

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TENTH SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records *



AD HOC COMMITTEE OF THE
TENTH SPECIAL SESSION
4th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 7 June 1978
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 4TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

CONTENTS

REVIEW AND APPRAISAL OF THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION IN THE LIGHT OF THE PRESSING NEED TO ACHIEVE SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS IN THE FIELD OF DISARMAMENT, THE CONTINUATION OF THE ARMS RACE AND THE CLOSE INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISARMAMENT, INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

ADOPTION OF A DECLARATION ON DISARMAMENT

ADOPTION OF A PROGRAMME OF ACTION ON DISARMAMENT

REVIEW OF THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN DISARMAMENT AND OF THE INTERNATIONAL MACHINERY FOR NEGOTIATIONS ON DISARMAMENT, INCLUDING IN PARTICULAR THE QUESTION OF CONVENING A WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

* 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.

78-70214

Distr. GENERAL
A/S-10/AC.1/PV.4
8 June 1978
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 9, 10, 11 AND 12

REVIEW AND APPRAISAL OF THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION IN THE LIGHT OF THE PRESSING NEED TO ACHIEVE SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS IN THE FIELD OF DISARMAMENT, THE CONTINUATION OF THE ARMS RACE AND THE CLOSE INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISARMAMENT, INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

ADOPTION OF A DECLARATION ON DISARMAMENT

ADOPTION OF A PROGRAMME OF ACTION ON DISARMAMENT

REVIEW OF THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN DISARMAMENT AND OF THE INTERNATIONAL MACHINERY FOR NEGOTIATIONS ON DISARMAMENT, INCLUDING IN PARTICULAR THE QUESTION OF CONVENING A WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to draw the attention of delegations to the fact that the following documents have been distributed: A/S-10/AC.1/1, a letter dated 24 May 1978 addressed to the Secretary-General from the Permanent Representative of Yugoslavia to the United Nations and transmitting a message from the President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the General Assembly on the occasion of its special session devoted to disarmament; A/S-10/AC.1/2, a letter dated 24 May 1978 from the Permanent Representatives of Austria, Finland, Sweden and Yugoslavia addressed to the Secretary-General and transmitting the "Views of the Swiss Government on some of the problems to be discussed by the General Assembly at its tenth special session"; A/S-10/AC.43, a note verbale dated 23 May 1978 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and enclosing a copy of "A study on Zionist conventional and nuclear armament"; A/S-10/AC.1/4, a letter dated 26 May 1978 from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the Secretary-General and transmitting the text of a document entitled "Practical measures for ending the arms race - proposals of the Soviet Union"; A/S-10/AC.1/5, a letter dated 29 May 1978 from the Chairman of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund addressed to the President of the General Assembly and transmitting

(The Chairman)

a "Message of the UNICEF Executive Board to the tenth special session of the General Assembly adopted by consensus on 26 May 1978"; A/C-10/AC.1/6, a letter dated 29 May 1978 from the Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and transmitting the text of a "Resolution adopted at the Extraordinary Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries and Observers participating in the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament - 29 May 1978"; A/S-10/AC.1/7, a note verbale dated 30 May 1978 from the Permanent Mission of France addressed to the Secretariat and transmitting a "Memorandum from the French Government concerning an international satellite monitoring agency"; A/S.10/AC.1/8, a note verbale dated 30 May 1978 from the Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations addressed to the United Nations Secretariat transmitting a "Memorandum from the French Government concerning the establishment of an International Institute for Disarmament Research"; A/S-10/AC.1/9, a letter dated 2 June 1978 from the Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and transmitting a document entitled "Establishment of a world disarmament authority"; A/S-10/AC.1/10, a letter dated 5 June 1978 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Viet Nam to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and enclosing a note on the "Question of a zone of peace in South-East Asia"; A/S-10/AC.1/11, a note verbale dated 5 June 1978 from the Permanent Mission of Nigeria to the United Nations addressed to the Secretariat and enclosing a note entitled "Proposal by Nigeria for a programme of United Nations fellowships on disarmament"; A/S-10/AC.1/12, a note verbale dated 2 June 1978 from the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations addressed to the Secretariat and enclosing a draft working paper entitled "Contribution to the seismological verification of a comprehensive test ban"; A/S.10/AC.1/13, a note verbale dated 2 June 1978 from the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations addressed to the Secretariat and submitting a draft working paper entitled "Invitation to attend an international chemical-weapon verification workshop in the Federal Republic of Germany"; A/S-10/AC.1/14, a note verbale dated 6 June 1978 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations

(The Chairman)

addressed to the Secretary-General and transmitting a "Working paper on the question of 'Disarmament Day'"; A/S-10/AC.1/L.1, a draft resolution entitled "Military and nuclear collaboration with Israel" and co-sponsored by Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam and Yemen.

(The Chairman)

In connexion with the documents that have just been introduced, I should like to remind the Committee of what I said at our organizational meeting, that those delegations making oral proposals during the general debate, and those not doing so but intending to submit proposals later, should submit their proposals in writing before the deadline set by this Committee - noon on 12 June. It would facilitate the work of the Committee and of the Working Groups if presentations by delegations indicated in what section of the draft final document the delegations would like to see their texts discussed for possible inclusion.

I have had consultations with the chairmen of Working Groups A and B and with the Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Committee and members of the Secretariat. Everyone agreed that a deadline, namely 21 June, should be set for the completion of the Working Groups' activities. That is because the documents produced by the two Working Groups will have to be considered in plenary by this Ad Hoc Committee and, when approved, must be submitted to the plenary session of the General Assembly, together with the report of this Committee. It would seem logical that if the Assembly's work is to be concluded on 28 June the Working Groups should have as their deadline 21 June, so that it will be possible for us to discuss these documents at plenary meetings of this Committee, at least for a few days, and so that the plenary session of the General Assembly will also have a couple of days to adopt the final document and hear statements that delegations may wish to make.

On the same point, I appeal to all delegations taking part in the Working Groups or the Drafting Groups to bear in mind the time element. We have very little time, so it should be used as effectively as possible. All comments should be specific and direct and should be made succinctly, so that the Drafting Groups and the Working Groups can make real progress in their work.

I should also like to recall the appeal I made at the beginning of our meetings that delegations should be as flexible as possible, so that progress can be made. It seems superfluous to say that no consensus solution can be reached on intransigent positions. No one can expect a consensus on that basis. Therefore, if we want decisions to be made in the spirit of consensus, all delegations must make an effort to enable compromise formulas to be found.

(The Chairman)

At our organizational meeting we agreed also to hear progress reports from the chairmen of the Working Groups on Monday afternoon, in principle. Since the Working Groups began to meet on Friday, 2 June, the first progress report will be considered at next Friday's meeting. Since on Friday morning a Head of State is speaking in the plenary meeting, the meeting of this Committee will be held on Friday afternoon at 3 p.m. and at that time we shall hear those progress reports.

It is now my pleasure to call upon the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme.

Mr. TOLBA (Executive Director, United Nations Environment Programme): I am deeply honoured to have this opportunity of participating in this historic session of the General Assembly in my capacity as Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme as it addresses itself to one of the central challenges facing mankind today. We realize, of course, that the issues on the agenda of the special session cannot be resolved by intemperate rhetoric or glib panaceas, since the question of armaments is deeply rooted in our perceptions of security and in the competitiveness of human nature, which is often productive but can also degenerate into senseless conflict.

I am sure we all agree that the process of armaments control and reduction must be moved forward, and the opportunities presented by this session must be used to revise our assumptions regarding the principal threats to national and global security. Over the ages, the nations of the world have been accustomed to thinking and acting as though the principal threats they faced arose from possible aggressive acts of other nations. I do not think we can maintain that any longer without severe qualification.

I say that for two reasons. First, we have come to see in our generation that the deterioration of the human environment and the depletion of the productive capacity of the earth's principal biological systems, on which the global economy depends, pose most serious threats not only to the continuing welfare of nations but also to the security of mankind as a whole. I am not suggesting that we must choose between giving our attention to questions of international security and to environmental problems. It is not an "either-or"

choice, and that is the second fact I want to stress. Wars and the arms race are themselves the source of severe threats to the whole human environment. We must see to it that we are not so mesmerized by the threats to our welfare and security posed by armed conflict that the quality of the human environment is allowed to degenerate to the point where there is nothing much left worth fighting for.

From the outset the international environmental movement has voiced its concern that the human environment should not be endangered by the development and use of armaments. It was largely environmental concerns that led to existing arms control agreements. The use of any weapon has an environmental impact and the development, testing and use of weapons of mass destruction represent man's deliberate destruction of all forms of life. Even conventional high explosives, chemical agents and incendiaries can have an enormous ecological impact, as has recently been abundantly demonstrated.

The declaration of the nations of the world at the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm in 1972 stated unambiguously that man and his environment must be spared the effects of nuclear weapons and all other means of mass destruction. It called upon States to try to reach prompt agreement, through the relevant international organs, on the elimination and complete destruction of such weapons. The Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), which concluded its sixth session less than two weeks ago, considered

"that the environmental consequences of the arms race, including weapons with harmful impacts for present and future generations and irreversible deterioration of the environment should be brought to the attention of the General Assembly and acknowledged the intention of the Executive Director to address the General Assembly at its special session."

It is heartening to see these types of weapons figuring so highly on the proposed list of priorities in disarmament negotiations which the special session is now considering.

It would be redundant to reiterate here all the environmental consequences of the arms race; they are known to all members of this Committee. Suffice it to say that the development, testing, transport and use of weapons, not only of

weapons of mass destruction but also of conventional weapons, have varying but clear deleterious effects on man's health as well as on the health of the environment, be it soil, water, air or any of the various ecosystems around us, let alone the irrational use of our scarce natural resources and the irrational use of much needed human and financial resources.

I am well aware that a start has already been made on the process of arms reduction and control, and the record is impressive. We have the partial test-ban Treaty; the Non-Proliferation Treaty; the Convention on biological and bacteriological weapons; the Treaty prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea bed and ocean floor; the Treaty concerning the peaceful uses of outer space; and the recent Convention on environmental modification as a weapon of war. The General Assembly at its last session called upon the Secretary-General to prepare a study on weapons of mass destruction and their effects on the environment, particularly their role in inducing desertification.

Those are all commendable steps, but it must be admitted that the process has been sluggish. This special session presents a most valuable opportunity to accelerate the process and move it forward. It represents an opportunity that must not be passed by and the links between disarmament and the environment must be taken fully into account, because the stresses and strains related to the arms race are increasing.

(Mr. Tolba, UNEP)

I know the reports before you stress the linkages between disarmament and development and propose excellent guidelines for an in-depth study on the subject. What I want to stress on this occasion is that peace, environment and development are inseparable. Peace is the only road to a better quality of life; and a healthy, productive environment is essential to the development which so many nations badly need, and which the release of resources through disarmament would help to accelerate. In that respect, I pledge the readiness of UNEP to co-operate with other members of the United Nations system in helping in the preparation of the most difficult but most needed study you will be embarking on. We in UNEP are firmly convinced that development - proper development - can only be achieved through peace and disarmament. We simply add that what we should always be talking about is environmentally sound development, sustained development, development without destruction.

I am sure you all know more facts about the arms race than I do. I am also sure the reports before you and the statements made here and in the general debate referred to a large body of such facts. But, still, let us look again at some of these facts. The development needs of the third world countries are urgent; yet global arms trade with them amounts to about three quarters of the total trade. Moreover, much sophisticated weaponry is going into areas of high tension, with consequent dangers to man and the environment.

If we consider skilled manpower, which is so badly needed for development in both developed and developing countries, you all know that some 500,000 of the world's best scientists and engineers are engaged in military research and development, which costs almost as much as all other global research and development activities. The total number of men and women now engaged full time in arms factories and research, and in the armed forces of the nations, is estimated by several sources to be somewhere between 60 and 70 million.

(Mr. Tolba, UNEP)

The total quantity of raw materials consumed for military purposes on a world-wide basis is staggering; yet there are shortages of non-renewable resources in both developed and developing countries.

If we take the question of costs, military expenditures - as again you all know - have increased thirty-fold this century. The figure in United States dollars for 1975 amounted to an astronomical \$371 billion, is now probably over \$400 billion and still rising. To put it more simply, world expenditures for military purposes eat up close to \$40 million per hour. A good deal of such expenditure can be channelled into environmentally sound development everywhere, in both developed and developing countries. If only one third of the world's military expenditures could be directed to an international fund for such development, developing countries would be able to meet their urgent needs and build the necessary economic and social infrastructure for a good life.

Another fact is that according to the best available estimates, the world total of arms transfers has increased from an average of \$9.5 billion annually in the 1973-1975 period to \$13.3 billion in 1976. If a tax at the rate of 5 per cent were levied on actual transfers, this should yield more than \$650 million per year, based on 1976 estimates. If levied on arms transfer agreements, that figure would become almost \$1.5 billion. More important, a tax at this rate would have the effect of reducing the volume of sales until, we hope, they are completely stopped.

In the next few years the focus of attention will be on the planning of a new international development strategy. Such a forward step requires an easing of international tensions, a growth in co-operative endeavours, and a continuing review of the linkages between disarmament, environment and development.

In section A, paragraph 5 of the International Development Strategy, the General Assembly stated that:

"The success of international development activities will depend in large measures on improvement in the general international situation, particularly on concrete progress towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control."

It further stated that:

(Mr. Tolba, UNEP)

"Progress towards general and complete disarmament should release substantial additional resources which could be utilized for the purpose of economic and social development, in particular that of developing countries." (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV))

Despite the magnitude and complexities of the challenge inherent in any demilitarization of the world's economy, the United Nations cannot falter here if it is to fulfil the expectations that the world continues to invest in it and to discharge its responsibilities for peace and human well-being to this and succeeding generations.

We are indeed at a crossroads with an increasingly impatient world quick to remind us that - and here I quote from the Cocoyoc Declaration adopted at Mexico in October 1974 and presented to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session:

"Thirty years have passed since the ... United Nations ... launched the effort to establish a new international order. Today, that order has reached a critical turning point. Its hopes of creating a better life for the whole human family have been largely frustrated. It has proved impossible /up till now/ to meet the 'inner limit' of satisfying fundamental human needs. On the contrary, more people are hungry, sick, shelterless and illiterate today than when the United Nations was first set up." (A/C.2/292, page 1)

Four years after Cocoyoc, one cannot claim that the situation has changed.

Today the call is for equity and a new international economic order premised on principles of environmentally sound and sustainable development and geared to the satisfaction of basic human needs. None of this is possible, however, without a fundamental restructuring of international economic relations, a reordering of global priorities, and a redeployment of our shrinking resources towards the urgent developmental and environmental problems facing mankind and vital to our collective security and survival.

Mr. KITTANI (Iraq): On behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam and Yemen, as well as on behalf of my own delegation, I have the honour formally to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/S-10/AC.1/L.1 to the Ad Hoc Committee.

Before turning to the paragraphs of the draft resolution there is one important point that we want to stress. The members of the Committee will have noticed that the 26-Power draft resolution is submitted under item 9 of the agenda of this special session; that is no coincidence. That item concerns, and indeed emphasizes, "the interrelationship between disarmament, international peace and security and economic development"; while agenda items 10, 11 and 12 deal, respectively, with the introduction, programme of action and machinery to be incorporated into the principal document of the session.

It is our submission that the continued escalation of Israeli armaments constitutes a direct and grave threat to international peace and security and seriously and adversely affects the economic and social development of a large number of Arab and African Members of this Organization. The General Assembly cannot let this special session pass without dealing with this clear and present threat and without taking the minimum steps to avert the dire consequences inherent in the continuation of that escalation.

I turn now to the text of the draft resolution; its preambular paragraphs are statements of fact. A vast number of Member States are indeed "gravely concerned over the continued and rapid Israeli military build-up" and they are seriously "alarmed by the increasing evidence regarding acquisition by Israel of nuclear weapons". May I, in this connexion, refer to the documented study (A/S-10/AC.1/3) circulated by my delegation which the Chairman was kind enough to introduce along with the other documents earlier this afternoon. I wish to stress in this regard in particular the chapters of that study dealing with Israel's nuclear capacity and the close military co-operation, including nuclear co-operation and collaboration, between Israel and South Africa.

(Mr. Kittani, Iraq)

The third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution deals with Israel's use of cluster bombs against the refugee camps and civilian targets in southern Lebanon. In addition to the particularly inhumane nature of that act, it is pertinent to draw attention to the fact that the United States Government has officially confirmed that the use of those deadly weapons by Israel violated the agreement between the suppliers and the users. We all know of more than one case in which the United States has instituted an arms embargo against an ally for much less serious acts; but Israel, evidently, is immune from similar actions on the part of Washington.

The fourth preambular paragraph recalls the repeated resolutions of the Assembly on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. Israel's refusal to sign and ratify the Non-Proliferation Treaty or to submit its nuclear installations to international safeguards and inspection is the single most important obstacle in the way of the implementation of those resolutions.

The fifth preambular paragraph states a fact which has become self-evident and can easily be recognized by any fair-minded person or Government. It reads:

"Recognizing that the continued escalation of Israeli armament constitutes a threat to international peace and security and underlies Israel's persistent defiance of General Assembly resolutions and its policy of expansion, occupation and denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people".

The same can easily be said for the next preambular paragraph.

The last preambular paragraph recalls the repeated condemnations by the General Assembly of the intensification of military collaboration between Israel and South Africa. This is of particular significance because the General Assembly has already adopted a resolution - I refer to resolution 32/105 F - dealing with one side of that military collaboration, and it is our submission that this is the time to complete that action, since this dangerous serpent has two heads, not one.

(Mr. Kittani, Iraq)

Reference to resolution 32/105 F, adopted at the last regular session and entitled "Military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa", makes my task of introducing the operative part of our draft resolution a simple one, for it is almost identical with the pertinent paragraphs of resolution 32/105 F. We should like simply and humbly to invite representatives to compare the two texts.

Finally, I wish to refer to document A/S-10/AC.1/6 - which, again, the Chairman was kind enough to introduce to the Ad Hoc Committee at the beginning of this meeting - which contains a letter dated 29 May 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka to the United Nations, in his capacity as Chairman of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries, addressed to the Secretary-General.

(Mr. Kittani, Iraq)

This document emanates from the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and leaders of delegations of Member States of the Non-Aligned Group of Countries, meeting in extraordinary session in New York on 29 May 1978. I should like to read out its opening paragraph and the paragraph pertinent to our draft resolution. The opening paragraph in question reads:

"Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Leaders of Delegations of Member States of the Non-Aligned Group of Countries ...

"1. Unanimously endorse the following sections of the Final Communiqué adopted by the Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries in Havana, 15-20 May 1978, relating to international security and détente; disarmament; the question of foreign military bases; utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes; the escalation of Israeli conventional and nuclear armaments and South Africa's plan to develop nuclear weapons:" (A/S-10/AC.1/6, annex, p. 1)

And the paragraph pertinent to our draft resolution reads:

"The Bureau" - and the Ministerial meeting of all non-aligned countries unanimously endorsed this - "condemned the Israeli military escalation in conventional arms and denounced its intentions of possessing nuclear weapons, as a serious threat to international peace and security and therefore called on all members of the Non-Aligned Movement at the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament to endorse a proposal:

"(a) Calling upon all States, in particular the United States of America, to co-operate fully in effective international action, in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, to avert the grave menace to international peace and security caused by the continued escalation of Israeli armament;

"(b) Requesting the Security Council to call upon all States under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter and irrespective of any existing contracts, to refrain from any supply of arms, ammunition, military equipment or vehicles, or any spare parts thereof, to Israel; to ensure that such supplies do not reach Israel through other parties and to end all transfer of nuclear equipment or fissionable material or technology to Israel." (Ibid., annex, p. 4)

(Mr. Kittani, Iraq)

What I have just stated, in short, sums up the operative part of our draft resolution. In conclusion, may I commend the draft resolution to the Ad Hoc Committee with the earnest hope that it will receive the serious attention and support which this grave situation deserves.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): I take pleasure in introducing the two working papers (A/S-10/AC.1/12 and A/S-10/AC.1/13) which the Chairman has already announced this afternoon.

They refer to an announcement made by Federal Chancellor Schmidt in his address to the special session on 25 May in which he underlined the importance the Federal Republic of Germany attaches to effective international verification of the compliance with arms control and disarmament agreements. In this context he expressed the readiness of the Federal Government to make available our experiences and facilities in this field. My delegation therefore is submitting today two working papers:

First, a comprehensive test-ban agreement will need an adequate verification system. My country participated in the Ad Hoc Working Group of Seismic Experts in Geneva. The final report of that Working Group contained theoretical conclusions as to the actual functioning of a monitoring system and recommended a practical test phase on that basis.

The Federal Republic of Germany is ready to make available for this test phase the Central Seismological Observatory Graefenberg for an international seismic data exchange reviewing the technical possibilities of monitoring a comprehensive test ban.

Second, the Federal Republic of Germany, in 1954, renounced unilaterally the production of chemical weapons and also accepted international verification procedures. Our experience has shown that such specific controls can be effective, financially bearable and without harm to commercial interests. This has been confirmed by a Pugwash Workshop held in one of our major chemical production plants in August 1977, which was attended by representatives of East and West.

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal
Republic of Germany)

The Federal Government is ready to share its experience in this field with others. It therefore invites all interested Member States of the United Nations to send industrial, scientific and administrative experts to our country in order to study on the spot the functioning of the verification system.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): I should like to introduce the proposal on a programme of United Nations fellowships on disarmament, contained in document A/S-10/AC.1/11, to which the Chairman referred earlier this afternoon.

The United Nations General Assembly special session devoted to disarmament has generated considerable interest. It is necessarily, in the view of my delegation, that this interest should be sustained world-wide. It has been recognized that disarmament is of interest to all countries and to all peoples. We think that in view of its close bearing on international peace and security, as well as on international development efforts, disarmament should no longer be the sole concern of just a few Powers. It should indeed not be only the preoccupation of public opinion in the developed countries. We think it should be the preoccupation of policy-makers and public opinion throughout the world.

Yet it can be said that in view of their complexities disarmament issues have really not received universal attention among all Member States of the United Nations which those issues deserve. This is in no way a reflection on the importance which should be attached to disarmament. It is, rather, in part due to the lack of general information easily accessible to those outside the limited circle of the few countries actively involved in disarmament negotiations. But we have to face the fact that this lack of wide participation is also due to the lack of expertise in this field in many countries, particularly among the group of developing countries. Yet the role of the United Nations in disarmament will become increasingly significant as a result of the decisions which this special session will take.

As part of the efforts, therefore, to enhance the role of the United Nations, my delegation believes that the special session should establish a programme that will promote greater awareness and greater expertise in issues of disarmament in Member States. A fellowship programme for officials nominated by Member States, we believe, should be launched. This programme will give the participants an in-depth course of lectures and seminars on disarmament issues, followed by an observation of the negotiations in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament whenever it is carrying out concrete negotiations. Under this programme also, the General Assembly, we hope, will approve funds for up to 20 annual fellowships for participants, mainly, though not exclusively, from developing countries. The Centre for Disarmament will organize a programme drawing on expertise from the United Nations system and from Member States and research institutes.

My delegation believes that this proposal can fit into part G of the section on Programme of Action, whose heading will, of course, be amended to read "Studies, Training and Information".

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

It is pertinent to note that in the past similar programmes have been approved by the General Assembly. In its resolution 926 (X) adopted on 14 December 1955, for instance, the General Assembly established a programme of advisory services, fellowships and scholarships in the field of human rights. The resolution authorized the Secretary-General

"... To take the programme authorized by the present resolution into account in preparing the budgetary estimates of the United Nations."

My delegation believes that the programme which was launched in 1955 in the field of human rights has been positively beneficial. The proposal of my delegation for a programme in the field of disarmament will, we are firmly convinced, prove to be of equal if not greater benefit, not only to the Member States whose officials will participate in it, but also to the United Nations through well-informed inputs, ideas and suggestions which will be available during its deliberations and negotiations on disarmament.

Naturally the question of the financial implications of that proposal will have arisen in the minds of representatives. We have also given it considerable thought, weighing the likely cost of the programme against the likely benefit. Our conclusion - and I hope that this will also be the conclusion of representatives here - is that the cost of the programme will pay for itself several times over when we consider the benefit which will be derived from it. We think that it is an investment by the international community which is worth making.

Mr. CHEN Chu (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Now the Ad Hoc Committee has started its work to prepare the final document for the special session. Over the past year and more, the Preparatory Committee, chaired by His Excellency Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, has held five sessions and done a lot of work. It has prepared and submitted a draft final document for consideration by the special session. Since the Chinese delegation did not participate in the drafting of the documents in the Preparatory Committee, we would like to take this opportunity to state briefly our views on this draft.

We have noted that the draft final document has embodied a number of positive views and proposals of the non-aligned and other small and medium-sized countries. For instance, it points out that no real progress has been made so far in the

(Mr. Chen Chu, China)

crucial field of the reduction of armaments while the arms race continues, that the disarmament negotiations and measures should follow the principles of respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of any State, and non-interference in the internal affairs of States and peaceful settlement of disputes, and that in adopting disarmament measures, equity and balance should be maintained. It stresses the special responsibilities of the two major nuclear Powers for halting and reversing the arms race in all its aspects and it calls on them to take the lead in drastically reducing their nuclear weapons. It stresses the need for the nuclear countries to undertake to refrain from the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones; it calls for the conclusion of a convention on the non-use of nuclear weapons; it stands for the prohibition of the establishment of new foreign military bases and the stationing of troops in foreign territories, the withdrawal of foreign troops and dismantling of foreign military bases; it calls for the prohibition of chemical and incendiary weapons; it calls for an undertaking not to concentrate armed forces near the frontiers of other States; it affirms that disarmament measures must not be interpreted as hindering the exercise of the right of all States to develop, transfer, acquire and use nuclear technology, equipment and materials for peaceful purposes; it asks the two major nuclear-weapon States to reduce by 10 per cent their military expenditure and to devote a considerable part of the savings to the promotion of the economic and social development of the developing countries; it affirms the right of all States to participate on an equal footing in disarmament deliberations which directly concern their national security; and it calls for the creation of new forums for disarmament deliberations and negotiations with a greater geographical and political representative character. All these would be conducive to progress in disarmament and merit attention. At the same time, we must not fail to see certain inadequacies in the draft final document, which leave room for further thoughts. We should like to offer some observations for the consideration of the Committee.

First, on the question of war and peace, the people of all countries are for peace and against a world war. It is necessary for the document of this special session to point out the danger of a new world war. At the same time, it must avoid spreading the horror of war but should enhance the confidence of the people

(Mr. Chen Chu, China)

in striving to put off the outbreak of war. The root cause of world war is the rivalry of imperialism and social-imperialism for hegemony, and the arms race is a means by which they seek hegemony. While opposing the arms race, we deem it necessary to point out in explicit terms that it is mainly the two super-Powers that are locked in such a race, and it is inappropriate to make the generalized reference to "the massive and competitive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced" by States. Otherwise, everyone is to blame for the arms race, and that is precisely what the super-Powers want, because they are doing their utmost to shift the blame for the arms race on to all other States, so as to evade disarmament by themselves. The struggle for genuine disarmament is undoubtedly beneficial to the safeguarding of international peace and security. But it must also be noted that the super-Powers cannot easily accept any reasonable proposals on disarmament, and that in the existing circumstances in which imperialism and social-imperialism still exist, it is all the more difficult to realize general and complete disarmament. Therefore, one must not over-estimate the possibilities and role of disarmament, or regard it as the fundamental way to the maintenance of world peace. It must be stressed that the struggle for disarmament will play a positive role in safeguarding world peace and putting off the outbreak of war only when it is linked with, and subordinate to, the struggle to safeguard national independence, defend State sovereignty and territorial integrity, oppose hegemonism and the policies of war and combat aggression and interference.

(Mr. Chen Chu, China)

Second, on the principles of disarmament, as is known to all, while possessing super-arsenals which far exceed those of all other countries, the two super-Powers are stepping up their arms expansion in all fields. It is the common demand of the great number of small and medium-sized countries that disarmament should begin with the reduction of arms of the two super-Powers. In their statements in the general debate many representatives have pointed out that the Soviet Union and the United States bear special responsibilities for disarmament. Some even pointed out explicitly that "the first and foremost objective of any disarmament strategy must remain the reduction of the arsenals of the two super-Powers". This indisputable and fundamental principle of disarmament should be clearly embodied in the principles of the declaration and given some expression in the measures listed in the Programme of Action. It is inappropriate to make a general reference to "the cessation of nuclear-weapon testing by all States", "agreement on the simultaneous cessation by all States of the production of nuclear weapons" and "the limitation and reduction of the armed forces of States and of their conventional weapons" etc., because the super-Powers may use this as a pretext to reject disarmament, and to maintain and enhance the supremacy in their nuclear and conventional armaments for world hegemony. The rationale in this regard has been expounded by the Chairman of the Chinese delegation in his statement in the general debate, and I am not going to repeat it here.

Third, on the priorities of disarmament, in our view, it is entirely necessary to list as priorities of disarmament the reduction of nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction, conventional weapons and reduction of armed forces. Such a provision must not be interpreted as attaching importance only to nuclear disarmament to the neglect of the urgency of the reduction of conventional armaments. Equal importance should be attached to both, and the two should proceed in conjunction. Special care must be taken to prevent the super-Powers from taking advantage of the urgent desire of the peoples for nuclear disarmament to play tricks on the question of nuclear disarmament, while delaying the reduction of their conventional armaments and even stepping up their competition in this field. One must not fail to see the present-day

(Mr. Chen Chu, China)

reality. The massive build-up of the super-Powers' conventional armaments is posing a grave threat to the independence and security of all States. In the absence of a massive reduction of the super-Powers' conventional armaments, the increasing danger of war cannot be lessened. We deem it necessary to incorporate in the section entitled "Immediate and short-term measures to halt and reverse the arms race" the following wording:

"Call on the two super-Powers to halt their arms race, set out to destroy by stages their nuclear weapons and drastically reduce their conventional weapons."

Fourth, on nuclear test ban and nuclear non-proliferation, since the so-called complete nuclear test ban, like the earlier partial nuclear test ban, far from restricting the two major nuclear Powers from continuing the production, stockpiling, development and use of nuclear weapons, will only help them to maintain and consolidate their nuclear hegemony and will not help remove the threat of nuclear war, we are therefore firmly opposed to the conclusion of a so-called "comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty". For the same reason, we cannot agree with the formulation: "the simultaneous cessation by all States of the production of nuclear weapons, the development and production of new types of nuclear weapons". If the two super-Powers do not destroy their nuclear weapons drastically, what reason do they have to ask other States to stop the production of nuclear weapons? As regards the so-called "nuclear non-proliferation", we have always held that the so-called "Non-Proliferation Treaty" is a conspiracy contrived by the Soviet Union and the United States to maintain their nuclear monopoly. They are using it as a means not only to prevent other States from developing their nuclear capabilities for self-defence, but also to restrict other States from using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The criticisms on this score made by the Foreign Ministers of Yugoslavia, Pakistan and Argentina are very convincing. While redoubling their efforts for the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons, the two super-Powers want to contain the horizontal proliferation, describing it as an important step to eliminate the threat of nuclear war. This will convince no one. There is no reason to impose the NPT on all States.

(Mr. Chen Chu, China)

Fifth, on the conventional armaments of the small and medium-sized countries, apart from pointing out the urgent need of first reducing the conventional armaments of the super-Powers, the final document should stress the need of many small and medium-sized countries to acquire the necessary capabilities for self-defence. There can be no indiscriminate talk about the reduction of conventional armaments. It is especially necessary to guard against the super-Powers' using the so-called general disarmament to weaken the strength of small and medium-sized countries for resisting aggression. As for restricting the transfer of conventional weapons, it should be made clear that all States have the right to acquire the necessary conventional weapons on an equal footing for the purpose of strengthening their national defence and defending their national independence and security, and that it is also necessary to oppose the attempt of exporting countries to use the export of conventional armaments for exploitation, interference and control of other countries, not to say their attempt to incite conflicts and wars among States.

Sixth, on disarmament and development, we consider it entirely reasonable for the small and medium-sized countries to demand that the real resources now being used for military purposes be released for the economic and social development in the world, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries. The military expenses of the Soviet Union and the United States account for over two thirds of those of all countries in the world. A large proportion of it comes from their plunder of the developing countries and it should be returned to its rightful owner. We support the proposal made by some countries for incorporating in the final document a call on the two major nuclear Powers to take the lead in channelling the resources released through the reduction of their military budgets towards the development of the developing countries.

Seventh, on the so-called international agreements on disarmament, we cannot agree with the attempt to insert into the final document a text lauding various international agreements on so-called disarmament and to impose such agreements on all States.

(Mr. Chen Chu, China)

Numerous facts prove that the existing so-called international agreements on disarmament concocted by the super-Powers, far from truly restricting the arms race and promoting disarmament, have become instruments for the super-Powers to deceive world opinion, cover up their acts of arms expansion and war preparations and prevent other States from strengthening their capabilities for self-defence. They do nothing but harm. If any mention is to be made about these agreements in the final document, it would be necessary to expose their hypocritical nature, instead of calling on more States to join them.

Eight, on machinery, we support the just demand of the numerous small and medium-sized countries for reforming the existing disarmament machineries. The state of affairs in which the machinery for disarmament is controlled by the super-Powers must be thoroughly changed. We propose that the part on "machinery" in the final document should state in the following explicit terms:

"The machinery for disarmament must ensure the realization of the reasonable proposals and just demands of all countries on disarmament and should be truly free from super-Power control and influence. It is especially necessary to guard against the super-Powers' attempt to use the machinery for disarmament as a means to delay disarmament and cover up their arms expansion. The questions of disarmament and international security, which concern the interests of all countries, should be deliberated by an international organ with the participation of all countries under the auspices of the United Nations. This international organ shall study and determine the specific items and procedures for disarmament negotiations and set up a negotiating body through consultations on a fair and equitable basis for concrete negotiations on measures for disarmament. The reduction of the super-Powers' nuclear and conventional armaments first should be given priority for consideration and deliberation. The negotiating body should be responsible to the deliberative organ and make timely report to the organ on its work".

In our view, the existing Conference of the Committee on Disarmament fails to meet the aforesaid principles. A new start should be made, and after the establishment of a deliberative organ a new negotiating body, which is fully representative, should be set up. With the establishment of a deliberative

(Mr. Chen Chu, China)

organ and a negotiating body for disarmament, which can reflect the views of all countries, all questions relating to disarmament can be discussed and considered there seriously. Accordingly, there will be no need at all for the World Disarmament Conference which the Soviet Union has been peddling over the years out of ulterior motives.

In order to present concisely our position on the question of disarmament, I hereby submit a Working Paper of the Chinese delegation. The statement I have made above is a further explanation of the basic principles embodied in the Working Paper. We hope these principled views will be given serious consideration by the Ad Hoc Committee and find full expression in the final document.

Besides, on the basis of the Working Paper we have submitted and in the light of the reasonable propositions contained in the statements of many third world and other small and medium-sized countries in the general debate, the Chinese delegation has already proposed certain concrete amendments to the Introduction, Declaration and the Programme of Action in the draft final document in Working Groups A and B respectively. We request that the Secretariat arrange for the circulation of these amendments as official documents of the Ad Hoc Committee, so as to facilitate the drafting work. We shall formally put forward our proposed amendments to the Preamble of the draft resolution and the portion on "Machinery" in the final document at an appropriate time, and we would also request that they be circulated as conference documents by that time.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): At the plenary meeting of this special session on 30 May 1978, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, Mr. Sunao Sonoda, appealed to the world in general, and to the nuclear-weapon States, in particular, for the complete abolition of nuclear weapons as an ultimate goal. At that time, he stated that:

"Today's nuclear weapons have a destructive capacity which defy comparison with the atomic bombs used against the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. If nuclear weapons were ever to be used again, the ensuing devastation and suffering would be enormous, quite beyond our imagination.

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

The Japanese people are firmly united in the conviction that such a tragedy must never be repeated. I believe that this determination is shared today not only by the Japanese people, but also by the peoples of the entire world. In the light of such a world-wide conviction, I think it would be highly significant to proclaim 6 August as Disarmament Day". (A/S-10/PV.9, p. 33)

A similar appeal has been made by the Japanese non-governmental organizations to the special session.

Indeed, it is most appropriate for us to set a specific date to remind all countries, as well as all peoples of the world, of the urgent necessity for progress towards general and complete disarmament, particularly in the area of nuclear disarmament, which is of the highest priority and the supreme task of our time.

Incidentally, my delegation has been informed so far that most of the delegations which the Japanese non-governmental organizations approached have shown favourable reactions to such an appeal.

In the view of my delegation, the most appropriate date for this purpose would be 6 August, when mankind experienced the first atomic bombing in its history.

Accordingly, the Japanese delegation wishes to propose the insertion of the following new paragraph, as contained in the working paper in document A/S-10/AC.1/14 dated 6 June 1978, immediately after paragraph 1 of section G.2. (Information) of the Programme of Action:

"The General Assembly proclaims 6 August as Disarmament Day".

Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (interpretation from French): Among the various initiatives that it has submitted during the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, France has proposed the creation of an international satellite monitoring agency and an international disarmament research institute. I should like briefly to spell out the precise scope and content of those proposals, which have been presented in two memorandums distributed as official documents of this session.

A number of considerations prompted us to propose the creation of an international satellite monitoring agency (A/S-10/AC.1/7). First, the realization that any disarmament agreement must be accompanied by the creation of a system of verification designed to ensure that the commitments undertaken by the parties to that agreement are effectively kept. That is an essential prerequisite for any progress in disarmament. Furthermore, quite apart from disarmament, the international community is considering the possibility of devising measures to increase international confidence and security. Various suggestions made in that connexion necessarily run up against the need to solve problems connected with monitoring their implementation.

So far, the application of what might be called conventional monitoring methods either has not been agreed upon among the parties involved or has been revealed to be insufficiently effective. That does not necessarily mean that those methods must be jettisoned or that the attempts to set them up are pointless. But it must be seen that at the present time the problem of monitoring disarmament agreements and confidence-building measures remains in its entirety.

However, the advent of space technology and the constant progress being made in it makes it possible for us to examine this problem from a completely new angle. Earth observation satellites gather extremely precise data for civilian purposes but even more so for military purposes. The possibilities of observation by those satellites are well known to the experts gathered here, and already the talks on disarmament taking place between the two main space Powers are broadly based on reliance on that technology. Certain disarmament experts from those countries have further demonstrated

(Mr. Leprette, France)

that the use of space technology for international monitoring is perfectly feasible. To envisage the use of earth observation satellites to monitor disarmament is therefore by no means a long-shot bet on the future. It is simply a question of noting a fact and drawing the correct conclusions from it in the disarmament efforts now being made by the international community. In the opinion of the French Government, the international satellite monitoring agency would have the job of gathering and processing information from earth observation satellites in order to disseminate it to the parties entitled to request it.

As we see it, the agency's authority should not do violence to the principle that States are internationally committed only to the extent that they consent to be so committed. On the basis of that principle, the agency would take part in monitoring the implementation of international disarmament agreements or security agreements or would carry out inquiries into specific situations. The document to which I have referred spells out the procedure proposed by France to carry out that task.

The best formula for the agency's status would appear to be to make it a specialized agency of the United Nations. That would make it possible at one and the same time to adapt its status to the specific nature of its mission and its funds and to have recourse to a formula that has stood the test of time in the United Nations family.

The proposal for an international satellite monitoring agency does of course raise the question of the technical capacity that it should be given and how it should be financed. There is nothing insurmountable in that, and France wishes above all to adopt a realistic approach. The agency's technological means will have to be set up gradually. It will not be able to have them all immediately. Therefore, it will have to rely on those possessed by the space Powers, particularly their satellite capacity, in a way to be defined between those States and the agency.

(Mr. Leprette, France)

In his connexion, it must be remembered that in coming years the number of States in a position to use observer capacity from space will increase and that therefore the agency's sources of information will become more diversified. At the same time, in order to ensure adequate autonomy for the agency, it is necessary that it should very quickly acquire a data processing centre and adequate staff to carry out its functions. It could subsequently develop its own means, to the point of having its own observation satellites.

For such a progressive development, the agency's running costs may be considered quite reasonable. The estimates of the cost of the investment and of running costs show that. Financing could come from a number of sources, in particular obligatory payments, voluntary payments taking account of contributions in kind by the space Powers, and payments for services rendered by the agency.

France is well aware of the problems involved in this proposal, but a detailed study shows, in our opinion, that none of them is insurmountable. However, it is essential that at this stage the proposal be carefully examined by the international community. That is why we request that there should be a decision at this special session to create a committee of experts whose job it would be to study the proposal, a committee made up of experts from the States most competent in this field, with due regard to a balanced geographical distribution. That committee of experts, working on the basis of a mandate to be drawn up by the General Assembly, should report on its work to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

This brings me to another proposal made by France, that for the creation of an international institute for disarmament research. The proposal is based on the concept that disarmament negotiations must be backed up by objective technical studies. The proposed institute would therefore be essentially designed to pursue a permanent programme of conceptual and applied research on disarmament matters and questions of international security. Its work should be conducted in a completely independent manner, in conjunction with the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the organs linked with him, particularly the United Nations Disarmament Centre.

(Mr. Leprette, France)

To this end, the institute should be an autonomous entity within the United Nations family, with a director-general and a governing council. That council, appointed by the Secretary-General, should be made up of independent persons chosen on the basis of their contribution to the cause of peace and disarmament and their scientific qualifications.

The institute's mandate should make it possible for it to avoid in any way overlapping what is being done by the United Nations Disarmament Centre, whose mission would remain more specifically linked with disarmament negotiations. In other words, the Centre would possibly have a less forward-looking and theoretical role than that which would be given to the institute.

The memorandum in document A/S-10/AC.1/8 contains a more detailed account of the views of the French Government on the status, the mandate and the financing of the international institute for disarmament research. Those views are purely suggestions, and that is why the French delegation considers that it would be fitting for the General Assembly to set up a group of experts to study all their implications.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The position of the Soviet Union on the most urgent questions of disarmament are to be found in the statement made at the plenary meeting of the special session on 26 May 1978 by the head of the Soviet delegation, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, and also in the document which has been distributed by the Soviet delegation on practical measures for ending the arms race (A/C.1/5), a proposal of the Soviet Union to which the Chairman referred today. On the basis of those documents the Soviet delegation is putting forward at the present meeting certain specific additions to the text of the draft final document. It is our belief that the formulations we have proposed will make it possible to give the final document more political weight and to reflect all of the most important trends in the efforts to halt the arms race and bring about disarmament.

On a number of our proposals, constructive discussions are already going on in the working groups. I do not intend to dwell in any detail on the actual content of the Soviet additions to the draft final document. They are being transmitted to the Secretariat and all delegations will be in a position to study them in detail. We would simply like to reserve our right to speak by way of clarification of our proposals at a somewhat later stage. May I express the hope that the fact that the Soviet Union has today submitted these additions will make for further constructive work in the working bodies of the special session and also help to bring about the general success of our work.

Mr. CAHANA (Israel): Since this is my delegation's first intervention under your chairmanship, Sir, allow me to express my compliments to you personally and to congratulate you on the manner in which you are conducting the debate. In view of the important and difficult discussions which lie ahead, I wish to assure you of the full co-operation of my delegation.

(Mr. Cahana, Israel)

The introduction today of the Iraqi draft resolution marks a sad deterioration in the proceedings of the current special session on disarmament. For our part, we are hardly surprised by such initiatives, for we have long become accustomed to the fact that hardly a session or conference of the United Nations can be convened without its being subverted by one or several of the Arab States into a forum for anti-Israeli propaganda. Indeed, it is appropriate that this draft resolution, full of the usual lies and distortions, has been initiated by a country notorious for its fanatical hostility towards Israel, a country which has rejected any and every effort at peace-making in the Middle East and which continues to inveigh regularly against Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), a warmongering country, which openly supports international terrorism and leaps at any opportunity to turn the United Nations itself into a weapon of political warfare.

Nor is it surprising that Iraq had little difficulty in rounding up a group of sponsors, for the majority of those States have been in a continuous state of war with Israel for over 30 years and would like nothing better than to see Israel deprived of all means of defence while they continue to augment their already massive military arsenals. All this, as I say, causes us no great surprise. It is a pattern to which we have become accustomed and inured over the years. It is a fact of international life which Israel can bear.

However, it is surely a matter for extreme regret that nations and millions of ordinary men and women throughout the world who placed their hopes in the unique opportunity presented by this special session to make their lives better and more secure will now see those hopes callously and cynically dashed. Instead of a serious forward-looking consensus document which they recently expected to be produced, they are likely to be faced with a disruptive and divisive draft resolution which runs counter to the letter, spirit and purpose of this special session. If there have been key words for this session, ideas on which it is based, they have been universality, co-operation, negotiation, détente, reconciliation and the legitimate security of all States at the lowest possible level of armaments. The draft

(Mr. Cahana, Israel)

resolution now introduced lies in the face of those concepts and throws into jeopardy the consensus for which we are so earnestly striving.

The choice therefore is clear: either this gathering will become an instrument of confidence-building and trust which will serve to reduce tensions and promote general and universal progress towards disarmament or this session will deteriorate into yet another weapon for political warfare against Israel. This draft resolution mocks not only the special session and the United Nations as a whole but also all the countries and leaders who take the goals of this meeting seriously and who are striving for positive results. It is up to them to make the responsible choice and reject this destructive diversion out of hand.

I have confined myself here to general observations of concern to this session as a whole and I reserve the right of my delegation to speak again on the item before us.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Israel for the kind words which he addressed to me personally.

Mr. KITTANI (Iraq): My delegation is not going to give any satisfaction to the representative of Israel. We are not going to be diverted from the subject under discussion and we appeal to all delegations to confine themselves to the subject of our draft resolution. The subject is simply the escalation of Israeli armament and military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa and we appeal to all members of this Committee not to be fooled by this timeworn trick. Every time any subject is discussed in this building, Israel drags in all kinds of extraneous issues, proceeding from the point of view that of all the Members of the United Nations only Israel is immune from any criticism, any kind of action or any resolution or sanction on the part of this Organization.

We simply say that we have too much respect for this Committee, and for you, Sir, as Chairman, to be diverted from the subject under discussion and we hope that any further comments on our draft resolution will be addressed to its substance and will be objective.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like again to remind members that the next meeting of this Committee will be on Friday, 9 June, at 3 p.m., in this room.

I would also recall that on 12 June, as agreed by this Committee, we shall hear the representatives of non-governmental organizations, and, on the morning of 13 June, the representative of the research institutes.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.