

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records*



UN LIBRARY

DEC 11 1978

UN/SA COLLECTION

FIRST COMMITTEE
61st meeting
held on
4 December 1978
10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 61ST MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 47: GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (concluded):

- (a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY;
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ~~ITEM~~ 128: CONCLUSION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF GUARANTEES OF THE SECURITY OF NON-NUCLEAR STATES (concluded)

AGENDA ITEM 50: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

Corrections will be issued shortly after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/33/PV.61
5 December 1978

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 47 AND 128 (concluded)

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will continue with the explanations of vote on a number of draft resolutions on Disarmament. As members of the Committee will recall, because of the desire of members, and for that matter the Chairman, to conclude the actual decision-taking and voting on the draft resolutions on Friday afternoon, it was agreed that a number of explanations of vote would be deferred to this morning. After the conclusion of the explanations of vote, the Committee will begin consideration of the last item on its agenda, item 50, concerning the strengthening of international security.

With the Committee's permission, we shall begin the explanations of vote with those concerning draft resolutions under agenda item 128, "Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States". I should alert the Committee to the fact that there is also one explanation of vote remaining under item 47, in connexion with draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2, on the subject of the Committee on Disarmament.

Before we go on to the actual explanations of vote, I wish to state that I believe there is no rule of procedure stipulating that only those delegations that signified on Friday their wish to explain their votes should be allowed to do so. At any rate there has been no proposal or decision to that effect. Therefore, if there are delegations, in addition to those that have asked for an opportunity to explain their votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2, A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 and A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1, wishing to do so the Chairman is prepared to receive requests to that effect.

We shall now begin with the explanations of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): The Swedish delegation followed with close attention the debate on this agenda item some two weeks ago, and we have also more recently closely studied the two draft resolutions introduced on the subject and voted upon. My delegation is pleased to note the high degree of flexibility which has characterized the sponsors of the two draft resolutions and which was necessary to obtain wide approval of the two resolutions. We have given our support to both. Although they deal only with the limited question of transferring the matter for consideration to the Committee on Disarmament, I now wish to make clear the views of my Government on the issue of security guarantees, to which it attaches great importance and which has rightly been given close attention for many years in international debates.

It has been and continues to be my Government's consistent position, in accordance with our traditional policy of neutrality, not to accept the concept of so-called positive security guarantees. An example of such guarantees is contained in Security Council 255 (1968), according to which the Council welcomed the fact that the nuclear Powers had expressed their intention to provide or support assistance to non-nuclear-weapon States that might be victims of an act of aggression or an object of a threat of aggression in which nuclear weapons were used.

The Swedish Government in principle favours negative security guarantees. By such we understand in this context co-ordinated and binding pledges from nuclear-weapon States not to use nuclear weapons and not to threaten to use such weapons against States and groups of States which have explicitly abstained from such weapons. One main reason for our support of negative security guarantees is the importance we attach to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the ways in which efficient security guarantees could diminish the risk of such proliferation.

The five nuclear Powers have formulated guarantees of which each has its own characteristics. These declarations vary in form and scope because the nuclear Powers consider themselves to have differing security situations in relation to each other and to allies. Any attempt to co-ordinate them has to grapple with these differences in a realistic way. The main responsibility for such co-ordination in content and form must, in order to avoid ambiguity, in our view, rest with the nuclear Powers themselves also in the future.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

For non-nuclear-weapon States increased security against the possible threat of use or actual use of nuclear weapons has a value in itself which needs no elaboration - all the more so since the absence of tangible progress in nuclear disarmament is exacerbating the concerns of non-nuclear-weapon States. Furthermore, the risk of nuclear-weapon proliferation would decrease if the general climate of security improved. One of many measures which could contribute to such an improvement is the provision of efficient security guarantees.

Security guarantees are, however, far from enough in themselves to bring about global security. They may become an important contribution thereto, but they should under no circumstances become an excuse for not taking effective measures to reverse the nuclear arms race and bring about disarmament.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

Moreover, their contribution would probably be diminished if the nuclear arms race continued unhindered after they were given. The impression could then easily spread that the dynamics of the arms race are so forceful and the pressures of a crisis situation so strong that guarantees probably would be disregarded if deterrence failed and the leading military Powers found themselves in open conflict with each other.

Under no circumstances should security guarantees become an excuse for a continued real armament process carried out by the leading military Powers at the expense of international security and the safety of smaller countries.

The debate in this Committee has illustrated a wide range of attitudes to the Soviet and Pakistan proposals for a convention. A number of modifications have been proposed. Many positive reactions have also been registered. Some countries, however, have expressed reservations of varying strength and scope. All these elements must now be taken into account by the Committee on Disarmament. As to the form of an international arrangement, the Swedish Government thinks it is too early to take a definite decision. Only further negotiations will prove how much substance a co-ordinated guarantee by the nuclear Powers will offer. Only then should the decision be taken as to the form of the guarantees.

In order to facilitate further deliberations on this matter when the Committee on Disarmament starts its work on the issue, my Government is in favour of a gradual and pragmatic approach which leaves open the question of the form of a possible future arrangement. Different methods could then be explored. Some countries have suggested that the nuclear Powers could together study the possibility of a joint manifestation by them in the Security Council with reference to individual declarations to the extent that is deemed necessary. That is one of several possible methods which, of course, should not be excluded bearing in mind that guarantees that are not binding and co-ordinated are of less value.

As to the content of the originally proposed draft conventions, my Government has some specific reservations. I am not going to enumerate them here since we shall have an opportunity to present them when the question is considered in the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

I want to conclude my remarks by expressing once again our great appreciation that it has been possible to deal with this very important and at the same time very difficult matter in this constructive way.

Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria): My delegation voted in favour of both draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 and A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1, which were adopted by this Committee last Friday. In explanation of those votes I should like to state the following:

Austria, situated in the centre of Europe and hence in the most highly armed region of the world, characterized by the presence of the main military alliance systems which include nuclear-weapon Powers, is particularly sensitive to all questions relating to disarmament, in both the nuclear and conventional fields.

Austria, as a country which already 23 years ago formally renounced the acquisition or production of nuclear weapons and which because of its status of permanent neutrality does not take part in military alliances, takes a particular interest in the question of what has come to be known as negative security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States. We welcome, therefore, the increased attention that is now being paid to this issue. Thus we have followed with great and immediate interest the statements made during the debate on agenda item 128.

I should like on this occasion to express my delegation's appreciation to the delegation of the Soviet Union for having initiated the debate we have had under this item, a debate which has certainly contributed in a very constructive way to clarifying the concept and relevant positions of Governments as regards the question of negative security guarantees.

We consider that non-nuclear-weapon States have every right to obtain such guarantees on the part of the nuclear-weapon States and we are convinced that these measures which, however, should not be seen as a substitute for nuclear disarmament, can strengthen the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. Austria has taken note with satisfaction, therefore, of the solemn unilateral declarations which the Governments of nuclear-weapon States issued or reissued in the course of the special session devoted to disarmament. We

(Mr. Sucharipa, Austria)

consider those declarations to be binding upon the respective Powers under international law. Furthermore, we consider that those declarations do not create any further obligations on the part of Austria in addition to those into which Austria has already entered.

We support the views of those delegations which have placed the matter before us in the context of measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear proliferation and we share the opinion that the issue should be dealt with further within the appropriate disarmament forums.

In considering the question of how further to enhance the unilateral declarations that have already been issued, we feel that an open mind and flexible approach will be necessary which should take into account, on an equal footing, all alternative solutions which are or will be proposed. In our view, however, the elaboration of an international convention in this field should be pursued only if it should prove possible for the nuclear-weapon States to find agreement on a common formula for negative security guarantees.

As in the original version of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6 reference was also made to Security Council resolution 255 (1968) relating to the so-called positive security guarantees, I would avail myself of this opportunity to reiterate our interpretation according to which it is and must be up to the country which is a victim of an act of aggression or threat of such an act to decide by itself whether and to what extent any assistance offered in this regard will be accepted.

Finally, I should like to express my delegation's sincere appreciation of the fact that, because of the flexibility shown by the initiators of the two draft resolutions and all delegations that participated in the negotiations thereon, it was possible for this Committee to approve the two draft resolutions by a large majority.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States has voted for draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 and, as is implicit in its vote is prepared to take the action called for by this draft resolution. In considering what international arrangements should be worked out, however, the United States

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

stands by its proposal made on 17 November of this year and contained in document A/C.1/33/7. In that proposal the United States stated that it considers that international cognizance of the Presidential statement enunciated by Secretary Vance last summer should be in the form of the Security Council taking formal note of that statement, as well as of the statements made by the other nuclear Powers to strengthen the confidence of non-nuclear-weapon States in their security against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. As I indicated earlier in this Committee, the United States also believes that there are other possible international arrangements such as nuclear-weapon-free zones, that would enhance the security of non-nuclear weapon States against the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): During the debate in this Committee on agenda item 128, the delegation of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania set forth its views on the problem being considered in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 and in the related draft convention on the so-called strengthening of security guarantees for non-nuclear States.

In explanation of its position concerning draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 the Albanian delegation now wishes to state the following.

The nuclear weapons in the hands of the super-Powers and imperialist Powers, particularly the United States and the Soviet Union, pose a serious threat to people and to international peace and security. The United States and the Soviet Union, as in the past, are constantly endeavouring to give the impression that the dangers posed by nuclear weapons can be reduced by the adoption of agreements and conventions, or by the elaboration of legal formulas, even in circumstances in which nuclear-weapon arsenals are increasing and in which the nuclear arms race continues. It is precisely that goal which the Soviet social imperialists are pursuing by proposing their draft resolution and draft convention. The texts of those drafts are so worded as to permit the nuclear-weapon Super-Powers to legitimize the right to maintain and augment their atomic arsenals, to improve further the manufacture of nuclear weapons and also to legalize their right to resort to the use of such weapons. Those texts provide for obligations only on the part of non-nuclear States by asking them to be satisfied with some formal and very conditional so-called guarantees. Those supposed guarantees are nothing but an attempt to compel the non-nuclear States to yield to the atomic blackmail of the nuclear Powers. At the same time, they are an attempt to jeopardize the very sovereignty of non-nuclear-weapon States.

The formal guarantees advocated by the draft convention in no way reduce the danger of nuclear weapons, nor do they exclude the possibility of the use of those weapons. The draft convention even contains threats that if any country does not sign the convention it may be subject to nuclear attacks.

It is for those reasons that the Albanian delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2. For reasons already stated, the Albanian delegation did not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: I note that the explanation of vote just made by the representative of Albania referred as well to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1. There is, of course, nothing that prevents delegations from combining explanations of vote if they so wish.

Mr. LENNUYEUX-COMNENE (France) (interpretation from French): First of all, I must say that if draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2, which was adopted on Friday, could have been the object of a consensus, the French delegation would not have undertaken to interfere with that consensus. However, since our Committee proceeded to a vote on that resolution, my delegation must explain why it abstained.

We are not unmindful that the vote on that resolution put an end to a debate on the advisability of concluding a specific convention providing for the granting of guarantees to all non-nuclear States, irrespective of their geographic, political or strategic situation. No doubt, since its inception the draft resolution in question has undergone significant changes aimed at making it acceptable to the vast majority of States represented here. However, we must note that operative paragraph 2 of resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 refers explicitly to a draft convention which the Committee on Disarmament is to consider as soon as possible. In that connexion, the French delegation notes that draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1, also adopted last Friday, does not prejudge the way in which the guarantees are to be given to non-nuclear-weapon States. That is why the French delegation was able to vote in favour of that draft.

In more general terms, my delegation does not think it is by means of a single convention, applying erga omnes, that guarantees may be granted to non-nuclear-weapon States. No doubt, guarantees must be given to those States in exchange for obligations undertaken, but only, in the view of my delegation, if those guarantees refer to nuclear-weapon-free zones. Furthermore, to that extent, the French Government is ready to conclude with those States, through organs designated by them and after negotiations with those organs, conventions providing for security guarantees which, with the extension of denuclearized zones, could be of interest to the majority of States represented here.

(Mr. Lennuyeux-Connène, France)

However, it is well to recall here the unique nature of the European region. In that part of the world where all the sources of tension have yet to disappear, and where enormous quantities of nuclear and conventional weapons are amassed, the proposal on which we have taken a decision could have very significant implications. We wonder, for our part, whether a convention guaranteeing the non-use of nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear States of that region would constitute a strengthening of security or whether it would not rather interfere with the existing political and military balance.

We therefore believe that the draft convention referred to in operative paragraph 2 of resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2, which was adopted on Friday, cannot meet the security objectives which France wishes for Europe, and that the Committee on Disarmament should not make it the essential basis of its deliberations on security guarantees for non-nuclear States.

Mr. BLOMBERG (Finland): Finland voted for draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 because we consider it important to pursue all approaches to conclude effective arrangements to assure all non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

As we said in our statement in the debate on agenda item 128, we hope that the Soviet Union initiative will lead to a thorough discussion of this crucial issue in the Committee on Disarmament, with the participation of both nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States. Such a consideration should aim at arrangements for the provision of security guarantees that would to the fullest possible extent meet the requirements and expectations of the non-nuclear-weapon States. My Government is prepared to contribute to the process.

As to the text of the draft resolution which the Committee has adopted, I wish to place on record that my delegation regrets the omission from the revised text of the preambular paragraph in which reference was made to Security Council resolution 255 (1968). That resolution, essential to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, provides for an arrangement to which my delegation continues to attach great importance. It complements in an essential way the main aim of the present draft resolution, the provision of negative security guarantees.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Belgium)(interpretation from French): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 last Friday, and I wish to explain why.

First of all, if the Committee had been able to arrive at a consensus on the draft my delegation would willingly have gone along with it. It is not the principle of negative guarantees itself that explains its attitude. My delegation is entirely in favour of such guarantees. This subject was highlighted during the statement made by my delegation about 10 days ago in this very room, and I shall quote the following excerpt from it.

(Mr. Elliott, Belgium)

"... this balance or this parallel status between the responsibilities of the nuclear and non-nuclear States also plays a decisive role in what has come to be called horizontal non-proliferation.

"Those that have renounced nuclear weapons, in accordance with a formula which, moreover, may be variable, must be protected against any risk of seeing abused the situation of relative inferiority in which they have been placed by force of circumstances. The problem of so-called negative security guarantees thus acquires a vital importance. My country considers it justified that such a commitment should be given, in accordance with appropriate formulas, account being taken of the security interests of one and all." (A/C.1/33/PV.47, p. 16)

So much for the principle.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 itself my delegation values the efforts made by its sponsors to produce it in its present form and thanks them.

However, my delegation had some problems with its operative paragraph 2. When compared with the draft presented to the General Assembly relating to to an international convention on the question, the wording does not seem capable of leading in favourable circumstances to a thorough examination of ways and means of finding valid solutions to this very important problem of negative guarantees. The different circumstances existing in various parts of the world do not in fact readily lend themselves to a global approach in a single convention.

Not having encountered similar difficulties with draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1, my delegation voted in favour of it.

Mr. BUENO (Brazil): Notwithstanding the adoption last Friday of the two draft resolutions on the question of assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States, documents A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 and A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1, my delegation deems it necessary to explain its vote.

(Mr. Bueno, Brazil)

It has been our consistently held and expressed opinion that the security of non-nuclear-weapon States and of the world in general can be achieved only by completely eliminating all nuclear weapons. While we note the complexities of such an endeavour, it must be acknowledged that none of the draft resolutions gives due importance to that unavoidable fact. The sponsors have preferred to resort to vague and ambiguous language, departing from the real issues that must be faced when dealing with a question of the utmost importance for the security of all States. It is a matter of concern for my delegation that the two documents adopted last Friday are devoid of any commitments on the part of the nuclear-weapon States.

In casting its vote in favour of the two draft resolutions the Brazilian delegation was aware of the circumstances that prevailed at the present time. We voted in favour of a principle, in conformity with our endeavours and consistent with Brazil's long-standing attitude of support for the urgent need of the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons. A true and unequivocal commitment in this respect is the only real assurance that meets the security needs of non-nuclear-weapon States.

Mr. MESHARRAFA (Egypt)(interpretation from Arabic): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 despite the many amendments introduced to the original text, because from the very outset we had favoured the Soviet initiative which we regarded as one among many other steps capable of strengthening the security of the non-nuclear States.

Nevertheless, we would have liked that draft to have contained an assurance that the guarantees offered to non-nuclear States would be an integral part of nuclear disarmament measures and closely linked to them. The greatest guarantee offered to non-nuclear States does not lie in the guarantees provided by the nuclear States but, rather and essentially, in vertical non proliferation in keeping with article VI of the Non Proliferation Treaty, in order to eliminate stockpiling and arsenals and prevent the possible use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances. Those are the major guarantees offered to the non-nuclear States, because we know full well that nuclear weapons will not be directed at the non-nuclear States so long as the major nuclear Powers have large stockpiles of conventional weapons that could be used against them.

Regarding the draft convention itself, my delegation has some comments that it will submit to the negotiating body when the text is discussed.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The explanation of the reasons why my delegation considered it not only advisable but necessary to vote in favour of both draft resolutions before us, that is, A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 and L.15/Rev.1, were already expressed in my statement to this Committee when we took up agenda item 128 on 2 November. I shall therefore not repeat them here but I shall simply recall that the record of the meeting held on that date, which was the twenty-fifth meeting, pages 16 to 22, reflects all of those reasons.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): I should like briefly to explain the vote of my delegation on the draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 which was adopted, regarding the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

Pakistan's concern about this question requires no reiteration. The main proposal in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 for an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States reflects a concern which we share. Indeed, we have advocated this course of action, not only at the current session but also at the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. The Pakistan delegation has worked closely with the Soviet Union and others to promote this idea at the present session of the Assembly. We are therefore gratified that the Assembly has endorsed the proposition that effective arrangements should be concluded to assure the non-nuclear weapon States against the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons and that, for this purpose, consideration will be given in the Committee on Disarmament to the conclusion of a draft international convention on this subject.

However, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 does not fully reflect the preoccupations of the non-nuclear-weapon States on this question. My delegation has explained this point at length while introducing draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1, which we believe better reflects the concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon States. Consequently, the Pakistan delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2. Nevertheless, we look forward to further co-operation with the sponsors of that text in promoting the proposal for an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States in the Committee on Disarmament and in other relevant forums.

The CHAIRMAN: As I had occasion to mention at the beginning of our proceedings this morning, there is a third draft resolution on which explanations of vote were deferred to this morning, that is, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 on the Committee on Disarmament.

Before going to that, however, I have been requested by the representative of Bahamas to announce for proper registration in the record of this Committee, that his delegation inadvertently abstained when draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 was put to the vote. It is also to be noted that the delegation of Bahamas was a co-sponsor of that draft resolution and therefore obviously would have voted for it.

We shall now proceed to explanations of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2.

Miss LOPEZ (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): I would have wished to speak last Friday when I so requested, but since it was not possible then, I should now like to state for the record that Venezuela has reservations concerning draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2. That should in no way be interpreted as a lack of interest in the initiative taken by several States which are already considering the question of the composition of the Committee on Disarmament. It is due to the fact that our delegation prefers a text of which we were a sponsor, and also to the timing of the proposal. We hope that the draft resolution adopted by the General Assembly will contribute to the effectiveness of our Organization in the field of disarmament, and we shall be in a position to give it our affirmative vote in plenary meeting when it again comes up for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: Unless I hear views to the contrary, this will conclude the consideration by the Committee of all the disarmament agenda items. During last week we have taken action on more than 40 draft resolutions submitted under agenda items 35 to 49, 125 and, finally, 128. As members will have noted, on most of those issues the Committee has acted not only with dispatch and efficiency, but at the same time with a remarkable degree of consensus or near-consensus, which I believe we all hope will bode well for the development in the field of disarmament during the months to come and during the year to come before the next session of the General Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 50

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

The CHAIRMAN: We will now move on to the consideration of the last item on the agenda of the First Committee at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, agenda item 50: Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

As members of the Committee may have observed, it has not been my habit as Chairman to introduce new items with lengthy statements or historic summaries of what has happened earlier. This is in the interest of efficiency and because I am well aware that these facts and the items are well known to the members of this Committee. I shall therefore, in this instance, confine myself to mentioning the main documents which form the basis for the Committee's consideration of item 50.

The first is a report by the Secretary-General, in document A/33/216 and Add.1, containing information received from 21 States concerning "Non-interference in internal affairs of States". As members will recall, this report has been submitted pursuant to a resolution adopted by the General Assembly last year.

(The Chairman)

The second is a report by the Secretary-General in document A/33/217 and Add.1 and 2, containing information and suggestions received from 19 States relating to the "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". This report, as members will recall, is based on the request recommended by the First Committee in connexion with the original adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

The third is a document and a proposal received during this session by the First Committee and containing a draft declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace, which has been submitted by the delegation of Poland in document A/C.1/33/L.58, dated 1 December 1978.

I have the privilege to welcome to the Committee His Excellency Mr. Eugeniusz Kulaga, Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Poland, who, as we all know I think, can be characterized without too much exaggeration as a charter member of this Committee from many earlier appearances. I have great pleasure in calling on Vice-Minister Kulaga.

Mr. KULAGA (Poland): Mr. Chairman, may I begin by thanking you for the very kind words you said about me, which I shall not reciprocate since my delegation has already conveyed its compliments to you. I am part of my delegation and entirely share its views.

My delegation feels privileged to be able to open this year's debate on one of the most important items on the agenda of the General Assembly. Few international documents, other than the Charter of the United Nations, have had a more profound impact upon the current relations among States than did the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. The political developments in the world since its adoption in 1970 have indeed proved to be a convincing testimony to the wisdom and far-sightedness of the initiators and drafters of the Declaration. Faithful to its commitment to making the world a more secure and better place to live, Poland has actively participated in the elaboration of the Declaration and continues to remain its staunch follower. Ever since the Declaration was first adopted, the Government of Poland has regularly reported to the General Assembly, through the Secretary-General, on the efforts it is constantly making towards its implementation, the newest such report having been submitted last summer and being now contained in document A/33/217, which is before this Committee.

(Mr. Kulaga, Poland)

Aware as it is of all the complexities of the world situation, the Government of Poland believes that the fundamental task of the international community at present, when war has ceased to be inevitable, is that of maintaining and consolidating the processes of détente, among which urgent and effective steps to halt the arms race and to put into effect meaningful disarmament measures stand out as overriding objectives. A straightforward course towards their implementation has just been offered in a new and important declaration of the States of the socialist community adopted last month in Moscow by the Political Consultative Committee of States Members of the Warsaw Treaty. The attainment of those objectives can and should be facilitated by numerous international factors, including, first of all, the ever more universal awareness and recognition that the peaceful coexistence of States with different systems and the non-use of force in international relations represent the basic conditions for a successful development of the world of today and for an effective solution of its pressing problems. In other words, international security can be strengthened only by multiplying the planes of understanding and co-operation and by eliminating areas of confrontation - especially in the military sphere. For the arms race and détente are in the long run incompatible and irreconcilable.

The maintenance of international peace and security has been one of the fundamental purposes of the United Nations. Its ultimate end is not a partial truce among individual nations but a permanent way of life for all mankind. It therefore takes a multi-dimensional approach to comprehend adequately and finally achieve that noble purpose. In political terms, world peace is a goal that can be attained only through common accord, first, by persevering efforts to resolve conflicts without recourse to force; secondly, by steadfast efforts to halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament; thirdly, by long-term efforts to develop in the mind of man a fully conscious vision of the supreme need for a solid foundation for peace. These three military and non-military, profoundly political components have to be viewed in a feed-back relationship. They also mutually complement and strengthen each other, leading to a constructive international co-operation. They make it undeniably evident that peace and international security, to be durable, have to be built concurrently in the practice of international relations and in the mind of man, for the real first-line of defence against war is man himself. With this in view, the Polish

(Mr. Kulaga, Poland)

delegation proposes to address itself to considerations which, having far-reaching political significance, deal also with deeply humanistic aspects of the issues at hand.

Four years ago, on 10 October 1974, speaking in the General Assembly of the United Nations at its twenty-ninth session, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, Edward Gierek, concluded his analysis of the state of world political affairs by stressing, in particular, the importance of moulding among nations and societies a consciousness which reflects the lofty aims of détente, co-operation and peace. He said in part:

"That is the special duty of our generation, which has known the tragedy of war, hatred and destruction. It is our obligation to overcome prejudice, distrust, intolerance, chauvinism and racialism, to inculcate in the younger generation a respect for other nations and a conviction of the right of all to live in freedom, equality and peace". (A/PV.2264, p. 17)

Developments during recent years have reaffirmed fully that the ideas spelt out from the United Nations rostrum by the Polish leader have been assuming ever greater topicality and vital urgency. The tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was in itself a tangible reminder that the political goodwill of Governments, in order to be genuine and effective, must reflect the conscious, creative and collective stimulus within their respective societies.

Guided by such an imperative of our times, as well as by the ideals deeply ingrained in the traditions of Poland's past and present, we have developed the ideas of four years ago into a comprehensive political initiative in the conviction that conditions are now ripe to discuss and take measures on the subject of the preparation of societies for life in peace, a question of paramount importance for the building of mutual confidence among States.

As Poland's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Emil Wojtaszek, put it in the general debate of the current session, on 28 September last, when presenting the initiative:

"Preparation for life in peace is the kind of activity which could be defined as the building of an infrastructure of peace in the consciousness of nations. The creation of a peaceful world can neither be fully effective nor durable unless there is a most profound awareness in the minds of men that world peace is of supreme value and thereby an objective of the highest priority". (A/33/PV.12, p. 43)

(Mr. Kulaga, Poland)

Consequently, more than two months ago, Poland submitted to the General Assembly of the United Nations a draft declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace, contained in document A/C.1/33/2 of 28 September 1978. Our initiative has elicited a positive and genuine response, both official and among the public at large. The Secretary-General of our Organization Mr. Kurt Waldheim, welcomed it as a move which could contribute to the realization of the main purpose of humanity, namely, the shaping of a peaceful future for mankind.

The preparation of societies for life in peace might be described as a specific kind of education. However, the sort of education required to advance the cause of peace must necessarily be more complex and altogether different from what is ordinarily meant by the word "education". The countless wars which haunted mankind for centuries have, unfortunately, developed more of an "education for and mentality of war" than of an "education for and mentality of peace". The founding fathers of the United Nations system therefore rightly perceived that:

"since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed".

What is precisely involved in our concept is the creation of an intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind for the practical transformation of the obsolete maxim "si vis pacem, para bellum" into the one reflecting the present aspirations of humanity - "si vis pacem, para pacem", that is, if you desire peace, prepare for peace. Or, as one of the great founders of the non-aligned movement, Jawaharlal Nehru, said: "If we desire peace, we must develop the temper of peace".

The ultimate goal of the preparation of societies for life in peace is that of bringing about a situation in which all future generations, in their attitudes towards other nations, shall not have - as do the present generations - to overcome the legacies of ignorance and prejudice of past epochs. This is why we view our initiative as a contribution to the process of creating a climate of mutual trust and building confidence among nations, of creating a more propitious atmosphere for progress in disarmament and for strengthening international security and, consequently, as a contribution to the implementation of the purposes of the United Nations.

(Mr. Kulaga, Poland)

Histories of nations and their socio-economic systems or political conditions may certainly differ, but the stakes in peace are equally high for all of them. The first and foremost duty of a State is to assure its people security and a chance to prosper in peace. Hence, the inherent right of man to life and to life in peace cannot but be viewed as the fundamental human right and, at the same time, the most condensed synthesis of a great many rules and principles of international law. The attitude to that right has in effect become the supreme criterion of the real nature and degree of respect for the other human rights. Because it entails the indispensable requirement of renouncing the threat or use of force, the right to life in peace does also have its profound political implications which our initiative fully recognizes.

What are Poland's credentials for having come out with such an international initiative at this particular time? Drawing lessons from the tragic experiences of the Second World War, in the past 33 post war years my country has consistently and actively participated in all the efforts aimed at establishing international security, achieving disarmament and consolidating détente. The first Polish disarmament proposals were submitted in the United Nations as early as 1946. It was in the same forum that in 1957 we came out with the plan for the creation of an atom-free zone in Central Europe, later modified to be a denuclearized and limited-armaments zone. Although the idea has not been brought to fruition in our part of the world, it had its important bearing upon the political climate in Europe and on similar projects in other parts of the globe. In 1964, also in the United Nations, we proposed the convening of a conference of all European States to examine the problem of European security in its entirety. Two years later, along with our socialist allies and friends, in the Bucharest Declaration of the Political Consultative Committee of States Members of the Warsaw Treaty, we developed the idea of convening a general European conference for the discussion of questions related to ensuring security in Europe and to the establishment of general European co-operation. Thanks to the persistent efforts of the States of the socialist community, joined by other interested States, the European

(Mr. Kulaga, Poland)

Conference has indeed been brought to full fruition. Its historic Final Document has now become widely known as the Magna Carta of Peace in Europe.

The present initiative is a direct continuation of the same spirit of Poland's consistent attachment to the ever valid purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Yet the motives and the premises upon which the initiative has been based also comprise other ingredients of Polish heritage. They have their origin in the best traditions of tolerance and compassion and the spirit of the people of Poland. They have their most genuine roots in our desire for a lasting peace, in our history and in the foundations of the socio-economic system of the socialist Poland of today. It is aimed at contributing to the construction of an irreversible peace by way of creating a favourable psychological and moral atmosphere for comprehensive disarmament and other peace-oriented measures.

Reference to the need for the acceptance of the notion of peace as an enduring component of the human mind has been made by a great many delegations, both in the general debate of our Assembly and in the First Committee of the current session as, indeed, in some other Committees. A number of them were kind enough to lend support to the Polish initiative. We are grateful to the delegations of Afghanistan, Bahamas, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Federal Republic of Germany, France, German Democratic Republic, Holy See, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Malta, Mongolia, Panama, Philippines, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR and Venezuela for the contributions in their statements at the thirty-third session, which - be it directly or indirectly - did strengthen the validity and the timeliness of the initiative on the preparation of societies for life in peace.

Indeed, the relevant passages from the statements by those delegations have added a unanimous voice of the widest geopolitical spectrum in support of the idea behind this initiative. In the exact words and arguments advanced in its favour, the following emerges from what we heard on the subject from like-minded delegations.

(Mr. Kulaga, Poland)

First, peace is a pre condition for life and survival. It is made, not found; which implies preparation and training for peace of man's will and intelligence. Peace and human solidarity spring from the mind of man, where they have to be forged into thoughts, habits and a dynamic mentality of positive action before they can lastingly and effectively enter world politics. A broadly conceived education for peace can bring mankind to a new era of progress and solidarity among all peoples. That is why the Polish initiative has been meant to reach the hearts and minds of men in the quest for peace.

Secondly, confidence-building cannot be confined to the sphere of military security. It is not possible to mobilize the will of mankind for disarmament and peace in a psychological atmosphere that breeds hate, hostility and violence. The struggle for disarmament and international security must be accompanied by a pedagogy of peace, by programmes that would breed a culture of peace and international friendship -- the indispensable "software" for the disarmament of the "hardware".

(Mr. Kulaga, Poland)

That is why the initiative, future-oriented as it is, offers a new instrument for an active promotion of détente as a necessary precondition for a genuine process of disarmament and a world without wars.

Thirdly, an aroused and enlightened public opinion is in itself a catalyst for dedicated efforts to secure results from which all would benefit.

There is growing recognition of the fact that all Governments have a responsibility to encourage the education of their peoples for the purposes of peace, co-operation and understanding among nations. The Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament called upon Member States inter alia to avoid dissemination of false and tendentious information concerning armaments. Improved and unbiased public information can certainly act to remove distrust and enhance confidence among nations. For international relations mean communication, they mean trust and sincerity in the cause of peace.

That is why our initiative recognizes the essential role of Governments as well as governmental and non-governmental organizations, both national and international, the mass media, educational processes and teaching methods, in promoting the ideas of peace and understanding among nations.

We have been happy to note that there is already a considerable degree of awareness of the problem and action is being taken for the preparation of societies for life in peace. Poland's "will for peace" has been enshrined as one of the pillars of our Constitution. The new Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of 7 October 1977 incorporates provisions with a view to "preventing wars of aggression", and "achieving universal and complete disarmament". It also bans war propaganda. Similar provisions are contained in the constitutions or relevant legislative acts of other socialist States, including my own. In fact, the quest for peace is inherent in the very nature of socialist society since, as the representative of Hungary pointed out in this Committee, at the inauguration of Disarmament Week:

"... in our countries there is no class or social stratum which would have any material interest in stirring up international tension and in the ensuing increase in arms production". (A/C.1/33/PV.13, p. 7)

(Mr. Kulaga, Poland)

We note with satisfaction reference to the illegality of war propaganda or wars of aggression in the constitutions of a number of States, notably Brazil, Italy and the Philippines. We welcomed the recent statement by President Giscard d'Estaing of France, made with reference to a specific situation directly relating to the preparation of societies for life in peace, namely that freedom of expression should be balanced by decency and respect for truth. Similarly, because of complaints by British Members of Parliament, London's Imperial War Museum has stopped selling copies of offensive Nazi Second World War posters. We are aware of the positive experiences in joint projects of revising school textbooks in Latin America, not to mention considerable achievements in the same field in relations between Poland and the Federal Republic of Germany. Let me add in passing that in the last several years we have started similar ventures with appropriate institutions of Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom. Modest as it still is, the movement to stop the pollution of the human mind and make it function in categories of peace has started. It is our earnest hope that the adoption of the Declaration will greatly enhance it.

In the last two months the Polish delegation has conducted intensive and very productive consultations on the initiative with scores of delegations. I am happy to report that the consultations have not failed our expectations. Poland's draft Declaration has received the warm and vigorous support of the membership of the United Nations. During the consultations we collected a number of very useful and pertinent comments as well as some proposals for amendments, to which we have given most careful consideration and attention, in the constructive spirit of the draft Declaration itself. If there are any delegations in this conference room which we have not managed to contact directly, I hope they will understand that we have failed to do so only due to our modest manpower resources and the time factor during a busy session like this one. But we want to thank all for the tremendous help, friendly advice and suggestions which, in our profound belief, have accounted for the elaboration of the consensus text now before this Committee.

(Mr. Kulaga, Poland)

It gives me great honour and pleasure, on behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Peru, Philippines, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Poland, to submit for adoption by the Committee a draft Declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace, which is contained in document A/C.1/33/L.58.

In the light of what I have already said and the nature of the subject it covers, the draft is in fact self-explanatory. It quotes directly a number of documents adopted in the United Nations and makes indirect reference to others, notably to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the thirtieth anniversary of which we shall be solemnly observing in a few days, to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. As much as it develops some of their provisions, the draft in no way infringes upon them, nor indeed does it affect any other international documents or commitments, including those undertaken in regional contexts.

The draft Declaration consists of four main parts. Its preamble reaffirms and makes reference to the existing United Nations record of accomplishment in fostering friendly relations and co-operation among States; it recognizes the paramount value of peace for and among nations and the role Governments, organization, the mass media, as well as educational institutions, can play in its promotion; and it covers the important aspects of disarmament, socio-economic development and all the other elements relative to the subject matter of the Declaration. Part I of the draft spells out the main principles to guide Member States in the preparation of societies for life in peace. Part II calls upon all States to act perseveringly and consistently to ensure that the provisions of the Declaration will be translated into the language of national and international practice. Part III proposes concrete follow-up measures to be taken on a national and international level towards the implementation of the Declaration. The Secretary-General of the United Nations would follow the progress made in that regard and report thereon periodically to the General Assembly.

(Mr. Kulaga, Poland)

It is the profound hope of the sponsors that both the First Committee and the General Assembly will unite on this occasion in a demonstration of support for the new dimension of the quest and preparation for peace. We formally move the adoption of the proposed Declaration by consensus.

In conclusion, may I be allowed to repeat the words of Edward Gierek, who, in his address to the General Assembly four years ago, said:

"Let us do everything possible to make the remaining quarter of this century, a century which has seen untold suffering brought upon mankind, an era of peaceful construction and of peace-oriented education."

(A/PV.2264, p. 17)

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I listened very carefully to the Deputy Foreign Minister of Poland's introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.58, which I have had occasion to go through word for word. I do not believe anybody can have any reservations on what is contained in that draft resolution. In fact, it sums up the total aspiration of mankind to attain a state of peace.

Inasmuch as I would vote for it, I can understand why our Polish colleague did not incorporate some practical measures so as to make the ideas that he and the other sponsors have elaborated more effective, in the sense that they can have an impact on every country - not only educationally, but perhaps in such a way as to influence people in the seat of power, regardless of their ideologies. Because, after all, man is seeking survival, and we are all threatened with annihilation. That is why I say it is very commendable on the part of our Polish colleague, and any of the sponsors and whoever votes for the draft resolution, to subscribe to it. There are no pitfalls in it; it is factual; it portrays things as they actually are, with no objective, perhaps, except to see that our pronouncement of peace should become known to the world at large through the United Nations taking a unanimous vote on such a resolution.

I said I would vote for the draft resolution without stint, without any reservations. However, I did not want to submit another draft resolution that would derive from the statement I had made during the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. I wrote that statement very carefully and was trying to find, so to speak, innovative ideas so that we might not just beguile ourselves with hopes that may not be realizable.

Why could such hopes not be achieved? I submit, as I said, that those in power -- or the hierarchy that runs any State -- would like to maintain their supremacy over the people of that State. That is only natural: they are politicians, and they are therefore convinced that they are the best politicians to run the country in an orderly fashion. But two world wars and subsequent wars have taught us that, irrespective of ideology, the people in the seat of power are subject to pressures from within their own countries which eventually reflect on their relationships with other countries.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

Usually those pressures are economic. Take, for example, any country where activism has become the order of the day. I remember, in my younger days, there were always activists, but there were not as many as there are now. They have proliferated, especially since the Second World War -- and just before the Second World War, I must say. Some of them are what we call civil rights protagonists. They are well-meaning; they are espousers of what appear to be good causes but perhaps quite often are impracticable causes. They live in a world of their own, a utopia, so to speak. That is a laudable idea; however, they arouse the people, especially the politicians, who may benefit by perhaps taking some of those causes as planks in their platforms in order to gain power.

The second category of activists, therefore, is that of the politicians -- and I am not speaking from book learning: I have noticed this for the last 55 years or so. They promise almost anything so that they may be turned into power. This is nothing new. In the so-called democratic system, whether it is a Western system or a communist or socialist system, the pattern is the same: the object is to gain the seat of power. That is the objective but the methods differ.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

As I have mentioned time and again, no matter how we would like to see democracy prevail - not the utopian democracy, but the democratic approach of trying to achieve something good for the people - unfortunately it has reduced itself to a system of democracy by subscription and contribution. It stands to reason that those who contribute to the election of a representative will have to heed his demands. Sometimes they turn their backs on him, but if they know he is powerful economically or otherwise; or, to be fair, in labour-union activities, what do they do? They have to bow to his wishes regardless of whether they will not touch upon the interests of other groups in society. Therefore, this is the pattern that we are facing nowadays in the world: democracy by subscription and contribution.

"He who pays the piper calls the tune." That is a general rule; I do not say it always happens, because there are always some courageous people amongst the politicians who stand for what they think is right. If they have the personality to arouse the imagination of the people as to the justice of their stand, then they succeed and usually they are dubbed as statesmen. But how many statesmen have we been having since the Second World War?

I must say that the press media are the mercenaries of the politicians, and also people with economic and labour-union power. They draw images. They do not deny it. They create an image of any person if it is in their interest to see him hold his post, and for no other reason than that they will get support in the event those mass media get into trouble of one sort or another.

Having said that, I turn to the socialist countries. And with all due respect - I am talking objectively - their democracy is democracy by prescription. In order to elucidate what I mean when I say a "democracy by prescription", it is the State which prescribes the form of government and what should be done, and they put in the ingredients. Many times they are good ingredients that they give those who elect the men in the seat of power to drink. Some may find the prescription a little bitter or too sweet to be put into practice.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

In other words, summing up what I said about this kind of democratic approach, I shall say not that there is a sort of total impracticability, but, at least that, unfortunately, the things that are promised cannot always be delivered. And this for the simple reason that - I have read many books in my life, but I am talking from my humble experience - regardless of the nationality or ideology, these things have happened because society has become subject to the industrial and technological revolution. The community has less to say about the leaders, because the community and even the family, both of which are the pillars of society, have been dispersed. Distances have shrunk and people go wherever they are asked to go in order to earn a living. Therefore it gives those who can exercise pressure more impact, whether communists, socialists or Western countries - or even monarchies, so that you may not think I am bypassing monarchy, which is predicated on a tribal system. Incidentally, the tribal system is the most democratic in effect. But we in Saudi Arabia are also subject to many forces that have been brought about - by what? By the industrial and technological revolution.

What do these groups that exercise pressure on any Government have that makes them so omnipotent, sometimes behind the scenes and sometimes flagrantly? They have the means wherewith to make a government fall. I am not mentioning names. Those in the seat of power, no matter how faithful they are to their ideas and the platform of their programme, sometimes have to bow down to those who exercise power because the pressure brought to bear against them may make them fall. And it is natural that they rationalize to those who elected them, saying "We will try our best next time and see how we can meet your wishes". I refer to the common electorate; I am not talking about the pressure groups. The pressure groups serve only their petty interests, if I may say so, whether they are industrialists, businessmen or labour-union chiefs.

That is the situation that we have not tackled in the United Nations by way of draft resolutions, because it is indeed a difficult problem to tackle. It is not so easy. I am not blaming anyone, including myself, for not trying to elaborate a draft resolution seeking to bring to the attention of the people what actually obtains in society - again, regardless of ideology and political persuasion.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

Then, I might be asked why do I speak if nothing can be achieved by a draft resolution or even by my statement of the day? It is simply to pave the way for the young who may be more capable than I because they are in the mêlée now. They are the pillars of the future and perhaps they may be able to devise something, by way of draft resolutions or otherwise, in the United Nations or elsewhere, to achieve satisfactory results, to make us immune from or at least not so much in danger of a holocaust if by miscalculation a nuclear global war of mass destruction should break out.

I saw last night a very revealing advertisement in the New York Times inserted by a colonel or some military man who has seen the horrors of war. It is quite an advertisement. It says that the Soviet Union and the United States have in their arsenals atomic weapons leaving aside other weapons wherewith the United States could kill - I do not know the exact figure because I have no memory for figures - over 150 million Russians and conversely, the Soviet Union could kill at least 114 million or 115 million Americans. He substantiates those figures in that advertisement, and his fears are very articulate. This is a military man; I do not think he has any axe to grind. If he were the only person to write about these things I would say that perhaps he is too fearful, that wars have affected his personality so that his fears have grown to the point where he wants to get these things off his chest and let people know what might be the implications of a global war. I will not call it a 'world war' because the last two "world wars" were really European wars, in effect. Why do I concentrate on what this gentleman said in his advertisement in the New York Times - and he promised that other advertisements would appear, perhaps in other papers too, but I happen to have read this advertisement in the New York Times.

Have we not mentioned "overkill" time and again? At one time, 10 or 15 years ago, I heard about "ten times overkill". That means each country could kill ten times the population concentrated in urban districts of any other country.

(Mr. Baroodi, Saudi Arabia)

My colleagues and you, Sir, may say, what is the purpose of this statement? We all know these things, those of us who are committed to peace. Shall we go by platitudes, by pious hopes that eventually, through talking and talking, we may influence the people in the seat of power to muzzle anyone who exercises pressure on them, regardless of what country it is? I submit that during the two world wars and in the wars in the aftermath of those two world wars, our pious hopes were not fulfilled. Those pressure groups are still enamoured of their own power. Unfortunately, some of them want more wealth than they can use -- and I am not excepting any State whatsoever. For us in the Middle East the blessing of oil may yet become a curse. Everywhere people are becoming drunk with more wealth, knowing in their innermost hearts, that they cannot use it. Others are enamoured of power. They want power, not perhaps to be luminaries in their respective States, but the kind of power which Julius Caesar sought, and Napoleon Bonaparte -- Napoleon I. Others want both power and wealth, but when they achieve it it becomes banal, because they find that others have had power and wealth and that it is nothing unusual. So they seek distinction which deteriorates into vainglory. Where there is no aristocracy, as in this host country, what do people seek? They seek awards, honorary degrees, something to set them apart from the public. Man, weak as he is, falls for such exaggerated distinctions. It is pathetic, but the young generation is becoming conscious of the situation of my generation -- and the more recent generation, for that matter.

What is the gist of this statement, which I have thought about very carefully before deciding to speak? I am not going to do anything innovative. You know, Mr. Chairman, I felt sorry for you in regard to the proposal about that film and the amount of argument it elicited from those who want the status quo. And people who did not dare to vote for it, abstained just because they were afraid of their own people -- afraid that they might be if not awakened, then manipulated by people who make it their business to manipulate. As I said, the number of manipulators has increased a hundredfold since the Second World War.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

Well, what shall we do? Just talk here? I may embarrass the gentleman from Poland, not only because he looks to me to be very modest, but because from the way he introduced this draft resolution I could see with what controlled ardour he wants it to be voted upon in the affirmative. Perchance it might help.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

But have we not here, for the last 25 or 30 years, been exerting efforts in that direction? And what have we achieved? Let us be frank with ourselves. The more we spoke about disarmament, the more diabolical armaments were manufactured, and the trade in arms has augmented. And when one has arms in his arsenals, he may be tempted to use those arms to pursue his policy.

Again, what shall we do? I leave it to the young amongst us here. If they want perhaps to ask me a question or two, I will be happy - I will be their servant - to think of something novel. I have something novel. I mentioned a programme of 10 points in my statements at the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament, hoping that some of them would be taken up. Nobody took them up and I did not want to be so presumptuous as to think that I am the only one that has novel ideas. I have no monopolies on ideas. There are many people who really surprise me with their sense of analysis, with their capacity to see things as they actually are. But, like me, one of a foregoing generation, they find themselves helpless.

However, do not be helpless. The question is the survival of the world or its demise. Even if, God forbid, the major Powers confront each other militarily, it will not be they alone who will suffer; it will be the whole world, because the biosphere will be poisoned, and it will not be a world which is worth living in.

Therefore, I hope we have profited from the time spent on this. You, Mr. Chairman, although very considerate on the one hand, are a disciplinarian on the other hand, seeing to it that we employ the time allotted to the Committee - perhaps the most important Committee of the General Assembly - usefully.

It is not that I am trying to impress my friends here with my ideas. It is in the humble spirit, not of awakening their fears, but rather of perhaps whetting their appetites and stimulating their intelligence, so that we may have some new ideas rather than the platitudinous resolutions, 30 or 40 of them, that we have adopted - I lost count - with the effect that we have burdened the advisory board of eminent persons with so many tasks that its members have my fullest sympathy. They have that sympathy not only because of the hard work they will be confronted with, but because I know how committed Ambassador de Rozas of Argentina and Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico are to the question of

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

disarmament, as is my Polish colleague Mr. Trepczynski. He has kept silent; it may be that the better wisdom is such silence. There are others. I do not want to enumerate them lest I forget some. All of them are committed. I would also commiserate with them because at the thirty-fourth session they may give us perhaps very good ideas, but ideas that have to be within the framework of their terms of reference. In the meantime, it is up to everyone, including them, to come forward with something drastic that might awaken the minds of those in the seats of power. After all, they are human; they have families. They are fathers, and even if they are not fathers they are the rulers of their countries. Perhaps, by our work in the United Nations, we might encourage them to take a new approach - something practical, something pragmatic, something that may be difficult to put into practice. But all beginnings of such questions are difficult.

That is my humble statement, which has been elicited by our colleague from Poland, whom I salute for all the honesty and the genuine desire on his part, and no doubt on the part of his Government, to see to it that each one of us contributes towards the ultimate goal: peace, peace, peace.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we adjourn, I have to announce that the delegation of Panama wishes to become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.58.

I should also like to inform the Committee that the next meeting will take place tomorrow morning at 10.30, and that unless I hear views to the contrary, intend to close the list of speakers on the present item tomorrow, Tuesday, at 5 p.m. I would ask delegations that wish to take part in the debate to be good enough to bear this in mind and to have their names inscribed.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.