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The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENT(S) TO BE ADOPTED AT THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, following informal consultations, it had been agreed that the Committee should recommend that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should adopt two documents, one containing the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament and the second encompassing all other items of its agenda. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to make such a recommendation.

2. It was so decided.

ANY REMAINING ORGANIZATIONAL AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS RELATED TO THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

3. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, following the proposal to launch the World Disarmament Campaign at the opening meeting of the second special session, some delegations had raised questions about the legal aspects of the issue, feeling that the General Assembly itself should first take a decision on the launching of the Campaign. To overcome that problem, it had been suggested during informal consultations that at the opening meeting the President of the Assembly might read out a draft decision or resolution, which could then be adopted by consensus before the World Disarmament Campaign was launched. The text of one formulation for such a decision or resolution had been circulated to all members; it read as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Recalling that, in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, it stressed the importance of mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of disarmament,

"Recalling likewise its resolution 35/152 I of 12 December 1980 and its resolution 36/92 C of 15 January 1982 related to the organization and financing of a World Disarmament Campaign under the auspices of the United Nations,

"1. Decides to launch the World Disarmament Campaign on the occasion of the opening of the second special session;

"2. Requests the Secretary-General to submit a programme of the Campaign."

Originally there had been three operative paragraphs but the second one, inviting Member States to make pledges towards the financing of the World Disarmament Campaign, had been deleted in deference to the wish of some delegations to seek instructions from their Governments on the matter.

4. Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom) said that it seemed hasty to decide to launch the World Disarmament Campaign before the programme was known. It was also clear
that, if the President of the General Assembly was to consult delegations in order to obtain a consensus on the matter, such consultations could not be completed on the opening day of the session. He therefore suggested that the first operative paragraph of the text should be amended to read as follows:

"1. Decides to launch the World Disarmament Campaign during the second special session devoted to disarmament;".

5. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said he had been under the impression that if the original operative paragraph 2 was deleted all delegations, including that of the United Kingdom, would agree to the text. There was nothing new in the text, since it referred back to the first special session and to General Assembly resolutions 35/152 I and 36/92 C, both of which had been extensively discussed at the relevant sessions of the Assembly. Indeed, two concessions had already been made, first by choosing the word "invites" in the original operative paragraph 2 and then by agreeing to omit that paragraph temporarily. The President of the Assembly could clearly consult the Chairmen of the regional groups in advance to see if there were any objections to the suggested draft resolution; if there were none, he could simply read out the text on the opening day for immediate adoption by consensus. He hoped that the United Kingdom representative would not press his objection to the Chairman's proposal, and he stressed that concessions should not be made only by one side.

6. The CHAIRMAN said it was difficult to believe that some delegations had no idea what the contents of the programme of the Campaign would be. Furthermore, the solemnity of the World Disarmament Campaign would be enhanced if it was launched at the opening of the session. If there was agreement in principle that the Campaign should be launched, there ought not to be any problems. However, it would be quite another matter if the United Kingdom had doubts about the whole idea.

7. Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom) said that he had no objection in principle; on the contrary, his delegation was firmly in favour of the Campaign. He was making the purely procedural point that it would be impossible to launch it while consultations were continuing. If those consultations were held prior to the session, his delegation would have no difficulties. His second point, namely, that the contents of the programme should be known in advance, was simply a matter of logic, but he did not intend to stand in the way of launching the Campaign.

8. Mr. OKAWA (Japan) said that, if Governments were to be invited to make pledges towards the financing of the Campaign, the States members of the General Assembly were entitled to first consider the programme and be given an opportunity to express their views, after which the programme would be adopted. He therefore suggested that paragraph 2 of the suggested text should be amplified to read:

"Requests the Secretary-General to submit a programme of the Campaign for consideration and adoption by the second special session".

9. Mr. de BEAUSSE (France) said he too felt that it would be imprudent to launch the Campaign before the programme was known. While he would prefer the General
Assembly to discuss the matter first, he could agree to the Chairman's proposal if there was a consensus on it. Nevertheless, he would be happier if the amendment proposed by the representative of Japan was accepted, so that the General Assembly's right to discuss and consider the World Disarmament Campaign and the ways in which it should be carried out would be safeguarded.

10. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) pointed out that the existing wording of operative paragraph 2 implied that the General Assembly would consider and adopt the programme. However, if some delegations felt the need to state everything explicitly, he had no objection to the Japanese proposal. He stressed that, since the second special session would have a heavy agenda containing several difficult items, it was only logical to expect that the programme submitted by the Secretary-General would contain only the broad outlines of the World Disarmament Campaign, because there would be no time for the Assembly to go into details.

11. The CHAIRMAN noted that there seemed to be no objection to the proposal made by the representative of Japan.

12. Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden) said that he would like to know the situation concerning pledges towards the financing of the Campaign and whether it was assumed that the President of the General Assembly would, during his consultations, try to discover if a consensus existed on the inclusion in the decision to be adopted of a paragraph relating to pledges.

13. The CHAIRMAN said that the President's consultations on the draft decision would no doubt involve the question of pledging. The results of those consultations would determine whether that question was included in the final draft. The President might also indicate that, when launching the Campaign, he would call on Governments and individuals to contribute to its funding.

14. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to recommend that the President of the General Assembly should launch the World Disarmament Campaign after a decision to that effect had been adopted at the first meeting of the special session. The text before the Committee, incorporating the Japanese amendment, would be forwarded to the President as one on which a consensus could be achieved.

15. It was so decided.

CONSIDERATION OF SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES RELATED TO THE SPECIAL SESSION, INCLUDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

16. Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India) drew attention to paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 36/81 B, which had been adopted against the background of increasing alarm over the danger of nuclear war. He hoped that the nuclear-weapon States, which had primary responsibility in the matter, would comply with that paragraph and submit their views on the prevention of nuclear war. His delegation regretted that so far only one of them, China, had done so. The others showed a lack of
sensitivity for the concerns of the international community by ignoring the request. Yet those were the same Powers which claimed primary responsibility for dealing with nuclear issues. The prevention of nuclear war was one of the main tasks confronting the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and it was imperative that that session should allay the fears of a nuclear holocaust. His delegation hoped that those nuclear-weapon States which had not yet done so would give the matter priority attention and submit their views to the Secretary-General before the special session.

17. Mr. Issraelian (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the importance of the forthcoming special session was enhanced by the fact that preparations for it were taking place at a time when armaments, especially nuclear weapons, were continuing to accumulate. The central topic in the Preparatory Committee's discussions had been the need to prevent nuclear war. New varieties of nuclear weapons were lowering the nuclear threshold, making talk of "limited" nuclear exchanges and the possibility of emerging victorious from them particularly dangerous. The production of new weapons was not the problem; the real problem - a political one - was how to prevent their emergence and use, and the United Nations, as the most representative body on earth, should have a say in that. He was only right. Therefore, that question of preventing nuclear war should be accorded due prominence during the special session.

18. He noted with satisfaction the growing awareness of the need for concrete action to halt the arms race and bring about disarmament. It was to be hoped that all States favouring the consolidation of world peace would so direct their efforts that the special session could make a worthy contribution to that goal. His delegation regarded the question of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament in that light.

19. The interest taken in the Preparatory Committee's work, especially by non-governmental organizations, indicated that the progress achieved at the special session would be followed closely throughout the world. Such public attention placed upon government representatives an obligation to ensure that the hopes pinned on the special session were not dashed. Public opinion could make a valuable contribution to the development of conditions conducive to practical moves towards disarmament and stronger political safeguards of peace. All sectors of Soviet society consistently spoke out in favour of disarmament and the strengthening of international peace and security.

20. Although it had not proved possible to reach agreement on all the substantive issues on which the success or failure of the special session largely depended, the Preparatory Committee had managed to do a great deal of useful work. He hoped that the same calm and constructive attitude would prevail during the special session itself.

21. Mr. de Souza e Silva (Brazil) said that Brazil, like India, was deeply disappointed that four nuclear-weapon States had chosen to disregard a General Assembly resolution which had been adopted unanimously. The Preparatory
Committee's report to the special session should urge the General Assembly to consider the views that had been submitted on the prevention of nuclear war.

22. **Mr. GIL** (Argentina) said his delegation also hoped that the nuclear-weapon Powers would respond to the appeal made in General Assembly resolution 36/81 B. His delegation was pleased that China had done so and deeply regretted that the others had not. It supported the Brazilian representative's suggestion that the Committee's report should reflect the concern felt on that point and hoped that the silence of the nuclear-weapon Powers with respect to specific measures to prevent nuclear war did not reflect a change in their position since the time when that resolution had been adopted. It was an extremely important resolution, and its provisions must be honoured by the countries to which it was addressed.

23. **Mr. ARRAM** (Pakistan) said that the adoption of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament at the special session would be a positive step. It was to be hoped that that session would result in a breakthrough on the major obstacles to disarmament and that it would find ways to mitigate the feeling of insecurity which plagued the world and produce specific measures for the prevention of nuclear war and for the implementation of nuclear disarmament. His delegation shared the disappointment at the failure of the nuclear-weapon States to respond to the appeal in General Assembly resolution 36/81 B and hoped that a response would be forthcoming at the special session. It also hoped that the special session would produce a consensus on conventional weapons, in view of their devastating effects.

24. **Mr. OTT** (German Democratic Republic) said the results of the current session of the Preparatory Committee showed that progress in the field of disarmament was possible even at a time of aggravated international relations and heightened tension, if all concerned were prepared to shoulder the responsibility for averting the danger of a nuclear catastrophe. Of course, a great deal of work remained to be done before the special session could be brought to a successful conclusion. His country was willing and ready to make its constructive contribution.

25. The Committee had approved a list of non-governmental organizations, national organizations and institutions concerned with peace and disarmament research to speak at the special session. In doing so, it was taking account of the fact that a movement of unprecedented proportions for peace and disarmament was gaining in scope and strength on all continents. That movement was certain to contribute to the special session.

26. In view of its location in the centre of Europe and in the immediate vicinity, to the west, of the largest concentration of nuclear weapons of all types, the German Democratic Republic had a very keen interest in the special session's giving a decisive impetus to halting the arms race, notably in the nuclear field. The prevention of nuclear war continued to be the paramount concern of the peoples of the world and must therefore be given the highest priority at the special session. His delegation would continue to support all proposals serving that objective and in particular the demand that nuclear-weapon States should enter into a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The complex tasks facing the special session could be solved if all States were guided by the challenging goal of safeguarding for mankind a future in peace, security and prosperity.
27. **Mr. MOUSSAOUI** (Algeria) said he too was disappointed that four nuclear-weapon Powers had failed to respond to the request in General Assembly resolution 36/81 B, which referred to a question of crucial importance, and hoped that they would do so before the special session so that the latter could take specific measures to prevent a nuclear catastrophe.

28. **Mr. LIANG Yufan** (China) said that the draft report of the Preparatory Committee (A/AC.206/L.2) and the annex to it provided a good basis for the work of the second special session devoted to disarmament. The composite paper containing the views of delegations would help the special session in its drafting work. He commended the non-aligned countries for their work in the Drafting Group; other countries had also submitted views which merited attention. The informal working group and the contact group on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament had had useful discussions which had clarified divergences and had focused on the major problems.

29. As to the number and nature of the documents to be adopted at the special session, his delegation was flexible. Their content was extremely important. They should concisely reflect the views of States on important agenda items, and especially on the international situation, and should stress analysis of the root causes of the arms race and suggest ways of giving an impetus to disarmament. The Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament should be a separate document.

30. Lastly, the success of the special session depended upon whether the Powers with the largest nuclear arsenals were prepared to change their positions and show their sincerity in working for nuclear disarmament.

31. **Mr. FIELDS** (United States of America) reiterated that the points raised by the representative of India, among others, were of great concern to the United States, as had been amply demonstrated by President Reagan in his statements and in his decision to attend the second special session devoted to disarmament. The draft report of the Preparatory Committee (A/AC.206/L.2) also reflected the concern of all delegations regarding the matters referred to by the representative of India.

32. He joined other representatives in paying a tribute to the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee and the Chairman of the Working Group. Also deserving of special commendation were the translators, who had performed magnificently.

33. **Mr. CABRAS** (Italy) introduced his delegation's working paper on the institutional machinery for disarmament and institutional aspects thereof (A/AC.206/22). The working paper contained an evaluation of the performance of United Nations bodies dealing with the question of disarmament and suggested how they could improve their performance. While it was quite comprehensive, the paper did not cover all aspects of the question. For example, it did not discuss the functioning of the Committee on Disarmament.

34. In preparing the paper, his delegation had been mindful of the need to enable the United Nations bodies in question to make an effective contribution to the disarmament effort.
REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS SPECIAL SESSION
(A/AC.206/L.2)

35. Mr. ERSUN (Turkey), Rapporteur, introducing the draft report (A/AC.206/L.2), said that the last part of paragraph 33 should be made a separate sentence, beginning as follows: "Thus it may be subsequently enriched ...". The introductory part of paragraph 38 should be amended to read: "... to transmit the following documents to its second special session ...".

36. The words "the first days available at the end of the general debate" in the first sentence of paragraph 49 were unnecessary and should be deleted. Paragraph 51 (Conference Room Paper 1982/9, Add.1) referred to the Committee's decision to add six research institutions to those which the committee of the whole would hear at the special session. On reflection, he believed that that new paragraph was unnecessary; it would be sufficient to amend the second sentence of paragraph 49 to read: "... would hear the views of the 56 non-governmental organizations and 23 peace and disarmament research institutions ...".

37. In paragraph 50, the words "in addition to the Working Group on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament (see para. 22 above)" should be placed after the words "decided to recommend that". With the deletion of paragraph 51, paragraph 52 should be renumbered and should read: "At its 40th meeting, on 13 May 1982, the Committee decided ...". Lastly, a new paragraph would have to be added to reflect the Committee's decision concerning the launching of the World Disarmament Campaign.

38. Mr. MAREF (Egypt) suggested that in paragraph 31 the words "one substantive session" should be replaced by "its fourth session" and in paragraph 32 the word "fourth" should be deleted. That would bring paragraph 31 into line with paragraphs 35 and 36; moreover, while the current session had been primarily substantive, the Committee had also discussed certain organizational matters.

39. Mr. RANHALI (Morocco) said that the date indicated in paragraph 43 of the French text was incorrect.

40. He did not agree with the Rapporteur's decision to refer to the six additional institutions in paragraph 49; reference should appear in a separate paragraph.

41. Mr. ERSUN (Turkey), Rapporteur, said that that question had already been discussed by the Committee, which had taken a purely technical decision after due consideration. He appealed to the representative of Morocco not to press the point.

42. Mr. de la GORCE (France) said that he agreed with the representative of Morocco. The suggested change would make the text incorrect, because the Ad Hoc Liaison Group had not selected the six additional research institutions. It might be better to state in paragraph 49 that the Preparatory Committee had decided to recommend that the committee of the whole should hear the views of 56 non-governmental organizations and 23 peace and disarmament research institutions, and that the Committee had also taken into consideration the relevant recommendations of the Ad Hoc Liaison Group.
43. Mr. ERSUN (Turkey), Rapporteur, suggested that the word "selected" in paragraph 49 should be replaced by "presented".

44. Mr. de la GORCE (France) said that, although the Ad Hoc Liaison Group had not in fact discussed the question of the six additional research institutions, he would not object to the further change suggested by the Rapporteur.

45. Mr. DON NANJIRA (Kenya) said that the annexes referred to in paragraphs 33 and 34 should be made available to all delegations.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.