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17th meeting

Tuesday, 1 April 1975,
at 11.25 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran)

OPENING OF THE SESSION (A/10068, A/AC.167/L.7)

The CHAIRMAN declared open the fourth session of the Committee.

He informed members that he had hoped new officers would be elected for the current session in order that he might be relieved of the delicate responsibilities of his position. However, during the course of informal consultations it had been pointed out to him that General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX) stated that the Ad Hoc Committee should resume its work on 1 April 1975; hence, it was not in order to elect new officers. If he heard no objection, he would take it that members agreed with that interpretation of General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX).

It was so agreed.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) expressed the satisfaction of his delegation at the fact that Mr. Hoveyda would continue in office.

Mr. SNID (Czechoslovakia) said his delegation was also happy to see that Mr. Hoveyda would continue in the Chair. Members were undoubtedly aware of the fact that Ambassador Kulaga of Poland had departed from New York and would therefore not be able to serve as Vice-Chairman. He therefore proposed that Mr. Ludwiczak, the Deputy Permanent Representative of Poland, should be elected Vice-Chairman in place of Ambassador Kulaga. He hoped his proposal would meet with the unanimous approval of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished Mr. Ludwiczak to serve as Vice-Chairman.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN expressed his regret at Ambassador Kulaga's departure and his confidence that Mr. Ludwiczak would serve with the same high degree of competence.
Mr. LUDWICZAK (Poland) expressed his sincere appreciation to all delegations for the honour they had bestowed on his country and on the region to which it belonged. He pledged his full co-operation with the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN informed members that he had just received a letter from the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs and Permanent Representative of the German Democratic Republic requesting that the German Democratic Republic should be permitted to follow the work of the Ad Hoc Committee as an observer. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to the request of the Permanent Representative of the German Democratic Republic.

It was so agreed.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic) took a place at the Committee table.

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of members to the letter dated 31 March 1975 from the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (A/10068).

He informed members that the Secretariat had received replies pursuant to paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX) from the following countries: Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Guatemala, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Mexico, Pakistan and Spain.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (A/AC.167/L.7)

The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to adopt the agenda.

The agenda was adopted.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN informed members that the Secretariat had scheduled meetings for the Committee for 3-4 April, 2-4 June, 7-25 July and 25-29 August. He suggested that the Committee should reconstitute the Working Group set up in 1974 and instruct it to meet from 2-4 June and from 7-18 July. The plenary could then
meet from 20-25 July to discuss the report of the Working Group and again on
25-29 August. Between 25 July and 25 August, the Working Group could hold private
meetings; the Secretariat would be requested to do everything possible to
facilitate such additional meetings of the Working Group.

With regard to the meetings scheduled for the current week, he suggested that
those scheduled for that same day should be devoted to organization of work and
those scheduled for 3 and 4 April should be devoted to the general debate.

If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to his
suggestions regarding the distribution of meeting time available to it.

It was so decided.

Mr. MIGLIUOLO (Italy) expressed the satisfaction of his delegation at
the continuation of Mr. Hoveyda as Chairman and at the election of Mr. Ludwiczak
as Vice-Chairman.

He proposed that the same criterion should be applied to the establishment of
the Working Group as had been applied for the continuation of the officers. In
other words, the Working Group appointed in 1974 should continue without any
change in its membership. It had made a positive contribution to the work of the
Committee during the past year and had been able to overcome serious obstacles
under the excellent leadership of Mr. Elias of Spain.

The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that
the Committee agreed to reconstitute the Working Group as set up in 1974 and to
charge it with preparing a draft report for consideration by the plenary.

It was so decided.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain), Rapporteur, said that it was important to establish
more precisely the Working Group's terms of reference particularly in view of its
experience during the previous year. The Chairman had suggested that the Working
Group should prepare a draft report for consideration by the plenary.
Paragraph 2 (a) of General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX) stated that the report
of the Committee to the General Assembly should include any conclusions and

...
(Mr. Elias, Spain)

recommendations it might deem pertinent concerning the comments received pursuant to paragraph 1. The Working Group should be told whether it was to prepare draft conclusions and recommendations or whether that part of the mandate pertained only to the plenary. If the latter was the case, then the Working Group would only discharge the first part of the mandate contained in paragraph 2 (a), namely, the preparation of an analytical report concerning the comments received from Governments.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that any change in the Working Group's mandate would require the approval not only of the members of the Committee but also of other Member States of the United Nations, entailing possibly lengthy consultations. He felt that the mandate should be left unchanged on the understanding that the Chairman of the Working Group would maintain close contact with the members of the Committee.

Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina) said he agreed with the Rapporteur that the Committee should be more specific in the instructions which it gave to the Working Group. It might be difficult for the Working Group to carry out its tasks properly if it was not sure of its terms of reference. The Group had done excellent work in 1974, guided by the debates in the plenary Committee, and he felt that it should continue to work in the same manner in 1975.

He suggested that the question of the Group's terms of reference should be left in abeyance until the Committee had concluded its general debate at the end of the week. It would be possible to lay down more precise guidelines for the Group's work after members had expressed their views and after the Chairman had held consultations with the representatives of the nuclear Powers, whose co-operation was essential to the Committee's work.

The CHAIRMAN said it was his understanding that the Committee's mandate, which was set forth in paragraph 2 of Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX), was that of the Working Group also. He noted that the mandate made provision for the preparation of conclusions and recommendations and was therefore slightly broader than it had been in 1974.

/...
Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said it should be borne in mind that the renewal of
the Committee's mandate formed part of a continuing political process aimed at
creating the necessary conditions for the convening of a world disarmament
conference. He asked whether consultations had been held with the two nuclear
Powers not represented on the Committee. Such consultations were essential, since
it would be impossible to hold a world disarmament conference without the
participation of the two nuclear Powers concerned.

He reiterated his view that every effort should be made to secure, through
consultations, the participation of the two nuclear Powers concerned in the
Committee's work. He endorsed the proposal to the effect that, once the general
debate was concluded, the Committee should draw up a more precise mandate for its
Working Group so as to facilitate the work of reaching concrete conclusions
in 1975.

The CHAIRMAN, replying to the representative of Tunisia, said that he had
held consultations with the representatives of the two nuclear Powers in question,
pursuant to resolution 3260 (XXIX). Their position had not changed since the most
recent sessions of the Committee and of the General Assembly and was therefore
well known to all members.

If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee approved the
proposal made by the representatives of Argentina and Tunisia to the effect that
members should bear in mind the question of the terms of reference of the Working
Group during the general debate so that, at the conclusion of the debate, the
Committee would be in a position to give more precise instructions to the Group
regarding its work for 1975.

It was so decided.

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the Committee
was resuming its work in a year which was marked by the thirtieth anniversary of
the victory over fascism and militarism in the Second World War and of the founding
of the United Nations. The Organization, born out of the sufferings of that
conflict, had proclaimed in its Charter, as a reflection of its paramount goal,
(Mr. Malik, USSR)

the determination of peoples to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. The Soviet Union was proud of the contribution it had made to the victory over fascism and to the noble cause of preventing a new world war. The Programme of Peace adopted at the Twenty-Fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had created favourable conditions both for preventing war and for achieving real progress towards disarmament. His delegation had just forwarded to the Secretary-General, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX), his Government's comments on the question of convening a world disarmament conference (A/10068), and he now read out those comments to the members of the Committee. The twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly had demonstrated the wide support which the idea of convening a world disarmament conference enjoyed among Member States, an overwhelming majority of which, including 35 of the 43 States which were participating in the work of the Committee, had expressed themselves in favour of convening the conference. In recent months, the Governments of three permanent members of the Security Council, the United Kingdom, France and the Soviet Union, had taken a similar position in communiqués issued in connexion with visits to the Soviet Union by the Prime Ministers of the United Kingdom and France. The non-aligned countries were also continuing to show great interest in convening the conference.

At its last session, the General Assembly had made an important new advance in that direction by authorizing the Committee to continue its work with the same membership and by agreeing on the functions it was to perform. Resolution 3260 (XXIX) called upon the Committee to prepare and to submit to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session an analytical report, including any pertinent conclusions and recommendations concerning the main objectives of a world disarmament conference. That concrete statement of the Committee's task would unquestionably enable the Committee to function in a more constructive manner and, his delegation hoped, to go on to the practical aspects of the preparations for convening the conference.

The General Assembly had adopted many historic decisions on questions relating to development and the establishment of a new international economic order and also on the problem of decolonization. The problems of development and decolonization
had now been solved by the United Nations, thanks largely to the efforts of the countries of the third world and the socialist countries, and what now remained was to mobilize efforts to implement the solutions which had been arrived at; that would be the task of the seventh special session of the General Assembly. At the same time, the problem of disarmament and of convening a world disarmament conference remained unsolved, and the progress made in that regard had been extremely slow. What must now be done was to make the thirtieth anniversary session of the General Assembly the Assembly's disarmament session.

At its twenty-ninth session, more particularly by its adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, the General Assembly had recognized that there was a direct link between disarmament and development and had placed all States under an obligation to further the cause of disarmament. Unless the problem of disarmament was solved and military budgets were reduced, it would not be possible to deal significantly with the problem of development. According to United States data, the world had spent a total of $4,300,000 million on armaments during the 1960s and 1970s, and the current annual figure was $250,000 million. An American economist had observed recently that "military spending is a prime source of inflation, pumping large sums of money into the economy without producing goods and services the public can buy".

The Ad Hoc Committee must therefore contribute to a solution of the disarmament problem by taking action to ensure the convening of a world disarmament conference instead of dwelling endlessly upon the complexity of the task. His delegation was prepared to take part in constructive discussion of every aspect of the conference's goals and in formulating specific proposals in that regard. It would also listen carefully to the views of other members of the Committee. His delegation was certain that as a result of the Committee's work it would prove possible to formulate a mutually acceptable approach to the problem and thus make a significant advance in the practical preparations for convening the conference.

Mr. HOLLAT (Hungary) said that his country had from the outset taken a positive attitude towards the convening of a world disarmament conference. The Hungarian Minister for Foreign Affairs, in a statement made at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, had said that the time had come for concrete steps...
(Mr. Hollai, Hungary)

to be taken with a view to the organization of the conference. Hungary's position was a logical outcome of the consistent policy of peace pursued by the Hungarian Government. It was motivated by a desire to move forward, to lessen tension and increase confidence in international relations.

Disarmament was a special and highly important sector of international efforts aimed at decreasing tension and distrust and at improving the chances of détente. The very real benefits of détente could be further strengthened by measures in the field of disarmament in particular. In other words, détente in the political sphere of international relations should be extended to the military sphere also. The convening of a world disarmament conference would be a further step in that direction, and the conference itself would serve as a forum for the discussion of a wide range of disarmament measures.

His country's full support for the convening of the conference stemmed not only from its policy of peace and international co-operation but from the recent historical experience of the Hungarian people. Hungary had suffered tremendous losses in the course of two world wars. Since its liberation from fascist rule and occupation, it had striven to co-operate in efforts aimed at reducing tension and increasing the chances of détente in the world. In so doing, his country remained faithful to the ideals of the grand Second World War coalition of anti-fascist forces. On the eve of the thirtieth anniversary of Hungary's liberation from fascism, he paid a special tribute to the people of the Soviet Union, who had been responsible for that event. His delegation was convinced that the co-operation of States with different social and economic systems in the field of disarmament was as possible now as their co-operation in the defeat of fascism had been three decades previously.

Preliminary steps had been taken to convene a world disarmament conference, but the pace of progress thus far had been slow. More concrete steps must be taken if the resolutions of the General Assembly were to be faithfully implemented. The necessary steps were listed in paragraph 2 of Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX). The maintenance of close contact with the representatives of the States possessing nuclear weapons was a particularly important task of the Committee, as was underlined in paragraph 3 of the same resolution, which invited those States to co-operate or maintain contact with the Committee. It was clear that there could...
hardly be meaningful progress unless all the nuclear Powers accepted that invitation. It was regrettable that not all of them seemed ready to join the Committee at the present time in finding ways and means to move ahead. His delegation remained hopeful, however, that given the overwhelming support of States Members of the United Nations for the early convening of a world disarmament conference, those countries would realize the futility of their current attitude.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.
18th meeting

Chairman: Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran)

GENERAL DEBATE (A/10068, A/10069) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a note verbale from the representative of Cuba asking that his delegation be allowed to participate as an observer in the work of the Committee. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed.

It was so decided.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Garcia Iturge (Cuba) took a place at the Committee table.

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of members to document A/10069, containing a letter dated 2 April 1975 from the Permanent Representative of Bulgaria to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General. The Secretary-General had also received communications from the Governments of Poland and Byelorussia pursuant to paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX).

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that the communications received from States pursuant to paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX) would provide the Ad Hoc Committee with an excellent tool for its future work. He noted that the deadline for the submission of such communications had been set at 31 March 1975. Since such deadlines were never inflexible, he suggested that the Secretariat should wait until 15 April and then, on 16 April, reproduce and circulate all the comments received to that date, either as Committee documents or as General Assembly documents under item 42 of the provisional agenda for the thirtieth session. If other communications were received at a later date, a second compilation could be circulated, perhaps as an addendum to the first. At any rate, the preliminary compilation of replies should not be delayed beyond 16 April.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) suggested that the deadline should be extended to 30 April.
The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the deadline suggested by the Mexican representative was not a deadline for the receipt of replies, which would remain open, but rather for the publication of the document. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to ask the Secretariat to prepare the document suggested by the Mexican representative on 16 April.

It was so decided.

Mr. BAYANDOR (Iran) said that the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee represented the triumph of realism over pious hopes. Progress in such a difficult field could only be made step by step, and the fact that the Committee's mandate had been renewed and even enlarged was to no little extent due to the recognition of that reality by the membership of the Committee. The report that had been drafted by the Working Group and completed by the Committee in 1974 represented a balanced picture of the views on a world disarmament conference at that juncture.

The Committee must now draw upon its past experience. That could be done not only by reinstituting the Working Group but also by remaining alive to the constraints and requirements of its task in a spirit of compromise and accommodation.

His delegation had already submitted its views in response to the request made in General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX). The question of the objectives of the conference could not be usefully treated in isolation from other aspects of the conference. While general and complete disarmament under effective international control should remain the ultimate goal, a world disarmament conference should strive first and foremost to achieve significant nuclear disarmament measures. However, dealing with the objectives of the conference without regard to what it potentially was capable of delivering would be tantamount to supporting an idea in abstraction. The success of the conference depended heavily upon the support and active participation of all nuclear and militarily significant States, both at the preparatory and conference stages. The participation of nuclear-weapon States was inevitably linked to the evolution of certain conditions and the fulfilment of certain requirements. There was no other realistic alternative but to follow the objective of a world disarmament conference through a gradual process. Members must turn their attention to the responsibilities and performance of the great Powers.
(Mr. Bayandor, Iran)

In spite of the positive aspects and results of détente, the priority items, long on the agenda of the arms control forums were still unresolved. The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) had left much to be desired; certain aspects of the accords that had been arrived at raised serious questions regarding the actual effect of SALT in the de-escalation of the nuclear arms race. If the meagre results of those negotiations were to be taken as a yardstick, it must be said that the road ahead was indeed a long one. Unless the nuclear Powers took serious and purposeful action to see that suitable conditions evolved, the present atmosphere of moderation was soon likely to dissipate. He sincerely hoped that the next round of SALT would prove to be more than another attempt to enhance strategic stability and balance between the two great Powers. His delegation also hoped that within the framework of CCD the nuclear Powers would act in the spirit of their commitments under article 6 of the non-proliferation treaty.

Finally, he wished to stress the need for positive co-operation and participation in the Committee's common endeavour by all States concerned. Iran had spared no effort to contribute to the attainment of the objectives of disarmament. Its recent membership in CCD had enhanced its ability to become more actively involved in the process. The clearest test of Iran's commitment to the cause had been its adherence to every single international instrument dealing with arms control. It had signed and ratified the non-proliferation treaty and had concluded the regional agreement under article III with IAEA. In 1974, Iran had initiated the proposal for denuclearization of the Middle East and, together with Egypt, had sponsored a resolution on the subject, which had been approved by the Assembly with near-unanimity.

He wished to restate his Government's determination to work in the Committee and other forums towards the evolution of conditions under which a world disarmament conference could be expected to succeed. It only remained for him to express his hope that through earnest and inspiring exertion of common efforts, members would succeed in their selfless endeavour.

Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said his delegation was deeply convinced that the successful implementation of the Committee's task would make it possible to take a more decisive step forward towards the concrete work of preparing and convening a world disarmament conference. The attainment of that objective would contribute towards the implementation of the fundamental purposes and principles
of the United Nations Charter. On behalf of the Polish Government, he wished to reaffirm the latter's consistent and full support for the prompt convening of a world disarmament conference with the participation of all States.

The current year marked the thirtieth anniversary of the victory over fascism, the end of the devastating Second World War and the establishment of the United Nations. It would therefore be most appropriate to convene a world disarmament conference at an early date. Poland, which had been the first victim of Nazi armed invasion and the first country to actively resist the forces of aggression, had consistently worked for the creation of a healthier international atmosphere. Poland had played an active role in the disarmament process both in the United Nations and in other negotiating forums. It stood ready to continue in such endeavours.

The favourable trend of recent political developments, the consolidation of détente, the dynamic implementation of the principle of peaceful coexistence and the positive aspect of USSR-United States relations, including efforts within the framework of SALT, were all indications of the timeliness of convening a world disarmament conference. Talks were being held and steps were being taken to prevent the danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons and achieve progress in disarmament in general. An important measure was the USSR proposal to prohibit action to influence the environment and climate for military purposes. All such steps paved the way to greater and more important undertakings and to halting the arms race, which consumed vast resources amounting to more than $240,000 million annually. There was a growing awareness of the need to shift resources from the arms race to social and economic development and to supplement and consolidate the process of political détente by a corresponding degree of military détente. The early convening of a world disarmament conference would be the most appropriate step towards the universalization and enhancement of the effectiveness of the disarmament efforts currently in progress.

His delegation welcomed the active participation in the work of the Committee by the representatives of three nuclear-weapon States - the USSR, France and the United Kingdom. It was to be regretted, however, that the two remaining nuclear-weapon States still declined to participate directly in the work of the Committee. It was to be hoped that the logic of international developments would eventually
(Mr. Czarkowski, Poland)

persuade them to change their position and that they would soon join the Committee's efforts and make their contribution to the preparation of a world disarmament conference.

The Polish Government had communicated to the Secretary-General its comments on the main objectives of a world disarmament conference, as requested by General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX). In brief, the position of his Government was the following:

First, that the main objectives of a world disarmament conference should be to encourage disarmament efforts by formulating guidelines and priorities with a view to the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament and that it could also point out specific measures of disarmament.

Second, that it should seek to ensure that all aspects of disarmament which were of interest to States, both in the nuclear and conventional fields, on global and regional scales, were discussed.

Third, that such a conference, with the participation of all States, should make an over-all review of the existing state of disarmament negotiations and elaborate on such a basis constructive recommendations as to the military, political, economic and social aspects of disarmament negotiations.

Fourth, that the conference could not be expected to embark upon negotiation of specific disarmament measures or replace the existing negotiating bodies.

His delegation was certain that the Ad Hoc Committee would be able to implement its tasks, thus moving forward the preparatory work for a world disarmament conference. His Government stood ready to contribute actively to the Committee's efforts towards that end.

Mr. GROZEV (Bulgaria) expressed the hope that, under the able direction of the Chairman, the Ad Hoc Committee would make a real contribution to the preparation and convening of a world disarmament conference.

The current session of the Committee had opened approximately one month before 9 May, Victory Day, on which the progressive and democratic world would celebrate the thirtieth anniversary of the great victory over Hitlerite fascism. The lessons of the Second World War provided the Committee with ample food for thought, and many of the Committee's members were living witnesses of the frantic arms race which had followed almost immediately upon the end of the First World War. The earnest appeals of the world's first socialist country, the
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in favour of disarmament and the efforts of all democratic forces to forge a unity which would forestall Nazi aggression had gone unheeded. Only after numerous European countries had fallen victim to aggression had the powerful anti-fascist coalition been formed, forcing the pretenders to world hegemony to surrender. The Soviet Union which had suffered the greatest human and material losses, had also earned the greatest honours for its contribution to the victory over Hitlerite fascism, which had been a turning point in human history. One of mankind's greatest achievements in the post-war period had been its success thus far in preventing a new world war.

The prevention of a new war was made even more imperative by the rapid accumulation of weapons of mass destruction which threatened the very existence of mankind. War could not be prevented and a durable peace established without halting the arms race and bringing about general and complete disarmament, including nuclear disarmament. The uncontrolled growth of military budgets had to be stopped, particularly in view of the suffering caused both by the economic crisis in the capitalist world and by natural disasters. Vast sums were being spent for military purposes at a time when the developing countries were searching for ways and means to escape the difficult situation in which they had been left by the cruel exploitation of colonialists and neo-colonialists. The developing countries were thus fully within their rights in criticizing those developed countries which were attempting to impede the establishment of new and more equitable economic relations.

Such considerations clearly brought home the great responsibility resting with the Committee, whose task, although seemingly rather modest and limited, was directly related to the achievement of a grand design, namely, the preparation and convening of the world disarmament conference. The conference would be a widely representative forum with the authority to carry out a detailed in-depth study of all aspects of disarmament. The conference's deliberations should stimulate and channel the efforts of Governments to end the arms race.
(Mr. Grozov, Bulgaria)

The idea of convening a conference was not new, and the General Assembly had already adopted four resolutions dealing with the subject. However, since other resolutions of the General Assembly had actually led to the planning and holding of conferences, there were grounds for wondering why the world disarmament conference was being held up, especially since it was of such vital importance to all mankind.

Because of the favourable evolution of the world political climate and achievements in the disarmament field, it was not only possible but also exceedingly imperative to hold such a conference. The convening of a conference and its results would mark a turning point in disarmament efforts aimed at complementing political détente with the reduction of military tensions in the world.

No one would deny the importance and complexity of disarmament problems, and it would be naive to believe that they could be solved over the next few years. Nevertheless, to assert that a solution was absolutely impossible was, to say the least, unjustifiably pessimistic. Those who were consciously attempting to thwart disarmament efforts, including the convening of a world conference, were committing the most serious crime possible against the interests of all mankind and the interests of their own peoples.

Although the successes already achieved in the realm of disarmament were not sufficient, they were encouraging and showed that only by demonstrating good will could the desired goal be achieved. In that connexion, the agreements concluded between the United States and the Soviet Union on reducing the danger of nuclear war were of great significance. However, while they and other agreements were unquestionably positive, they could not bring about a durable and effective solution for all the complex problems of disarmament, including nuclear disarmament. Thus, the careful preparation and the convening of a world conference at the earliest possible date was all the more necessary. The Committee had done a useful job the previous year, and its task now was to take a major step forward in the preparation of the conference as required by the provisions of resolution 3260 (XXIX).

That resolution stated that the Committee should give priority to the preparation of an analytical report accompanied by conclusions and recommendations. Accordingly, the Committee should now undertake a concrete analysis and classify
the opinions of Governments regarding the major objectives of the conference. The
most authoritative sources for that purpose would be the replies of Governments,
including those received during the current year, the statements of heads of
delегations before the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly and opinions
expressed during the current debate. The document which had been prepared by the
Secretariat at the request of the Committee would be a particularly useful source
of such information. It was a positive development that at the very first meeting
of the current session the Committee had adopted a plan of action and had
instructed the Working Group to carry out consultations and to prepare a draft of
the analytical report accompanied by relevant conclusions and recommendations.

His delegation's position on the problems of disarmament and the convening of
a world conference was well known and had been summarized in the document prepared
by the Secretariat. It had been presented once again at the twenty-ninth General
Assembly and in the reply of his Government contained in document A/10069. In the
view of his Government, it was imperative never to relent in the efforts aimed at
ending the arms race, and no opportunity should be missed which might contribute
to the achievement of progress in that area. Negotiations must be conducted with
a sincere political will to achieve actual disarmament. Towards that end, it was
possible and imperative to clear the way for practical preparation of the world
disarmament conference. Everyone was in agreement as to the necessity of adequate
preparation. His delegation was convinced that during its current session the
Ad Hoc Committee would lay the foundation for such preparations and that the
General Assembly at its thirtieth session would explicitly instruct the Committee
to undertake the concrete preparation of the conference.

His delegation believed that the time had already come to discuss and decide
upon the agenda for the conference and the date on which it was to be convened.
The Committee could be authorized to carry out that task the following year, but
it would be extremely useful if it could begin making progress on those two matters
at its current session.

In its resolution 3260 (XXIX), the General Assembly had reiterated its
conviction that all the peoples of the world had a vital interest in the success of
disarmament negotiations and that all States should be in a position to contribute
to the adoption of measures for the achievement of that goal. It also stressed
that a world conference, adequately prepared and convened at an appropriate time,
(Mr. Grozov, Bulgaria)

could promote the realization of such aims and that the co-operation of all nuclear Powers would considerably facilitate their attainment. In view of that resolution, the Committee should not be so fearful of exceeding its terms of reference by achieving something additional which could facilitate the preparation and accelerate the convening of the conference. Only those who opposed disarmament and the conference had something to fear from such a development.

His delegation also believed that it was time for the two nuclear Powers which were still absent from the Committee to take their places and express their opinions. In that connexion, he referred to the statement made previously by the Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China to the effect that if a world disarmament conference on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons should take place, the People's Republic of China was ready to assume its appropriate obligations. He also expressed the wish that the People's Republic of China might confirm the view previously expressed by its National Assembly that all countries, especially the great Powers, should take action to put an end to the arms race, reduce their weapons, including atomic and hydrogen weapons, and conclude an international agreement governing those questions.

With regard to the other country possessing nuclear weapons which was not yet participating in the deliberations of the Committee, he recalled that the joint communiqué issued by the United States and the Soviet Union in 1972 had stated that the ultimate goal of those two countries was general and complete disarmament, including nuclear disarmament under strict international control, and that the convening of a world disarmament conference at an appropriate time could play a positive role in that connexion.

At stake were problems whose solution was of vital importance to all peoples and States, large and small - those that possessed nuclear weapons and those that did not. The questions involved had to be dealt with openly. Every Government had the sovereign right to express its opinion both on the matter of convening the world conference and on matters relating to its preparation. However, the Government of any nuclear Power which attempted to impede the Committee's deliberations by laying down pre-conditions with regard to the convening and the practical preparation of the conference would bear a heavy responsibility.

/...
His delegation was profoundly convinced that the political conditions for the convening of a conference on disarmament had been met, and it hoped that the forthcoming session of the General Assembly would go down in history as the session of disarmament.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain)* said that his delegation was convinced of the growing importance of the subject of the World Disarmament Conference and also of the importance of the work which the Committee was called upon to perform.

His delegation also believed that the recognition of the importance of the subject reflected a general feeling, in spite of certain expressions of scepticism and in spite of the fear experienced by some delegations of becoming involved in an undertaking which was too idealistic or too ambitious. A certain degree of realism was necessary and the General Assembly itself had been realistic in recognizing, in Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX), that for the moment it did not seem possible to reach a definite conclusion on the convening of the World Disarmament Conference. However, an excess of that kind of realism, which ignored the need for a multilateral and universal forum to control armaments, would in its turn be unrealistic, since it would disregard the limitations and disadvantages of the other fora which constituted valid alternatives, either at the bilateral level, like the SALT talks, or at the level of negotiations between groups, like the talks on the mutual and balanced reduction of forces, or at the multilateral level on a reduced scale, like the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament or the European Conference on Security and Co-operation.

Obviously, all those efforts were useful, each one in its own sphere, and should be encouraged. However, his delegation believed that in the near future the advantages of a General Conference would become apparent also for those who so far had placed their main hopes in the other fora. Undoubtedly, the negotiations taking place in the bilateral level, between groups, and at the multilateral level on a reduced scale, were subject to limitations which made them ineffective in producing disarmament on a general scale.

---

* The statement by the representative of Spain was included in extenso by decision of the Committee.
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Bilateral negotiations - both between two States and between two groups of States or alliances - through their very nature, were seeking only a balance of forces or a mutual accommodation in the arms race between the two countries or groups of countries in question. Such a situation was inevitable because, if at any time the bilateral negotiations envisaged a significant reduction in armaments, they would have to take into account immediately the armaments of third countries. In other words, disarmament, if it was to have any meaning, must be general. Similarly, if the multilateral negotiations on a limited scale ever reached agreement on general disarmament, they would still retain a discriminatory character both from the structural and the functional point of view.

However, the importance of the subject of the World Disarmament Conference did not become apparent so much from a comparison of the General Conference with the other existing fora as from the comparison between the World Disarmament Conference and the lack of such a conference. One of the arguments which had sometimes been used against the World Disarmament Conference was that it would create illusions whose frustration would give rise to a new danger. However, if that argument were closely analysed, it would prove to be excessive, because it could be applied equally well to the bilateral negotiations and the other fora which had also given rise to certain hopes, albeit modest.

Therefore if the Committee weighed the convening of the World Disarmament Conference with the failure to convene it or, what amounted to the same thing, its indefinite postponement, it would become clearly aware of the danger of nuclear proliferation, facilitated by technology, in its two mutually interdependent aspects, horizontal proliferation and vertical proliferation: the increase in the number of nuclear States and the quantitative and qualitative increase in the arsenals held by the nuclear States. There was yet a third dimension of nuclear proliferation that might be added, namely, the nuclear arming of terrorist groups, whether subversive or composed of common criminals, that being the result to which the other two proliferations would inevitably lead. Unfortunately, the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty was clearly discriminatory, not because it had created the division between nuclear and non-nuclear States, but because it tended to institutionalize that division, especially if it was used as an instrument of pressure against countries that were on the verge of becoming nuclear Powers with the aim of forcing them to accept the perpetuation of a dependent and
subordinate status in that field without receiving in return any genuine guarantee of anti-nuclear security.

General and complete disarmament must be first and foremost nuclear disarmament; and nuclear disarmament must be preceded by the cessation of the armaments race, which really amounted to what was usually called by the extremely optimistic term "control" of nuclear weapons. It was true that there were efforts to limit the production and use of nuclear weapons, and they should not be belittled, whether carried on in bilateral forums such as SALT or under multilateral arrangements such as the non-proliferation Treaty or the creation of denuclearized zones. However, those efforts must be systematized and be supplemented by some declaration or undertaking on the part of the nuclear States that would be capable of inspiring a minimum of confidence among the non-nuclear States.

That situation - the imminent threat of proliferation - was perhaps the strongest argument in favour of the World Disarmament Conference. No one expected that such a conference could produce the solution to the problem overnight, through some magic formula. Anyone who gave serious thought to a World Disarmament Conference envisaged it as a gradual process, the first stages of which should consolidate and guarantee the control measures which had previously been achieved with regard to both the production and the use of nuclear weapons.

In that connexion, it seemed appropriate to recall once again that the use of nuclear weapons was already prohibited and condemned by the General Assembly in the Declaration adopted by the Assembly in its resolution 1653 (XVI) of 24 November 1961, paragraph 2 of which had called for consultations on the possibility of a conference to draw up a convention that would effectively prohibit the use of such weapons "for war purposes".

The purposes sought in General Assembly resolution 1653 (XVI) remained unfulfilled; however, bearing in mind that no one really thought the nuclear Powers were planning to use those weapons for war purposes rather than for security purposes, it seemed quite reasonable to hope that they might be able to find a formula for a declaration, whether jointly or separately, which would constitute a parallel in the 1970s to the famous renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy formulated in the 1920s. Of the five countries which had...
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officially stated that they had nuclear weapons, there were two which apparently had already found the formula for a declaration of self-limitation in the use of such weapons.

The fact was that nuclear weapons were a security device and, consequently, nuclear disarmament, however, ardently desired, would not be practical unless disarmament measures were paralleled by other security measures which would make the first use of nuclear weapons by any country useless and impossible.

For that reason, the Government of Spain, in its comments on the objectives of a world disarmament conference communicated to the Secretary-General pursuant to resolution 3260 (XXIX), said that, if a consensus were reached to the effect that the objectives of the Conference should be practical, clearly defined and properly graduated measures of disarmament, with sufficient guarantees so that no State would feel its own security threatened during the intermediate stage between the organization and termination of the Conference, the conditions which some Powers still insisted upon in relation to the conference would be met and their fears would be dispelled.

Elsewhere in its communication, the Government of Spain reiterated its previous statements to the effect that the world disarmament conference should have as its main objectives the general renunciation of nuclear and conventional rearmament and the achievement of a general agreement on practical, gradual and effectively guaranteed measures for the diminution of nuclear and conventional stockpiles, pending the achievement of general and complete disarmament and the transformation of military machines into bodies equipped with the minimum weaponry needed for the maintenance of international order and security, under effective international control.

The Committee's task was not to prepare for the World Disarmament Conference but to discharge the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly, and to that end it should be clearly aware of the mandate.

In the sixth preambular paragraph of resolution 3260 (XXIX) it was recognized that it did not yet seem possible to reach a final conclusion with regard to the convening of a world disarmament conference. However, that apparently negative
note was better understood in the context of the operative paragraphs, especially paragraph 2 (a) and (b), in which the Committee was called upon to prepare an analytical report with conclusions and recommendations, and to maintain certain contacts. Both the report and the contacts referred to the positions of States, with the one difference that the report could deal with the comments of any Member State, whereas the contacts should be maintained with the representatives of the States possessing nuclear weapons in order to keep currently informed of any change in their respective positions.

That was the part of the resolution in which the intention of the General Assembly was less easily understandable, since it was not clear how or why any nuclear State should change its position or what need there was for it to do so. It might be thought that the General Assembly had been carried away with the idea that some States were in favour of a world disarmament conference and others opposed it, whereas that distinction was much less clear than might appear at first glance. What had to be changed were the circumstances which had given rise to the positions of each of the five official nuclear States, and the relationship of those circumstances to each other. The Committee would be facing an impossible or problematical task if it hoped that in the course of those contacts some nuclear State might come to it and say that it had changed its position. His delegation preferred to interpret paragraph 2 (b) of the resolution in the sense that the Committee should, through contacts with the nuclear States, keep abreast of changes in the general situation from the point of view of those States, because of the special responsibility they bore in the maintenance of international security. Only if those States were convinced that international security, in a given context, would be better served and better guaranteed if a world conference was convened or prepared, would they participate in the necessary consensus for it without a change having to occur in their positions. That appeared to be the true meaning of operative paragraph 2.

However, what were the circumstances which might change to produce such a result? In his delegation's opinion, the change in the situation should appear primarily in the field of the conditions necessary for the convening of the WDC, in which, as the delegation of Spain had stated on a previous occasion, it was necessary to distinguish between the requisites and the prerequisites. The
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requisites, such as universality, equality, participation of all the nuclear States, etc., were not preconditions but elements which the Conference itself would have to combine when it was held. Nor was adequate, complete, detailed or thorough preparation, or whatever description might be preferred, a true prerequisite, because although by definition it had to precede the Conference, it could not precede the decision to hold the conference. It was impossible to begin preparing something which was not going to take place, or if it was not known that it would take place.

On the other hand, the prerequisites had to exist before the decision could be taken to convene the WDC. What were the prerequisites? A study of the abundant material available, in the form of replies to the Secretary-General and declarations made within or outside the United Nations, revealed only three conditions which were clearly prerequisites. The number was not great, although they were formidable prerequisites, both in their extent and in their implications:

1. A sufficient level of détente, including the cessation of serious local confrontations, and the creation of a minimum of mutual trust.

2. General support, understood in the limited sense, namely, that no militarily important States should be opposed to the Conference. That support would in all probability be forthcoming, when the first precondition, détente, was satisfied.

3. A system of sufficient control over the production and use of nuclear weapons, which should strengthen the minimum of confidence of States, both nuclear and non-nuclear, in their own security (a system which would have to be based on a combination of various kinds of machinery, such as the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the acceptance of demilitarized zones, bilateral negotiations and public commitments to self-restraint in the use of nuclear weapons).

In conclusion, the Spanish delegation firmly believed that in the near future the situation regarding those important prerequisites would develop in a way which was favourable to the convening, within a reasonable time, of the World Conference, and that consequently the work of the Committee, to which his delegation would make every contribution within its power, would be useful and beneficial to peace.

/...
Mr. PUENTSAJOROV (Mongolia) expressed the hope that the Committee would make further progress towards the preparation of a world disarmament conference, the early convening of which was in the vital interest of all mankind.

The Committee was beginning its work 30 years after the peoples of the anti-Hitlerite coalition had achieved a victory over the forces of fascism and militarism, thus ending one of the bloodiest and most devastating wars in the history of mankind. The Soviet Union, the world's first socialist country, had played a decisive role in that victory, which had demonstrated the possibility of co-operation between countries with different social systems in order to ensure world peace.

Over the last 30 years, radical changes had been wrought by the forces of peace, national independence, democracy and socialism. The growing power of the Soviet Union and of the countries of the socialist community, combined with the efforts of all peace-loving countries and socialist forces, had made it possible to avert another world war. In recent years, the trend towards the easing of international tensions had gained momentum and progress had been made towards finding solutions to previously insoluble international problems. The intensification of the process of détente was closely linked with the reduction of the danger of global military confrontation, particularly between the two world systems. Nevertheless, astronomical sums were still being spent on the arms race and on the development of more sophisticated nuclear and conventional weapons of mass destruction.

If a thermonuclear war was to be prevented, a system guaranteeing general security must be established. Experience had shown that it was possible to undertake concerted action for the limitation of the arms race on the basis of the principle of equal security for all parties concerned. Experience had also shown the usefulness of partial disarmament agreements which had opened the way to further agreements at the bilateral, regional and global levels. The convening of a world disarmament conference would therefore be a historic step towards the establishment of a system for the international regulation and limitation of arms and would facilitate the release of resources for economic, scientific and technological development of all countries, in particular the developing countries.
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His delegation therefore attached great importance to the earliest possible convening of a world disarmament conference in which all the countries of the world took part. At a time when problems such as development, population, food and environment were attracting wide public attention, it was unthinkable that such an important and vital problem as disarmament should receive inadequate attention. He expressed the hope that the work of the Committee would help the General Assembly to take the necessary decision to convene the conference.

As far as the organization of work was concerned, he agreed that the mandate given by the General Assembly to the Committee also applied to the Working Group and felt that a list of the problems to be dealt with by the conference should be drawn up so as to provide the General Assembly with a fuller picture of the task to be carried out by the conference and to facilitate agreement on other practical problems.

Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines) said that all mankind wanted international peace and security and a halt to the arms race that threatened civilization and impeded progress and development. The Philippines had been a victim of the most total war ever known and was therefore fully and firmly committed to general and complete disarmament, which would make available enormous resources for development, in particular for the developing countries, and would help to achieve the objectives of the Second Development Decade.

His delegation had been encouraged by the positive steps taken by the Committee in 1974 under the able leadership of the Chairman and by the untiring efforts of the Working Group, and it looked forward with optimism to the participation of all the nuclear and major military Powers in the deliberations of the Committee. Without the participation of all the nuclear Powers, the Committee's efforts would be ineffectual.

His delegation shared the general horror of the awesome weapons of mass destruction currently being developed. His delegation referred to an article in The New York Times of 23 February 1975 which described, in terrifying detail, "smart bombs" that seek tanks, missiles that read maps, guns that pick their targets, satellites that duel to the death. The development of such weapons lent a sense of great urgency to the work of the Committee. The resources devoted to
develop more sophisticated weaponry would be better used in improving the economic conditions and the quality of life of all the peoples of the world.

The Government of the Philippines was a signatory of various agreements and treaties and had supported various resolutions and proposals relating to nuclear disarmament. Furthermore, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines had agreed to declare their region of the world a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality. The full implementation of the declaration should help to ensure a climate of peace and stability in the region, conducive to the objectives of disarmament.

The views of his delegation on the preparation, participation in and timing of a world disarmament conference could be found in document A/9628 and other documents. His delegation was ready to co-operate with the Committee in order to ensure that its work bore fruitful results.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.
19th meeting

Chairman: Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran)

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

The CHAIRMAN announced that the Secretary-General had received communications from the Governments of Canada and Upper Volta regarding their views on the main objectives of the conference.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that the Ad Hoc Committee was dealing with one of the oldest problems in the history of the United Nations. All countries, large and small, had a tendency not to disarm but to keep increasing their stockpiles of weapons, which they euphemistically described as means of defence. The powerful nations went about acquiring a nuclear strike capacity to arm themselves against the vicissitudes of fate and history. A number of studies had amply documented that trend, which was too serious to be ignored.

The proposal made by the Soviet Union for the reduction of military budgets by 10 per cent had thus far not borne any fruit. Perhaps more imagination and action were needed so that funds which were diverted to the arms race could be used for the purposes of development.

The danger of nuclear proliferation was further complicated by the fact that even individuals, if they had a little know-how and a supply of plutonium, could manufacture atomic weapons. Such details served to conjure up a horrible vision of the future which might one day prove to be a reality and every effort must be made to prevent that from happening.

No country was opposed to disarmament per se, as an ideal or prospect for the future. Unfortunately, however, not all countries had given their support to the idea of convening a world disarmament conference.

His delegation regarded a world disarmament conference as one of the means available for creating an atmosphere of peace. Because of the importance and difficult nature of the problems that a conference would deal with, serious and detailed preparations were necessary to ensure success. A world disarmament conference would provide an appropriate forum in which all States could participate...
on an equal footing to deal with problems affecting the destiny of all the world's peoples. It would thus serve to strengthen peace and international security.

The major problem was not to decide on a venue for the conference or its rules of procedure but rather to obtain the agreement of the five nuclear Powers. It was necessary to bring together the divergent viewpoints so as to take into account the political fact that a majority of States were in favour of convening a conference and agreed that all the nuclear Powers without exception must participate actively in it.

His delegation welcomed the view expressed by the French delegation at the twenty-ninth General Assembly that the preparation of a world disarmament conference required an act of faith on the part of all countries and that the conference should lead to a commitment from all countries to refrain from the use of arms against other States except for the purpose of self-defence as defined in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

On the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, the General Assembly had adopted a resolution establishing the principle that States should refrain from the threat or use of force. It was curious that almost five years later there was talk of the possibility of military intervention for the purpose of defending economic interests. Intervention of that sort was not only contrary to the spirit of the Charter but was an outmoded nineteenth century concept which the United Nations should make every effort to oppose.

The renewed mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee was more specific than that of the previous year. If the Committee continued to grapple with the problems facing it, it should be able to make progress towards their solution and every effort should be made to avoid discouragement and pessimism. In carrying out the mandate set out in resolution 3260 (XXIX), the Ad Hoc Committee should seek to discover the possibilities of reaching a consensus on the time-table and purposes of the conference, while in its work it should keep up with the latest developments; it was important not to give the impression of stagnation.

With regard to a possible date for the convening of the conference, his delegation believed that 1978 would be appropriate since that would leave three years for preparation. In order to keep in touch with the latest developments and give publicity to the desire of the international community for the preparation and convening of a world disarmament conference, the Ad Hoc Committee might consider the possibility of dispatching missions to major capitals.

/...
Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation was taking the floor in the Ad Hoc Committee for a number of reasons, including the fact that within a matter of weeks the anniversary of the victory over Hitlerite fascism and the end of the Second World War, a turning point in the history of the people of the German Democratic Republic, would be celebrated once again. He expressed the gratitude of his people to those of the Soviet Union and to the other peoples of the anti-Hitler coalition for the struggle they had waged against fascism. Because the German Democratic Republic had been established in the midst of war, the struggle for peace and international security had been enshrined in its constitution as a fundamental principle of its foreign policy.

The United Nations had also been established as a consequence of the struggle of the peoples of the anti-Hitler coalition, and its basic principle was the protection and maintenance of peace. Many successes had been won in that struggle, including the attainment of independence by colonial peoples, the current reign of peace in Europe - which was the longest period of peace in the last 100 years of its history - and the continued spread of détente. The German Democratic Republic and the other States of the socialist community had acted to ensure that the process of détente would be irreversible and extended into all areas. They were prepared to continue to do so in the future.

There was, however, a contradiction between the positive trend towards détente and the spending of more than $250,000 million for military purposes each year. The constant build-up of arsenals was not only a threat to peace and international security but also had unacceptable economic consequences. The twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly had made it clear that the arms race was responsible for inflation, unemployment and monetary chaos in one area of the world, as well as for maintaining the resources available for assistance to developing countries at an insufficient level. His delegation therefore believed that wide-ranging measures for arms limitation and disarmament were necessary.

The Ad Hoc Committee was dealing with problems of great urgency. During the general debates at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic had drawn attention to the need for convening a world disarmament conference and had pointed out that it was high time to begin preparations for the conference on the basis of the results already achieved. He had affirmed that the German Democratic Republic could...
not share the opinion of some States that the time was not ripe for the holding of such a conference.

The Ad Hoc Committee’s report to the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly and the debates at that session, including the deliberations of the First Committee, had shown that there was agreement among the overwhelming majority of States regarding the basic questions involved in the holding of a world disarmament conference. His delegation was convinced that the conference should be held in close collaboration with the United Nations and there was general agreement concerning participation in the conference. Furthermore, it believed that the conference should last for one or two months, that the agenda should be fairly broad so as to allow for discussion of the various proposals and ideas regarding disarmament, especially general and complete disarmament, and that careful preparation of the conference was imperative.

Among the circumstances which made it possible to move on to the concrete preparations for the conference was the steady advance of détente. The Soviet Union and the United States had reached an agreement on strategic arms limitation during their summit meeting at Vladivostok. The European Conference on Security and Co-operation was drawing to a close, and negotiations were being held in Vienna on the reduction of forces in Central Europe. An overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations had entrusted the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament with the task of drafting a convention on the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military purposes. And not least important was the fact that three nuclear Powers were already taking part directly in the work of the Committee. All those facts led inexorably to the conclusion that the concrete preparations for the conference should begin as soon as possible.

Before the Second World War, fascist Germany’s policy at blocking disarmament agreements and conducting a frantic arms build-up had been rightly regarded as an expression of aggressive intent, and past experience should provide food for thought. At the same time, the positive changes which had occurred in the world should move the Committee to encourage, at long last, the taking of decisive steps towards general and complete disarmament - or, better yet, to take such steps itself - by calling for the convening of a world disarmament conference at the earliest possible date.

/...
Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that the Committee could be assured of his delegation’s full co-operation. The task of preparing an analytical and comprehensive report to be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session should not prove too difficult, since a substantial amount of relevant material was already contained in the Committee’s report to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session.

In spite of the Committee’s efforts, however, little progress had been made towards disarmament, and expenditures on arms had grown to frightening proportions. There had, however, been some positive developments, such as the movement towards détente and the establishment of a link between a reduction in military spending and a corresponding increase in development expenditures. An important test of the success of détente would be the amount of progress made towards disarmament. It was time to take the first step towards that goal and to make adequate preparations for a world disarmament conference. The objectives of such a conference were so vital to world peace that they should not be prejudiced by pre-conditions.

Although an overwhelming majority of the peoples of the world favoured the convening of such a conference, no positive steps had yet been taken. That situation might be attributed to fears of some that the hasty convening of the conference might cause it to fail. That apprehension might be based on an expectation that one conference would produce all desired results. However, in the opinion of his delegation, there would have to be a series of world disarmament conferences, or even a special session of the General Assembly to discuss the question of disarmament. It was necessary to recognize the perils of the arms race and respond to the clearly expressed aspirations of the vast majority of States and peoples for disarmament.

He expressed the hope that it would be possible to achieve a consensus regarding the convening of the conference. If the Committee failed again in its task, there would be no reason for it to continue its efforts.

The views of the Indian Government with regard to the question of disarmament were well known. In view of the vital importance of a world disarmament conference to mankind as a whole, it would be useful to mobilize public opinion and to encourage non-governmental organizations to become more involved in the convening of such a conference.

Mr. SMÍD (Czechoslovakia) said that the position of his Government on the convening of a world disarmament conference was well known and had most recently,
been stated in the communication dated 22 February 1975 from the Minister for
Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia to the Secretary-General.

The year 1975 was of particular importance not only to Czechoslovakia but to
the countries of the socialist community generally and to all peaceful and
progressive nations, since it was the thirtieth anniversary of the liberation
of Czechoslovakia by the heroic Soviet army, of the world-wide victory over
fascism and of the creation of the United Nations. In remembering the year 1945,
the Committee should feel a moral obligation to substantially increase its
efforts.

His Government believed that the time had come for more significant progress
to be made towards the convening of a world disarmament conference and that
a start should be made on the more concrete preparatory work. Although his
delegation was aware that the conference should be well prepared, the preparations
themselves should not be endlessly delayed. Nor should the convening of the
conference be made dependent on the fulfilment of a number of preconditions,
such as the implementation of extensive preparatory measures in the field of
arms limitation and disarmament. Furthermore, there did not seem to be any
justification for the fears that the convening of a world disarmament conference
would be detrimental to existing bodies already engaged in multilateral
negotiations on disarmament issues. His delegation was of the opinion that
such delays and preconditions were not in keeping with the spirit of General
Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX).

One of the Committee's important tasks was to maintain close contact with
the Governments which possessed nuclear arms. That task was currently being made
considerably easier by the participation of the United Kingdom, France and the
Soviet Union in the work of the Committee. His delegation was convinced that the
active approach of those countries to the solving of the disarmament problem would
make a significant contribution to the work of the Committee. The negative
position of the remaining nuclear Powers constituted a serious obstacle to both
the preparatory work and the convening of the Conference itself and was also
disrupting the atmosphere of mutual understanding and trust among the future
participants in the conference. He emphasized the need for consistent
(Mr. Smid, Czechoslovakia)
implementation of the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 3183 (XXVIII) and 3260 (XXIX), which asked the nuclear Powers to co-operate and to maintain contact with the Committee.

His Government placed high hopes in the world disarmament conference because, with the participation of all States and, in particular, of nuclear Powers and States possessing great military potential, the conference could provide a global solution to the disarmament question. It could also provide new hopes for curbing the arms race and reducing military spending, thus opening new possibilities for the provision of greater economic assistance to the developing countries. Finally, it would surely contribute to solving local international conflicts and to gradually eliminating hotbeds of war. To achieve those aims, the conference should examine the entire complex of disarmament questions, with first priority being given to the complete prohibition and destruction of all nuclear stockpiles; it should consider matters relating to the prohibition of nuclear tests by all States in all environments and to other partial measures in the field of nuclear disarmament; it should pursue efforts aimed at slowing down and halting the arms race, at relaxing international tension and at the complete prohibition and destruction of stockpiles of all weapons of mass destruction; it could also study the results already achieved in the field of disarmament and evaluate the significance of partial disarmament measures in promoting the achievement of general and complete disarmament; finally, it could consider questions relating to the negative economic and social consequences of disarmament and thus stabilize the relationship between disarmament and economic development, particularly with regard to the developing countries.

Such were the aims of the overwhelming majority of mankind and of the States which were participating actively, in one way or another, in the work of the Committee. Although the achievement of those aims was at present beyond the competence of the Committee, it was fully within its terms of reference to prepare an analytical report which would emphasize the usefulness and urgency of convening the conference.
Mr. BENSMAIL (Algeria) said that the number of resolutions on disarmament adopted by the General Assembly illustrated the international community's concern with regard to the dangers of the arms race.

The mandate given by the General Assembly to the Committee was quite clear, and the Working Group should begin its work at the earliest possible opportunity. It was gratifying to see three nuclear Powers participating in the work of the Committee, and it was to be hoped that the other nuclear Powers would also co-operate.

His Government's position with regard to the convening of a world disarmament conference had been explained both in the United Nations and at the conferences of non-aligned countries. At the recent meeting in Havana, the non-aligned countries had reiterated their support for the convening of a conference at the earliest possible time. The main objective of the conference should be to achieve general and complete disarmament, which would involve the total banning of nuclear-weapons testing, the destruction of nuclear stockpiles, the dismantling of military bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops from all regions of the world. In addition, the conference should take stock of the results achieved thus far in the field of disarmament, determine trends and basic principles for future disarmament activities and subsequently lay down general guidelines for future disarmament negotiations by drawing up a programme for those negotiations and setting up suitable international machinery to ensure their success.

He proposed that the statement made by the representative of Spain at the 16th meeting of the Committee should be reproduced in extenso in the record of that meeting.

The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the proposal made by the representative of Algeria and would request the Secretary to make the necessary arrangements.

It was so decided.

Mr. MATIN (Pakistan) said it was well known that Pakistan supported in principle the idea of general and complete disarmament under the right conditions and in an atmosphere of international understanding, trust and co-operation. His Government believed that a world disarmament conference, if properly prepared,
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enjoying the blessing of all the nuclear Powers and convened at the appropriate time, could achieve significant progress towards disarmament. It was therefore necessary to increase efforts to create the necessary framework to enable all the nuclear Powers to participate in, or at least co-operate with, the Committee. Without the co-operation of the nuclear Powers, it was unlikely that any progress would be made.

The Committee and the Working Group should examine in depth the views of Member States regarding the possibility of convening the conference, with a view to identifying areas of agreement and significant differences.

His own Government believed that the reduction of nuclear stockpiles and of arms expenditures by those Powers with the largest arsenals would help to establish the climate of confidence needed for the success of the conference. It also believed that, if the conference was to be productive, it must develop measures safeguarding non-nuclear States against nuclear threat or attack.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) said that his Government's position with regard to the convening of a world disarmament conference was clearly stated in document A/9628. On a number of occasions, the French delegation had emphasized the importance which it attached to efforts directed towards achieving genuine disarmament. The partial measures implemented thus far had obviously been inadequate and at times discriminatory, and they had in no way slowed down the arms race, as was clearly illustrated by the currently astronomical level of military spending. France was in favour of convening a world disarmament conference with the participation of all nuclear Powers. That position had recently been reiterated in a joint communiqué issued by France and the Soviet Union. Without the participation of all nuclear Powers at all stages, the conference would be unsuccessful. That fact should be borne in mind constantly by both the Committee and the Working Group. The Working Group must avoid any formula which might be unacceptable to countries which were not members of the Group, and, in particular, to nuclear Powers not participating in the work of the Committee. Any other course could be disastrous for the cause of the conference. It was essential to maintain a close link between the Working Group, the other members of the Committee and all those who were to maintain contact with them under the terms of General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX).

His delegation would give the Committee all possible support.
Mr. Saito (Japan) said that, with regard to the substantive issues involved in the Committee's work in 1975, his Government's views were well known. However, it was of great importance to re-emphasize that participation of all nuclear Powers was necessary for the success of a world disarmament conference. More systematic liaison must be established with the nuclear Powers in the Committee's future work. He proposed that that should be placed among the matters to be considered by the Working Group.

Mr. Driess (Tunisia) recalled that he had earlier made a number of suggestions and had asked the Chairman to request the Working Group to take them into consideration. He had stressed the value of the idea of sending missions to the major capitals concerned for the purpose of maintaining contact. His delegation felt also that the Working Group should be given a mandate to identify options on which the Committee might need to take decisions at future meetings.

The Chairman said that the Working Group's mandate was perfectly clear: it would have to reconsider replies from States, taking into account what had been said in the Committee. The question of the Working Group's mandate had been raised by the Argentine representative at the start of the Committee's session and had been discussed by several speakers in the debate. Summing up the situation with regard to the Working Group's mandate, he felt that it was determined by the mandate of the Committee itself, which was set forth in paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX).

He felt that what had been requested by the Japanese and Tunisian representatives was self-evident, because the Working Group and the Committee had to take into account the views of States. It was stated in the first part of paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX) that the Committee was to "resume its work, in accordance with the procedure established in General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII)". That, taken in conjunction with the statement in paragraph 2 (a) that the Committee was to work on the basis of consensus, made the Committee's mandate quite clear. Paragraph 2 (h) was a reminder of the need to maintain close contact with the representatives of the States possessing nuclear weapons. He believed that all the comments which had been made in the Committee indicated that the Working Group should at all stages of its work maintain contact...
with other Committee members and with States not directly represented in the Committee. What the Working Group was expected to do in 1975 was, as in 1974, to prepare the ground with sufficient care so as to make it possible for the Committee to hold a fruitful debate in the short time available to it. In view of the previous year's success in proceeding on the basis of consensus, he felt sure that the Working Group would in the current year also follow the sole procedure which made it possible for progress to be made towards the common goal. He pointed out that the whole Committee was extremely prudent and had been established in a prudent way, and he agreed with the Indian representative in favouring a stage-by-stage kind of progress, which was, in his view, what the Committee was actually achieving.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he agreed that the mandate of the Committee and, consequently, of the Working Group had been clearly defined in paragraph 2 (a) and (b) of General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX). Many speakers had stressed that that resolution gave broad opportunities to the Committee and, consequently, to the Working Group. It could therefore be hoped that the Committee, on the basis of the broad mandate given it by the General Assembly, would obtain results and submit to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session an analytical report and any conclusions and proposals which the Committee and the Working Group found it necessary and expedient to make. Under paragraph 2 (b) of the resolution, the Committee was instructed to maintain close contact with the representatives of the nuclear Powers so as to keep abreast of any changes in their position. Unfortunately, two nuclear Powers were not directly participating in the Committee's work. The question arose what the Committee should do if those two nuclear Powers did not change their respective positions. Should the Committee consider itself paralysed or should it go on working? On the basis of its terms of reference, he believed that the Committee should actively continue its work and prepare an analytical report, with conclusions and recommendations, because it was apparent from the Committee's debates so far that a majority of members were in favour of holding a world disarmament conference. The representative of Tunisia had even named a tentative date, which should be borne in mind.

...
He asked the Secretariat to inform the Committee how many world conferences on various world problems had been held since the founding of the United Nations 30 years earlier. That information would be of great interest to members. International conferences had been held on a wide variety of questions, such as population, housing, women, the law of the sea, etc. Was it true that all those subjects were more important than the question of disarmament for the United Nations and for the world as a whole?

His delegation felt that the Committee should continue its work and make any relevant proposals, regardless of whether the two nuclear Powers not participating in its work introduced changes in their positions. Even though it was true that a world disarmament conference should have the participation of all the nuclear Powers and all Powers having a major military potential, the Committee should press on with its work, and his delegation fully agreed with the Chairman's analysis of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN said that his summary had been based on comments from delegations and the clear wording of paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX). It was stated in paragraph 2 (a) that the Committee should prepare and submit to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session, on the basis of consensus, an analytical report, including any conclusions and recommendations it might deem pertinent, concerning the comments received pursuant to paragraph 1 of the resolution. The remainder of paragraph 2 was equally clear. The Committee should in no event allow itself to be intimidated, because it had a mandate to report to the General Assembly.

Patience and time were needed, and the members of the Committee must make every effort to convince others of what they themselves believed. He therefore appealed to the Committee to endeavour to accomplish that in private meetings with other representatives.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) agreed with the Chairman that Member States should make every effort to share in the Committee's heavy burden of work. General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX) was the most recent of four resolutions on the same subject which had been adopted, two of them by consensus and the two most recent by a unanimous vote. He therefore believed that the Committee could safely deduce that all members of the General Assembly, including the two nuclear
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Powers which were not participating in the Committee's work, shared the view stated in the third and fourth preambular paragraphs of General Assembly resolution 3260 (XXIX), in which the Assembly reiterated its conviction that all peoples of the world had a vital interest in the success of disarmament negotiations and that all States should be in a position to contribute to the adoption of measures for the achievement of that goal and stressed anew its belief that a world disarmament conference, adequately prepared and convened at an appropriate time, could promote the realization of such aims and that the cooperation of all nuclear Powers would considerably facilitate their attainment.

Those provisions in fact constituted what was known as a truism.

In the light of the foregoing, the second preambular paragraph should be understood as closely linked with the fourth, because there did not at present exist in the world or within the framework of the United Nations any place where all peoples of the world could express their views on disarmament. Still less had they all an opportunity through their Governments to make a constructive contribution to that goal. In the General Assembly, with its extensive agenda, the First Committee did not have time for in-depth consideration of the question of world disarmament. In his view, therefore, the fourth preambular paragraph was simply a natural corollary of the third. The third preambular paragraph stressed the General Assembly's conviction that all States should be in a position to contribute to the adoption of measures for the achievement of disarmament, and his delegation believed that the fourth preambular paragraph, particularly the reference to the "co-operation of all nuclear Powers", should be understood in the spirit and the letter of the Charter of the United Nations, which spoke of the sovereign equality of all States. That paragraph should not be understood as an attempt to establish a certain kind of superiority or to create a situation which implied a certain hierarchy. Any delegation should find it possible to maintain the kind of contacts referred to in the resolution in a normal way, at the beginning or the end of meetings. One of the nuclear Powers not participating in the Committee's work was a super-Power, but it must not be considered that that designation necessitated a derogation from the principle of sovereign equality laid down in the United Nations Charter. The other nuclear Power which was not represented in the Committee frequently stated categorically that it was not a super-Power and that it had no
desire to become one. He hoped that representatives of those two nuclear Powers which were not participating in the Committee's work would at least attend its meetings, so that they could show that the co-operation referred to in the resolution was not an empty word.

The CHAIRMAN assured the Mexican representative that he would inform the two nuclear Powers not participating in the Committee's work of the Mexican representative's comments.

The letter from the Austrian Government which he had circulated to members of the Committee could be considered by members at the next meeting or at a subsequent meeting, since no member had commented on it in the current debate.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

The CHAIRMAN, in declaring the session closed, expressed appreciation to members for their co-operation and assured them that he would do his utmost to help the Working Group to achieve results. However, he stressed that the Working Group, the Bureau and the Chairman were not alone and that the co-operation of all was necessary.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.