

CD/PV.64  
28 February 1980  
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIXTY-FOURTH PLENARY MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva  
on Thursday, 23 February 1980, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. D.S. McPHAIL

(Canada)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. A. BENYAMINA

Argentina: Mr. A. DUMONT  
Miss N. FRIYRE PENABAD

Australia: Mr. A. BEHM  
Ms. M. WICKES

Belgium: Mr. A. ONKELINX  
Mr. J-M. NOIRFALISSE

Brazil: Mr. C.A. de SOUZA E SILVA  
Mr. S. de QUEIROZ DUARTE

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV  
Mr. P. POPTCHEV  
Mr. K. PRAMOV

Burma: U SAW HLAING  
U NGWE VIN

Canada: Mr. D.S. McPHAIL  
Mr. J.T. SIMARD

China: Mr. YU Pei-Wen  
Mr. LIANG Yu-Fan  
Mr. YANG Hu-Shan  
Mr. LUO Ren-Shi  
Mr. LIANG De-Fen  
Mrs. GE Yu-Yun  
Mr. XU Liu-Gen

Cuba: Mrs. V. BORODOWSKY JACKIEWICH

Czechoslovakia: Mr. M. RUZEK  
Mr. P. LUKES  
Mr. E. ZAPOTOCKY  
Mr. J. JIRUSEK

Egypt:

Mr. O. EL-SHAFEI  
Mr. M. EL-BARADEI  
Mr. N. FAHMY

Ethiopia:

Mr. F. YOHANNES

France:

Mr. F. de la GORCE  
Mr. J. de BEAUSSE  
Mr. M. COUTHURES

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER  
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI  
Mr. J. DEMBSKI  
Mr. KAULFUSS

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. G. PFEIFFER  
Mr. N. KLINGLER

Hungary:

Mr. I. KÖMIVES  
Mr. C. GYÖRFFY

India:

Mr. S. SARAN

Indonesia:

Mr. S. DARUSMAN  
Mr. I.M. DAMANIK  
Mr. HARYOMATARAM  
Mr. H.M.U. SILABAN

Iran:

Mr. D. AMERI

Italy:

Mr. V. CORDERO DI MONTEZEMOLO  
Mr. C. TALIANI  
Mr. M. MORENO  
Mr. C. FRATESCHI  
Mr. F. de LUCA

Japan:

Mr. Y. OKAWA  
Mr. T. IWANAMI  
Mr. R. ISHII  
Mr. K. MIYATA

Kenya: Mr. S. SHITENI  
Mr. G.N. MUNIU

Mexico: Mr. H.A. CÁCERES

Mongolia: Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG  
Mr. L. BAYART

Morocco: Mr. M. CHRAIBI

Netherlands: Mr. R. FEIN

Nigeria: Mr. O. ADENIJI  
Mr. T.O. OLUMOKO  
Mr. T. AGUIYI-IRONSI

Pakistan: Mr. J.K.A. MARKER  
Mr. M. AKRAM  
Mr. S. BASHIR

Peru: Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA  
Mr. H. PAC  
Mr. J. CIAŁCOWICZ

Romania: Mr. C. ENȚE  
Mr. T. MELESCANU

Sri Lanka: Mr. I.B. FONSEKA

Sweden: Mr. S. STRÖMBÄCK  
Mr. J. PRAWITZ

Union of Soviet Socialist  
Republics: Mr. V.L. ISSRAELIAN  
Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN  
Mr. V.I. USTINOV  
Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV  
Mr. Y.P. KLIUKIN  
Mr. B.I. KORNYIENKO

United Kingdom: Mr. D.H. SUMTERHAYES  
Mr. P.M.V. FRANCIS

United States of America:

Mr. C. FLOWERREE  
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY  
Mr. J. CALVERT  
Mr. J.W. MACDONALD  
Ms. B. MURRAY  
Mr. P. SALGADO  
Mr. M. SANCHES  
Ms. S. FLOOD  
Mr. G. SUCHEN

Venezuela:

Mrs. R. MUGICA de ADAMES

Yugoslavia:

Mr. D. DJOKIĆ

Zaire:

Secretary to the Committee on Disarmament  
and Personal Representative of the  
Secretary-General:

Mr. R. JAIPAL

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, the Pakistan delegation would like to congratulate you most warmly on your assumption of the chairmanship of the Committee on Disarmament at this significant moment for the work of this body. May I take this opportunity, on behalf of my delegation, of also welcoming you as Canada's representative on the CD and of assuring you of our fullest co-operation, especially in the discharge of your responsibilities as Chairman during the first, important month of the CD's 1980 session. Given Canada's unswerving commitment to the goals of disarmament, and your own distinguished contribution, Pakistan is confident that the Committee will be able to embark on its work in a constructive and positive manner.

The Pakistan delegation would also wish to place on record its admiration and warm appreciation for the sterling work performed by your distinguished predecessor, Ambassador U Saw Hlaing of Burma, whose patience, perseverance and diplomatic skill brought to a successful conclusion the complicated problems that beset the work of this Committee during its final session last year. The results so achieved have provided us with a most useful foundation for the continuation of our work.

Pakistan has consistently taken the view that genuine and universal progress towards disarmament cannot be promoted without the participation and contribution of the People's Republic of China. We are, therefore, most gratified that China has taken its place in the Committee on Disarmament. China's active participation will not only enhance the representative character of the CD, but it will also increase the relevance and effectiveness of the role of the Committee in the pursuit of the goals of disarmament.

The past session of the CD concluded last August with a degree of disappointment at our failure to make progress on the priority issues, particularly the comprehensive test-ban treaty and the prohibition of chemical weapons. But there was also an air of expectation. After protracted negotiations, the SALT II Treaty had been signed by the super-Powers, and we were led to believe that progress was imminent in the other restricted negotiations being conducted mainly between them. There was, therefore, hope that, finally, the stage was set for concrete and substantive achievements towards the disarmament goals that were universally agreed upon at the General Assembly's special session on disarmament.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

As we open this second session of the CD, on the threshold of the 1980s, we are confronted with a situation which is, to say the least, dismal for the disarmament process. This situation has come about because one of "the principal goals of disarmament", which is, in the words of the Final Document, to eliminate "the use and the threat of force ... from international life", has been grossly violated by a major Power. The very first "principle" of disarmament, under which Member States stressed, at the special session, the special importance of refraining from the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any State, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and the inviolability of international frontiers, has been abrogated with impunity.

Paragraph 34 of the Final Document states:

"Disarmament, relaxation of international tension, respect for the right to self-determination and national independence, the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the strengthening of international peace and security are directly related to each other. Progress in any of these spheres has a beneficial effect on all of them; in turn, failure in one sphere has negative effects on others."

It is obvious that the atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence between the major nuclear Powers -- constructed through the professions of peaceful co-existence, the policy of détente, the much-heralded Helsinki Conference and the SALT negotiations -- has been shattered. Obviously, such mutual trust can be resurrected only through clear evidence, in deeds, that each side is prepared to abide by the norms of international conduct, particularly the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

In the present climate of tension between the super-Powers, disarmament is bound to suffer. Yet these two Powers have a special responsibility to avert another arms spiral and to pursue tangible progress towards nuclear and conventional disarmament, despite the doubts which have been cast by current events. The Pakistan delegation notes that the series of negotiations between the super-Powers, and the two major military blocs, are to be continued or resumed in the near future. In this context, my delegation takes cognizance of the fact that recent developments have placed impediments to the early ratification of the SALT II agreement. But we nevertheless take the view that despite all its imperfections, the SALT II agreement should be ratified by both parties as soon

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

as possible. In the meantime, it is in the interest of the super-Powers, and in the interest of a saner and safer world, that they should strictly observe the limitations and restrictions agreed upon in SALT II.

Trust and mutual confidence is most important between the super-Powers. But today, it is equally important to build such trust between these great Powers and the majority of the small and medium States of the non-aligned and third world. During the past two decades, threats to world peace and security have emanated most frequently from conflicts and tensions that have arisen in regions of the world that are far from Europe, the traditional focus of political and military confrontation between the two super-Powers. The conflicts in the Middle East, southern Africa and south-east Asia continue to pose threats to international peace and security, due to the involvement of one or the other major Power as well as the aggressive and expansionist designs of regional Powers, such as Israel and South Africa. In recent weeks, great-Power confrontation has been precipitated in the region of south-west Asia. The sovereign and independent State of Afghanistan has been occupied by the military forces of a super-Power. This occupation, and the continued presence of Soviet forces in Afghanistan, is a matter of concern for the entire international community, and it has been rightly deplored by 104 Member States of the United Nations, as well as by the recent Conference of Islamic States. Not only is the occupation of Afghanistan a flagrant violation of the norms of international conduct, but it has opened an ominous new perspective in the concept of great-Power pressures. Such action will set a precedent that endangers the very existence of small non-aligned countries.

An extraordinary session of the Conference of Islamic Foreign Ministers was convened in Islamabad from 27 to 29 January to consider the consequences of the foreign occupation of Afghanistan. The Conference unanimously condemned Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan and called for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Soviet troops in Afghanistan. It suspended Afghanistan's membership of the Islamic Conference, and urged all States and peoples to support the just struggle of the Afghan people "to safeguard their faith, national independence and territorial integrity, and to recover their right to determine their destiny".



(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

In a statement in this Committee a year ago, my delegation stated that global stability cannot be maintained by a balance of mutual deterrence in strategic armaments alone, and that this must be matched by a corresponding equilibrium in various sensitive regions of the world. For many years, Pakistan has drawn the attention of the international community to the imperative of maintaining a military balance in the region of south and south-west Asia. The equilibrium which existed in the region more than a decade ago was progressively eroded through a series of crises, and by a combination of significant military acquisitions by some States and denial of defensive capability to others, especially my country.

This situation has been further severely aggravated by the introduction of the military forces of a super-Power into Afghanistan. It is, therefore, quite natural for countries in the region to seek the means of assuring their security, and Pakistan is no exception. The Final Document of the special session on disarmament emphasizes the need "to ensure the right of each State to security ...". But no State should seek perfect security for itself while denying even a minimum measure of security to others. Pakistan wishes to develop relations of friendship with all States, particularly with its neighbours, on the basis of the principles of the United Nations Charter and of peaceful co-existence; Pakistan does not seek hostility or confrontation with any country.

Despite my country's deep concern over recent developments affecting our region, we remain committed to the preservation of international peace and security through disarmament. There is no doubt that this year the Committee on Disarmament faces serious difficulties in making concrete progress on the main items of its agenda. But Pakistan believes that the Committee can respond constructively to this challenge and, indeed, make a positive contribution to defusing world tensions and advancing the objectives of disarmament.

An important contribution which the CD can make to the promotion of disarmament and international security is by evolving effective international agreement "to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

weapons". For over a decade, Pakistan has drawn the attention of the international community to the vulnerability of the non-nuclear-weapon States, especially the non-aligned countries, to nuclear attack or blackmail.

During its 1979 session, the CD considered various proposals regarding undertakings to be given by the nuclear Powers not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. There was a general trend in the Committee to embody such undertakings in an international convention, and this predisposition was further confirmed at the Non-Aligned Summit in Havana and at the last General Assembly session. The Pakistan delegation continues to believe that an international convention would be the most appropriate form in which assurances regarding the non-use of nuclear weapons can be provided to non-nuclear-weapon States. As regards the nature and content of such assurances, we consider that to be effective and credible the guarantees should be as categorical and unconditional as the declaration made by China, which has undertaken never to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. At the same time, Pakistan has attempted to take into account the difficulties of the major nuclear Powers and, through protracted negotiations, we have evolved the formula contained in article I of the draft convention presented to the CD by my delegation. This formulation has been widely supported in the General Assembly and forms the most suitable basis for an agreed common obligation by the nuclear-weapon States. The Pakistan delegation hopes that the ad hoc Working Group established on this subject last year will be revived and resume its work without delay with a view to concluding an international agreement on this subject as soon as possible.

Pakistan considers that it is time that the Committee devoted serious efforts to giving substance to the system of collective security in the nuclear era, as envisaged in the United Nations Charter. Recent developments have made it evident that guarantees of non-use will not be sufficient to give credible assurance of security to non-nuclear-weapon States against the nuclear threat.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

Today, several non-nuclear-weapon States are the object of threats from certain nuclear Powers including, implicitly the threat of nuclear weapons. Moreover, in situations of crisis, a nuclear threat may emanate from countries which are not now formally recognized as nuclear-weapon States. We have learnt with considerable concern of the nuclear explosion conducted in the vicinity of South Africa on 22 September 1979, and presume that this presages the emergence of another quasi nuclear-weapon State. All those African countries which oppose the abhorrent policy of apartheid are potential victims of a South African nuclear threat or attack. The Arab States also feel threatened by Israel's presumptive nuclear capability.

My delegation believes that the current deterioration in the relations between the super-Powers has increased rather than diminished the responsibilities of the Committee on Disarmament, especially with regard to the priority items entrusted to it by the United Nations General Assembly, i.e. the nuclear-test-ban treaty and the prohibition of chemical weapons.

It is our hope that the trilateral negotiations on the test-ban treaty will lead to a positive outcome in the near future. The members of the Group of 21 are convinced that, irrespective of the progress, or lack of it, in the restricted negotiations, the CD should assume its responsibility for the elaboration of the nuclear-weapon-test-ban treaty without further delay. We hope that agreement can already be reached for the establishment of an ad hoc working group to commence negotiations on such a treaty. It is important that, pending the conclusion of this treaty, the two major nuclear Powers, which have been responsible for over 90 per cent of the nuclear testing, should call a unilateral halt to their nuclear tests, as evidence of their commitment to prevent the further development of their nuclear weaponry.

The earliest conclusion of a convention prohibiting the use, manufacture or stockpiling of chemical weapons is equally important. The Pakistan delegation expresses the hope that a working group will be set up immediately by the Committee with a clear mandate to elaborate a convention for the total prohibition of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

At this session, the CD has been asked by the General Assembly to undertake a particularly significant and onerous responsibility -- that of negotiating the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament. The elaboration of the Programme is designed to achieve "the final objective" of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. It may well be said that the present is hardly a propitious moment to embark on this ambitious task. But my delegation believes that it is precisely because of this deterioration in the international situation that it devolves upon this multilateral forum to instil a measure of restraint, in the policies of the Great Powers in particular. A reiteration by the vast majority of member States of their continuing and irrevocable determination to achieve general and complete disarmament would exert a moral influence for restraint. We are fortunate to have before us the "elements" of the Comprehensive Programme, agreed upon in the Disarmament Commission. The CD is expected to finalize the Programme in time for its presentation to the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. Thus, the time available for negotiating the Programme in the CD is relatively brief. We hope, therefore, that after an initial discussion on the subject in the Committee, a Working Group will be established to commence the negotiations on the Comprehensive Programme.

Despite the gravity of the present state of international relations, my delegation has not lost hope for the future. The present situation has thrown into sharp relief the consequences of the policies of domination, the instability of a peace based on the balance of terror and the dangers of an uninhibited arms race. The message is again reiterated with emphatic warning. If mankind is to avoid a catastrophic conflict, then nations, large and small, must conduct themselves in accordance with the established norms of international conduct, and evolve an effective system of collective and universal security.

Mr. C. FLOVERREE (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, before I begin my remarks, I will beg your indulgence to permit me to make a brief personal comment. Having been associated with the work of this Committee in various capacities for almost three years, I have come to appreciate the high level of diplomatic skill among the representatives sitting around this table. I therefore feel specially honoured at being elected by my Government to replace my distinguished predecessor, Professor Adrien Fisher. As I'm honoured to take my seat among you, so I'm proud to represent the United States of America. There will of course be differences between the views of my country and those of others, but whether we agree or disagree, you can rest assured that I will do my utmost faithfully to convey the views of other countries to my Government, to interpret accurately my Government's positions to the other members of the Committee and to work unceasingly to narrow the gaps or to bridge them, when the possibility exists. Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I look forward with high anticipation to work with you as close colleagues during the busy period ahead. I would now like to turn to my prepared statement.

At the plenary meeting on 14 February, before I took up my new duties, the delegation of the Soviet Union saw fit to burden this Committee with a long, intemperate statement that was replete with inaccuracies and distortions about actions and policies of the United States and its allies. The Soviet account would have us believe that these actions and policies deliberately undermined efforts to limit armaments and reduce international tensions. The statement gave a version of the history of military policies of the NATO alliance over the past 25 years which is ludicrous on its face. As just one example, it ignored the fact that the NATO decision of 12 December 1979 included a proposal to negotiate the limitation of long-range theatre nuclear forces long before their anticipated deployment. In contrast to the secrecy that shrouds Soviet policy-making in this field, the rationale for United States and NATO decisions has been publicly debated from their very inception. The record is there for all serious students of history to read and draw their own conclusions.

The Soviet statement of 14 February also distorted the United States positions on important arms-control negotiations. These positions are likewise on the public record. The President of the United States has made clear the continuing interest of my country in serious arms-limitation measures that

(Mr. C. Flowerree, United States)

enhance our own and international security despite the atmosphere of international tension prevailing after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. For example, in asking for temporary deferral of Senate action on SALT ratification in the wake of these events, the President confirmed his continuing dedication to the goals of SALT. His letter to the Senate in its entirety was included in Ambassador Fisher's statement of 7 February, as were the relevant passages from the President's State of the Union message.

What purposes of this Committee did the Soviet statement serve in rehearsing this distorted version of history? Clearly, the objective was not to advance our work here. The real Soviet motivation, I am sure, is apparent to all. The United States is confident that the Committee will give the Soviet statement the attention it deserves and will continue to concentrate its efforts on the serious business before us.

Mr. ONKELINK (Belgium) (translated from French): I am sorry to have to revert today -- although very briefly -- to a general commentary, but I am unable to conceal my delegation's surprise and disappointment at the statement to the Committee on 14 February by the representative of the USSR, Ambassador Issraelyan. That address, by the tone adopted, and by the attacks made in it on a number of countries, was, in our opinion, contrary to the spirit which had prevailed in our proceedings from the beginning of the session.

Although a large number of delegations had, at the beginning of their general statements, expressed concern about the international situation and the events in Afghanistan, they did so in moderate and restrained terms, precisely in order to avoid a controversial tone which would have prejudiced the progress of our work.

We were unable to understand why, when the general statements had come to an end and the Committee was already concerning itself with the organization of its work, the representative of the USSR should suddenly have indulged in such abusive remarks about the Western Countries.

Any attempt to lay the blame for the present deterioration in the international situation, as Ambassador Issraelyan has endeavoured to do, on what is alleged to be a policy pursued over the last few years by a number of

(Mr. Onkelinx, Belgium)

Western countries will not stand up to an analysis of the facts. Countries like ours, which attach such importance to the efforts to achieve détente and disarmament, cannot but receive with some bewilderment Mr. Issraelyan's assertion that, long before the events in Afghanistan, action had been taken in the West which had thrown doubt upon pursuit of the policy of détente. If we had not been primarily concerned with avoiding controversy and resuming our real work as soon as possible, we would have asked the representative of the USSR a great many questions in order to clear up the extremely serious charges levelled at the countries in question.

In his statement, Ambassador Issraelyan attributed to an American initiative the decision taken by NATO last December to carry out a plan for the modernization of theatre nuclear weapons, accompanied by proposals for negotiations on the reduction of this type of armament.

May I remind you here that it was the western European nations which, three years ago, were the first to express their concern at the deployment by the USSR of new long-range theatre nuclear weapons. The European misgivings were inspired by a combination of factors connected with the world and regional strategic situation.

Western Europe has in fact been a witness in the last few years to the intensive build-up, in both quality and quantity, of all the USSR's theatre nuclear weapons, and of its long-range weapons, of this type in particular, a build-up which has led to a qualitative change in the threats hanging over western Europe.

To the several hundred SS-20 missiles already deployed, 50 or so more are added every year and all of these have triple warheads. At the same time the new Backfire bombers continue to be deployed. The old SS-4 and SS-5 missiles are not being withdrawn for all that, any more than the old Blinder and Badger bombers. Even if the number of Soviet long-range operational nuclear launchers were to be reduced between now and 1985 after the withdrawal of old equipment, as we have been told to expect, there will nevertheless be a

(Mr. Onkelinx, Belgium)

considerable increase in the number of Soviet nuclear warheads targeted on objectives in western Europe, not to speak of the greatly increased precision of these weapons.

In several parts of his speech, Ambassador Issraelyan accused the Western countries of seeking military superiority and of attempting to destroy the principle of the maintenance of equal security among States.

The nations belonging to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are not imperialist or power-hungry countries. Their association is a purely defensive alliance, and its military objective is simply to deter all possible aggressors and to rule out the use of military force for political purposes, thus making it possible to negotiate on equal terms. The decisions taken are aimed solely at preserving equilibrium where it already exists or restoring it wherever it is wanting. It is sufficient to have followed the lively debate -- and I presume that Ambassador Issraelyan did so very closely -- which has taken place in several of our countries among the general public, the political parties and parliaments to realize that a debate of that nature was not the act of peoples and leaders in search of power and military superiority.

It is the offer of negotiations addressed to the USSR in December by the Western countries which should have first claim on the attention of the Soviet authorities. If, at the time the decisions were taken to deploy the SS-20 and the Backfire, the USSR had followed them up by a similar proposal to hold talks, it is very probable that a dialogue would long ago have been established between our countries.

Moreover, if the USSR were to accept the offer of negotiation which has been made without any conditions attaching to it, the Western countries would take any outcome the negotiations might have into account, as they have clearly committed themselves to do, in implementing their modernization plan.

Belgium and its partners will spare no effort aimed at the realization of concrete measures of disarmament, so that all our States can safeguard their security at less cost. It hopes that the USSR will reply as quickly as possible to the proposals made in December, and that progress in other areas of negotiation will soon make it possible to set the European continent on the path to effective disarmament.



Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, before I begin my statement, since this is the first occasion that we have met in a formal meeting, I wish to offer a very warm welcome to my next-door neighbour, Ambassador Charles Flowerree, who has already sat with us on several occasions, but whose presence here I warmly welcome, because of his long experience in disarmament matters. I am sure he will be a most effective addition to the membership of our Committee, and we look forward to working with him. I would also like to say a word of welcome to Ambassador Marker, who has just returned.

In the statement which I made to the Committee on 7 February, I drew attention to the fact that my country, along with other NATO allies, had early last December supported some carefully worked out and comprehensive arms-control proposals designed to ensure that there is a better future balance of long-range theatre nuclear forces in the European area. The purpose of the December offer was to promote negotiation. The proposal to modernize the allied theatre nuclear force which forms an integral part of long-term arrangements which were foreshadowed in that announcement will not even begin to be carried out before 1983.

Although I and other Western colleagues have pointed out that NATO has no plan to achieve what is called "nuclear superiority", a succession of vehement attacks have been made on us by speakers from Warsaw Pact countries who have tried to allege against all the facts of the case that NATO is indulging in a new arms race.

The facts about the existing and future deployment of nuclear arms in western Europe are widely known. By the nature of open Western societies the facts about these deployments are fully discussed and debated within the Western countries and outside. This is helpful, because we shall never make progress towards building confidence and enhancing security unless we are able to talk openly about the situation. I would point out, however, that facts about military deployments in eastern Europe are less easy to come by. Even harder to obtain is information about the future plans of the Warsaw Pact countries.

We believe that any study of the material in the public domain will show that the present European situation is one in which the Warsaw Pact countries have a

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

superiority in theatre nuclear weapons. That superiority is small or great according to the assumptions made. But it is unquestionably increasing. It follows therefore that we do not agree with suggestions that the countries of the NATO alliance are seeking "nuclear supremacy".

Against this background I want to make one specific comment, which is in the nature of a correction to something said in the Committee. In his statement of 12 February the distinguished representative of the German Democratic Republic referred to an analysis which appears in the latest version of the annual publication entitled "The Military Balance". This publication, which is generally acknowledged to be an authoritative attempt by non-official analysts to assess the state of military balance throughout the world, is published by the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London. The statement by the distinguished representative of the German Democratic Republic to which I have just referred said that according to the Institute there was a "balance in terms of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe". This is not quite what the Institute's study shows, and it is not what the Institute said. Their actual comment, and I quote, was that "something very close to parity now exists between the theatre nuclear forces of NATO and the Warsaw Pact ...", and this is presumably the passage to which the distinguished representative of the German Democratic Republic was referring. But he failed to add that the sentence I have just read out continues with the statement "although it is moving in favour of the Warsaw Pact". That is, that the balance is moving against the West.

I should add that, because of the number of occasions on which the study by the International Institute for Strategic Studies was quoted out of context at the time it was issued in September last year, the Institute issued a press release clarifying the issue on 8 November. Anyone who cares to read "The Military Balance" for 1979/80 and the statement of clarification issued by the Institute will gain a clear and accurate picture of the situation.

Mr. PEELFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): In the view of my delegation, it is of crucial importance that this Committee continue its work in a constructive spirit determined by the political will of all its members to achieve concrete results in the field of disarmament and arms control. In the pursuit of this objective, it is one of the important duties of this Committee to prepare the ground for negotiation and to contribute to a better understanding of those problems which so far have prevented progress. It is in this context that I would like to reply to a statement of the representative of the Soviet Union of 14 February in which he questioned the seriousness of the Western negotiating offer on long-range theatre nuclear forces (LRTNF).

I would like to refer to my statement in this Committee of 7 February and recall some of my arguments:

"On 12 December 1979, in view of the growing Soviet superiority in the field of medium-range nuclear weapons, the members of NATO decided on measures necessary to assure a policy of defence and deterrence. At the same time, they proposed negotiations on limitations on both sides, on the basis of equality and parity, before the new systems to be introduced in three or four years' time are actually deployed. The Western Alliance is willing to reach concrete results on limiting medium-range systems on both sides at the lowest possible level. If the Soviet Union had at the time proceeded in the same way before introducing the SS-20 missiles and the Backfire bomber, the problem of medium-range nuclear systems would appear today in an altogether different light."

"The willingness of the West to continue the policy of constructive arms control is reflected in NATO's wide-ranging offer, made on

(Mr. Pfciffer, Federal Republic of Germany)

12 and 14 December, of negotiations on the limitation of theatre nuclear forces, on an interim result in the MBFR negotiations, and on the further development of confidence-building measures in Europe. Those proposals are still on the table. It is now up to the other negotiating side to make a constructive reply, especially with regard to negotiations on theatre nuclear forces."

Let me stress again: The Western negotiating offer on long-range theatre nuclear forces (LRTNF) is part of a comprehensive proposal of a wide range of arms-control negotiations unanimously decided upon by the member States of NATO on 12 and 14 December. It is our genuine hope that this constructive proposal, aiming at concrete and balanced results in limiting medium-range systems, will not be answered by polemics only. It would indeed be of great significance to the efforts to contribute to stability and détente if these negotiations were started immediately and without preconditions. Every week that passes is a week lost for negotiations. Let me add as a factual statement, that the American long-range theatre nuclear forces will be ready for deployment only in 1983. By contrast the Soviet Union is now already adding one new SS-20 missile to its arsenal every week.

I hope that these remarks, together with the remarks of my British colleague, will help our colleagues from the Warsaw Pact States to better understand the unique chance contained in the Western offer. My delegation continues to believe that the Committee on Disarmament must devote its time and energy to the subjects on its agenda.

We hope that it will be possible, with the co-operation of all the States members of the CD, to start constructive work in order to meet the expectations of the international community. As I have said in my statement on 7 February: "World opinion will judge the Committee on Disarmament by the concrete results of its work."

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian) : At these last meetings of the Committee on Disarmament a number of delegations have again touched upon questions of the present international situation and have expressed their views as to the causes of the situation that has arisen. At today's meeting, too, there have been such statements. The Committee's interest in questions of the current international situation is quite legitimate, for progress in our work on carrying out disarmament tasks will of course depend on how the relations between States develop and on the strengthening of international détente. The main thing is that basic questions of the present international situation should be objectively and correctly assessed.

In this connexion I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to the address delivered to Soviet electors on 22 February 1980 by Mr. Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, in which there are answers to many of the questions disturbing the international community which have been the subject of discussion in the Committee. In this important address, it is stated that one of the basic factors of international life has been the policy of peace conducted by the countries of the socialist community, and their joint struggle for détente and diminution of the threat of world nuclear-missile war. It is now in that struggle that the main assurance of a peaceful future for mankind lies.

We can say with satisfaction that the most important decisions in connexion with strengthening peace and curbing the arms race adopted in international forums, including the Committee on Disarmament, during the last decade, which is justly described as the decade of détente, and also the most important negotiations on these questions, have been the result of initiatives taken by the countries of socialism and of their joint action with other States, especially the non-aligned countries. Their concrete proposals on questions of disarmament and international co-operation constitute a broad, far-sighted and realistic programme for securing peace in our time. For the implementation of that programme, we shall fight hard and untiringly.

Peace and détente are necessary not only to the Soviet people but to the peoples of the whole world, and especially the peoples which have freed themselves from colonial oppression and are engaged in the difficult task of building a new, independent life. For them, no less than for the countries of

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

socialism, lasting peace, strict respect for the sovereignty of States and the rights of peoples, as well as international relations based on genuine equality of rights, are a necessity.

The strengthening of peace and the success of the peoples' liberation struggle have not been to the taste of the war-mongering circles of imperialism and their myrmidons. What was their reaction to the development of mutually advantageous contracts between the socialist countries and many capitalist countries, to the success of the all European security conference at Helsinki, to the victory of the revolutionary peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America over the interventionists and the hirelings of imperialism? In its statement of 14 February based on factual material, the Soviet delegation showed how the United States and some of its allies have already for a number of years been taking steps that were aimed at undermining détente, aggravating the international situation and establishing the military superiority of the NATO countries over the Warsaw Treaty member States. As the members of the Committee will remember, we did this on the basis of facts, on the basis of sources, including Western sources, which no one in the statements made today succeeded in refuting. A manifestation of this same line is the provocation of various situations of conflict, and the whipping up of a quite unimaginable anti-Soviet campaign of hysteria whose echoes also reach the Committee on Disarmament. To this noisy accompaniment, the United States intends to establish, and has started establishing, a network of military bases in the countries of the Middle and Near East and in the countries of Africa.

In his address, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev explained in detail the real nature of the events in Afghanistan and the Soviet Union's position towards that State. He made the situation quite clear :

"We shall be ready to start withdrawing our forces as soon as all forms of outside interference against the Government and people of Afghanistan have completely stopped. Let the United States together with Afghanistan's neighbours guarantee this, and then the need for Soviet military assistance will no longer exist. The Government of Afghanistan for its part has, as you know, clearly stated that it intends to maintain peaceful and friendly relations with its neighbours, particularly Iran and Pakistan."

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

In our assessment of the present international situation we proceed from the position that détente has grown deep roots. People everywhere, in East and West, North and South, have recognized the advantages of a quiet, peaceful life and profitable trade. They will not so easily renounce the advantages of living in conditions of détente. As against the "doctrine" of war hysteria and the arms race, the Soviet Union supports the doctrine of a continuous struggle for peace and security in the world. In the 1980s, as earlier in the 1970s, the Soviet Union stands for the strengthening, and not for the destruction, of détente. For the reduction, and not the expansion, of armaments. For rapprochement and mutual understanding among the peoples, and not for artificial alienation and enmity.

In view of the extreme importance of Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's address, and of the profound analysis of the international situation it contains, the Soviet delegation intends to have the main parts of that speech distributed as an official document of the Committee on Disarmament.

The Soviet delegation cannot of course ignore the statements that were made today. I wish above all to reply to the statement by the delegation of Pakistan. Like the delegations of the other socialist countries at previous meetings of the Committee, the Soviet delegation has already given a fitting reply to certain similar anti-Soviet fabrications, has revealed their genuine motives and aims and the real causes of the aggravation of the international situation, including the situation in the Near East. I should merely like to refer to the fact that, as you know, it is precisely from Pakistan territory that the intervention against Afghanistan proceeds, being directed by other Powers, in particular the United States and China. The forces of imperialism and reaction have recently still further increased their attempts to convert Pakistan into an area of tension, a centre for the spread of that intervention, and this is very disturbing.

I should like in this connexion to draw attention to a statement made by Mr. A.A. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union. On his recent visit to India he said, among other things, the following: "If Pakistan continues along this road, it will not derive any benefit from doing so, but will destroy its position as an independent State. Its interests would require the strengthening of its independence and the maintenance of good, friendly relations with all neighbouring countries."

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The group of NATO countries has also made statements today, and we shall study them with due care. But I should like to make a few remarks at the outset. At the beginning of the Committee's work, the Soviet delegation, in its first statement, on the day of the Committee's opening, called for the constructive conduct of negotiations. In doing so, we proceeded from the position that the representatives of the 40 independent, sovereign States sitting at this table have their own points of view on the causes of the aggravation of international tension. Naturally, the Soviet Union, too, had and has its point of view. But we do not try to impose it on anyone believing that other delegations, too, would adopt the same attitude. We called upon all delegations to follow our example. Everybody is well aware of what happened. We were therefore surprised, to say the least, at the statement by Ambassador Onkelinx of Belgium, who discovered that the statements made during the general debate containing an appraisal of the international situation were very mild, and that everyone spoke "in moderate and restrained terms". Allow me in this connexion to quote extracts from the statement by one delegation which spoke at the very beginning of the debate. That delegation alleged, with reference to my country, that it "is aggressively pursuing a strategy of outflanking Europe and, on the other hand, is stepping up its aggression, interference and subversion in many places in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is resorting to every possible means, from engineering wars by proxy and staging coups d'état to fostering puppet régimes and dispatching their own troops abroad", etc., etc. That is the kind of slander and insinuations to which the speaker in question resorted. There was not only foul language in that statement. And you, Mr. Belgian Ambassador, you call that a "moderate" statement? Well, some people may be accustomed to listening to such insinuations against their country, but the Soviet delegation has never let such insinuations go unanswered and has no intention of doing so. We gave warning about this in our statement "on the order of business", we drew attention to the inadmissibility of such statements and called upon all delegations not to introduce a spirit of confrontation into the Committee's work. It was not we who started the controversy, but we shall not be afraid of it.

Many delegations, it is true, while sticking to their points of view, tried not to provoke confrontation, and we are grateful to them for that. But a certain group of States, consisting mainly of the delegations of China, the United States and its allies in NATO, chose the path of confrontation. There is



(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

quite obviously a tendency in the Committee, inspired by the States I have mentioned, towards diverting the Committee on Disarmament from negotiations and introducing into the discussion questions which have no relation to the Committee's work. It is precisely those delegations which will bear the responsibility for the failure of constructive negotiations such as might lead to positive results.

How is it possible to make statements of willingness to undertake constructive co-operation and at the same time tolerate flagrant attacks on one of the Committee's members? If anyone has a real desire to conduct negotiations, let us avoid touching on questions which do not fall within the competence of this Committee. But so long as the anti-Soviet attacks continue, we shall duly reply to them.

We have had no opportunity of acquainting ourselves with the texts of the statements by the delegations of the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, touching upon certain problems connected with the military policy of those States. We shall study them and express our opinions on them. We consider that, although some of the questions raised by them are not directly related to the agenda of our Committee, we might perhaps be able quietly to exchange opinions on questions connected with military policy and problems of disarmament. We reserve the right to revert to these questions at one of the Committee's meetings, as also to the "question" of Afghanistan, since some delegations stubbornly and importunately continue to impose their points of view on this "question" on the Committee, while some, the delegation of China for example, have even found it possible to speak twice on the subject.

At the beginning of the Committee's session, the Soviet delegation expressed apprehension that a certain group of States, not wishing to enter upon serious negotiations on disarmament, might seek any excuse for diverting the Committee from the fulfilment of its tasks. These fears, unfortunately, are justified.

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan) : I apologize for taking the floor again, but I feel it necessary to place on record certain facts arising from the statement that has just been made by the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Issraelyan. He has said that it is precisely from the territory of Pakistan that interference has been mounted against Afghanistan.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

I wish to place on record before this Committee, quite categorically, that no operations are being mounted from Pakistan against Afghanistan, and that there is no American or Chinese presence in Pakistan other than the normal diplomatic and commercial representation. This is precisely the same as the Soviet presence in Pakistan.

On the other hand, there are half a million citizens of Afghanistan who have fled their country in terror and will receive, and continue to receive, hospitality as refugees, in accordance with the traditions of Islam, until such time as conditions of peace in their own unhappy land will permit them to return to Afghanistan.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian) : I regard the statement by the distinguished representative of Pakistan, Ambassador Marker, as a further invitation to a discussion on the "question" of Afghanistan. I do not suppose he wants to have this "question" included in the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament, but I can respond to his appeal and shall, if necessary, adduce the relevant facts which will confirm what was said in the Soviet delegation's statement.

The CHAIRMAN : If no other delegation wishes to take the floor, I believe that terminates our agenda of work in plenary for this morning. I wish to propose that we convene an informal meeting immediately, in this room, to consider several matters in connexion with our further work.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.