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REPORT OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS FORTIETH SESSION (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: Delegations will recall that our meeting yesterday was adjourned after we postponed a decision on the question of annexes to the report of the Commission. The postponement was agreed to in order to allow delegations to consult on the matter. Following consultations among interested delegations, an understanding has emerged that the report of the Commission should include as annexes only those documents which form an integral part of the report of the Commission and those which have not been translated and distributed during the course of the Commission's meetings.

The secretariat is now distributing a list of the annexes that would be included in the report of the Commission since they meet the criteria I have just outlined. Members will see that the items are self-explanatory. The first is the compilation of proposals for recommendations on agenda item 4. The second is the working paper which is an integral part of the report of Working Group I, on military budgets. The third is the paper that forms an integral part of the report of Working Group II. The fourth is the statement that the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs made in Working Group III, on the cost of disarmament studies. The fifth is the list of topics which were agreed to in Working Group III. The sixth is the paper from the delegation of Uruguay requesting publication of a document entitled "The United Nations and Disarmament", covering the period from 1945 to 1985. The seventh, which again is self-explanatory, is the review of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade.

I hope that I have the agreement of the Commission that we follow the procedure whereby these seven documents would be annexed to the report.

Mr. SHARMA (India): Since the silence probably indicates that there is agreement on the part of the Commission to acceptance of the annexes as stated, I should like to inquire whether what has been agreed to or the way in which it has been agreed will set a precedent for future sessions of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Will it be a kind of rule of procedure whereby in future the inclusion of annexes will be determined, or can I take it that this is being agreed to only as a one-time consensus reached in the manner in which consensuses generally come about and will be lost and forgotten subsequently, and that fresh
and innovative considerations will be brought forth next time? If the answer is that this will be a precedent for all time, I should like it to be stated what the exact basis is - for instance, whether it is financial considerations - so that subsequently this will be used for other arguments that arise. In the past we have been going along with precedents for the sake of a quick consensus. Now this will be one new precedent in which financial considerations are advanced to open up an issue which traditionally has been settled tacitly.

I should be grateful for clarification, Mr. Chairman.
The CHAIRMAN: I should like to assure the representative of India that the decision we take at this session of the Commission regarding the annexes will, I hope, constitute a precedent for future sessions of the Commission because it is based on criteria to which the General Assembly agreed at its twenty-second session and which have been subsequently reiterated every year. So I hope that this will now be the basis on which future meetings of the Disarmament Commission will take care of the question of annexes.

If I were to make a judgement on the basis of the debate that took place on this particular question yesterday I would say that the financial aspect is only one consideration in the matter. Basically, as was pointed out by some delegations, the principle of following guidelines put forward by the General Assembly has been the main consideration. The point was also made that Conference Services - if I am now using the right expression - did take exception to the Commission's report last year because of its inclusion of a number of annexes which had earlier been circulated as documents. I hope that these explanations will satisfy the representative of India and that I can have his agreement to the proposal I have made.

Mr. SHARMA (India): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for your kind explanation. Inasmuch as a General Assembly resolution has been cited as the basis for this change from previous practice I should like to go back to the point in yesterday afternoon's debate when you suggested that we follow the precedent set last year. Your suggestion was followed by quite a long silence and only a few delegations - maybe just one delegation - repeated their points. I should like to know whether that suggestion was based on the General Assembly's resolution and, if so, whether it is specific to that one resolution or whether similar respect will in future be accorded to all General Assembly resolutions, not just those on the dissemination and printing of documents, but also those on the more substantive issues with which the Commission is supposed to deal.

The CHAIRMAN: I appeal to the representative of India not to begin a debate on this question. We have spent a fair amount of time discussing it and I think that perhaps it would be better for the Commission's session if I could again request him to agree to the solution I have proposed. I think that getting into a debate on the question would really not serve any purpose at this stage.

Mr. SHARMA (India): I shall accept your advice, Mr. Chairman. The debate that was started yesterday was itself, in my view, totally unnecessary and superfluous. I shall agree to the solution you proposed, with the caveat that this
(Mr. Sharma, India)

constitutes a very bad precedent because it resulted in a whole afternoon's proceedings of the Disarmament Commission being wasted on a kind of exercise that did not even match the cost of holding the meeting and represented a gross misuse of rational arguments through application of the rule of consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of India for his very co-operative attitude.

May I then take it that the solution to which we have agreed will include the annexing of the seven documents listed in the paper just circulated?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Having settled that question, with the co-operation and understanding of all delegations, we can now proceed to the adoption of the draft report of the Commission as a whole, after making the necessary adjustments, in the light of the decision just taken on the question of annexes, to the relevant paragraphs of the draft report.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the draft report.

The draft report of the Commission, as a whole, as amended, was adopted.

CONCLUDING STATEMENTS

Mr. MIGLIORINI (Italy) (interpretation from French): I speak today on behalf of the 10 member countries of the European Community.

The delegations on whose behalf I have the honour to speak affirmed, at the beginning of the work of the session, their confidence in this Commission and in its ability to make a substantial contribution to the cause of disarmament. They emphasized the special responsibility of the Commission in the development of recommendations concerning particularly complex and specific disarmament problems. They also affirmed their readiness to contribute actively to the Commission's work and to the search for positive results conducive to consensus on the question on the Commission's agenda.

At the conclusion of the session, the delegations of the Ten reaffirm their commitment to the objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control as well as their confidence in the role of the Disarmament Commission, even though they must note with regret that the results of this session have been disappointing.
In spite of the efforts made by you, Mr. Chairman, and by the other officers of the Commission, it has not been possible to achieve significant progress on the principal issues.

The attainment of consensus has once again proved impossible, for example, on agenda item 4, which deals with the over-all issues of nuclear and conventional disarmament and which we consider to be of fundamental importance.

In the view of the Ten, the progress of our work would be considerably facilitated if delegations were to try to promote a spirit of mutual comprehension, to develop grounds for understanding and to find areas of agreement.

The Ten are aware of the dangers of a growing accumulation of armaments, in particular of nuclear weapons. Since the proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects is a subject of universal concern, it is up to all States to contribute to the attainment of the objective of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. The Ten have already stressed on many occasions the importance of a balanced approach to nuclear and conventional disarmament aimed at strengthening stability and international security and at promoting the adoption of measures for concrete and verifiable reduction.
The delegations of the Ten were in favour of studying the possibility of arriving at a certain number of acceptable recommendations on item 4 with a view to their submission to the General Assembly. The possibility of arriving at such a result by means of a selection process should not be rejected a priori.

In the light of difficulties encountered in recent years, they also suggest that a new approach be considered that might open up the prospect of progress by the Commission on this point.

There is a conceptual link between the debate which took place on agenda item 4 and that on agenda item 7. Positive aspects emerged from the latter discussion, which should not be neglected; these encourage the hope that the Commission's deliberations may become more substantive in the near future. The documents submitted by many delegations, particularly the delegation of Cameroon, contributed greatly to an understanding of the determining factors in the process of disarmament.

A lengthy debate took place on the usefulness of strengthening United Nations machinery in the field of disarmament. The conceptual bases for the beginning of this process have been established, particularly in a programme of work. Although the Ten do not always see their substantive views reflected in that document, they consider that on the whole it constitutes a useful guide for the future work of the Commission.

The delegations of the Ten are very grateful for the efforts made to draw up a concise and objective report on agenda item 9, concerning the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. As they emphasized at the beginning of the session, they are fully aware that significant obstacles continue to prevent progress towards disarmament. They also realize that the results achieved during this Decade have been very limited.

The delegations of the Ten are, none the less, convinced that the difficult international conditions can change. The resumption of the Geneva bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union is a very positive factor.

Convinced that only a constructive attitude on the part of all Members of the United Nations can promote progress in disarmament, the Ten will continue to make every possible effort in all forums with a view to attainment of these objectives.
In connection with the debate on item 8, on the naval arms race, the delegations of the Ten expressed the opinion at the beginning of the discussion that it was neither desirable nor appropriate, to begin discussion of this item at a time when the study being carried out by a group of experts within the framework of the United Nations had not yet been completed. They reaffirm now that in the present circumstances the discussion was premature.

The reduction of military budgets has been on the Commission's agenda since 1981. The delegations of the Ten felt that the working paper prepared by the Chairman would make it possible to arrive at agreed solutions. In this respect, they regret that a few delegations persist in maintaining positions that make a consensus impossible.

Bearing in mind the importance of this question for the overall disarmament undertaking, the Ten firmly hope that its consideration will continue and that it will be kept on the Commission's agenda.

They reaffirm their conviction that a progressive reduction of military expenditures on a concrete, objective, mutually agreed basis, without prejudice to the security of any State, would contribute to curbing the arms race and make it possible to reallocate resources now used for military purposes to economic and social progress, especially that of the developing countries.

In the view of the Ten, the reduction of military budgets should be based on appropriate comparability and verification procedures. In this respect, the use of the standardized international reporting instrument should make the transparency and comparison of military expenditures possible. Moreover, the goal can be achieved only if a larger number of States agree to participate. Nevertheless, the Ten note with satisfaction that an increasing number of States are providing statistical data on the basis of the instrument agreed by the United Nations.

The Ten regret that the Commission has once again been unable to arrive at consensus recommendations on agenda item 6 concerning South Africa's nuclear capability. Intensive efforts in this connection have been made by many delegations both in the Working Group and in informal consultations. In spite of certain compromise proposals, the drafting effort did not yield positive results. The delegations of the Ten take note of the agreement in principle of the members of the Disarmament Commission on certain fundamental aspects of the question. The entire international community agrees that South Africa must put an end to its
(Mr. Migliorini, Italy)

policy of apartheid; that nothing must be done to aid the maintenance of that system; that anything that could contribute to the development of a South African nuclear military capability must be totally rejected; that South Africa should publicly declare that it renounces the development and acquisition of nuclear weapons and that it should place all its nuclear installations under the International Atomic Agency safeguards system.

The delegations of the Ten note once again the lack of specific conclusions on this question. They feel that the Commission should consider the possibility of a new approach, and in particular should examine the idea of adopting recommendations by consensus at least on the most important aspects of the question.

The delegations of the Ten reaffirm their conviction that the Disarmament Commission, particularly in a more favourable international situation, could constitute a more effective instrument for the attainment of the common objective of general and complete disarmament. The Ten are committed to peace and stability. They are eager to promote the reduction of all types of weapons and of the risk of any conflict.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should like to express to you the warmest appreciation of our 10 delegations and our congratulations on the excellent, competent and effective way in which you have guided our work. It is, above all, thanks to your efforts, your foresight and your spirit of conciliation that this session has had its encouraging aspects which can serve as a point of reference for the future.

I also extend our heartfelt thanks to the Chairmen of the Working Groups, the other officers of the Commission, the Secretary of the Commission and the other members of the secretariat.

Mrs. THEORIN (Sweden): In the age of nuclear weapons, security cannot be achieved for one country alone. The nuclear age has brought a unique threat to all humankind.

Not only are more people than ever before threatened by the existing weapons; not only are more resources than ever before diverted from urgent civilian needs; but what is at stake now is the future of our civilization, maybe even life as such on this planet. And, as if the threat to this Earth were not enough, we are now also faced with the fateful prospect of an accelerating arms race in outer space.
The States possessing nuclear weapons have the power to decide over life and death - not only their own life and death, but also the life and death of the two thirds of humankind living in the non-nuclear-weapon States.

We all naturally welcome the fact that, after a long period of virtually no dialogue between the two super-Powers, bilateral negotiations on central disarmament areas are now taking place. But our future, too, is at stake; we will always remind them that these vital issues cannot be confined to discussions between the super-Powers alone. The non-nuclear States must also have a say.

Therefore, we have again and again stressed the need for serious substantive negotiations within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. We attach great importance to the deliberative work carried out by the First Committee of the General Assembly and the Disarmament Commission. In these forums it is not only the nuclear powers that can make their voices heard.

We continue to take an active interest in the work to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. The institutional reforms carried out through the years, most recently two years ago following a study proposed by my Government, have given the United Nations an improved capacity to respond to the needs of all States to participate in efforts to bring about, through disarmament, a safe world for us all.

The current session of the Disarmament Commission has devoted its attention to a number of important topics. Many countries wish to see a concentration of the work of this body on fewer issues, where it could produce viable contributions to the deliberations of the General Assembly.

Nevertheless, the diversity of our agenda in a way reflects the complexity of today's discussions on disarmament. The arms race is transcending all geographical boundaries - it is moving out into space and onto the oceans. The arms race casts its dark shadow on political relations between the major world Powers. It aggravates local and regional conflicts, making some of them even more explosive threats to international security. It steals precious resources urgently needed for crucial development purposes.

Military budgets and their reduction is a topic which has been on the agenda of the United Nations since 1973. Through many years of patient work by expert groups, considerable progress has now been made in establishing instruments to make possible negotiations on the reduction of military budgets. Definitions and a system for standardized reporting on military expenditures have been elaborated,
allowing for comparisons between different countries as well as between different
times.

The results and suggestions contained in the reports of the study groups will
probably prove valuable in the context of negotiations in this field for a
considerable time to come. When the Commission this year again took up the matter,
it was the hope of the Swedish delegation that the further efforts made by the
sponsors of this item would allow us to conclude the work on principles for
freezing and reducing military expenditures. We regret that this has not proved
possible.

The Swedish Government considers the issue of the nuclear capability of South
Africa to be a matter of serious concern. Sweden strongly opposes nuclear
collaboration with South Africa. We will continue to do so, and we call upon
everyone to desist from such collaboration. We have stepped up our efforts - for
instance, in the United Nations - to bring about the international isolation of the
racist Pretoria régime. It is becoming more and more obvious to everyone that
lasting peace in southern Africa is impossible until the repulsive apartheid system
has been abolished.

Another subject on our agenda is the naval arms race and arms control in the
maritime domain. This is an area which has attracted comparatively little
attention in the period since the Second World War.

An important reason for the apparent lack of interest in naval forces as far
as disarmament is concerned is the fact that the legal régime at sea has only
recently been clearly defined. During the Third United Nations Conference on the
Law of the Sea attempts were made to discuss limitations on the military use of the
high seas - more than 70 per cent of the earth's surface - considered to be the
common heritage of humankind. However, the issue was seen to fall primarily within
the general mandate of the Conference on Disarmament. The Conference on
Disarmament, on the other hand, deemed it difficult to deal with naval issues
before the Law of the Sea Conference had defined the legal régime of the sea.

On 10 December 1982 the new Convention on the Law of the Sea was signed at
Montego Bay, Jamaica. From that date on, we have had a firm legal basis for
discussions about arms limitation and disarmament at sea. It can be added that
even if a few States, mainly major Western Powers, have not yet signed the
Convention, there seems to be no disagreement on its more security-related
provisions, all the more so as the majority of those are customary international
law, thus binding on all States.
Recognizing the fact that a consideration of naval issues was long overdue, and that previous barriers had been removed, Sweden in 1983 initiated a General Assembly resolution calling for a United Nations study in this field. In the resolution, the Secretary-General was requested, "with the assistance of qualified governmental experts, to carry out a comprehensive study on the naval arms race".

The aim of the study was said to be to facilitate "the identification of possible areas for disarmament and confidence-building measures". (General Assembly resolution 38/189 G, para. 1)

The Secretary-General was asked to report to this year's session of the General Assembly.

There were good reasons to start dealing with this subject by means of a United Nations study. The subject is new to modern disarmament work, the legal basis has only recently been defined, and many Governments have not yet adopted a position on the various issues involved.

The work of the group of experts appointed by the Secretary-General is well under way. The expert group includes representatives from many parts of the world, and is working under the able chairmanship of the Ambassador of Indonesia to the United Nations. Although the group is thus geographically quite representative, Sweden would have welcomed the nomination of experts to participate in it by other countries which in the General Assembly and in this Commission have shown a particular interest in the topic.

The study to be presented by the Secretary-General will no doubt facilitate a broad, substantial discussion on measures to curb the arms race at sea.

I will at this stage, as a contribution to the general discussion of this topic, make a few brief comments on one particular aspect of the naval arms race: nuclear weapons deployed at sea.

Submarine-based strategic nuclear weapons are a well-known element of the strategic nuclear balance between the two super-Powers. They are subject to limitations by the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks agreements and are a subject of the ongoing bilateral negotiations in Geneva. Recently, plans to deploy sea-launched nuclear cruise missiles in large numbers have attracted considerable public attention. Much less attention has been paid to the fairly large number of tactical nuclear weapons on board warships.
The nuclear Powers possess, it has been estimated, more than 7,000 submarine-launched ballistic missile warheads. They also have more than 5,000 tactical nuclear weapons for use by naval forces. Thus, more than a quarter of the world's stockpile of nuclear weapons is earmarked for naval use.

The principle of freedom of navigation permits the nuclear Powers to move those weapons all over the world and to deploy them off any coastal point of their choosing. Indeed, they frequently do so, almost as a matter of routine. This creates legitimate concerns in many countries, in particular when warships of nuclear-weapon Powers make use of their right to innocent passage through the territorial waters of other States or call at foreign harbours.

Several nuclear-weapon States pursue the policy of neither confirming nor denying the presence of any nuclear weapons on board any particular ship at any particular time. Such a policy is hardly building confidence between States. It is, in fact, a confidence-blocking measure that should be abandoned. Suggestions have been made regarding different possibilities of identifying vessels carrying nuclear weapons. Such vessels may then be made subject to whatever special regulations can be agreed upon. The purpose should be to minimize the use of ships carrying nuclear weapons for routine patrols and the risk of nuclear incidents at sea.
My Government is looking forward to expressing further its viewpoints on the topic of the nuclearization of the oceans and measures for naval disarmament. We expect to do so after we have had the possibility, together with the other Member States of the United Nations, of examining the report on the Secretary-General's study.

The emergence of long-range cruise missiles is a significant result of military technological developments. Cruise missiles are of particular concern for at least two major reasons. One is that they may have dual capability—that is, they are able to carry both conventional and nuclear warheads. The other is that the latest generations of these missiles can be made to approach their targets from any possible direction and fly through the air space of non-belligerent States also. The dual capability of these missiles is, in a tense situation, likely to cause fear and mistrust of the adversary, thus increasing the risk of miscalculation and dangerous mistakes. In this sense cruise missiles are particularly destabilizing. Although we take it for granted that the territorial integrity of neutral States will be respected, the characteristics of cruise missiles are a cause of particular concern. It is of urgent importance to seek limitations on, or even prohibitions of, long-range cruise missiles. This has to be achieved before they have been deployed in large numbers and before new, and perhaps even more efficient, types have been developed. In fact, it can be said that today we have a unique opportunity to achieve such measures.

It is assumed that questions pertaining to ground- and air-launched cruise missiles are discussed in the bilateral Geneva negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States. It is important that sea- or submarine-launched cruise missiles also be covered by such negotiations. As a first step it should be possible for the super-Powers to agree to a moratorium on the further development, testing and deployment of cruise missiles, aiming at their complete abolition at a later stage. Such a step would serve the general interest of enhanced international stability and certainly also meet some of the particular concerns of neutral States.

During the last year much attention has been given to the question of space weapons and defence against nuclear ballistic missiles. I have on other instances had the possibility of expressing the strong apprehensions of the Swedish Government vis-à-vis the prospect of an arms race in outer space. The risk is obvious that attempts to develop defensive systems against ballistic missiles will
lead to an accelerated development of other types of nuclear weapons and their 
modes of delivery. Two such developments are those I have touched upon in my 
contribution today - sea-based nuclear weapons and cruise missiles. Such 
developments will be to the benefit of the security of no one. Sea-based nuclear 
weapons and cruise missiles will bring the nuclear peril close also to the shores 
of States far away from the centres of today's global political tensions. They 
will make it even more obvious that all countries are threatened by the policies 
pursued by the nuclear-weapon Powers, and that all countries have to join in the 
efforts to bring those Powers to change their course.

Let me emphasize that it is not only futile but dangerous to believe that the 
nuclear menace can be averted by any technological means. The only solution is a 
political one - to start the process of nuclear disarmament, now. No political 
goal is more urgent than nuclear disarmament. Never has so much been at stake.

The arms race seems to have its own logic. Action is followed by 
counter-action. New weapons systems bring about the development of 
counter-weapons. More arms lead to more planning for their use. More planning for 
war leads to more distrust. And more distrust leads to more arms. I am convinced 
that there is also a logic of disarmament. Countries can also plan for peace. 
Progress can lead to progress. Fewer arms can lead to more trust. And more trust 
can pave the way for further disarmament measures.

The road towards disarmament might seem long and difficult. It is therefore 
all the more important to start moving now, and to take at least some steps in the 
right direction. Every day, every year, every conference and session can be made a 
turning-point - until it is too late.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): It is a good tradition that 
the Commission devotes the final plenary meetings of each session to a review and 
assessment of its work. For the 10 members of the European Community the 
representative of Italy has already placed on record some of the views the 
Community members share. I should like to amplify his general presentation by 
adding a number of more detailed aspects.

May I first say a word of appreciation of your own performance, Mr. Chairman. 
You have presided over our proceedings with calm and poise. As we know from 
earlier occasions, among your outstanding traits is a marked sense of fairness and 
of balance. You have used these fine attributes to excellent effect. Not once has
our Commission experienced a moment of unpleasantness, of exacerbation, of hostile encounter between delegations. A thoroughly businesslike atmosphere has prevailed. We owe it in large measure to you, Mr. Chairman, that it has been possible to avoid any undue polarization of views.

Unfortunately, your outstanding contribution could not always be translated into the desired substantive results of our session. On the whole, the 1985 session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission leaves an ambivalent impression. I should like to substantiate my view first by touching on individual agenda items and then by making a few general remarks on the function of the Disarmament Commission in multilateral disarmament, and how that function can best be fulfilled in the future.

Three of our traditional agenda items have not markedly advanced. This is a matter of regret to my delegation. Discussions in the Committee of the Whole on overriding issues of nuclear and conventional disarmament proved only marginally fruitful since they led only to a limited streamlining of an earlier draft text. Because of the over-rigorous position of two delegations it was impossible to digest from the previous material a number of consensus recommendations, suitably prefaced by a general disclaimer as to their partial nature. Even a limited number of recommendations could have been profitably forwarded to the General Assembly, showing that the Commission is engaged in an on-going process on this important, indeed overriding, item. Such a gradual approach would have also enabled us to benefit from the consensus language that emerged on two particularly topical issues - the resumption of the bilateral negotiations between the two major nuclear Powers and the issues of outer space - demonstrating to the General Assembly that the Commission is not content with stagnation and the sterile rehashing of outdated material. The few delegations that could not lend their support to such a gradual endeavour must, again, ask themselves whether by their rigid all-or-nothing position they do not stifle multilateral disarmament efforts altogether, nipping in the bud any momentum that might arise.

In preparing for next year's annual session, delegations should probe whether, in these circumstances, it would be useful to continue work on the present draft texts, or whether a fresh approach, analysing the disarmament scene anew as it may evolve during the year would not be worthy of consideration. In keeping with the comprehensive wording of the agenda item, it might also be a good idea to place the emphasis of future work differently.
For instance, the United Nations study on conventional disarmament, adopted unanimously by the participating governmental experts and transmitted to the General Assembly by the Secretary-General, is now before us and still awaits discussion by the larger community of States. So far, this study has unfortunately not enriched our work on agenda item 4. It could, no doubt, be the subject of an in-depth consideration at the next round of meetings, even without a specific mandate to that effect by the General Assembly.

Participants in the discussion on the reduction of military budgets are again reminiscent of a group of joggers exercising on a treadmill in an enclosed gymnasium. They do keep running, performing the ritual movements and even producing the requisite amount of sweat. But when they descend from their exercise machines, it becomes clear that the movement was only apparent and that not an inch of ground has actually been covered.

In this year's exercise, the runners appear to be fatigued and listless. Yet we should all be aware that the non-success of the present round does not diminish the importance and topicality of the subject of military budgets. The exercise cannot simply be discontinued, although my delegation would be open to a new, more promising formula by which the process could be carried further.

The task remains vital. It is also manageable to build into a model of budget reductions the elements of comparability and mutual information which are the absolute prerequisites for measuring and, indeed, achieving future progress.

My delegation will continue to castigate by appropriate argument those who pretend that the reduction of military budgets is a purely declaratory exercise while refusing to provide the tools which alone can make this process workable both in terms of concrete results and in terms of the generation of confidence among States.

One important and positive feature of this year's treatment of the subject should, however, not be forgotten: Romania, in its particularly prominent role as standard-bearer for this item, has finally decided to join the United Nations standardized reporting system on military budgets. While in this first round of the exercise the submitted matrix does not yet display all the desired data, it is considered by my delegation - and, I know, many others - as an essential step forward.
In reality, its significance goes beyond the Romanian case. A barrier has been broken. If participation in the standardized reporting system is possible, without any loss to the country's security, for one member of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, with its close military integration, there should be no logical hurdle to emulating this praiseworthy example by other members of the Pact. Romania, by showing willingness to comply with the relevant General Assembly resolutions, has honoured the United Nations and itself. I should also like to take this opportunity to commend the Chairman of the Group on military budgets, Mr. Tinca, for his earnest efforts to obtain results against great odds and to come forward with a number of creative proposals for compromise.

It is a matter of particular concern to my delegation that the Working Group on the question of the nuclear capability of South Africa has again failed to produce results. This failure is particularly worrisome in the year when the Non-Proliferation Treaty is before the international community for its third overall review. It would have been most desirable for the General Assembly to have consensus recommendations before it as to how it should react in a determined manner in the face of the danger that South Africa may be acquiring a dangerous category of highly destabilizing new weapons.

If one looks at the texts under discussion, it appears that very few litigious formulations would have remained to be cleared up in order for the General Assembly to take such action, although they were important in nature. The sticking point in these few cases has centred on a differing appreciation of the facts by African countries and others. Goodwill and flexibility on all sides and some creative negotiating should have enabled us to overcome this hurdle. My delegation still does not fully understand why a juxtaposition of the diverse views in these few instances would not have been possible, allowing an overall consensus on a package of specific recommendations. We are unanimous in condemning certain practices by the South African Government. In my part of the world, there is deep understanding and sympathy for the feeling of Africans over what is happening to their brethren under the apartheid régime. This has been reflected in a conscious effort by some Western delegations to present consensus formulations for specific recommendations on critical issues.
It is saddening that the serious willingness to contribute to the cause of Africa has not at all times been recognized by African delegations. The emotions aroused by the subject-matter are understandable and justified; we share them. But they have led to a certain degree of irrationality in our debate. My delegation hopes that a more rational approach to these remaining issues will be possible. Should this not be the case, it might be better to discontinue the search for a complete package of consensus recommendations on the subject-matter for the time being. The state of the deliberations can be clearly recognized from existing documents of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Apart from these matters of long-standing concern to the Commission, two new items have been included on the agenda and selected by the Commission for specific recommendations. Here, happily, the picture looks somewhat less bleak. Regarding the mid-term review for the Second Disarmament Decade, thanks to your excellent personal contribution, Mr. Chairman, the Commission has been able to agree on a brief, matter-of-fact text that describes in general and sobre terms the far less than satisfactory status of the Second Disarmament Decade. That was all the Commission could do. It would have been futile to embellish the unsatisfactory record of the Decade. Nevertheless, the text does not diminish our collective hope that more can be achieved in the remaining half of the Decade.

Happily, the Commission has not succumbed to the temptation of using the discussion on the mid-term review as a pretext for mutual recrimination and a fruitless polarization of views on basic issues of disarmament. My delegation considers it a manifestation of collective wisdom that a working paper that had initially been circulated with this goal in mind has been discarded without further debate. The ability of the Commission to agree on a joint text, notwithstanding the sorry state of disarmament in general, is certainly an encouraging factor for those who look forward to the Third Review Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty with the objective of examining the Treaty instrument in a fair and constructive manner.

A new and fruitful field of endeavour has opened up for our Commission with the introduction by the delegation of Cameroon and the other sponsors of General Assembly resolution 39/151 G of a request to provide a comprehensive review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. The adoption of a
pertinent list of topics for appropriate recommendations is a promising beginning for that endeavour, which could occupy the Commission profitably for some time and could, indeed, lead to a number of meaningful and manageable adjustments in the present United Nations disarmament machinery.

During the debates, my delegation argued, as did other delegations, that while a general reaffirmation of the political commitment of States to the disarmament process and to their obligation under the Charter and other fundamental United Nations instruments is essential the Commission should place the emphasis of its future work in this field on a detailed examination of the different institutional components of the multilateral disarmament machinery. It is true that this machinery has in a general sense functioned satisfactorily so far, but from the debates and from a number of excellent working papers, among them a remarkable analysis by the delegation of Cameroon itself, it has already emerged that a number of improvements aimed at making individual institutions and programmes more operational and more cost effective could well be envisaged.
The working paper by Cameron, and papers by Italy, on behalf of the European Ten, the United States, Romania, Norway and others are marked by a suitably realistic and pragmatic spirit, such as also characterized the incipient debates in the relevant working groups. My delegation is interested to see this debate continued and pledges its full support to the initiators of the project. The first leg of the debate has been encouraging and has confirmed my delegation in the support it gave to resolution 39/151 I as one of the original sponsors.

The list of topics for consideration and recommendation under this agenda item is a good and balanced one; it contains, however, at least one ambiguity. I consider it important to place on record at this time my interpretation of that particular aspect of the document. Working Group III provides a detailed list of multilateral organs and activities under heading IV of its working paper A/CN.10/1985/WG.III/WP.1/Rev.1. The fact that the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) also appear in that list indicates, in my delegation's view, that the activities of such bodies in the field of disarmament should be critically examined. It does not mean by any stretch of the imagination that those activities should be enlarged or even maintained. My delegation has consistently taken a most critical view of political activities of specialized agencies which are often at variance with their professional terms of reference. The aim of the inquiry which the Commission is to undertake is to point out where the specialized agencies have in the past trespassed on political territory, duplicating work that is legitimately done by the United Nations.

It is a matter of regret that, despite the promising nature of its assignment, Working Group III was prevented from initiating its work right at the beginning of the session. Despite the valiant efforts of its experienced Chairman, Ambassador Engo, the Working Group was thus unable to exploit its full potential.

That leads me to a more general criticism of this annual session. Despite your efforts, Mr. Chairman, and despite the partial achievements that I have cited, the session has been far from successful. This is easily seen by a comparison of the voluminous and substantive reports of the past two years and the thin product that will constitute the report of this year's session. The unique importance and, indeed, the true function of the United Nations Disarmament Commission lie in its capacity to deal with a limited number of disarmament items from among the long,
overburdened list of topics which is before the First Committee of the General Assembly every year. The fact that the United Nations Disarmament Commission can select an appropriate number of topics for in-depth consideration provides a unique opportunity for the detailed confrontation of arguments and the elaboration of solid, constructive, specific proposals on the basis of consensus. But this potential of the United Nations Disarmament Commission can be realized only if full advantage is taken of the entire available working period of four weeks and if there is a common purpose in concentrating on a selected number of issues. This annual session has shown that any major delay in the commencement of our work and any extensive procedural debates - especially if the detrimental and unfair principle of linkage between various working bodies is invoked - can stultify the Commission's work.

Delegations will find it attractive to embark on detailed work only if they see a sufficiently long working period ahead of them. If the propitious moment has passed and time is wasted in frustrating procedural wrangles, it is psychologically difficult to generate a rich and intensive debate among participants who already have a deadline for reporting and see the end of the session menacingly before them. The deficiencies of our current session are therefore in large measure the responsibility of those who have prevented us from starting our concrete work on all agreed subjects at the propitious juncture.

These developments should provide a lesson for all of us as regards the next annual session. We should all agree now that the Disarmament Commission is ill served if controversial resolutions and controversial procedural proposals are brought before it, holding up the work of all for the parochial interests of a few. My delegation is confident that we can restore the Disarmament Commission, after this year's partial failure, to its full importance as from next year if we all work hard to reach agreement on a common format and a common working method well ahead of time. This year's event should provide a warning to those who think that battles they have failed to win in the General Assembly can be easily won in the Disarmament Commission without seriously harming the institution.

I shall close with a brief reminder. During the 1983 and the 1984 sessions my delegation was instrumental in placing before the Commission for intensive consideration the subject of guidelines for confidence-building measures and their implementation. We all agreed at the end of the previous annual session and during
the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly that a period of reflection on the subject would be good. Indeed, it is the impression of my delegation that the subject may have matured in the meantime, especially since the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, at present being held in Stockholm, has dealt with the subject-matter extensively. Our next substantive session, in 1986, may be the opportune time for a renewed and, it is hoped, final consideration of the subject-matter. By that time the Commission will be able to draw some conclusions from the Stockholm negotiations and the application of confidence-building measures in other parts of the world, specifically on the part of developing countries. My delegation is looking forward to the next round of work on that subject in the United Nations Disarmament Commission, anticipating a rewarding and constructive debate.

Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): The United Nations Disarmament Commission is nearing the end of this year's session. My delegation notes with appreciation today that the majority of States represented here have endeavoured to make an effective contribution to solving the main task of our time - the prevention of a nuclear war and the cessation of the arms race in the nuclear and other fields.

You, Mr. Chairman, have used your great diplomatic skills to contribute to the businesslike atmosphere and results of the session. For that, my delegation expresses its thanks and appreciation to you, to all the other officers of the Commission and to the members of the Secretariat, including the interpreters.

Permit me to make just a few remarks at the conclusion of our session.

At the beginning of the session many delegations rightly took the opportunity on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the victory over nazism and fascism in the Second World War, to recall the lessons to be drawn for the present time. Peace in the world, which at that time was gained at the cost of enormous sacrifices, is more threatened today than ever before. This fatal danger to all mankind emanates from the striving of those in well-known imperialist circles to intensify the arms race on earth, to spread it to outer space and to halt social progress in the world by a policy of military and economic threat and blackmail.
In view of that, it is all the more imperative to unite all forces striving for peace, despite differences, in order to eliminate the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. That is precisely the aim of the decisions recently adopted at the meeting of the Warsaw Treaty member States. The same basic concern is expressed in the appeal addressed by the Soviet party and State leadership to the peoples, parliaments and Governments of all countries on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War, and which is expressly supported by the German Democratic Republic.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic would like to express the hope that this attitude of peace, dialogue, understanding and co-operation in the search for a peaceful solution to all burning issues of the present time will find a positive response.

A number of recent activities of socialist States has again shown that they continue to be prepared to travel their part of the road. On the other hand, the decisions which were adopted at the latest series of meetings of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and which are directed at continuing the arms race, in no way help to improve the international climate or to strengthen confidence among States. Reason dictates that we must jointly oppose those forces that only talk of peace but step up the nuclear arms race, that preach a policy of strength and pursue imperialist plans for world hegemony.

Like the representatives of most other States, my delegation regards item 4 namely, the elaboration of recommendations for the prevention of a nuclear war and for bringing about nuclear disarmament, as the most significant question on the agenda. An appropriate agreement on this question would explicitly demonstrate the support of all States represented here for the provisions of the Final Document of the first United Nations special session devoted to disarmament and their implementation. A considerable impetus would be given to negotiations at various levels.

This session has shown again that socialist and non-aligned States, as well as a number of other States, favour effective measures for the prevention of nuclear war and of an arms race in outer space, and cessation of the nuclear arms race.

On the other hand, however, a few other States now reject, as they have rejected before, priority measures such as the non-first use of nuclear weapons, the freezing of nuclear arsenals and an immediate comprehensive nuclear-weapon-test
ban. We welcome the readiness of the Soviet Union, which was reaffirmed during our
session, to announce, together with the other nuclear-weapon States, a moratorium
on all nuclear explosions on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the
nuclear catastrophe of Hiroshima on 6 August. The people of the world expect a
positive answer from the other nuclear-weapon States, in keeping with their special
responsibility as permanent members of the United Nations Security Council.

An important part of the struggle for disarmament is the curbing of the naval
arms race. Therefore, the German Democratic Republic considers it very important
that the United Nations Disarmament Commission has for the first time put this
question on its agenda. Together with the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the
Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic has, in a working paper, submitted
concrete ideas for appropriate measures. My delegation strongly advocates a speedy
preparation for such negotiations. The Commission can make its contribution to
that end. It is to be hoped that the expert study to be finalized in due time will
also contribute towards reaching agreement on practical steps for curbing the naval
arms race.

We deeply regret, however, that instead of being prepared for a substantive
discussion of pertinent questions, some States resort to pretexts, excuses and even
slander to deny the urgency of holding negotiations. Therefore, we should like to
take this opportunity to call upon the Western nuclear-weapon States and their
allies to reconsider their position and to participate in businesslike
deliberations on that issue.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic welcomes the fact that it was
possible to reach agreement on a document on agenda item 9, namely, "Review of the
Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade". We attach special
importance to the reaffirmation by all States of their willingness to use the
second half of the Decade to take concrete and practical measures to prevent war,
in particular a nuclear war. Unfortunately, it was not possible to put forward
more concrete recommendations on this question. The measures proposed by the
delegations of India and Nigeria would, in our view, have constituted an
appropriate basis to that end.

It is imperative that in the remaining years of the Second Disarmament Decade
efforts should be directed towards the adoption of substantive measures aimed at
the elimination of the nuclear danger. We shall get nowhere by dealing mainly with
institutional questions of the disarmament mechanism. We share the view held by
the delegations of the Soviet Union, the Polish People's Republic, the Socialist
Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Brazil, Argentina, Sweden and of many other States,
that the existing mechanism for deliberations and negotiations on disarmament
questions is sufficient. What is required, in our view, is that the mechanism
should be given substance, that the various bodies and forums should be used for
effective negotiations and for the elaboration of disarmament agreements. Such an
approach should include, for example, a start on negotiations, at the Conference on
Disarmament, on the prevention of a nuclear war and of an arms race in outer space,
on a nuclear-weapon-test ban and on nuclear disarmament, as well as the speedy
preparation and holding of a conference on the conversion of the Indian Ocean into
a zone of peace.

The Disarmament Commission has been dealing for several years with the
questions of the reduction of military budgets and of the nuclear capacity of South
Africa without adopting appropriate recommendations. The reasons for such a
situation have become more obvious this year than ever before. While the majority
of delegations advocates principles for the balanced reduction of military budgets,
some States try to prejudice, or even prevent, possible negotiations by setting
unrealistic preconditions. Again it has become clear that insistence on so-called
principles of transparency and comparability does not serve the question of
freezing and reducing military budgets.

A similar situation exists with regard to the question of the nuclear capacity
of South Africa. We share the view held by African States that a relevant document
must clearly demonstrate the dangers resulting from South Africa's nuclear
ambitions and must provide for relevant measures for its elimination. No cutbacks
must be allowed on this question.
(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

The firm position of the German Democratic Republic on this issue was reflected again in the joint communiqué in connection with the recent visit by the President of the People's Republic of the Congo to the German Democratic Republic. It is stated in that document that:

"Both sides were agreed that serious dangers to peace and security in the region and in the world emanate from the continued aggressive policy of the South African racist régime. They condemned the attempts of South Africa and its imperialist allies to impose on the peoples of the region neo-colonialist solutions in violation of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence."

In conclusion, I reaffirm that the German Democratic Republic will continue its efforts in co-operating jointly with all peace-loving forces in a world-wide coalition of common sense and realism. In doing so it attaches special importance to the forthcoming fortieth anniversary session of the General Assembly. Commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the foundation of the United Nations in a worthy form means, in our view, doing everything to prevent a nuclear catastrophe, to end the arms race on earth and prevent its spread into outer space, and to proceed to disarmament.

The German Democratic Republic will contribute to bringing about General Assembly decisions that serve that purpose.

Mr. Issraelyan (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The current session of the Disarmament Commission is coming to an end, and, like other delegations, we should like to say a few words about its results. The main result of the session was the reiterated confirmation of the great urgency of the problem of disarmament and of the concern of the international community at the present state of international relations as a whole and at the continuing arms race.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have taken an active part in the work of the Commission and all its subsidiary organs. We have explained our position in detail on all items on the agenda and have shown flexibility and a constructive spirit in the attempt to reach comprehensive, concrete decisions. If this session is ending with practically no tangible results, that is not our fault.
(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

We should like to comment first of all on the new items on the Commission's agenda. We are pleased at the consideration of the question of curbing the naval arms race, which was included on the agenda of this session in accordance with a well-known resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session on the initiative of Bulgaria. Our discussion of that item showed, first and foremost, the great need urgently to take steps to curb the naval arms race. Whether the opponents of curbing the arms race on the oceans and seas wanted it or not, the discussion demonstrated the existence of a military threat from the oceans and seas and the deep concern of many States at that problem. Thus, the work of the Commission helped pinpoint an important problem, and we hope that in the future it will help find the key to its solution. Although some put forward artificial pretexts in an attempt to undermine the discussion of this item, no one, in the final analysis, gainsaid the importance of the problem. In our view, the discussion of this item, in which over 20 delegations participated, provided us with much material with which to compare the viewpoints of States and to prepare for the serious negotiations which we believe will commence in due course.

The need to prevent an arms race on the oceans and seas is not a minor question, as one delegation put it. This is an urgent, timely question, as was shown clearly and convincingly this morning in the statement of the representative of Sweden, Mrs. Theorin. We consider that the necessity of searching for ways of reducing the military threat on the oceans and seas has been confirmed also by the presence of the question of confidence-building measures on the agenda of the Stockholm Conference. The socialist countries have recently made their proposals on this question.

We welcome the initiative of the delegation of Cameroon, which proposed that the Commission review the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. Here too the exchange of views and the elaboration of a programme of work for the Commission were indeed useful. It is well known that, from the very beginning, the Soviet delegation has been in favour of a comprehensive approach to this question, which would be in keeping with the resolution adopted on the initiative of Cameroon. Despite the attempt by certain delegations to reduce everything to a discussion of limiting the activities of the First Committee and of carrying out various studies, the programme of work adopted by the Commission with our active participation reflects the comprehensive approach. We intend in future to press for the widest use of the possibilities afforded by the General Assembly and its subsidiary bodies, including the First Committee.
Activity by delegations in the consideration of disarmament matters should be encouraged, not limited; their desire to make a contribution by drafting new resolutions should be welcomed, not constrained; action by the United Nations specialized agencies to prevent war and bring about disarmament should be bolstered, for there is no international body for which questions of the survival of mankind are extraneous. We shall ensure that United Nations activities in the field of disarmament are not reduced to the production of various, often useless, studies, which, in recent years, have come to number nearly 30.

We are satisfied at the Commission's having succeeded in working out a document on agenda item 9, "Review and appraisal of the implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade". That document, of course, has many gaps. It would look much more impressive if important disarmament agreements had been reached during the first five years of the Decade, which is what we seriously and sincerely wanted. The reason for the absence of progress towards limiting and reversing the arms race are sufficiently well known, and we have often spoken of them. We express the hope that the recommendations made in this document will find expression in deeds during the second half of the Decade.

The Commission's consideration of agenda items 4, 5 and 6 can only be viewed as a failure. The principal factor which prevented the Commission from working out a document on agenda item 4 was the obstinate refusal of the United States and some of its allies to meet the nearly universal demand for a complete end to be put to nuclear-weapons tests, for a freeze on nuclear arsenals, for the non-first use of nuclear weapons, for the prohibition and destruction of such weapons and for effective measures to prevent an arms race in outer space.
The same unconstructive position of the Western countries, which spurn the views of the overwhelming majority of Member States, especially of the African countries, has for the umpteenth time doomed to failure consideration of the question of the nuclear potential of South Africa. We shall continue to support the rightful demand of the African countries that effective measures be taken to oppose the acquisition by South Africa of nuclear capability, as demanded in well-known resolutions of the General Assembly on this matter.

The Commission is also marking time on the question of the reduction of military budgets. The Soviet Union, which more than 10 years ago asked for a substantial reduction of military budgets, especially those of the militarily important States, and which has constantly taken measures to facilitate a positive solution, has at this session of the Commission again showed its interest in a successful conclusion of the work of the Commission on this matter. However, here again, as often before, the delegations of Western countries from the outset rejected the proposal of the Soviet Union, and as a result the Commission has not moved forward one inch. In fact the problem of the reduction of the non-productive waste of resources on armaments becomes more acute with each passing year.

This in brief is our assessment of the items on the agenda of the Commission. Despite the disappointing results of this session, we look forward to the future with hope. The work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission can and must be effective and fruitful. There are no objective reasons why it should not be so. The delegation of the Soviet Union is fully convinced that this international forum is able successfully to cope with the tasks entrusted to it by the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament and to work out useful recommendations on various disarmament problems.

We have always stressed our readiness to consider any constructive proposals that would help to curb the arms race. We are always ready to work out concrete recommendations leading to businesslike negotiations on arms control and disarmament. We have always been against negotiation's sake and against attempts to create endless delays in real disarmament measures. We consider that the collective efforts made in the Disarmament Commission can and must lead to constructive results which would help to curb the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, and remove the danger of war. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it will continue to co-operate fully with all States ready by means of specific practical action to contribute to achieving such results.
in our common work. We shall be on the side of those who fight for disarmament not
in words but in deeds.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, allow me on behalf of the Soviet delegation to
express to you my deep gratitude for the skilful and organized manner in which you
have directed our work. We wish you full success in the future in the fight for
disarmament. We wish also to express our gratitude to the Chairmen of the Working
Groups, the officers of the Commission, the staff of the Department for Disarmament
Affairs and all other members of the Secretariat for the excellent services they
have provided at this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): At the current substantive session the Disarmament
Commission had before it a larger number of items than in previous years. Half of
them were new items, while the other half had been carried over from previous
sessions. My delegation hopes that the Disarmament Commission will complete the
implementation of resolution 37/78 H, so that we may conclude our work on some of
the older items. This would permit more meaningful consideration of the new
items. I am thinking especially of the new item on the review of the role of the
United Nations in the field of disarmament, to which I shall revert later on in
this statement.

Let me first make a few brief comments on the results of our work this year.
My delegation notes that, despite some modest progress in the elaboration of the
draft principles on the reduction of military budgets, under item 5, the central
divergencies of opinion still remain. If they cannot be resolved at the 1986
session, the Disarmament Commission should terminate its consideration of the
question and transmit the existing text, together with any amendments thereto, to
the General Assembly. Governments might then receive it to reflect further on the
matter and suggest suitable courses of action, and the item could again be brought
before the Commission one or two sessions later to be re-examined in the light of
such suggestions.

We regret once again the lack of agreement on the question of the nuclear
capability of South Africa, under item 6, for very much the same reasons as those
which have prevented the drafting of recommendations for the past several years.
My delegation continues to believe that the continued presence of this item on the
agenda of the Commission is increasingly damaging, rather than advancing, the cause
of those who would like the United Nations to take clear-cut decisions on the issue
of the nuclear capability of South Africa. Therefore we continue to favour the
idea that the treatment of this question be moved outside the purview of the Disarmament Commission.

The section of our report dealing with the mid-term review of the implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, under item 9, does not reflect, in the view of my delegation, the retrogression in attitudes towards the commitments contained in the Declaration. Nor do we think that it takes adequately into account the concern of the international community over the continuing proliferation of nuclear weapons by the nuclear-weapon Powers.

With regard to item 8, concerning the naval arms race, my delegation takes note of the opinions expressed so far in the debate. If there is a general desire that this item remain on the Commission's agenda for the 1986 session, we would urge proper consideration of the nuclear aspects of the naval arms race and, in this context, of the need for effective verification of the obligations assumed by nuclear-weapon parties to arrangements dealing with nuclear-weapon-free zones. There seems to be no reason why the nuclear-weapon Powers should enjoy a privileged status regarding verification of compliance with their international obligations. In this context I note the interesting remarks made this morning by the representative of Sweden, Mrs. Theorin, to the effect that the proliferation of nuclear weapons on ships and submarines all over the world obviously has a negative effect on confidence among States.

The continuing inability of the Commission to formulate a complete set of recommendations on the range of subjects under item 4 is again a source of concern to my delegation. We are thankful for the additional support received this year from several quarters for our earlier proposal regarding the treatment of item 4, since we believe that the perpetuation of a stalemate in the formulation of such recommendations is ultimately counterproductive.

The frustration and disappointment of the entire community of nations at the lack of results in disarmament efforts were very cogently epitomized in the debate on item 7, concerning the review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. To my delegation, the debate revealed three very important points.
First, it seems clear that the general feeling of frustration is both very deep and very sincere. It cannot be glossed over, as it was sometimes in the past, by mere mechanical devices meant to satisfy topical or individual concerns. Secondly, there are misconceptions which must be clarified if we wish to make genuine progress; the fundamental solidarity of the third-world nations should be better understood by those nations which seem only too anxious to foster their own aims by exploiting legitimate differences of perspective. Thirdly, most of us agree that the fate of the human race cannot continue to be determined exclusively by a restricted circle of a select few. The rest of the world does not accept being relegated to the sidelines of the decision-making process.

These three points suggest to my delegation the following observations on the follow-up work to be undertaken on item 7.

Since the inception of the United Nations, developing countries have been in the forefront in endeavours to bring about the transformation of the unjust power structures inherited from the recent historical past and supported by the possession of unchallenged military might by a select few. One important manifestation of those efforts has been the clamour for multilateral negotiations on matters that fundamentally affect the vital security interests of every nation, regardless of its size, military power or degree of social and economic development. Recognition of the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament evolved from those concerns. At the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1978, all nations represented here agreed on some basic commitments and on the machinery needed to implement them. The machinery then established marked an improvement on that previously in existence; it is obvious that it can be further improved. But the review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament should not consist solely of attempts to make institutional or procedural improvements. Our sovereign countries are not represented here merely to take organizational decisions or to give procedural guidelines to the organs of the machinery. We are entitled to demand an account of the activities of those organs, whose functions and responsibilities derive from the commitments assumed by every State Member of this Organization in conformity with the collective expression of our will, and we are entitled to investigate the reasons for failure and to prescribe solutions collectively. This is the political dimension of the review of the role of the United Nations.
Support of the political commitment to negotiate multilaterally the priority issues of disarmament is a major part of the exercise of the collective will. That commitment is not being honoured. Brazil holds that the General Assembly - that is, all of us together - have the power and the right, and indeed the duty, to press for the fulfilment of those commitments and to prescribe and implement the appropriate remedies so that the present unsatisfactory situation is reversed.

It is disturbing to note that instant support for only the institutional aspects of the review seems to go hand in hand with the consistent denial of the possibility of multilateral negotiations in the only international body created for that purpose. Some go so far as to deny the General Assembly the competence to give any directions to the multilateral negotiating body, on either procedural or substantive matters. We cannot agree with such an imbalanced and selective approach. The role of the United Nations would be diminished, not enhanced, if those attitudes should prevail.

My delegation will support all initiatives made in good faith and aimed at helping the United Nations, through the organs it created, to discharge its responsibilities in the field of disarmament. At the same time, we shall resist any attempt to use such initiatives as tools to undermine the basic solidarity of developing countries in the field of disarmament or, for that matter, in any other field. The vast majority of the Members of this Organization is made up of nations which are not grouped in close-knit blocs or in military alliances or associations. Our basic solidarity stems from our common determination to achieve economic and social development by peaceful means, from our common rejection of structures of hegemony and domination, from our common aspiration to genuine security that does not jeopardize the security of any other nation. Our strength lies also in our acceptance of our very diversity, in our respect for each other's sovereignty, in our struggle to defend our individual personality and character which do not follow any particular leadership except that of the purposes and principles upon which this Organization was founded.

The nations that are united by this profound understanding and solidarity have, and must continue to have, the courage of their convictions since they do not rely on mighty arsenals to back their international action. It will be, rather, through the power of common ideals and aspirations that the organs created for the tasks of disarmament by this Organization shall finally be enabled to implement the
(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

The collective will of the peoples of the world. Brazil is ready, as part of this assembly of free and equal nations, to continue to play its part to bring about the achievement of our common endeavour.

I could not finish, Mr. Chairman, without thanking you for your very able discharge of the difficult functions of the chairmanship of this Commission and, through you, thanking the Chairmen of the three working groups: Ambassadors Davidson Hepburn of the Bahamas and Paul Engo of the Cameroons and Mr. Gheorghe Tinca of Romania, as well as the other officers of the Commission. We are deeply indebted to all of them.

Mr. IDULE-AMOKO (Uganda): Mr. Chairman, I wish to place on record the deep appreciation of my delegation for the most efficient and able manner in which you have conducted the proceedings of the Commission during its current session. If the Commission has fallen short of expectations in discharging the tasks entrusted to it, I wish to assure you that the blame does not lie with you or with any officer of the Commission. Responsibility for the lack of progress in disarmament negotiations rests squarely on the shoulders of Member States, in particular the nuclear-weapon States.

We are almost midway through the United Nations Second Disarmament Decade. If recent history and statistics are anything to go by, we can rightly lament the total lack of progress in disarmament. World military expenditures, on the other hand, now exceed a trillion dollars. Developed countries have squandered twenty times as much on military hardware as they have provided for economic assistance. International arms transfers have increased threefold over the last two decades. Yet, just one fifth of annual military expenditures could have abolished world hunger by the end of this century. It seems to us that during the Second Disarmament Decade the security of peoples and States—militarily, politically and socially—will not be enhanced but diminished. The Decade has witnessed a further wastage of resources, and lost opportunities for the attainment of the lofty objectives of disarmament and peace. We wish to echo the oft-stated cry of the international community that the world can either continue to pursue the arms race with characteristic vigour or move consciously and with deliberate speed towards more stable and balanced social and economic development within a more sustainable international economic and political order. It cannot do both.
As in previous years, the Commission considered and failed to pronounce itself on the nuclear and military programmes of the racist Pretoria régime. We are deeply disturbed by this development. We cannot understand how a body like this can shun the responsibility of addressing the threat posed by a racist Government to international peace and security through its sinister designs for the acquisition of nuclear weapons.
The nuclear capability of the Pretoria régime is no longer a matter of doubt. The latest revelations have strengthened the proof of the veracity of this. As should be clear to everyone, apartheid is a cancer in the international body politic. It is a negation of the most fundamental human principles all of us profess to cherish. It is immoral, abhorrent and criminal. The position of the United Nations in this regard is clear and unequivocal. It is therefore incumbent on all organs of the United Nations to work relentlessly towards the eradication of this evil system, which is sustained through violence and brute force. The nuclear and military programme of the illegal régime is aimed principally at strengthening its instruments of violence. It is also intended to arm the fascist régime for the perpetration of wars of aggression, colonialism and State terrorism. With the possession of nuclear weapons, apartheid South Africa would hold to ransom the rest of Africa and the entire international community and thus delay the demise of apartheid.

The role of our Commission, therefore, should not be to give diplomatic comfort to the Pretoria régime in perpetrating these pernicious crimes. We thought that at this critical moment, when reports emanating daily from South Africa recount the escalation of violence and numerous deaths, our resolve to ensure the eradication of apartheid would be strengthened, and we were asestricken when we realized that there were attempts to dilute the resolve of the international community on the question of apartheid. Old tricks were again employed to weaken further a text whose basic thrust was to restate the universal revulsion and opposition of the international community against apartheid South Africa and its nuclear programme. We are very pleased to note that all those tricks were successfully exposed for what they were and firmly rebuffed. How many times must we remind the racist régime and its collaborators that history is never on the side of oppressors? When the day of reckoning arrives, as indeed it must, the oppressed peoples of Namibia and South Africa will triumph. We have no doubt whatsoever about this.

I wish to refer to yet another issue that features on the agenda of the current session of the Commission: that is, the item relating to the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

My Government's position on the review of the role of the Organization in the field of disarmament is given on pages 11 to 13 of document A/CN.10/69. I need not, therefore, restate it fully here.
We approach this question with an open mind. We proceed from the premise that in the evolution of social development everything is dynamic and nothing is static. We sincerely hope that our position will be seen and appreciated in this light. In presenting our proposals we are inspired and guided by the spirit and the letter of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, particularly as embodied in the following paragraphs: paragraph 28, which says, inter alia, that all States have the right to participate in disarmament negotiations; paragraph 114, which states, among other things, that the United Nations has a central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament; paragraph 120, which states that the membership of the Committee on Disarmament — now the Conference on Disarmament — will be reviewed at regular intervals; and, last but not least, paragraph 123, which provides that United Nations specialized agencies and other institutions and programmes within the United Nations system should assume some responsibility with regard to studies and information on disarmament, and requests the Centre on Disarmament to increase contacts with non-governmental organizations and research institutions in this field.

In the course of our deliberations a body of arguments was advanced, with a high degree of diplomatic proficiency, as to why there has been a lack of progress in disarmament. Among the reasons given was the lack of political will. We totally agree with this approach. Nevertheless, it is equally true to say that built-in procedural hurdles in deliberative and negotiating bodies compound the difficulties in resolving the problem. Another reason could be the fact that the participation of States in disarmament questions is not universal, which hinders understanding and appreciation of the issues involved.

The question arises, therefore, how the right of all Member States to participate in disarmament negotiations can be exercised in practice, bearing in mind that there is only one multilateral negotiating organ, the Conference on Disarmament. To us the only logical answer is the adoption of the principle of rotation, which can be applied with flexibility taking into account the principle of equitable geographical balance. These are issues for discussion and agreement. The most important thing is to accept the principle. The principle of continuity — which I think should be termed the principle of perpetuity — as advocated by some delegations, would run counter to the letter of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which establishes the right of all States to participate in disarmament negotiations.
(Mr. Idule-Amoko, Uganda)

At this juncture, therefore, it may be worth recalling a popular Vietnamese proverb: "When you drink water, remember the source."

It is also inconceivable to us that we should be accused of wanting to politicize United Nations agencies when our request is that they should be actively involved in the promotion of peace and social progress, especially since this assignment has been expressly entrusted to them by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Another matter of particular concern to my delegation is the role our Organization should play in the maintenance of regional peace and stability. This Organization should devise effective ways and means of assisting regional organizations such as the Organization of African Unity in, say, peace-keeping operations, when such operations are initiated by the latter, on the understanding that outside interests stand aloof and do not hinder the successful settlement of regional conflicts.

It has also been argued, quite rightly, that the proliferation of resolutions in the First Committee is a consequence of the frustration and concern of Member States at the lack of progress in disarmament. I wish to state why, although we support most of those resolutions, we have reservations on their continued proliferation. The persistent failure to implement effectively the numerous resolutions on disarmament, coupled with the lack of political will, tends to diminish our seriousness in the eyes of the international public, which monitors the work of our Organization. Moreover, from a third-world perspective, it dissipates our human and meagre financial resources. For these and other reasons we share the frustration at the proliferation of resolutions. Hence our contention that the non-aligned positions on peace and disarmament should serve as the rallying points for conflict resolution and management.

However, as I stated earlier, my delegation approaches these issues with an open mind and believes that we should continue to discuss in a constructive spirit the complex problems of war and peace.
Mr. CAMPORA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): We are sure that every representative present bears the world situation in mind when considering any of the subjects related to disarmament. We believe that disarmament discussions and negotiations reflect that world situation. It is clear that the possibility of making progress on disarmament matters strictly depends on the international atmosphere.

When the world situation is replete with points of conflict, when not even one continent is free of areas of confrontation and when international tensions are growing, there is bound to develop in parallel a distrust that permeates and paralyses the will to negotiate. In other words, progress can be made in disarmament only in an atmosphere of international détente. In our view, that means regarding the adoption of concrete measures and agreements on disarmament as being more a result of existing factors and conditions than a process with its own thrust.

Therefore, all of us here know that the crucial factor in our deliberations on disarmament issues is each delegation's view of the current world situation, of what are the problems affecting international peace and security and of what are the present conflicts affecting international relations. Although in the current discussions those conflicts have been mentioned only occasionally, there can be no doubt that they are very much in the minds and thinking of those representatives who deal with disarmament questions.

The world situation is a given in disarmament discussions. A clear picture of the conditions characterizing the present-day international scene, with all its tensions and conflicts, is a prerequisite. Knowledge of the world situation in itself explains the point we have reached at the current session of the Commission, which is coming to an end. To a great extent, that situation limits the scope of our conclusions. The fact that more progress has not been made is simply because conditions have not made that possible, because the existing tensions do not help to dispel distrust.

I do not believe that either this Commission or the other existing mechanisms to consider the question of disarmament within the framework of the United Nations are to blame for the lack of substantive progress on the various items. We believe that the responsibility lies elsewhere, we believe that nothing would be simpler or more satisfying for the Commission and all the delegations than to reach the end of our deliberations with a good document full of concrete and effective
recommendations. But, unfortunately, that has not happened. The results are limited, despite the perseverance and intense personal efforts of representatives and United Nations officials.

I particularly want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, of the great esteem in which you are held by my delegation and our appreciation of the way in which the Commission's work has been conducted with cordial efficiency, resulting from your personal qualities. It is therefore a great pleasure for me to congratulate you and express the hope that the United Nations may always count on your valuable cooperation.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.