGENDA ITEM 2

### Minute of silent prayer or meditation

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

*The representatives, standing, observed a minute's silence.*

### Closure of the twelfth special session

282. The PRESIDENT: I declare closed the twelfth special session of the General Assembly.

*The meeting rose at 7 p.m.*

---

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1982, document S/15268.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid., Supplement for April, May and June 1982, document S/15252.*