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The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: We are starting this meeting late because the Bureau held a meeting earlier this afternoon. It was the aim of the Bureau, in holding that meeting, to be able to recommend to the Committee a programme of our work until the end of this special session. Unfortunately, the Bureau is not in a position to do that this afternoon, mainly because the recommendation was going to be based on the reports which the Bureau had hoped to receive from the presiding officers of the two Working Groups that have not reported finally to the Ad Hoc Committee.

As the Committee will hear from the report of the Chairman of Working Group III, the Bureau, after listening to that report, felt of course that it should accept the recommendation which the Chairman of the Working Group made to the Bureau and which he will make again in presenting his report before this Committee.

With regard to Working Group I, on the comprehensive programme of disarmament, the Chairman of that Working Group is not in a position to report finally today. There are various consultations still going on, efforts are being made to find solutions to the many problems that still beset that Working Group and on the recommendation of the Chairman of the Working Group, the Bureau agreed to allow those consultations and efforts to continue until tomorrow. The Chairman of that Working Group will then be in a position to submit his final report on Thursday morning.

I should say that the Bureau felt a certain sense of crisis pervading the Committee. It was the general feeling in the Bureau that sufficient progress is not being made. If any progress at all is being made, certainly it is not sufficient to give the Committee the feeling that it is grappling with the many problems on its agenda. The Bureau felt that the next 24 hours would be crucial in determining the result of this session.

This, in a sense, is why the Bureau is willing to allow the work being carried out in various subsidiary bodies to continue, including the drafting work being undertaken on the review and assessment document.
The Bureau, of course, hopes that by Thursday morning things will be clear and that the necessary decisions will be taken promptly.

PRESENTATION OF REPORTS

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the German Democratic Republic, the Chairman of Working Group III, to submit his report to the Committee.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic), Chairman of Working Group III: In accordance with the recommendation of this Committee, agenda items 11 and 13 were entrusted to Working Group III. As I mentioned in my report to this Committee on 28 June, Working Group III, after having had a preliminary round of discussions, postponed consideration of agenda item 11 until after this Committee had heard all the proposals submitted by Member States for consideration by the special session. Since then we have given detailed consideration to item 11, which deals with the implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade and the initiatives and proposals of Member States.

Our initial discussions on item 11 were held in Working Group III as a whole and were later carried on in an open-ended group, since item 13 was being simultaneously considered by the Working Group. At the request of the Group, the Secretariat prepared a list of proposals received from Member States by the deadline of 26 June, which was subsequently revised at the request of delegations. In considering the list the Group reached broad agreement that it should be guided by the example set in paragraph 125 of the Final Document of the first special session. As a basis for further deliberations, Working Group III presents, in chapeau, almost agreed upon except for a small problem still to be resolved, an introduction to a list of proposals submitted by Member States. The chapeau is to be found in annex I to this report, together with a draft list of proposals.

The Working Group proposes that the delegations concerned should, by midnight on 7 July, present to the Secretariat a résumé of the content of their respective proposals. No résumé may exceed the equivalent of six lines in the English language version in the standard form of General Assembly document, not including the title of each proposal.
The Working Group proposes that the question of whether the résumés should be included in the main text of the final document of the second special session or should be placed in an annex should be decided at a later stage.

The Working Group also recommends that the résumés should be published under the same cover as the main text, for distribution worldwide, and that, following the practice set at the first special session, the verbatim text of all proposals should be published in a special volume annexed to this document of the special session.
Following the decision of the Ad Hoc Committee on 2 July, the Group undertook consideration of the question of the prevention of nuclear war, which has been discussed extensively. While those discussions clearly demonstrated that the prevention of nuclear war is widely viewed as the most important issue facing mankind, various approaches to its different aspects have been put forward. The Group has received two specific proposals on the subject, one submitted by the delegation of Bulgaria and the other by the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Netherlands. Those proposals are reproduced in annex II, A and B.

The Group expressed the wish to continue consideration of the question of the prevention of nuclear war on the basis of the two proposals presented, with a view to producing a consensus document which should become a part of the final document of this special session. I therefore recommend that the consideration of this item be continued in a small drafting group, which should report on the outcome of its deliberations as soon as possible.

With regard to agenda item 13, the Group has concluded its deliberation of three sub-items: (a) disarmament education, seminars and training (United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament); (b) World Disarmament Campaign; (c) other public information activities. The text adopted by the Group in recommending the continuation and extension of the United Nations fellowships programme is given in annex III A. In discussing the World Disarmament Campaign, the Group requested the Chairman to prepare an informal paper based upon an extensive exchange of views and several working papers submitted by delegations. On the basis of the text produced by the Chairman, with the assistance of the Secretariat, the Group, working in smaller, open-ended meetings, has produced a draft on the objectives, content, modalities and financial implications of the World Disarmament Campaign. Twelve of the 23 paragraphs in the draft have been agreed upon and the others are still in brackets or partly in brackets in the text in annex III B.
During its discussions the Group sought and received clarification from the chief of the Information and Studies Branch of the Centre for Disarmament and the chief of the Planning, Programming and Evaluation Unit of the Department of Public Information. The Group also heard a statement by the representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on the subject of disarmament education.

In the formal paper prepared by the Chairman, due account was of course taken of the Secretary-General's report on the subject of the World Disarmament Campaign, as contained in documents A/S-12/27 and A/36/458. Our consideration of subitem (c) of agenda item 13, dealing with public information activities, was facilitated by documents A/AC.200/18 and A/AC.201/21 on those subjects. In this connexion, I should like to express my thanks to the representatives of the Centre for Disarmament for so ably assisting the Working Group in discharging its responsibility.

I submit this report of the Working Group for approval by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman of Working Group III has highlighted in his report two issues - the work being carried out on the item concerning the prevention of the outbreak of nuclear war and the World Disarmament Campaign. He has recommended the continuation in a small drafting group of work on the prevention of the outbreak of nuclear war. I understand that discussion of that subject was quite lively when it was taken up in the Working Group, and that some working papers were presented, papers that can form the basis for the continuation of work on the issue in a small group in accordance with the recommendation of the Chairman of the Working Group. May I take it that the Ad Hoc Committee accepts that recommendation?

It was so decided.
The CHAIRMAN: I shall later inform members of the modalities for carrying out that recommendation.

Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): In its capacity as Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, my delegation has been holding broad consultations with delegations of members of the Movement on the general progress in the negotiations being held in connexion with the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. There is grave concern among the non-aligned countries about the present status of the negotiations. Progress is essential if there is to be a successful conclusion to this special session. This concern has increased as we have come closer to the date for the conclusion of our work without seeing substantial progress guaranteeing a successful outcome.

The particular importance that our Group has attached to the success of the session is clear to all. We promoted the very idea of holding the first and second special sessions on disarmament, and the non-aligned countries were in the front line of the negotiations on the question. This positive attitude was also shown in the disarmament forums preceding the current session, where the non-aligned countries took important initiatives and negotiated seriously and flexibly in the way that has always characterized our conduct.

Most recently, the Co-ordinating Bureau of our Movement, meeting in Havana on the eve of the second special session devoted to disarmament, issued a communiqué, which has been distributed in document A/S-12/AC.1/1, reiterating the positive, flexible and serious attitude of our Movement and expressing our expectation that positive work will be done during the second special session devoted to disarmament, to which we attach so much importance.
Subsequently, at the outset of this session, on 7 June, we made major efforts to reach agreement on all the questions under discussion. It is reasonable to mention here the efforts that have been and still are being made by a great many Chairmen, most of them from our own ranks, in order to achieve through intensive informal consultations the agreements it appears will be so difficult to achieve within the Working Groups.

We have supported and continue to support those important initiatives. Be that as it may, the problem is that our efforts, which are acknowledged and supported outside our own ranks, have unfortunately not so far produced results on this increasingly urgent issue.

The non-aligned are firmly committed to continuing their efforts on all fronts. However, we are approaching the limits of time and of flexibility. This is a joint undertaking, and if we are to be successful, as world public opinion so strongly desires, the same effort will have to be made by everybody.

We are speaking in a spirit of goodwill, and we urge all members to spare no effort to bring this transcendental undertaking to a successful conclusion.

Mr. VENKATESHVARAN (India): We have all heard the statement made by the representative of Cuba as the current Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, which is of great relevance to our work. The importance of our succeeding in our endeavours at this special session is clearly not of concern to non-aligned countries only: it concerns every delegation represented here. At the outset, therefore, I should like to convey my delegation's deep concern at the disappointing pace of the progress in our work at the special session.

The conclusion of the second special session on disarmament is only three days away. Yet it would indeed take a courageous person to claim at this point that we are anywhere near attaining the important objectives for which this session was convened. My delegation is also particularly concerned at certain disturbing trends over the past few weeks, which appear to be leading us in the opposite direction and towards resigning ourselves to despondency. It is indeed strange and somewhat perplexing that the concerns and commitments expressed at the highest level by the leaders of our countries at this session
have not even found adequate expression in the positions taken by some delegations at the working level in the different groups set up to negotiate the documents of the special session. While solemn statements have been made reaffirming the validity of the Final Document, attempts to continue to change the accepted time-honoured priorities in disarmament negotiations and in some cases even to reverse them altogether. New doctrines and themes are being advanced which would have the effect of reconciling the world to an endless and catastrophic arms race while the main actors involved debate whether the present time is propitious for disarmament.

I should like to make it clear that my delegation will not and cannot be a party to any attempted dilution of the Final Document and would accept no compromise that would have the effect of casting doubt on what had already been accepted by consensus only four years ago at the first special session on disarmament. This is particularly valid in regard to the overriding concern of the international community on nuclear disarmament issues and the urgent need to conclude a nuclear test ban at the earliest possible time.

It is in the field of the prevention of nuclear war that my delegation finds the widest gap yawning between the concern expressed by world leaders and the work we, their representatives, are carrying out here in identifying practical measures at this session. I can find no statement made in plenary meeting which does not refer to the grave issue of the danger of a nuclear war. No one who has had occasion also to listen to the respective representatives of the non-governmental organizations during the past weeks can be left in any doubt as to the depth of popular anxiety and concern over the danger of nuclear war. And yet we still seem to be paralysed and unable to agree even on some modest measures in this regard which could help to allay the fear that has us in its grip.

The prevention of nuclear war is the overriding concern of the time and in the view of my delegation, as of many, many others, the success or failure of this special session will in the final analysis be determined by whether or not we are able to discipline ourselves and adopt concrete and practical measures for the prevention of a
nuclear holocaust, pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons. On several occasions in the past we have pointed out that any use of nuclear weapons in any part of the world would have devastating consequences, and not merely for those directly involved in the conflict. In fact it has been said that in the aftermath of a nuclear war the living would envy the dead. While those in the immediate vicinity would die instantaneously from heat and blast, the rest of humanity would perish slowly and painfully from a host of radioactivity-related diseases.

Given the very nature of nuclear weapons as weapons of mass destruction, the consequences of their use would respect no national or regional boundaries. It is obvious therefore that all the peoples of the world have a vital interest in ensuring that these weapons are never used, whether by accident or by design, whether in anger or through cold calculation. All possible means must be explored to ensure the survival of mankind and of our civilization. The world’s intellectual, moral, scientific and spiritual energies must be pooled in the service of this most urgent and crucial of tasks.

Over the decades since the invention of atomic weapons these vital issues relating to human survival have unfortunately been left to be decided by a handful of nuclear weapon States and, worse, to armchair strategists and representatives of interest groups for which immediate gains and profit take precedence over their responsibility to the human race itself. The advent of nuclear weapons and their integration into the war machines of the nuclear-weapon States and their allies have led to the growth of a pernicious new theology with a new breed of high priests who preach doctrines of deterrence, of parity and of balance of terror. Whereas the vast majority of nations and peoples of the world demand their basic right to survive, the right to safeguard their future and that of their children, these high priests are locked in a maze of esoteric doctrines which have no relevance to reality. Is it any surprise, therefore, that in answer to the clamour for an end to the menace of nuclear weapons we hear voices raised in defence of doctrines of deterrence, in defence of the arms race itself?
Is it not ironical that at a meeting on disarmament the build-up of armaments is being justified in the name of disarmament and the option to use nuclear weapons is being concealed in the name of preventing nuclear war? Yet, that is precisely what is happening even as these meetings are taking place.

The time has come to break this stranglehold. What is needed for this is for us to embark on a critical and rational analysis. We need to hear the objective and well-considered opinions of eminent scientists as to whether the existing safeguards for the prevention of the accidental use of nuclear weapons are adequate; and, if not, what further steps may be necessary. We need to hear eminent lawyers and jurists advise us whether the existing body of international law, including the Charter of the United Nations, in fact sanctions the use of nuclear weapons in any circumstances.

It has been asserted time and again -- and most recently during this session -- by some delegations that the use of nuclear weapons would be in keeping with Article 51 of the Charter. By delegation challenges this facile assumption, which makes the security of third States and even universal security dependent on the security perceptions and defence doctrines of a handful of nuclear-weapon States. The non-nuclear-weapon States and all the peoples of the world have the right to know whether such sweeping assertions, so freely made, really can bear legal scrutiny.

And, lastly, since we are all human beings endowed with intelligence and living in societies the fabric of which is maintained and enriched by a delicate and intricate web of moral and ethical principles, we need to ask whether even the threat of waging nuclear war which would destroy civilization and mankind is sustainable on the plea of self-defence, or is morally even an acceptable proposition.

Let those whom the world holds in high regard, such as eminent scientists, philosophers, religious leaders and thinkers, tell us what their views are on this burning issue of our time.

It is with this objective in view that India and Mexico have submitted a draft resolution seeking the setting up of such a group by the Secretary-General of the United Nations for adoption, it is hoped by consensus, at this special session.
There is an apprehension that nuclear war may one day creep up on us in the dark without our knowing it. A nuclear war may also break out as a result of the cumulative process of mutual suspicion and concentration amongst the major Powers and their alliance systems, taking them into a position from which retreat for any one of them may be politically unacceptable. This only forcefully points to the need for effective procedures to be evolved for the collective control, management and resolution of critical and confrontational situations, in which non-nuclear-weapon States outside military alliances could play an important role, before this escalates to a nuclear war. In a word, we need procedures both within and outside the United Nations for ensuring the calming of crises. The advice and recommendations of eminent and experienced statesmen, public personalities and jurists in this regard would be most valuable, in order – to quote the Final Document –

"... that an international conscience may develop and that world public opinion may exercise a positive influence..."

(resolution S-10/2, para. 15)

In other words, a new direction is needed for the expression of national creativity, a direction away from the development of armaments.

In making this recommendation we prejudge no recommendation nor point to any preconceived conclusion, even though we ourselves have very strong and definite views on the issue. What we base ourselves on is the conviction that all of us gathered here are united in attaching the highest importance to the prevention of nuclear war and that we recognize that this is an issue that involves the vital security interests of all States and the survival of mankind as a whole.

My delegation would accordingly urge with the fullest emphasis at its command that the highest priority be accorded to implementing measures on non-use, non-first-use and a freeze on the production, testing and deployment of nuclear weapons, leading to the total elimination of these weapons of mass destruction; and that these solemn commitments be clearly reflected in the documents adopted at this special session devoted to disarmament.
Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden): I shall make a statement of principle, in the same vein as the two statements that we have just heard by the representatives of Cuba and India.

Certainly many delegations, if not all present here, share a deep concern about the present state of the issues before the second special session on disarmament, of which there are little more than three days left. No decisive progress is in sight. The Swedish delegation has not yet taken a decision on the final position that we shall take on Friday concerning those issues. It is still our ambition that this session will represent steps forward.

On behalf of the Swedish delegation, I should like to make a statement now relating to a particular aspect of the difficulties with which we are faced, one which we believe it is important to make this afternoon. Sweden is not in any circumstances whatsoever going to contribute to any consensus decision on any texts emanating from this session which are weaker than the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, which was adopted by consensus. This position relates to the 1976 document as a whole, but in particular to paragraphs 47 to 51, which deal with nuclear disarmament and the comprehensive test ban. Any weakening of the position of the highest authoritative body of the United Nations in these respects as compared with 1976 would represent a most serious setback for our endeavours, which we are not going to accept. Therefore, no one can count on the Swedish delegation for any consensus decisions on weakened and watered-down texts as compared with the unanimous decision reached in the Assembly four years ago. I wanted to make that emphatically clear.

Mr. IJAHJIRA (Kenya): First, I should like to thank the Chairman of Working Group III, the Ambassador of the German Democratic Republic, for the report he has submitted this afternoon and in particular for the recommendations made therein. I hope that some tangible results, some real progress in genuine and true negotiations, can be achieved in that Group, and indeed in the other Working Groups of this Committee of the whole, so that this session which we call "special" can end on a positive and sound note.

I wish also to express my gratitude to the Ambassador of Cuba, the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement. We fully subscribe to what he has said. My delegation proposes that that statement be made an official statement of this Committee.
Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian). We have listened attentively to the statements made by several delegations and we should like to associate ourselves with those who have expressed concern and worry about the state of affairs of the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In fact, we have three days left before the end of the session and we have absolutely no grounds for assuming that we shall manage to achieve and carry out the tasks which were assigned to us by the international community.

The essential question before this session is the question of preventing a nuclear war. That has been talked about in the rooms of this building and particularly loudly and insistently outside this building. It is for that particular reason that the Head of State of the Soviet Union, President Brezhnev, stated in his message to this session that the Soviet Union would assume the solemn commitment never to use nuclear weapons first. That was an illustration of our desire to hold constructive negotiations at the second special session devoted to disarmament on matters pertaining to the prevention of a nuclear war.

In its statement in the Ad Hoc Committee on 17 June, the Soviet delegation formally proposed that special attention be given to the question of preventing nuclear war. Regardless of whether or not this question was included formally in the agenda of the session, we said that it was included in the agenda of life itself. Unfortunately, we came up against difficulties in the form of statements that this question was not one of the items of the agenda. We can only express our dissatisfaction at the fact that it was only on 1 July - a few days ago - that the Committee decided that the question of preventing nuclear war should be taken up in Working Group III. What did that discussion show? Today we heard the report of the Chairman of Working Group III, who stated that the question was discussed in a very lively manner, documents were introduced but no agreement was reached. Why was that not done at the very beginning of this session, as suggested by a broad group of delegations?

We still believe that the central question of this special session is the question of the prevention of nuclear war. Therefore, the Soviet delegation is ready to agree that consultations should continue, on this question in particular, and that one more attempt should be made to reach agreement on the question of the prevention of nuclear war.
I should like to speak briefly about the organization of the work of the session now. We have three days left. That is not very much time, yet it is not necessarily so little if we organize our work properly. We are now examining simultaneously in different rooms several hundred different texts and suggestions. We heard this afternoon that we are to receive the report of Working Group I on Thursday morning. Like many other delegations, we have several questions arising from that. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask whether you base yourself on the presumption that this session will not finish on 9 July but at some later date? The fact is that, if we are to see the report of Working Group I in this Committee on Thursday, then we cannot finish our work on 9 July. Therefore, I should like to suggest that we finish work in all the working groups tomorrow. Wednesday evening, that we hold an evening meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee to hear the reports of the Chairmen of all three working groups and the contact groups. In that way we shall have two days left to conclude the session as a whole.

Perhaps we could concentrate our attention on what has been said today by the representatives of Cuba, India and Sweden and, as we have already stressed, what has been stated within these rooms as well as outside them, that is, on the prevention of nuclear war.

Mr. de SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil): We have just heard important statements, especially the statement made by the Chairman of the Swedish delegation. The Brazilian delegation fully shares the views expressed in all those statements. During the past four years in the disarmament forums of the United Nations we have not witnessed any movement towards the adoption of meaningful steps in the field of disarmament, but rather frequent attempts to erode concepts and commitments that had been agreed upon by consensus by the whole international community.

My delegation wishes to make it very clear that it will not accept any result of this special session that detracts from the agreed principles, objectives and priorities in the field of disarmament which were adopted four years ago and to which, we are convinced, all the participants in this special session should still be fully committed.
Mr. HEWZIES (Canada): I should like to say three sentences. The first is that my delegation and a number of other delegations with which we have worked closely have fully supported throughout all measures aimed at the prevention of all war, in particular, nuclear war. We have played an active part in negotiations expecting consensus documents to result from this session and we are prepared to continue to work as hard as possible towards that end. We also believe strongly in maintaining the force of consensus support for the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament.

Mr. NITHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia): I wish also to express the support of the Yugoslav delegation for the views expressed by previous speakers, notably the representatives of Sweden, India and Cuba. I wish also to express the great concern and disappointment of the Yugoslav delegation at the results achieved so far in the second special session on disarmament. The course of the negotiations has shown that, despite the many declarations made during the general debate, when it comes to accepting specific obligations that will lead to the fulfilment of those declarations, some countries are finding many excuses and are refusing to reaffirm the consensus decisions that were adopted at the first special session on disarmament.

As some delegations which spoke before me have said, the Yugoslav delegation also will not be able to subscribe to any document or documents that will be less than the consensus reached at the first special session on disarmament.
Mr. DONGEN (Netherlands): We have just heard it argued that the prevention of nuclear war should have been from the very beginning the central theme of this meeting, and that this subject did not receive sufficient attention because of the attitude of some delegations which refused the formation of a special drafting group on this subject.

I would submit two things. The first is that far from having been neglected at this meeting, however disappointing our results may have been so far, the subject has been in the minds of all representatives, irrespective of the working group or the drafting group in which they have been engaged. In fact, if anything, the prevention of a nuclear holocaust has been the backdrop against which all discussions in virtually all groups have taken place. Such being the case, I can not subscribe to the view expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union that it has not received sufficient attention.

Nor do I believe that it contributes to the attainment of the goal we all have in mind to formulate or to submit proposals which are so far distant from the reality of the world as it is today — which is, alas, far from perfect — that the cause of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of the outbreak of nuclear war is not thereby realistically advanced.

My delegation, with the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany, submitted a proposal this morning — which is an honest attempt, motivated by great concern and by a recognition of the importance of the subject — in the form of a working paper which represents a more realistic, a more factual and, admittedly, a more modest approach to this particular subject.

We believe that this is the right way to approach these problems. We must also bear in mind that, however much we may all wish for disarmament, no responsible Government can afford to forget that it is responsible to its own citizens for their security and that this subject must therefore be addressed in a realistic manner. We believe that the propagandistic approach adopted by some delegations is not helpful towards that end, because we attach so much importance to the subject that we believe any approach other than a realistic one leads us away from the target we would all like to achieve and that here if anywhere perfection is the enemy of progress.
Mr. STAYKOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): This is a very important meeting at which we have heard the report of the Chairman of Working Group III. At the same time, we have heard a statement by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Ad Hoc Committee's assessment of the state of our work.

We seem now to be taking stock of the work done at the second special session. Like a considerable number of delegations that have already spoken, the Bulgarian delegation is very disturbed in regard to the progress of the work of our session. We are disturbed by the fact that we have not achieved concrete results and that we have not found mutually acceptable formulations. We have developed a very complex structure of working bodies, but it is quite clear that we do not have the documents that we should draw up and that it is up to us to draft.

For the Bulgarian delegation, like many other delegations, the primary issue, the question of questions, is the prevention of a nuclear war. I have already spoken about this at the meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee, for my country attaches paramount importance to this matter. That is why we have drafted a document containing formulations expressing the concern of the peoples and of the majority of delegations gathered here.

We believe that our special session cannot be successful unless, in the final document, there is a text concerning the prevention of nuclear war. That is why we support all efforts to reach a solution to this very important question and are prepared to take part in consultations on this matter.

I should like to make a second comment. I agree with the previous speakers who have said that we should speed up our work and aim at the Working Groups completing their work tomorrow, and that tomorrow the Ad Hoc Committee should have an evening meeting to hear the reports of those Groups.
Mr. UCHUNO (Nigeria): My delegation has asked to speak at this rather late moment in the deliberations of this Committee because of the deep feeling of despair which the proceedings of this session has generated in our minds.

We have all been here for a whole month and one sticking point has rather knocked us all flat. It seems to me that we should look at this matter in a realistic way. Is there anybody in this Committee who wants a nuclear war? Is there any nation that can afford the obloquy associated with starting a nuclear war? What should we say to all the non-governmental organizations that have pleaded with us to ensure that nuclear war does not break out in this world?
What are we to say to all the young men and women, and the old men and women, demonstrating for peace in all the streets of the cities and villages of the world?

I believe we have an obligation to all the people who have pinned their hope of living out their lives in peace, their hope of not being the witnesses or victims of a nuclear war, on this special session. Are we going to disappoint those hopes?

The Final Document is clear on this. It even says that waging a nuclear war would be the greatest crime anyone could commit -- a crime against humanity. I think therefore that we should cast our minds back to 1978, search our consciences and decide whether we are going to go down in history as the representatives who failed to rise to the occasion to prevent what we all know would be an indescribable disaster.

I therefore appeal to all delegations, since all of us want a consensus. If we say we want to vote, and the decision is carried by an overwhelming vote, that will not prevent a nuclear war, because those who have different perceptions of their security will still do what they want to do. Therefore, in order not to waste the time of all the delegations, not to disappoint humanity and not to waste the funds of very many poor countries which have spent a sizable sum of money to be represented at this session, I think we owe it to the world and it is our duty to come to an agreement in good conscience.

I understand perfectly well the security fears of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries. They have made it clear to us that their ground forces are no match for the ground forces of the Warsaw Pact countries. I am sure that this Committee can take account of this fear in some other section of the document which we are going to draw up. But let this not destroy the whole work of the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament.
I therefore appeal to all delegations to accept this and to show understanding of the fear of the entire world, which has entrusted its security to us. It is not just a question of the security of one State or the security of one bloc, it is the security of the entire human race.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): I listened with approbation to what the representative of the Netherlands said about the handling of the question of the prevention of nuclear war at this session and I should like to add that my delegation supports the working paper which has been jointly submitted by the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany.

The representative of the Soviet Union gave some impression that there was an objection in some circles, perhaps, to further discussion of the question of the prevention of nuclear war. This is entirely untrue and is not the case. As you said, Sir, a drafting group is to be set up to continue the work on an urgent basis and I hope that that work will continue on the basis of the moderate and realistic approach outlined in the paper submitted by the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany.

That leads me to ask you, Mr. Chairman, two practical questions. Following the report which we had from the Chairman of Working Group III, you made some suggestions as to how we should proceed with the drafting on the question of the prevention of nuclear war and I would be very grateful if, at the end of this meeting you could elaborate further on your proposals. My delegation attaches great importance to being represented on that drafting group and we shall play a full part in its work.

I am also a little unclear as to exactly where we stand in respect of our future work on the World Disarmament Campaign. We have made useful and significant progress already in the Working Group on this question and it seems that there would be a good prospect of continuing that and reaching useful results on this very important question, which is of particular interest to public opinion in my own country. Again, we should like to be represented on the drafting group which will deal with the World Disarmament Campaign and we should be grateful if you would just clarify at the end of this meeting how you intend to set up these drafting groups and which States will be represented.
The CHAIRMAN: Before I am overwhelmed by these questions I might as well attempt to answer some of them.

First of all, the representative of the United Kingdom made reference to the World Disarmament Campaign. I am sorry if I omitted this in the submission of the report by the Chairman of Working Group III. The Bureau, when it considered what recommendations it could make to the Committee this afternoon, agreed with the Chairman of the Working Group that there was a need for further work on the World Disarmament Campaign programme and also that a small group could be entrusted with this. The question, of course, concerned the representation of these various small drafting groups because these are matters of interest to everyone. I think we shall have to trust the judgement of the various spokesmen and representatives of the various groups, because the more compact the drafting group the better it works.

I intend to hold consultations after this meeting, with the assistance, of course, of the Chairman of Working Group III, to determine the representation on the two drafting groups. We shall make sure that the membership is broadly representative of the various interests involved.

The representative of the Soviet Union — supported, I think, by the representative of Bulgaria — suggested that perhaps, instead of meeting on Thursday morning to receive the report of Working Group I, essentially, we should endeavour to hold a meeting tomorrow night. I have been in consultation with the Chairman of Working Group I, on the comprehensive programme of disarmament. He thought initially that he might need the whole of tomorrow evening, or at least part of it, as well, but he believes now that it might be possible for him to report to a meeting scheduled for after 8 o'clock tomorrow evening. We could possibly, therefore, have a night session tomorrow, at which we would receive the report of Working Group I on the comprehensive programme.
Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, as I said when you were kind enough to consult me about the possibility of arranging for the Working Group to report tomorrow night, that is possible. The only thing I want to make clear is that, having consulted the Secretariat, I have been told that what will not be possible is to get clean copies of the documents for the purpose of reporting. So the report I present tomorrow will be one similar to the one we heard today from the Chairman of Working Group III, when, as members know, the documents were not and are still not available. So, in those circumstances, I shall be happy to report tomorrow night.

Having said that and in connexion with the other questions that have been under discussion this afternoon I wish to add a few words. The great interest Mexico takes in the question of the prevention of war is well known. The reason why I did not deem it necessary to repeat this on each occasion that this matter came up is because my delegation feels that in these matters it is deeds and not words that count. My delegation has always sought to express this interest through deeds. I shall mention here only three very recent facts.

At the previous session of the General Assembly – the thirty-sixth session – my delegation was among those that sponsored a draft resolution, which became a resolution, whereby a call was made to

"all nuclear-weapon States to submit to the Secretary-General by 30 April 1982 ... their views, proposals and practical suggestions for ensuring the prevention of nuclear war." (resolution 36/81 III)

Besides that paragraph, which was the only one in the original draft, my delegation proposed the addition of a second paragraph. Once the sponsors of the original draft agreed to it, my delegation became a co-sponsor. That second paragraph reads as follows:

"Invites all other Member States that so desire to do likewise." (ibid.)

That is the first example.

Secondly, Mexico is one of the very few countries which have to date complied with that resolution. Its view is contained in document A/3-12/11, dated 4 May 1982. Although it may seem immodest because it concerns my own country, it is one of the most extensive and best documented replies sent to the Secretary-General.
Later, when, in 1980 in Geneva, we started to deal with the comprehensive programme of disarmament, it was the Mexican delegation which first presented a draft text on objectives. In that draft text, which was subsequently revised, the immediate objective of the programme was the prevention of nuclear war. So, it was with great satisfaction that we noted in the text distributed on Friday by the Chairman of Working Group I, among the paragraphs relating to goals that are already generally approved, the fact that among the immediate objectives of the comprehensive programme of disarmament the very first is the elimination or prevention - and we do not yet know whether it will be 'elimination' or 'prevention' - of the danger of war, in particular nuclear war, the prevention of which continues to be the most critical and urgent task of the present time. That appears in document WG.1/L.1.

Lastly, my delegation has from the outset been in favour of having Working Group III, whose Chairman is the representative of the German Democratic Republic, discuss the question of prevention of nuclear war, which had been suggested here at the beginning by a group of delegations. That that could not be done was for reasons that the Chairman himself explained at a meeting of the Bureau or of the Chairmen of the Working Groups - reasons which I do not need to dwell on now.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the next speakers, I should like for us first to dispose of the question as to whether or not to meet tomorrow night to hear the report of Working Group I. Members have heard the explanation just given by the Chairman of the Working Group that, should we meet tomorrow night, we shall not have the necessary documents. I take it that those documents will be ready for the meeting on Thursday morning.

Would it be productive to hold a meeting even though the documents are not ready? I think that the case of the comprehensive programme of disarmament is one where we need to have the text before us so that we can either study it overnight or ask for instructions before the next morning.
I am putting the question to the representative of the Soviet Union. On the comprehensive programme of disarmament, and based on the suggestion which he has made that, instead of meeting on Thursday morning to receive the report of the Working Group, we should perhaps meet tomorrow night, the Chairman of the Working Group is, of course, ready to report tomorrow night, but he has informed us that he has been told by the Secretariat that the document will not be ready at that time.

So my question is whether it would be useful to hold such a meeting to listen to his oral report if the documents are not in our hands, because I thought that the intention was to be able to pour over the document that night and this is why I thought the suggestion had merit, so that the following morning, on Thursday, we could start, perhaps in a contact group, to see what we can do with the outstanding issues.

I call on the representative of Mexico to make a further clarification before we take a decision.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish):
Mr. Chairman, you and all the members undoubtedly have the documents which were distributed on Friday. WG.I/L.1, WG.I/L.2 and WG.I/L.3, corresponding to Drafting Groups A, B, and C.

I understand that a document similar to those documents describing the situation on Friday was to be ready today – this afternoon. So I would not be surprised if, this evening or tonight, a document similar to them covering Drafting Group D also came out.
The new documents - tomorrow night or on Thursday morning - should only cover modifications to be made in accordance with agreements reached subsequently. I hope that these modifications, these agreements, which would indicate progress, will be very large in number. Unfortunately, so far I have no basis for such optimism. If that were to happen I think those changes could be made verbally, and using that as the basis for our work we would have a complete picture.

The CHAIRMAN: That is very helpful. On the basis of that perhaps we can agree to hold a meeting tomorrow night at which we can indicate, on the basis of the documents that have already been circulated, whatever changes are to be made as a result of the consultations to be held between now and tomorrow evening. Therefore the representative of the Soviet Union need not answer my question.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): First of all, my delegation would like its name to be associated with the informal paper entitled "Prevention of war, in particular nuclear war", which was presented to Working Group III by the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany and of the Netherlands, if, of course, that is acceptable to those two delegations.

My second point is that, as representing a country which has learned by experience what a nuclear war entails, my delegation would like to be a member of the small group that will be continuing the discussion on this particular subject, the prevention of war, in particular nuclear war.

Mr. GILCHRIST (Jamaica): My delegation has refrained from raising the specific question of the World Disarmament Campaign up to now because I knew, Sir, that you would come round to it. Now that you have done so and that other delegations have commented on it, I want to underline my delegation's particular attachment to continuing discussions on the World Disarmament Campaign, which is of vital importance to us all.
I would also hope that we would continue to work on the paper which has emerged from the drafting group, because I feel that with further resolve and determination we might narrow down the differences even further.

Mr. GAJDA (Hungary): I wish to make two points. I should like first of all to recall that four years ago the socialist countries participated actively and in a constructive manner all through the first special session on disarmament and were, in fact, instrumental in the elaboration and adoption of the Final Document. The Hungarian People's Republic, like other socialist countries, started preparations for this special session well in advance. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of our countries had occasion last December to review the state of our preparations and to include a résumé of them in the communiqué issued in December on the meeting of the Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty. That communiqué was in fact made public as an official document of the General Assembly last year. In the communiqué the representatives of our countries said:

"The participants in the meeting reaffirmed the determination of their States to continue to contribute to the preparations for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament ... They expressed their interest in the successful holding of that session and in orienting its work towards the adoption of decisions that would bring a real change in the direction of halting the arms race and achieving disarmament and revitalize the negotiations on those issues." (A/36/307, p. 6)

The communiqué went on:

"It was stressed at the meeting that all States, regardless of size, military potential or geographical situation, had a duty to contribute actively to solving the problems of arms limitation and disarmament, in the United Nations and elsewhere. The second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament would provide a good opportunity for that as well." (ibid.)

The opinion thus expressed by the Foreign Ministers of our States was an expression of our readiness and willingness to contribute to the success of this special session. In the course of preparations for the second special session on disarmament and in the past four weeks we have continued to work and to contribute to the success of this session on the basis of the Final Document.
It is therefore natural for us to state that for the delegations of the socialist countries anything that might undermine the validity of that document is simply inconceivable.

Secondly, I wish also to recall that the Hungarian delegation was among those which formally supported the proposal made by the delegation of the Soviet Union on 17 June requesting proper treatment for the most important and most urgent question of the present time, the prevention of nuclear war. Again, on 1 July, my delegation expressed its surprise and disappointment over the handling of this item and urged that steps be taken to remedy the situation. I must state that the lively discussion in Working Group III in these last couple of days has proved the validity of the proposal and the great importance of the question. In the few days we have at our disposal we should therefore concentrate our efforts on finding a proper and acceptable solution and on drawing up the relevant part for inclusion in our final document, expressing the great concern we in this room and the masses outside have expressed in that respect.

My delegation is ready to contribute actively to the drafting of an acceptable compromise document on the question.
Mr. de LA CORCE (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation asked at the beginning of this meeting to speak in order to raise a particular point relating to the work of Working Group III. It wished, and still wishes, to emphasize the meaning that should be given to the provisional list of proposals by States annexed to the Working Group's report with reference to agenda item 11. Clearly the inclusion of proposals on that list leaves open the question of their consideration in the appropriate context during the present session and cannot in any way prejudge the decisions taken on some of those proposals during this session. It seems to us useful to affirm this point in order to avoid the confusion that could be caused by the similarity of the wording, but not of meaning, between paragraph 125 of the Final Document and the report that we are discussing.

Naturally, my delegation has listened very carefully to the statements that have just been made in this debate, which of course go beyond the modest but substantive comments that I have just made. In particular, we have heard statements about the prevention of nuclear war. My delegation has already expressed its views about that in the Working Group. It attaches appropriate importance to this fundamental issue, which in reality is that of the prevention of nuclear war and of recourse to force. We shall continue to co-operate in the consideration of this question in the very brief time that can be given to it, particularly with those delegations that have submitted or supported the document submitted to Working Group III this morning.

We have also heard statements about our work and its conclusion. My delegation shares the concern that has been expressed. It does indeed seem doubtful that we can conclude in a positive manner our work on the programme which was proposed to us and which we adopted on the basis of the Preparatory Committee's report. However, whatever conclusions we reach, what seems to my delegation to be of prime importance is that we maintain a very important gain, that we maintain the Final Document, the charter of disarmament, in its entirety.
In that respect, we support what has been said by several of our colleagues, particularly by Mrs. Thorsson on behalf of the Swedish delegation. We must also maintain the system set up in 1978 during the first special session devoted to disarmament to organize the discussions and negotiations on disarmament questions under the auspices of the United Nations, with the participation of all. That is a system that enables all countries to assume the responsibilities relating to the disarmament process. Our even more direct responsibility is to maintain an essential element of that system, namely, the special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, for it might be thought that in some ways that indispensable element of our system might be jeopardized.

Of course, we do not wish to prejudge the outcome of our work or the scope or importance of the documents that we shall adopt. We have every confidence, Mr. Chairman, that you will guide our session to a conclusion which, without concealing the difficulties and disappointments, will show nevertheless a will for co-operation and action, fully respecting our objectives and the conditions which in any case must be met if we are to achieve progress in disarmament.

Mr. WEDEWER (Federal Republic of Germany): Some earlier speakers have suggested, perhaps in a self-centred manner, that they feel more ardently than others about the prevention of nuclear war, that they are more attached than others to the Final Document, that they are more concerned than others about where we stand in our work. I speak for my delegation to dissipate, as others have done, those mistaken impressions.

My delegation has often stressed that for us a second special session on disarmament that impaired, and did not strengthen, the Final Document would be inconceivable. My delegation considers it imperative that, whatever the outcome of our session, both the Final Document in its entirety, in its carefully balanced language, and the multilateral disarmament process of which we are all a part should survive and be strengthened.

Like others, my delegation must refute the criticism that we have neglected important parts of our work, that we have not got the emphasis right, or even that we have dodged the question of the prevention of nuclear war. That is not so. My delegation has worked diligently with others and made as much use of our time as possible in the face of great and very complex problems. We now see that we cannot perhaps cope with them all.
We offer our fullest co-operation in all the demands placed on us in the remaining days even at the price of exceeding the time-limit. If we can contribute to achieving more compromise by putting in more work we shall be happy to do so.

On the important subject of the prevention of nuclear war, we have, jointly with the Netherlands delegation, submitted a paper and made it clear that we are striving for consensus in our work in the tradition of the special session. We should not abandon that consensus. As the representative of the Netherlands said, we have tried to include realistic proposals both as to structure and content. We hope that we can direct our work towards that consensus. We look forward to working with others to achieve it.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): The Australian delegation shares the concern that many delegates have expressed this afternoon about the lack of progress in the special session. We think that you are right, Mr. Chairman, to have expressed to us this afternoon the concern of the Bureau on that issue.

The Australian Government's commitment against the nuclear arms race and in support of efforts to prevent the horizontal spread of nuclear weapons is well known, and I shall not repeat it. Many have suggested this afternoon that a central issue here is the prevention of nuclear war. I should like to add my delegation's voice to theirs; it is a central issue. It is clear to the Australian delegation that there is perhaps no more vital issue facing humanity today. It is also clear to us that that view is shared virtually universally.
But it seems to us that another issue has been raised this afternoon, and that is the question of consensus. Ify delegation supports the consensus method of doing our work. For us consensus means that realistic proposals should be made, that there should be a flexibility of approach that we should all strive to highlight areas of agreement rather than divisions. In our view the enemy of consensus is in fact advantage being sought on the basis of division. Ify delegation has not done that, nor will it.

Within arms control and disarmament negotiations themselves, the mirror image of consensus is verification. It is only those agreements which are verifiable that will prove viable. It is only those that are open and transparent that will shore up confidence.

For these reasons declarations which cannot be verified cannot advance our cause, and they should be avoided. Ify delegation stands ready during these last hours and days of our session to work with others for a final document on the basis of consensus.

Mr. STRATTON (United States of America): As a member of the United States Congress I want to express my appreciation of having had the opportunity to represent my country in these very significant disarmament discussions at this session. It is an opportunity that comes very rarely to one in my position, and I have been happy indeed to be a part of this undertaking.

I think what has concerned me most in some of the discussions that have been going on here this afternoon, and what has led me to speak on behalf of my delegation, is the fact that, as the representatives of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom have already indicated, what we want is not only to prevent nuclear war but to prevent all war. We particularly want to prevent conventional war. The history of the last few years suggests that that is the kind of war that is most likely to erupt on this planet of ours, and, as we have been repeatedly reminded, conventional wars can be devastating. There is no particular gimmick or fix that I know of that will actually solve this particular problem, whatever the rhetoric may be. For example, one of the proposals that has been made at this session - the non-first-use proposal -
(Mr. Stratton, United States)

is one that, as every member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization knows, would, if adopted by Members at this session, make Western Europe far more vulnerable to the overwhelming conventional military forces that the Soviet Union has located on the border between Western and Eastern Europe, which are, incidentally, far more numerous than is required for the legitimate defence of the Soviet Union.

The fact is that, as I have said, there is no quick fix, no simple gimmick and no particular slogan that in itself is going to bring an end to either conventional war or nuclear war — not even some statement that might be written up in a document turned out by an organization as respected and as distinguished as the United Nations. If that had been possible we should have ended war long before this.

I get the distinct impression that what has been going on here this afternoon is an exercise in which the United States has been rather subtly blamed for its refusal to fall for such a simple and highly unrealistic brand of wording to put into a final document. But I should like to point out that the fact is that my country has been concerned not so much with formulations in documents issued by organizations as with working for real, definite arms control. We have been working for radical reductions in weapons, not only conventional but nuclear.

Back in 1977 President Carter, who, as the Members of this Organization may recall, announced in his inaugural address on the steps of the Capitol in Washington that his objective was to end, eliminate and wipe out all nuclear weapons, made a very sweeping and radical proposal to carry out that idea, that the two super-Powers should reduce their nuclear weapons by very substantial margins. It was, I think, the most sweeping disarmament proposal that had ever been made by an American President. But those recommendations were rudely and harshly rejected out of hand. And yet we in the United States have continued to persevere not just in flowery rhetoric but in concrete and realistic suggestions for the reduction of the danger of war in any form.

For example, over the past seven months the United States has proposed four major points as an agenda for peace: the elimination of the land-based intermediate-range missiles that are threatening the people of Europe on both sides of the iron curtain, and one third reduction in strategic ballistic missile
warheads; a substantial reduction in NATO and Warsaw Pact ground and air forces, and new safeguards to reduce the risk of accidental war. We urge the Soviet Union to join with us in this realistic and important quest to do something specific to bring about an end to war, nuclear as well as conventional.

Let me conclude by pointing out that we really do not need any new formula from this second special session on disarmament to bring about an end to war. We have the statement of what is required as one of the basic tenets of the United Nations Charter, specifically its Article 24. We do not need to rewrite that Article but simply to carry out our obligations under it.

The CHAIRMAN: The various statements we have heard this afternoon have further emphasized the urgency with which we should grapple with the task before us.

It is clear that the impatience evident in the statements of several delegations arises from frustration, from the feeling that progress at this session is not as discernible as had been expected. It is also clear that those statements should spur us on to make renewed efforts in the 24 hours which we have given ourselves to try again to get together in small drafting groups and small informal groups to look into some of the problems that still confront us and the session.

I therefore propose that we adjourn this meeting and that those delegations that together with the Chairman of Working Group II I will look into some of these issues first meet with me and later determine when and how they can undertake the task that has been assigned to them with a view to their being able to report one way or the other very quickly - perhaps at our meeting tomorrow night.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.