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The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS (continued)

Mr. LAIGLESIA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, may I first of all express the satisfaction of the delegation of Spain at seeing you at the head of the Disarmament Commission. I am certain that your recognized experience in the disarmament field is a guarantee that the Commission will bring its first substantive session to a successful conclusion.

The Government of Spain has already had occasion to set forth its views and suggestions regarding the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme in the reply to the inquiry carried out by the Secretary-General pursuant to the General Assembly decision in resolution 33/91 A, of 16 December 1978. Accordingly, in this brief statement I shall confine myself to some of the aspects of our Commission's work which the delegation of Spain deems it of interest to single out.

In the first place, as regards the nature of the task entrusted to the Disarmament Commission, in its paragraph 118 the final document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament clearly set forth the Commission's mandate. Now, that mandate is sufficiently broad to allow the Commission to devote its time to considering any of the various problems in the disarmament field. My delegation believes that in successive stages of its work the Disarmament Commission might consider the possibility, already referred to by another delegation, of concentrating on specific items which at any given time may occupy the attention of the international community in regard to disarmament.
Obviously, the Disarmament Commission must never lose sight of the fact that it is a deliberative body. It is no less obvious that we would make a serious mistake if we were in any way to equate "deliberative" with "inoperative". The fact that the Disarmament Commission is made up of all States Members of the United Nations is in accord with the generally accepted principle that all States in the world have an interest in disarmament and thus it is the forum in which most of them can make their voices heard in regard to negotiations that affect all. We would therefore have to insist that, although having no negotiating authority since that is clearly the purview of the Committee on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission does have the competence to make recommendations to the Committee through the General Assembly. These recommendations will, we hope, summarize the consensus existing at any given time among States regarding the urgency and priority to be attached to the consideration of problems and also the approach for a possible solution.

The priority task that we face at the beginning of this session and that is reflected in agenda item 3 is extremely useful in this regard, since the identification and consideration of elements of a broad disarmament programme that can be included in recommendations adopted by all States Members will facilitate the work of the Committee on Disarmament when it prepares that comprehensive programme which is to be the frame of reference for all efforts - unilateral, bilateral, regional or world-wide - designed to achieve the objective that the international community has set for itself, namely, general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

There can be no doubt that among these efforts the most urgent refer to nuclear disarmament. Responsibility for nuclear disarmament - which is the true precept for a genuine non-proliferation policy - is naturally incumbent on the nuclear Powers, all of them. And there is no doubt that those whose weapons are qualitatively and quantitatively significant have greater responsibility. Accordingly, my delegation wishes to join in expressing satisfaction and hope at the announcement of the conclusion and forthcoming signing of the second treaty on the limitation of strategic weapons (SALT II) by the United States and the Soviet Union. The measures which it seems will be included in it on the limitation and in some cases reduction of forces are good news for a world too well accustomed to hearing talk solely of the rise in the arms race between the super-Powers. We also trust that when this treaty enters into force, it
will lead to a new phase in the talks on the limitation of nuclear armaments in which it will be possible to take into account the legitimate concerns of those countries that, because of their geographical location, are directly affected.

The primary importance of nuclear disarmament should not make us forget that the arms race in conventional weapons is for most States a reason for expenditures that in many cases prevent the scant resources available to many of them from being used in the economic and social development of their peoples. This is a subject to which a regional approach would seem to be particularly apt, because it is only within the context of a given area or region that there can be any meaning in trying to control the international transfer of conventional weapons. An important aspect is the control of illicit traffic in this kind of weaponry, and here unilateral measures taken by Governments to prevent such traffic should be complemented by some kind of regional agreement.

It would be illusory to expect a world without weapons, but, at the same time that advances are made towards disarmament, conditions must be created that will enable peaceful international co-existence to become a reality without resorting to force of arms. In this respect, collateral measures such as those intended to strengthen confidence are particularly relevant. The European countries can offer the experience of the measures agreed to in the context of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Special attention will also have to be given to the strengthening of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations, to the elaboration of effective methods for the peaceful settlement of disputes and to the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of the maintenance of peace.

In this course towards the goal of disarmament, we must never forget, as is stated quite rightly in the Final Document, that at each stage the objective must be to maintain security with the lowest possible level of weapons and military forces. We shall make scant headway if the adoption of certain measures implies, from the viewpoint of any given State, an actual lessening of its security.

These are the views that the delegation of Spain wished to put forth at this time in the work of the Commission.
Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic expects positive results from the present session of the Disarmament Commission, its first session devoted to considering matters of substance. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic intends to co-operate constructively with you, Mr. Chairman, and with other delegations.

A year has passed since the tenth special session of the General Assembly was held, at which a detailed discussion of disarmament matters took place. The Final Document of the special session reflects the range of problems on which the greatest degree of agreement could be reached. At our meetings here, we must attempt further to embody in concrete action the results of the special session, to develop them further and thus bring closer the day of their final implementation. This has been the approach taken by the States belonging to the Warsaw Pact which, at the end of the Moscow meeting of the Political Consultative Committee in November last year, presented to the peoples and Governments of all States a broad peace programme involving the restriction of armaments, the promotion of disarmament and the ensuring of international security. It contains many of those ideas which were included in the Final Document of the tenth special session and further develops the concept of how those measures can in fact be carried out. This document of the States of the Warsaw Pact is the foundation of our activities.

In accordance with the decisions taken by the recent tenth plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unified Party of the German Democratic Republic, the representatives of our Government have done everything consistent with promoting the solution of the most vital question for mankind, namely, how to preserve and strengthen peace throughout the world by means of political and military détente.

We are pleased to note that those forces which favour the strengthening and the further development of détente have become stronger and more united. This has been observed particularly in the growth of the national independence movements and the movement which fosters peace, economic and social progress and self-determination in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. There is a growing awareness that these goals can be achieved only by successfully combating the
arms race. We see that trend also in the strengthening of the peace movement and in the impassioned protests which have been expressed by broad segments of the population against the arms race and the military-industrial complexes which tend to multiply the dangers which threaten peace and which simply provide profits for those who manufacture weapons.

At the same time, those who oppose détente have stepped up their attacks, that is, those that are essentially the chauvinist forces of the large Powers. It is precisely those forces - which in Asia, Africa and the Middle East carry out so-called punitive expeditions or afford them support by giving them either material or political assistance - that foster the arms race and attempt to counteract genuine disarmament measures.

The recent aggression which was carried out against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam shows what a policy of acting from force leads to. It leads to militaristic adventurism. The danger of that action for international peace was fortunately averted because of the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese people and the assistance of the Soviet Union and its judicious policies, and also because of international solidarity. Once again it has been proved that any attempt to run against the current of history by military means is doomed to failure.

The attempts which have been made by certain circles to fabricate something like a military and political alliance of the United States, China, Japan and Western Europe against other States will hardly help to bring about an end to the arms race. Once again we should like to stress that there is no reasonable alternative to peaceful coexistence. It is illogical to seek to avoid nuclear warfare on the one hand, and, at the same time, to fan the flames of the arms race, both in the area of nuclear and conventional weapons. It is essential that a constructive approach be adopted in disarmament matters.

The socialist States have already frequently had occasion to state that there is no form of weapon with respect to which they would not be willing to enter into negotiations concerning its limitation or complete elimination - while, of course, strictly observing the principles of equality and of full security for all States. This was the guiding principle which motivated the Ministers of
Foreign Affairs of the States parties to the Warsaw Pact at their meeting in Budapest at the beginning of this week. The proposals which they made on disarmament matters and their suggestions for enhancing the political and international legal guarantees for the security of States and strengthening trust are aimed at giving a fresh impetus to the desire of States to put an end to the arms race and to proceed to carry out disarmament, both in individual regions and on an international scale. For example, it has been suggested that the Vienna talks should be successfully concluded. We are still expecting a constructive reaction to the proposals made by the Socialist States on 6 June. At the same time, it would be possible to reach on a fully mutual basis agreement on the question of arms limitation, which has caused concern to the other party. We consider that conditions are ripe for a European conference of the States which participated in the Helsinki meeting, a conference that could discuss and establish the ways and means to strengthen security and trust in Europe. Such a conference, we feel, could well be held this year.
The German Democratic Republic attaches great importance to the atmosphere of mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States regarding the treaty to limit strategic weapons. We are firmly convinced that the coming into force of that treaty will have a very positive impact on the international climate. Unfortunately, certain North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) bodies at the present time are favouring the manufacture and emplacement of new nuclear-missile systems, including neutron weapons, in certain Western European countries. Such activities can only be regarded as aimed at creating further difficulties and political complications. Therefore, the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the member countries of the Warsaw Pact appeal to the NATO countries not to further complicate matters in Europe, to refrain from any action which would lead to an increase in the arms race and resolutely to embark on the path to military détente and disarmament.

The socialist States did not come empty-handed to this discussion of a general disarmament programme. Bearing in mind the final goal — that is, general and complete disarmament — throughout the history of their existence they have been constantly working out and presenting their own groundwork proposals. The present views of the German Democratic Republic on the subject can be found in detail in the reply addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in accordance with the questionnaire which he sent out.

I should like to offer a few further clarifications: priority we believe should be attached to the sort of steps which are needed to put an end to the arms race and to reduce the size of armed forces and armaments to a very low level, while at the same time not destroying the military balance of power. We believe that first and foremost we should consider those measures which are aimed at putting an end to nuclear armament and also efforts at nuclear disarmament. The socialist States, in order to fulfil the provisions of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly and also the resolution of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, put forward a proposal in the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva which won the support of other members of the Committee. It refers to the halting of
the manufacture of all forms of nuclear weapons and also to the gradual reduction of stockpiles until this form of weapon is completely eliminated. We consider that the Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of strategic arms as it now stands, as well as the steps which will be undertaken subsequently during the next round of talks, a very valuable component of the over-all process of nuclear disarmament. The proposal made by the socialist States takes account of that. There is no doubt that general nuclear disarmament - which is precisely the point of the proposal - should involve the participation of all nuclear States.

In order for the nuclear arms race to be ended it is important that there be a total prohibition on all nuclear-weapons tests. It is also essential that ways to strengthen the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should be discussed in close connexion with nuclear disarmament. The appearance of additional nuclear-weapon States would considerably increase the threat to international peace and security throughout the world and make nuclear disarmament even more difficult. The non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is a particularly important and urgent topic since the racist régimes, whose aggressive policies are well known, are already stretching out their hands for nuclear weapons. We should like to thank the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid for presenting the report of the United Nations Seminar on Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa. That document not only makes it clear what danger for the African States is to be found lurking in the nuclear policies of South Africa, but also confirms that such policies would be completely unfeasible was not broad assistance forthcoming from the Western Powers. We consider that all these matters should also be duly reflected in the report to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

Other important disarmament matters are closely interrelated with the question of nuclear disarmament: the prohibition of such weapons of mass destruction as chemical weapons and the prevention of the devising of new means and systems of weapons of mass destruction. Such weapons are also fraught with a serious threat. It is important to ensure that success in the field of nuclear disarmament is not simply nullified as a result of the invention of new weapons systems.
At the same time as we move towards nuclear disarmament, steps should also be taken which are aimed at strengthening political and international legal guarantees of the security of States and measures aimed at reducing the danger of nuclear war and at strengthening trust among States. Only in this way can the foundation be laid for the universal enactment of far-reaching disarmament measures which can be properly and reliably implemented.

There is also a certain parallel between nuclear disarmament and disarmament in the field of conventional weapons. Here, first and foremost, it is essential that there be a halt to the expansion of the armies and the conventional weaponry of the permanent members of the Security Council, as well as of those States linked with them by military agreements; that their conventional armed forces and armaments be gradually reduced, that their trade in conventional weapons be restricted and that their foreign military bases be eliminated.

Carrying out a broad disarmament programme is a difficult task. Therefore, the time has come to consider how best to proceed to implement it. We consider that a world disarmament conference with the participation of all States would be the most appropriate forum for a thorough discussion of these very diverse and complex problems. We believe that the convening of such a conference is a subject which should be considered in conjunction with the various elements which would go to make up a comprehensive programme of disarmament.
Miss LOPÉZ (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): This first substantive session of the Disarmament Commission is a propitious occasion for us to express the firm hope that the work of this body will respond to the aspirations and expectations that led to its revitalization.

We can say without fear of error that we are at a crucial stage in the crusade against the arms race, a phase which, if there is a constructive attitude and a spirit of willingness, can allow us to use the impetus generated by the General Assembly special session on disarmament to encourage the process that will lead to benefits for international peace and security. During the special session it became clear that there was a need to act urgently and resolutely, that such action could not be postponed and that it was desirable for efforts towards disarmament to be channelled along new paths that would be more efficient and productive. Under the aegis of this unprecedented event, the Committee on Disarmament began its work, and now the Disarmament Commission is beginning the substantive phase of its activities.

In accordance with the mandate given it by the special session, the Disarmament Commission has before it the important task of considering the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. For years now, proposals have been made to that effect, and today there is a more or less general point of view regarding the content and the priorities of such a programme.

Although Venezuela's opinion on the comprehensive programme of disarmament has already been transmitted to the Secretary-General, we believe it will be relevant to refer briefly to some points which in our opinion should be stressed.

In the first place, we must emphasize that in Venezuela's opinion the Final Document of the special session, in which there is an order of priority for disarmament measures, is the fundamental guideline for the disarmament negotiations at the bilateral, regional and multilateral levels.

Obviously, the question of nuclear weapons deserves special consideration. The nuclear arms race, whose origin dates back, ironically, to the very
birth of the United Nations, has developed to such an extent that all the efforts and attempts to contain it have been left far behind.

Today, the nuclear arsenals of the major Powers and the vast destructive power of the weapons with which they are equipped cast a large, dark shadow over the world. The stockpiling of other types of weapons in different parts of the world is also a serious danger, but that can in no way detract from the attention which the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the constant improvement of such weapons deserves. This is a vital problem, requiring maximum priority. The inevitable corollary of this situation is that the nuclear Powers have the responsibility of acting effectively and decisively to correct the alarming course that such weapons have been following.

Obviously, therefore measures and actions relating to nuclear disarmament must constitute the fundamental element, the element of priority, in the comprehensive programme of disarmament. On those lines, the prompt conclusion of a treaty to prohibit nuclear weapon tests in all environments, including nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, is an essential prerequisite for limiting the arms race.

In regard to nuclear disarmament, the SALT talks of course play an important role. The fact that SALT II does not provide for substantial reductions in the arsenals or for qualitative restrictions does not make the agreement less significant. It is important that the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union continue within the framework of SALT III, in order that qualitative limitations may be imposed and that considerable reductions in strategic nuclear weapon systems may be achieved.

In addition to the nuclear threat, there is the devastating danger posed by weapons of mass destruction and the new systems for such weapons. In that respect, there is, among other things, an urgent need to reach agreement on the prohibition of the manufacture, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction. Since this has been a priority item at the United Nations and in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament for many years, efforts must be intensified to find a solution in the near future to the remaining technical problems. In spite of the complex nature of the questions of control, the main obstacle to an agreement seems to be political.
On the other hand, all States should adhere to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction, as well as to the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare.

The limitation and regulation of the transfer of conventional weapons must also have a prominent place in the comprehensive programme of disarmament. It is absolutely necessary to impose restrictions and controls on the international traffic in weapons, since that increases the danger of the escalation of local conflicts and leads to a waste of resources which could otherwise be used for more constructive and noble ends. Therefore, we must promote the conclusion of international and regional agreements limiting the trade in weapons. In addition to a favourable attitude on the part of the States concerned, the resolute co-operation of the weapons-supplying countries is essential; for the sake of peace and harmony, those countries must put an end to their frantic arms sales, which give them astronomical profits.

At present, efforts are being made in our region, Latin America, to establish machinery for consultations between the countries of the region to consider the possibilities of achieving the reduction or prohibition of the transfer of certain kinds of weapons. The existence in some parts of the world of particularly adverse conditions for the reaching of regional agreements should not be used indefinitely as an excuse for not trying to solve, by means of dialogue, common problems that are largely the result of the uncontrolled acquisition of weapons, which increases tension and mistrust.
Basically there is no region that is free from serious difficulties or complexities, but as long as there is willingness on the part of States to place the supreme good of peace above any other individual motive no obstacle will be insurmountable and no initiative will be doomed to failure. At any rate, regional initiatives will be more significant to the extent that they can contribute to the generation of similar actions in other parts of the world.

Our delegation shares the view, stated by some delegations in this debate, that in order to bring about a meeting of minds and to smooth rough edges it is important to implement measures intended to create and consolidate confidence among States as an effective means to facilitate the conclusion of disarmament agreements. As the delegation of Sweden said recently,

"A broad outlook on security concepts among nations should inspire the confidence-building efforts." (A/57/10/PV.11, p. 6)

The reduction of military budgets should be considered as an important element of the comprehensive programme. In this respect the great Powers can and must set the best example. States have supplied information regarding their military expenditures, and mechanisms must be established to compile it.

Implementation of complete disarmament measures should release resources that are now being used for military purposes so that they may be used instead for economic and social progress, and particularly for the benefit of the developing countries. The United Nations study on the relationship between disarmament and development, to which we attach special importance, will formulate practical measures to reassign material and human resources to efforts towards disarmament.

Finally, the delegation of Venezuela would like to emphasize the importance of adopting measures designed to mobilize and sensitize world public opinion on the risks and implications of the arms race, as well as on the efforts being made, mainly at the United Nations, to contain that race. In order to give vigorous impetus to the campaign for disarmament, the peoples of all countries must participate in a more active, coherent and organized manner. Religious, academic, political and other movements can play significant roles. After all, the negative consequences of the arms race affect all the peoples of the world since they threaten their existence and impose economic and social sacrifices upon them.
When, at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, the delegation of Venezuela sponsored the resolution on the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, it did so in the conviction that the principles contained therein are an important commitment by States Members of the Organization to guarantee a better world for coming generations. At this time we would once again indicate our concern at the arms race and in particular the nuclear arms race, and we reiterate our support for a basic principle of the Declaration, which states:

"A basic instrument of the maintenance of peace is the elimination of the threat inherent in the arms race, as well as efforts towards general and complete disarmament, under effective international control, including partial measures with that end in view, in accordance with the principles agreed upon within the United Nations and relevant international agreements."

(General Assembly resolution 33/73, p. 3)

At present in this Commission we are making efforts to design a comprehensive programme of disarmament that would take into account the most urgent and priority aspects of disarmament and seek concrete solutions.

We would not wish to end this statement without expressing our pleasure at the fact that in this debate all the important military Powers have expressed their views and have indicated concrete proposals that will certainly give us food for thought in this Commission and in other competent forums.

Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): Mr. Chairman, allow me first of all to express my delegation's satisfaction at your election. We are convinced that you and the other members of the Bureau will bring the work of this session to a successful conclusion. May I assure you of our readiness to co-operate with you in all your efforts.

The Disarmament Commission received its mandate from the special session of the United Nations General Assembly. The Commission should, inter alia, consider the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament to be submitted as recommendations to the General Assembly and, through it, to the negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament.
We agree with your proposal, Mr. Chairman, that statements at this stage should focus mainly on item 2 of our agenda. Therefore I should like briefly to dwell on the basic principles and goals as well as some of the main outlines of a comprehensive programme or disarmament.

The experiences of the last decade have clearly shown that advances in the relaxation of international tension and the atmosphere of mutual trust and peaceful cooperation among States have a direct and positive effect upon the results of disarmament and arms control efforts. Conversely, if the achievements of détente are to be made lasting, they should be complemented by disarmament measures.

The ultimate goal of our efforts in this field was and remains general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The history of disarmament negotiations proves that this aim can be achieved only by the combination of bilateral, regional and multilateral disarmament efforts, which should all point to a broad range of disarmament measures.

In our opinion, one of the basic objectives of disarmament is the strengthening of international security, including the security of each individual State. Therefore the principle of unimpaired security of States should be strictly observed so that no State or group of States gains unilateral military advantage over others at any stage of the implementation of particular disarmament measures envisaged in the programme.

Another important principle is the universality of disarmament measures. This principle implies the broadest possible participation of States in all the disarmament efforts and in the implementation of particular disarmament measures. The absence of nuclear Powers or militarily significant States from disarmament or arms control measures would impede or prevent implementation of the comprehensive programme.

Measures of disarmament and arms control should be accompanied by effective verification. Specific verification measures should be commensurate with the subject, scope and character of particular disarmament measures in order to provide reasonable safeguards for strict compliance by all signatories with the provisions of a given disarmament instrument.

A comprehensive programme of disarmament should outline a disarmament strategy based on broad consent. It should embrace the complex phenomenon of disarmament, with its military, political, economic and other aspects. It is
desirable that disarmament measures be not merely enumerated but made part of a comprehensive system and framework for the disarmament efforts of the various forums. The programme should clearly indicate orders of priority and tasks ripe for solution at a given stage.

Now I should like to outline some preliminary ideas concerning subjects to be included in the comprehensive programme. The Programme of Action of the Final Document of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament gives a proper and agreed basis for considering the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.
The continuing nuclear arms race poses the greatest threat not only to international peace and security but also to the survival of mankind. The major task of disarmament should therefore be the halting and reversing of the nuclear arms race. In our opinion, the ending of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of stockpiles of them until their complete elimination should be the highest priority task in this field.

At different stages of the negotiations on nuclear disarmament consideration should be given to such aspects as cessation of the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, cessation of the production of fissionable materials for military purposes and gradual reduction and destruction of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles.

The general and complete cessation of nuclear weapon tests should also be included as a priority item, the attainment of which would effectively put an end to the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and contribute to the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime.

In this context I should like to welcome the news of the Soviet-American agreement on SALT II. We sincerely hope that the signing of this treaty in June will be followed by early ratification. We are convinced that the treaty will give added impetus to other disarmament negotiations and contribute to concrete disarmament measures, both nuclear and convention.

A comprehensive programme of disarmament should pay appropriate attention to the question of other weapons of mass destruction. Measures should include the prohibition of the production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and the development and production of new types of weapons of mass destruction.

Adequate attention should be paid to the political, international, legal and security aspects of disarmament, including the elaboration of a treaty on the non-use of force in international relations and an international convention to strengthen the security guarantees of the non-nuclear States.

Appropriate attention should also be given to regional disarmament measures, such as the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace in different parts of the world.
Because of the high-level concentration of military forces and destructive armaments, both conventional and nuclear, in Europe, that continent requires special attention also in a comprehensive disarmament programme. That is why my Government, together with other socialist Governments, put forward a series of proposals aimed at strengthening security and co-operation in Europe.

This goal was again clearly demonstrated at the meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, held in my capital, Budapest. The communiqué issued on 15 May as a result of that meeting comprises a number of concrete proposals aimed at disarmament, strengthening détente and enhancing mutual confidence.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, was informed yesterday at his meeting with the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Gromyko, of the Warsaw Treaty countries’ proposals, which call for, among other things, simultaneous dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), quick conclusion of the United States-Soviet Union strategic arms limitation treaty, SALT II, and moving on to SALT III, talks on ending the manufacture of all nuclear weapons and reduction of stockpiles of them, renunciation of the use of force in inter-State relations, and conclusion of a treaty banning all nuclear weapon tests and renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon States, as well as a number of other proposals.

In conclusion, I should like to express our hope that the statements made so far in this Commission will facilitate our present task, since they have many elements in common. It will be the task of the working group to suggest to this Commission a text acceptable to all. We for our part are ready to co-operate in the working group to achieve this end.
Mr. GHAREKHANI (India): The views of the Government of India on the elements to be included in a comprehensive programme of disarmament have already been communicated to the Secretary-General and are contained in document A/CN.10/PV.14. My statement today will therefore be brief.

Under the terms of paragraph 118 of the Final Document, the Disarmament Commission is called upon, inter alia, to consider the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament to be submitted as recommendations to the General Assembly and, through it, to the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation sees the roles of the Disarmament Commission and the Committee on Disarmament as mutually complementary. It is true that the Disarmament Commission is a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly of the United Nations, whereas the parentage of the Committee on Disarmament is not quite clear. Nevertheless, my delegation is convinced that the Committee on Disarmament is duty bound to give most serious consideration to any recommendations which may be addressed to it by the General Assembly. Similarly, the Disarmament Commission should also respect the autonomy of the Committee on Disarmament in the organization of its work and so on. In short, we believe that both the deliberative and the negotiating organs in the field of disarmament should work in harmony with each other in the pursuit of our common objectives.

The goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control was adopted by the General Assembly as long ago as November 1959. We realize, of course, that it is a goal which is not easy to achieve. Indeed, it is quite possible that that goal may continue to elude the international community for several more decades. It is, however, important that determined efforts should continue to be made at least in the general direction of that ultimate objective. Unfortunately, the history of the past 20 years has shown that mankind is marching perhaps in the reverse direction. The arms race instead of slowing down, has multiplied several times. Progress in the field of concrete disarmament has been painfully slow, disappointing and almost non-existent.

At the same time, my delegation would like to express its satisfaction at the reported agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on the second stage of their strategic arms limitation talks (SALT). We hope that further stages of the SALT negotiations will follow soon, resulting in substantial reductions in the nuclear arsenals of the two most important nuclear-weapon States.
The elaboration of a comprehensive programme dealing with all aspects of the problem of the cessation of the arms race would, we are convinced, constitute a significant step towards reaching the ultimate objective. Basically, the Government of India believes in a global and all-embracing approach to bring about real disarmament and a lasting peace in international security. We supported some partial measures only in so far as they sought to promote progress towards general and complete disarmament. For a comprehensive programme of disarmament to be effective and credible, it should contain principles, main elements and machinery of implementation.
The comprehensive programme is distinct from the Programme of Action which was adopted at the tenth special session. Whereas the Programme of Action is a selection of measures which could be, and indeed ought to be, implemented in the immediate future, the comprehensive programme should be general, leading progressively to the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. Our own views on the main elements of the comprehensive programme are contained in document A/CN.10/1. My delegation, along with other non-aligned delegations, hopes to be able to introduce a draft working paper on the elements of a comprehensive programme before tomorrow afternoon.

My delegation agrees with what the Chairman has said about the role of the Disarmament Commission on the subject of the comprehensive programme. We are of the view that work relating to the elaboration of the elements of the comprehensive programme should be completed before we adjourn on 8 June. Our recommendations then would be transmitted to the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva through the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session. Thereafter the task of negotiating the texts of the various elements would necessarily be the responsibility of the Committee on Disarmament. The negotiating body, in its turn, would keep the General Assembly informed of the progress in the matter. My delegation is convinced that the Disarmament Commission should have further opportunities to keep itself informed of the work of the Committee on Disarmament and to make such further recommendations to it as may be deemed desirable. This continuous exchange between the two organs is essential if the international community is to have an effective voice in the field of disarmament.
Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation, like others, will attempt to concentrate its comments in this first substantive session of the Disarmament Commission on agenda item 3 relating to the consideration of the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. This does not indicate any lack of interest in other substantive issues such as the various aspects of the arms race, especially of the nuclear arms race, or the harmonization of views on concrete steps for the progressive reduction of military budgets and the reallocation of the resources thus released for economic and social development, issues which appear as agenda items 4 and 5. It is due to the fact that we have agreed that on this occasion we should concentrate our efforts on considering the elements to which I have referred and which we shall eventually have to convert into recommendations to the General Assembly that subsequently will be transmitted to the Committee on Disarmament.

My delegation believes that our present consideration of the elements of such a programme should not be regarded as the sum total of our responsibility in this field. We are aware of the fact that the Committee on Disarmament also has a responsibility in this regard, and the efforts of both parties should converge to serve the same purpose.

We believe, therefore, that as the Committee on Disarmament makes progress on its own task the results should be transmitted to this deliberative organ, which would then have a fresh opportunity to contribute to a goal which is sought by the entire international community which is so properly and fully represented in this body.*

It is no accident that the international community is now particularly interested in drawing up a comprehensive programme of disarmament. This interest can be explained in part by the fact that there is a deep-felt wish to prevent the results of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which were so hard won, from being dissipated in the maze of international problems; and, on the other hand, because it is realized that partial agreements, however important they may be, can have

* Mr. Boel (Denmark) took the Chair.
only a limited impact and that their importance tends to fade if they are not included in a much broader context, like pieces of a mosaic which gradually make up the final design and at the same time are concrete parts of it.

For each day we see that, on the rare occasions when disarmament agreements have been achieved, they are accompanied by rather disturbing elements which are essentially further steps in the arms race and create new areas of concern, thus expanding the already vast field of armaments problems. Nevertheless, we should like to express our pleasure at the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union have achieved agreement in the second round of talks on strategic arms limitation (SALT II). It is our hope that that agreement will be promptly implemented and, more importantly, followed by other agreements that will result in a reduction of nuclear weapons and weapon-launchers.

Thus it is necessary that, without overlooking the urgent and specific nature of the present task of negotiating, in the form in which it was established by the special session of the General Assembly, consideration be given to a programme which is likely to give a sense of perspective to action undertaken by States. That perspective can only be one of material progress towards the final objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

As we have stated, we shall attempt in so doing to embody in a gradual, organic, balanced and verifiable process all the disarmament measures that we consider likely to lead to the successful achievement of that final goal. In this sense the task before us should not be regarded as in any way designed to supersede the Programme of Action contained in the Final Document of the special session but, rather, to complement it and making it easier of fulfilment. Nor is it a question of tacitly or overtly using the task we are now embarked on as an excuse to put off any specific measures whose special urgency has been particularly stressed by the special session. Specific mention in this connexion should be made of the nuclear test-ban treaty and the treaty concerning chemical weapons. They should be completed without any further delay.
It is an axiom for my delegation and others that disarmament is a responsibility that is shared by all; but there are some who bear more responsibility than others. We cannot refer to the comprehensive programme of disarmament, or any other aspect of the problem, without taking into account the realities of the international situation which is characterized by profound inequalities in armaments levels - to mention only the question of arms themselves, without analysing how the use or threat of use of those weapons in many parts of the world seriously contributes to the present danger.

Accordingly we can only recall that the programme with which we are dealing must take into account the need for the disarmament process to be promoted through a gradual reduction of weapons, which will not imply any lessening of the security of any State least of all, naturally, that of the States that possess the fewest weapons.
That fundamental principle of disarmament negotiations must be taken into account at all times and applied equally with the others which are recorded in the Final Document of the special session. It goes without saying that the priorities agreed to at that time must be the subject of urgent measures for their implementation. In regard to such principles and priorities, this comprehensive, realistic and flexible programme should facilitate the start of urgent measures to halt the arms race in all its aspects and begin a process of genuine disarmament — a process which by its very nature will promote the establishment of conditions for a more stable, peaceful and just international order that will ensure the security of all peoples and establish a new international economic order.

Therefore, the programme is not a treaty in the conventional meaning of the word, but rather an instrument to make it easier to arrive at concrete and effective disarmament measures at the various levels — bilateral, regional and multilateral — which, interconnected and directed as a whole towards a common objective, will lead us to its realization. On the other hand, singling out such measures should not present major difficulties, since the main sectors to be acted on were agreed by consensus at the special session.

It might not be without value to recall that almost 20 years ago, at its fourteenth session, the General Assembly proclaimed the objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Two decades later, and with mankind facing as never before the prospect of its own self-destruction, as recognized in the Final Document of the special session, my delegation believes that no effort should be spared to reverse the trend which has made tangible the insecurity of all, and to seek in the disarmament process the achievement of the aspiration for security which is inherent in the rational quality of the human being.
The key component of the comprehensive programme can be none other than a set of measures that will make it possible to direct the process towards the final objective of general and complete disarmament.

Among those measures it is hard to overestimate the definite importance and priority of nuclear disarmament. The prohibition of the threat or use of nuclear weapons enunciated by the international community through a resolution of the General Assembly must be made effective and the nuclear arms race brought to an immediate halt. The so-called qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons must be suspended forthwith, and the necessary negotiations leading to a gradual, progressive reduction of nuclear arsenals and delivery systems must begin without delay so that the genuine nuclear disarmament called for by the vast majority of peoples may become effective within a given time. In this same field, we must promote the establishment, in appropriate circumstances, of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace.

There must be a guarantee that the use of all other weapons of mass destruction will be effectively forbidden and that research on and the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction will be prevented. As regards chemical weapons, it goes without saying that their prohibition, together with the prohibition of further nuclear weapons tests, will be the subject of a treaty before completion of the comprehensive programme.

With a view to general and complete disarmament, countries possessing the largest arsenals of conventional weapons will have to take the initial steps for the limitation and gradual reduction of those weapons. A treaty on the prohibition of weapons likely to cause undue suffering or to have indiscriminate effects should be concluded promptly. In due course, States should maintain only the agreed level of weapons needed to protect the security of their citizens and to contribute to United Nations peace-keeping forces.
A similar process is to be followed in the matter of armed forces, starting, understandably and logically, with those countries having the best equipped and the largest armed forces.

The reduction of military expenditures has been the subject of considerable attention by the international community in recent years. Advances in the sophistication of the concept of military expenditures must be taken into account in working out agreed procedures for the reduction of those expenditures.

But such a programme is inconceivable without adequate means of verification, a definite guarantee of the good faith of the parties, an element that would increase the confidence needed for the elaboration of broader treaties. In this task, obviously, our Organization must play a major role, and this must be duly considered.

It has been rightly thought that the disarmament process should not lessen but rather increase the feeling of security of individual countries. In this respect, the disarmament process must of necessity go hand in hand with an effective improvement in the operation of international security machinery, which so directly affects the very essence of the international Organization, and with confidence-building measures, on which the General Assembly has already pronounced itself in a preliminary fashion.

Furthermore, as is clear, and as recognized in the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly, the link between disarmament and economic and social development is clear: the resources released as a result of the implementation of disarmament measures must be devoted to the economic and social development of all countries, particularly the developing ones.

In all this, the United Nations will play a central, preponderant role. Our Commission must be adequately and appropriately informed of progress made by the Committee on Disarmament in this field and be willing to make new contributions to this common endeavour.
Finally, time-frames must be established for the implementation of the various phases of the disarmament programme; besides being sufficiently broad and flexible, those time-frames must reflect a sense of the relative urgency and priority of each phase. Otherwise its drafting would be practically academic. We must bear in mind that if it is deemed necessary to wait until all ideal conditions exist before starting the disarmament process, we might as well recognize that it will never begin and that it is precisely the constant intensification of all aspects of the arms race which should promote our determination to reverse the trend which has brought us to our present insecurity.

In this connexion, my delegation, unlike those who believe it unrealistic to think in terms of time-frames, considers that what is realistic is precisely to combine action with the protestations of devotion to the cause of disarmament and to agree that that is what we are working for - and not to design mere schemes for possible study by zealous historians.

Without indulging in dangerous optimism, my delegation considers that the participation in this debate and the replies to the inquiry of the Secretary-General are sufficient proof of the interest of the international community in the work of our Commission and, more specifically, of the importance attached in various sectors to the preparation of the comprehensive disarmament programme. My delegation will endeavour to contribute to the task before us, and expresses the hope that its results will be an auspicious sign of the will to fulfil the oft proclaimed aspiration to begin the disarmament process.
Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I should like at the outset to express our appreciation of the wisdom and effectiveness with which our Chairman, Mr. Vellodi, has been guiding our deliberations. I express the confident hope that these deliberations will prove useful and constructive and I assure the Chairman of our full co-operation.

The revival of the Disarmament Commission and its establishment as a continuing deliberative body with a broad mandate is one of the highlights of the special session devoted to disarmament. The opportunity is thus afforded for substantial deliberation and in-depth examination by this Commission of the causes of the long stagnation in all disarmament endeavours. In the same context, and parallel to the work of the Commission, are the relevant studies to be conducted in the search for new and more imaginative approaches to the arms race, which lies at the very core of the whole disarmament problem.

Two important studies by expert groups set up by resolutions of the General Assembly at the special session are those concerning the interrelationship between disarmament and development, on the one hand, and disarmament and international security, on the other. The former is to deal with the consequences of the arms race and the latter with its root causes. Both are of major significance.

We have as a priority item on our agenda the consideration of the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. A primary and fundamental element is the halting of the arms race. Obviously, agreements towards the elimination or reduction of weapons can hardly be expected whilst the production of new and more sophisticated weapons of global destruction continues unabated in a competitive and unrelenting arms race. Our attention should therefore primarily be centred on measures that will contribute to the cessation of the arms race, which is obviously the key to the effectiveness of any disarmament programme; for the sad reality remains that all efforts at progress on disarmament for two decades, since the General Assembly adopted the goal of general and complete disarmament, have produced hardly any results. There must be a fundamental hindrance to account for the failure of all those studies and persistent and repeated efforts. This problem will have to be looked into more carefully.
Meanwhile, the arms race during those two decades has been rapidly and dangerously escalating quantitatively and qualitatively. In particular, its qualitative aspect of the search for more deadly nuclear weapons poses new and ever more threatening problems. Already some years ago, in 1970, the warning was given that by its qualitative development the thermonuclear weapon would soon reach the point of uncontrollability. So the efforts at controlling these weapons will be as nothing while this arms race continues. No longer man but the deadly machine will rule and determine the future of mankind. We have by now dangerously approached that point, if we have not already reached it.

Some experts think that we have reached it. Human control is increasingly becoming illusory, being submerged by the unrelenting momentum of a frenetic race in armament, which already appears to be beyond the exercise of human reason.

Apart from the many and increasing dangers that the arms race poses and the size of the enormous and impermissible drain on resources direly needed for development, it involves a further evil consequence: the arms race in itself engenders a climate of confrontation and hostility that is antagonistic to the disarmament effort and stands in the way of any agreement on disarmament measures. For, indeed, the climate of confidence required for disarmament measures cannot flower in the midst of a competitive and accelerating arms race, and this is perhaps a main cause of the failure of all disarmament efforts so far.

We must avoid repeating the past in the futility of efforts directed at the elimination or reduction of stocks of armaments without at the same time turning our attention to the compelling necessity of taking concrete steps towards the effective halting of the arms race. Past experience has amply demonstrated that disarmament agreements involving inspection and control cannot possibly be reached in a climate of mistrust and suspicion engendered and intensified by the sharp antagonism of the unremitting and escalating arms race. Let us therefore briefly deal with the key problem regarding the possibilities and means of curbing the arms race as a major element in any comprehensive programme of disarmament, which should be imaginative in its approach. To that end we must look into the root causes of the arms race so that our efforts may become meaningful.
One root cause is that the security of nations still relies on the outdated and outmoded concept of a balance of power that is wholly unadjusted to our times as long as, in a supposed effort at maintaining or regaining that balance, the resulting arms race negates all disarmament progress. As long as the community of nations operates on this concept and its inseparable accompaniment, the arms race, the latter will unavoidably continue for ever. The so-called balance of power is a conceptually distorted relic of the past. Now in the nineteenth century it was a balance between five or six major Powers acting in agreement in the concert of Europe and it worked well, although in an undemocratic way, but it worked through agreement and with results. It did not involve at all any arms competition. In our radically changed world, the balance of power has assumed a totally different nature. It is now clearly a balance of weapons between two major Powers acting not in concert but in extreme antagonism. It is therefore a negative notion running counter to all concepts of a United Nations era and the tenets of the Charter which aim at harmonizing the relations of nations towards security and peace. The so-called balance of power has therefore no place in our world of today. Not only does it not provide security, but through its linkage to the escalating arms race it threatens the very survival of mankind.
One of the basic elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament is the adoption of measures to supplant the false notion of security and replace it by genuine collective security through co-operation in the United Nations in strict accordance with the Charter through compliance with the explicit provisions of Chapters VI and VII of the Charter for international order, security and peace.

We cannot have disarmament in a world of continuing and aggravated anarchy. The international community of the United Nations would, if the Charter were applied, operate effectively in a manner adjusted to our times. There is no sense in being in a United Nations era, pretending to conform with the United Nations Charter provisions and, at the same time, acting as if we were in the nineteenth century, in a period of balance of power and of force and domination, which have nothing to do with a United Nations era. There is an imbalance between our times and the requirement to act in accordance with the moral standards demanded by our times and by our membership in the United Nations. It is because we act in a contrary way that we cannot have any effective disarmament. These are the basic considerations regarding an effective and comprehensive programme of disarmament, if we really mean business and not a repetition of the past efforts.

Therefore, the agreements envisaged in Article 43 of the Charter will have to be seriously considered as one of the main elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament that would help to stop the arms race. More detailed elaboration of the relevant procedures would be left for the Working Group. In this respect, it should be borne in mind that concrete and constructive suggestions on programmes of disarmament are in existence. They were put forward in the hopeful period of co-operation between the super-Powers in the United Nations during the first three years of the 1960s. I refer to the McCloy-Zorin Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations of 1961 and the subsequent proposals made by both the Soviet Union and the United States in 1962. They were concrete and valid proposals. More recently, there were also the various proposals that were made in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) by Mexico, Sweden and Yugoslavia in 1970.
As our colleague from Mexico, Ambassador Garcia Robles, pointed out in his statement, we are not starting from scratch; we must take account of those proposals and particularly of the agreements already reached on them and the commitments already made in accordance with those proposals and statements.

The McCloy-Zorin Joint Statement of Agreed Principles provides, in the first place, in paragraph 7, that progress in disarmament should be accompanied by measures to strengthen institutions for maintaining peace and security in accordance with the principles and provisions of the United Nations Charter; and measures to maintain international peace and security, including the obligation of States to place at the disposal of the United Nations agreed manpower necessary for an international police force. It also provides that arrangements for the use of this force should ensure that the United Nations can effectively deter or suppress any threat or use of arms or aggression in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations. This provision of the McCloy-Zorin Joint Statement of Agreed Principles is reproduced verbatim and forms part of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly in paragraph 110. It is therefore part of what we have to consider in dealing with this problem of elements of comprehensive disarmament.

The 1962 proposals made by the Soviet Union for a draft treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control provide in its article 18 for the conclusion of

"agreements with the Security Council by which they undertake to make available to the latter armed forces ... as provided in Article 43 of the United Nations Charter." (Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Annexes, p. 6)

I turn now to the United States outline of a treaty on general and complete disarmament, of the same year, one month later. This also provides in the first stage for the prompt conclusion of the agreements envisaged in Article 43 of the Charter for a United Nations peace force. Similar provisions also appear in the proposals made in the CCD in 1970 by Mexico, Sweden and Yugoslavia.

We see that all through the years some effort was made towards agreement on disarmament, when, exceptionally a Joint Statement of Agreed Principles was made by the Soviet Union and the United States - and various proposals were put forward by the two super-Powers, yet we were not able to get anywhere. The reason
is that while all these things were being done the arms race was escalating and doing its own job to destroy every effort that was made. Therefore, we must bear in mind what has already been agreed to in these documents, what has already been proposed by the super-Powers, and turn our attention to what was missing at that time, namely, an effort to slow down or stop the arms race. That is the key to the work of this Commission, which really represents an important advance in the work for disarmament because it has the time for deliberation. The Commission has a wide enough mandate to deal with these problems which were previously dealt with cursorily and hurriedly in a few days during the sessions of the General Assembly.

Parallel to the aforesaid endeavour towards international security as a means for halting the arms race, collateral measures of disarmament should simultaneously be taken, with priority given to measures for nuclear disarmament, as provided for in the Final Document of the special session. Priority should also be given to those measures which are more directly conducive to the halting of the arms race. We would list among those the following. First come verifiable measures for the cessation of the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear-weapon testing. To that end, a treaty banning underground nuclear tests should be entered into, thereby winding up the long delayed completion of the partial test ban treaty. The relevant work for such a complete ban has virtually been accomplished. By all accounts, what essentially remains is the political decision to proceed to its conclusion. We therefore express the confident hope that this may be one of the first important achievements of the momentum created by the special session on disarmament.
Next we would list the freezing of all nuclear weapons as well as all conventional weapons of mass destruction. In this regard we fully appreciate the achievement of SALT II in setting a ceiling on the race in strategic arms. Yet it has no effect on halting or reducing the current arms race and therefore we continue to repeat the necessity of taking steps to curb the arms race and of studying measures to that end.

The programme should also include measures to enhance the non-proliferation régime on the basis of generally acceptable safeguards under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) with an undertaking by the nuclear Powers to undertake nuclear disarmament.

In the field of conventional weapons there should be a freeze on the research and development of chemical weapons. To that end we should call for the completion of a convention on chemical weapons and for the destruction of existing stockpiles. We could also call for a convention stopping research, development and stockpiling of all kinds of new weapons of mass destruction, that could be achieved either by one convention or through a series of conventions. A further element would be agreement for the freezing and reduction of present armies and military budgets. In that regard the possibility of abolishing conscription might be considered.

On this occasion I might recall that my President, the President of Cyprus, made a proposal at the special session for the total demilitarization and disarmament of the Republic of Cyprus and the implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions. The proposal forms part of the Final Document, paragraph 125 (u).

Before concluding I should like to say a few words about a moratorium on the use of outer space except for benign purposes which should be agreed upon. We could seek the adoption of a protocol to the 1966 Treaty on outer space preventing the use of outer space for aggressive military purposes. Another element would be to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace and to explore possibilities of the creation of other such zones, including the Mediterranean. A further long-term aspect is that of educating the peoples of the world in peace and security. Public opinion influences parliaments and such an approach would facilitate the conclusion of relevant treaties and conventions on disarmament. The movement of public opinion towards disarmament should
be uniform in all social systems throughout the world. Insufficient attention has been paid to that dimension of disarmament and consideration should be given to it in this Commission.

Finally, the list of elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament could be further extended, but the important thing is that we in this Commission should try to do all we can to make such recommendations, through the General Assembly, to the Committee on Disarmament as will permit the achievement of effective results and will allow us truly to feel that we have performed our duty to humanity and for its survival.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.