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The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. The **CHAIRMAN** asked the members of the Committee whether they were now able to adopt by consensus document A/AC.187/80, the working paper prepared by Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden. If so, the Committee's recommendation to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly would be that the Assembly should recommend initiating a study as provided in the document.

2. **Mr. SCALABRINI** (France) said that, although he had no objection to a decision by consensus on the working paper, he could not give his full assent to the Chairman's proposal since he had received no instructions from his Government on the matter.

3. **Mr. TIMERBAEV** (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that a study along the lines proposed in document A/AC.187/80 would in no way prejudice any decisions that might be taken on that study.

4. The **CHAIRMAN** said that, if the Committee recommended to the General Assembly that it should initiate the study proposed in the Nordic paper, the thirty-second session would take an appropriate decision. It could accept or reject the recommendation of the Committee.

5. **Mr. OXLEY** (Australia) said that he had studied the Nordic working paper and that it merited serious consideration. However, it was difficult to endorse the proposed study without knowing what its terms of reference would be. His Government recognized the need for a study of the social and economic consequences of the arms race and had set up an expert group for that purpose; however, he had had no opportunity to refer the proposals in the Nordic paper to his Government. The paper indicated that its objective was for the General Assembly to endorse the proposed study, which might lead to specific action of some kind by the United Nations. He would be grateful if the representatives of the Nordic countries would explain exactly what they hoped the General Assembly would endorse. Several possible studies were outlined in the paper, and he would be happy to support the principle of those studies if the terms of reference were more clearly defined.

6. **Mrs. THORSSON** (Sweden) said she wished to emphasize that the representatives of the Nordic countries were not asking the Preparatory Committee to adopt the ideas contained in document A/AC.187/80. They were merely suggesting that the Committee recommend to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly that a study should be made of the question of disarmament and development within terms of reference which would be further elaborated by the General Assembly, so that the special session could take the final decision in May 1978.

7. The **CHAIRMAN** said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted the following recommendation by consensus: that the General Assembly at its thirty-second regular session decide to begin a study on disarmament and development, whose specific terms of reference would be considered
by the General Assembly in the First Committee in the course of consideration of
the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee.

8. **It was so decided.**

**PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)**

9. **Mr. TIEBERBAEV** (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on behalf of his
own delegation as well as those of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic
Republic, Hungary, Mongolia and Poland, said that he wished to propose draft basic
provisions for the declaration on disarmament and the programme of action on
disarmament.

10. With regard to the declaration on disarmament, their view was that the
document could consist of two parts. The first part should contain appraisals of
a general character arising from an objective analysis of the present situation in
the field of disarmament. In formulating those appraisals, account should be taken
of the fact that, despite the efforts of the peace-loving forces, there had been
no success in halting the arms race. Its continuation posed the most serious
threat for all peoples. The task of stemming the arms race and attaining
disarmament was particularly urgent at the present time because of the actions of
the opponents of détente, particularly the United States, which threatened to
intensify the danger of nuclear war. The recent decisions of the United States
regarding cruise missiles and the neutron bomb and the increase in NATO's armed
strength in Europe bore witness to that danger. On the other hand, recent years
had seen some success in halting the arms race. There had been a positive
development in international relations towards the reduction of tension, and that
process was determining the course of events in the world. Significant agreements
had also been reached in recent years in the matter of arms limitation and the
prevention of nuclear war.

11. However, further progress had to be made in solving both long-standing and
recent problems. There was no lack of problems to be tackled, and the present task
was to give practical effect to the useful initiatives which had been made and to
direct efforts towards achieving effective international agreements in the field
of disarmament.

12. The second part of the declaration could contain a number of fundamental
provisions to be put into effect through talks and agreements designed to halt the
arms race and achieve disarmament. Many members of the Committee had referred
to the need for such basic provisions, and a majority of States had expressed a wish
for them in their replies to the Secretary-General's letter concerning the special
session.

13. It was important for the declaration to make the point that success could be
achieved in reducing international tension if there were concrete results in
limiting the arms race and in disarmament. The special session should declare
itself in favour of strengthening détente, so that the process of reducing
international tension could advance smoothly.

...
14. World peace and security on a firm and permanent basis could only be guaranteed by general and complete disarmament under strict international control, which must be the chief aim of all disarmament efforts.

15. The declaration should also state the importance of partial measures in limiting the arms race. Such measures were sometimes viewed sceptically. However, partial measures were stages in the process of achieving general and complete disarmament. They reduced the danger of war, lightened the burden of the arms race and helped to reduce the arsenals maintained by States.

16. The declaration should also state that all countries should refrain from actions which could have a negative effect on disarmament efforts. The willingness of States to adopt a constructive approach to international negotiations and demonstrate a political will to achieve agreement was an important condition of success in arms limitation talks. Another was the principle that the security of States must not be impaired. The strict observance of that principle had always brought positive results, and attempts to circumvent it and gain unilateral advantage had always hampered the search for solutions. That principle had been reflected in the Soviet-American agreements of recent years and was the basis of the Vienna Strategic Arms Limitation Talks as well as of all current disarmament negotiations.

17. The socialist delegations also proposed that the future document should emphasize the importance of a general affirmation of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations within the context of creating favourable conditions for halting the arms race. That principle was the cornerstone of United Nations activities and was emphasized in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. At the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union had put forward a draft world treaty on the non-use of force (A/31/243). In the view of the socialist countries, the declaration should call on all States to refrain from the use of force or the threat of force, so that the principle would become a law of international conduct.

18. Many of the replies received from States concerning the special session had expressed serious concern that the growth of armaments was overtaking the efforts of States in the field of disarmament and that that tendency had increased in recent years. It was essential to limit armaments, especially weapons of mass destruction. A useful contribution could be made by applying the principle of using the achievements of science and technology exclusively for peaceful purposes.

19. The participation of all States of the world was needed in order to solve a problem as important as that of disarmament. Disarmament could not be achieved if certain States disarmed while others were permitted to increase their war potential. The socialist countries therefore proposed that the declaration should contain the principle of participation in negotiations and elaboration of agreements by the largest possible number of States, especially the nuclear Powers and those possessing the most powerful weapons and armed forces.
20. Many delegations had referred to the importance of effective control of disarmament measures, and it would be useful for the declaration to contain a statement to that effect. The scope and nature of the control measures would be determined by the scope, nature and specific characteristics of the concrete measures provided for in the disarmament agreements.

21. The declaration should also provide that the resources released as a result of disarmament measures would be used to solve world problems, improve the standard of living of peoples, and contribute to the economic and social progress of the developing countries.

22. The second final document, the programme of action on disarmament, should define the direction which priority efforts of States in that field should take. The views of the Soviet Union concerning the most pressing tasks had been set forth in detail in the memorandum on questions of ending the arms race and disarmament (A/31/232), which had been presented to the thirty-first session of the General Assembly. The main task to be defined in the programme was the halting of the nuclear arms race. The production of nuclear weapons, the equipping of armed forces with such weapons and the development of new types must be halted. At the same time, measures must be undertaken to limit the production of conventional armaments. Useful experience had been achieved through the Soviet-United States Agreement on Measures to Reduce the Risk of Outbreak of Nuclear War, the Soviet-French Agreement on the Prevention of Accidental or Unauthorized Use of Nuclear Weapons, and others. The special session must emphasize the usefulness of such measures.

23. Another important task was the outlawing of nuclear tests. That problem had recently been considered by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and further talks on the subject would begin on 3 October between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union.

24. An important aspect of the struggle against the threat of nuclear war was action to strengthen the régime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The threat would be immeasurably increased if new States obtained such weapons. That such a possibility existed was apparent from the reports of preparations for nuclear tests in the Republic of South Africa. The possession of nuclear weapons by the racist régime in Pretoria would be a direct threat to the security of African States and would lead to a rapid escalation of instability and tension in southern Africa besides increasing the nuclear threat to all mankind. The programme of action should therefore contain a provision for increasing the effectiveness of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. International co-operation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy was valuable, but such co-operation must not become a means of furthering the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

25. Chemical weapons of mass destruction must also be prohibited and destroyed. That problem was being intensively discussed in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and also between the Soviet Union and the United States.

26. His delegation was glad to note that many States were proposing that the programme of action should deal with the prohibition of the development of new
types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. A new draft agreement on that question had been proposed by the Soviet Union in early August in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and could lead to progress in achieving a new and important international agreement. Another matter of interest to many States was the creation of nuclear-free zones. That was an important regional means of disarmament and would increase the security of States in such zones.

27. The programme of action should emphasize the importance of limiting conventional armaments. Most of the expenditure for military purposes was devoted to such armaments, and armed conflicts involving their use led to tragic loss of life and material resources. Military bases in foreign territory must be eliminated and foreign troops withdrawn from such territory. The programme of action should also provide for the complete demilitarization of the sea-bed and for regional measures of disarmament.

28. Although a number of States, in expressing their views in relation to the special session, had expressed the wish for rapid progress in disarmament, the programme of action should be realistic in character and concentrate on truly urgent matters.

29. The present system of disarmament negotiations was not in itself responsible for the slow progress being achieved; the form of the discussions corresponded to the scale and nature of disarmament problems. However, more effective work could be done, particularly in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. The success of disarmament efforts ultimately depended on the political will of the States concerned. His delegation was convinced that the question should be considered in the widest and most authoritative forum possible, namely in a world disarmament conference. Such a forum could consider all questions connected with disarmament and take effective decisions. If properly organized and provided with working organs to prepare agreed decisions that took account of the interests of all States, a world disarmament conference could elaborate concrete, effective measures for limiting the arms race and achieving disarmament. The programme of action should therefore contain recommendations concerning the preparation and organization of a world disarmament conference. A date should be proposed for the conference and a preparatory committee established.

30. The impact of the declaration and programme of action would depend on the degree of consensus which they reflected. It was therefore important that the Committee's work should produce solid documentation. Mr. Gromyko, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, had observed at the luncheon in Moscow on 5 September in honour of the Secretary-General of the United Nations that goodwill was not lacking on the part of the Soviet Union. Given similar goodwill on the part of other States, the special session would be constructive and play an important part in preparing for a world disarmament conference.

31. He hoped that the members of the Preparatory Committee would give careful consideration to the proposals of the Soviet Union and the other socialist States concerning the final documents for the special session.

/...
32. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland) said that his delegation saw in the contents of the two documents just submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union not only important evidence of the consistent and constructive line of action of the socialist community in the field of disarmament but also the outline of a programme which was in conformity with the vital interests of all States, regardless of their size, geographical location or level of socio-economic development. It was happy to note that the principles of disarmament negotiations and agreements contained in those documents represented the highest common denominator of numerous ideas and proposals advanced by a great majority of States.

33. Those principles, none of which would diminish the security of any State, fully reflected the basic requirements of security of all States and the scope of their responsibility in the field of disarmament. Adherence to those fundamental principles was the condition sine qua non of success in all disarmament negotiations.

34. The basic provisions of the draft programme of action on disarmament submitted by the Soviet Union were based on consideration for the undiminished security of all States and reflected concern that certain States should not gain unilateral advantages at the expense of others.

35. While they were realistic in their approach to the extremely complex subject of disarmament, they were still intended to solve without further delay the most important and pressing disarmament problems. They took into consideration a number of elements of the respective positions of various groups of States. The adoption of such a programme of action on disarmament and the commencement of its implementation would be the most effective method of achieving substantial progress in bringing closer the ultimate objective, namely general and complete disarmament.

36. Thanks to the progress made in political détente and peaceful co-operation between States, the ensuing growth of confidence in international relations and the establishment of a new peace- and progress-oriented relationship of forces in the world, objective political and material conditions had emerged for a radical turn in halting the arms race and greatly accelerating disarmament processes. The proposals of the socialist States took due account of that fact and of the inseparable link between disarmament, security and the socio-economic development of States.

37. Nevertheless, his delegation felt that the results of the indisputably important disarmament negotiations held so far were still insufficient and that ever greater efforts were needed to accelerate the negotiating process.

38. One of the conditions for substantial progress in disarmament was the complete isolation of the champions of cold war, who continued to be active and were seeking to increase tension and continue the arms race. Furthermore, all States must refrain from actions which might have a negative effect on the over-all disarmament effort. He was referring in particular to attempts to develop and manufacture new types of weapons of mass destruction.

/...
39. In order for disarmament measures to be really effective, they must be adhered to by all States without exception, especially those possessing nuclear weapons and a significant military potential.

40. Poland participated actively in the solution of the most pressing disarmament problems at both the regional and the international levels. Its delegation would do its utmost to contribute to the preparations for the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and to its constructive deliberations and fruitful results. It believed, however, that in order to achieve a real breakthrough towards general and complete disarmament it was essential to convene a world disarmament conference. The special session should therefore include in its programme of action a decision to convene such a conference on a specific and not too distant date. The General Assembly should request the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, as the competent Assembly organ, to submit a report to the special session containing observations and proposals on all aspects of the convening of a conference. It was gratifying that the Preparatory Committee had reached a consensus to that effect.

41. The President of the thirty-first session of the General Assembly had laid down the principle that all interests should be properly represented in the Preparatory Committee. The present composition of the Committee did not reflect the active involvement in, and extent of contribution to, disarmament efforts of the group of Eastern European States. The Committee's report to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly should therefore contain a recommendation calling for action to take adequate account of the interests of all groups of States and rectify the present imbalance in the Committee.

42. His delegation would spare neither goodwill nor effort in maintaining fruitful co-operation with all those who were genuinely interested in putting an end to the arms race and accelerating effective disarmament.

43. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) said that the working documents submitted by the Soviet Union on behalf of the socialist countries, of which his delegation was a co-sponsor, reflected the experience accumulated by those countries in 10 years of striving for disarmament.

44. In order for a comprehensive agreement to be reached, all States must be prepared to show political goodwill and to maintain a constructive approach to the negotiations taking place in the Committee. He urged all States to refrain from actions which might adversely affect the Committee's efforts in the field of disarmament. Obviously, nuclear weapons were of primary importance in that regard, but it should be borne in mind that the problems of disarmament were complex and that there was a definite link between nuclear and non-nuclear arms systems. For that reason, the Soviet papers proposed that a reduction in nuclear arsenals should be matched by a reduction in military forces and stockpiles of conventional weapons.
It was important for as many countries as possible to reach a consensus on those matters, especially countries with nuclear arsenals and large armed forces.

45. Agreement had still not been reached on the convening of a world disarmament conference, which could be of great value in promoting the cause of disarmament. His delegation hoped that the special session would make significant progress towards the convening of such a conference.

46. His delegation agreed with the point made by the representative of Poland on the representation of Eastern European countries in the Preparatory Committee. Neither Bulgaria nor Czechoslovakia, both of which were co-sponsors of the Soviet documents and had played a considerable part in disarmament negotiations, were members of the Committee. That situation should not continue. The dissatisfaction of various delegations with the make-up of the Committee should be reflected in the latter’s report to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly.

47. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan) said that the special session should not become another occasion for general, abstract discussion. The adoption of a declaration or resolutions on disarmament would not in itself represent an advance towards actual measures of disarmament. What was needed was agreements on specific issues.

48. Bearing in mind that the comprehensive test-ban treaty and the treaty banning chemical weapons could be expected to be finalized before May 1978, his delegation had in May 1977 proposed the addition of a subitem to the draft agenda of the special session in order to facilitate their discussion. The Preparatory Committee had adopted the agenda without that subitem, but that did not preclude the possibility of conducting discussions on specific disarmament agreements during the special session.

49. The special session should give particular attention to two areas: the security of non-nuclear States, and the creation of non-nuclear zones. In that connexion, his delegation commended the document submitted by Mexico to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD 545), of which it had become a co-sponsor.

50. The Secretariat should enlist the aid of experts in preparing the documents for the special session. It was important that information on the work of the special session be disseminated as widely as possible. Members of the Committee had come to agree on the great importance of the role played by OPI and the non-governmental organizations in publicizing the work of CCD. It was to be hoped that that work would continue for the special session, which was likely to be the most important event in the United Nations calendar for 1978.

51. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) said that he regretted the harsh and recriminatory tone of some of the statements in the speech made by the representative of the Soviet Union.

52. Mr. ASHE (United Kingdom) suggested, in view of the wide support in the
Committee for the idea that the non-governmental organizations could fulfil a useful function, both in the Committee and at the special session, that the same facilities should be extended to the NGOs during the special session as at the current session of the Committee.

53. **Mr. Rossides** (Cyprus) said that he supported the United Kingdom proposal because the non-governmental organizations did much useful and constructive work.

54. When the question of the relationship between disarmament and development had been raised, he had proposed that a study should be undertaken on the relationship between disarmament and international security. It had been said at that time that no funds were available for the purpose, and he now wished to give notice that he would again raise the issue in the First Committee of the General Assembly. Disarmament could be achieved only by halting the arms race; the question, however, was how to achieve that goal. Up to the present time, only half measures had been taken, such as the partial nuclear-weapons test-ban treaty, which permitted underground tests to continue.

55. International security was today based not on the principles of the Charter but on the balance of power. The latter was in fact a balance of weapons, and as long as it remained the basis of peace, there would be no halt to the arms race. It was therefore vital to conduct the proposed study in order to determine how international security and disarmament could be achieved under the United Nations Charter.

56. **Mr. Skinner** (Canada) associated his delegation with the remarks made by the representative of the United Kingdom concerning non-governmental organizations. He hoped that other delegations, too, would support that proposal, and in that connexion he drew attention to the memorandum to States members of the Preparatory Committee submitted on 29 August by the NGO Committee on Disarmament, which had been circulated as a supplement to Conference Room Paper No. 3.

57. **Mrs. Thorsen** (Sweden) said that her delegation appreciated the United Kingdom initiative regarding non-governmental organizations. She recalled that at the second session of the Committee a proposal on NGOs by the Bureau had been adopted by consensus, and at that time she had said that she had hoped that the Committee would be able to go further in broadening its relationship with the NGOs. That had not been possible then, or even at the present time, and her delegation was therefore prepared to accept a consensus along the lines of the United Kingdom proposal. She hoped that many delegations would be ready to engage in informal consultations with non-governmental organizations, and she wished to inform the NGO members present that her delegation was certainly prepared to do so.

/...
58. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) recalled his statement on non-governmental organizations in his note verbale of 26 April 1977 (A/AC.187/34, para. 14) and said that the valuable co-operation of non-governmental organizations would no doubt help to highlight the importance and sensitivity of the issues to be discussed at the special session. Accordingly, his delegation fully supported the United Kingdom proposal.

59. Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria) said that his delegation, too, supported the United Kingdom proposal and hoped that it would be acceptable to the Committee at large.

60. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) associated his delegation with the United Kingdom proposal and said that activities outside the halls of Governments and international organizations were as important as those inside for the prospects for progress in disarmament. His delegation, too, would welcome the views of non-governmental organizations prior to, during and after the special session.

61. Mr. SCALABRE (France) associated his delegation with the statements made in favour of the United Kingdom proposal and said he wondered whether the Committee might be prepared to adopt it at the present meeting.

62. Mr. ULUCAYIK (Turkey) said that his delegation wished to add its voice in support of the United Kingdom proposal.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted the United Kingdom proposal that the Preparatory Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that non-governmental organizations in the field of disarmament be accorded the same facilities at the special session as had been granted to them in the Preparatory Committee.

64. It was so decided.

65. Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka) said that, in connexion with the date and duration of the special session, certain changes would have to be made in the schedule of the construction work to be undertaken in the General Assembly hall and in other conference rooms. The Committee on Conferences was meeting currently and was about to prepare its report to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly. He believed that the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee should inform the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences of the decisions taken in the Preparatory Committee so that the Committee on Conferences could adopt the necessary administrative measures to obtain the required changes in the construction schedule.

66. The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of Sri Lanka for his timely suggestion and said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed that the Secretariat should inform the Committee on Conferences of the decisions taken by the Preparatory Committee so that the necessary administrative measures could be taken.

67. It was so decided.
ORGANIZATION OF FUTURE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE (continued)

68. Mr. SCHLAICH (Federal Republic of Germany), referring to the matter of intersessional work, recalled that the Chairman had stated that most delegations represented in the Preparatory Committee would be participating in the debate on disarmament in the First Committee of the General Assembly. He therefore believed that it would be advisable during those weeks for members of the Preparatory Committee to hold informal or even formal meetings of the Committee convened by the Chairman after consultations. That would provide an opportunity for an exchange of views and for the distribution of various papers and would help to accelerate the preparatory work for the fourth session.

69. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, in the course of the debate at the present session, he had said he believed that major progress could be achieved through frequent contacts in the intersessional period. He had also suggested that, if some delegations found it useful, the Committee could perhaps meet either formally or informally on organizational matters. He therefore suggested that he, as Chairman, should consult the Bureau in the event that some delegations wished to convene a meeting. If the Bureau agreed, he would then convene a meeting, which, he wished to make clear, would deal with organizational matters only; in other words, no substantive matters would be discussed. In the absence of other comments, he took it that the Committee so agreed.

70. It was so decided.

71. Mr. WATAI (Japan) said that he wished to raise the question of whether all nuclear-weapon States would actually take part in the special session. While it was true that all of those States were Members of the United Nations and had the right to participate, he believed that the report of the Preparatory Committee to the General Assembly should state that the success of the special session would depend on the active and constructive participation of all Member States, particularly the nuclear-weapon States.

72. The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of Japan for his timely suggestion, which would be included in the report of the Committee to the General Assembly.

73. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) drew attention to the summary record of the 16th meeting and said that his statement, as there reproduced, had been completely misinterpreted. He intended to submit a corrected text to the Secretariat so that his statement, which had been very well summarized by the Chairman, could be accurately reflected.

74. The CHAIRMAN said that he vividly recalled the statement made by the representative of Mexico at the 16th meeting and was grateful to him for pointing out the inadvertent errors in the summary record. He wished to assure the representative of Mexico that his statement would be accurately reflected in the corrected record.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.