



UN DOCUMENT

OCT 0 1980

UN/LA C...

FIRST COMMITTEE  
17th meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 28 October 1980  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 17TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. NAIK (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

- General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. de Souza e Silva (Brazil)  
Mr. Komives (Hungary)  
Mr. de Laiglesia (Spain)  
Mr. Al-Doy (Bahrain)  
Mr. Fein (Netherlands)

---

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/35/PV.17  
28 October 1980

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): Once again we are meeting in the First Committee to discuss a rather lengthy agenda of questions related to disarmament and international security and once again we are trying to take stock of their development in the multilateral sphere during the past year. As we do so, my delegation cannot fail to note at the outset the failure of the international community and especially of the nuclear-weapon Powers to achieve even modest progress in slowing down the arms race, let alone in the priority field of nuclear disarmament itself. Time and again the General Assembly has assigned top priority to nuclear disarmament and in every multilateral forum attention has been called to the lack of tangible results even in organizational understandings that would have paved the way for meaningful negotiations on this question.

At the same time the world community has been watching with mounting apprehension the continuing build-up of new systems of nuclear armaments of unparalleled accuracy and destructive power. New doctrines are announced to replace previous concepts of how to wage nuclear war. In those formulations there seems to be an underlying assumption that provides ample cause for the increasing concern of mankind about its own survival. Speaking at the opening of the general debate at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, the Minister for External Relations of Brazil, Ambassador Guerreiro, said:

"New strategies are planned with a sinister logic, as if it were possible to survive a nuclear war." (A/35/PV.4, p. 8)

Indeed, such doctrines proceed from the basic premise that it is possible to wage and win a nuclear war; and although planners and strategists would not concede at the present time that such a possibility exists, that is, that either of the two super-Powers would emerge unscathed from a nuclear

(Mr. de Souza e Silva, Brazil)

confrontation, the impression remains that those planners and strategists believe that the continuing qualitative improvement of their weaponry is the key factor in achieving absolute security. We know, however, as a famous quotation has it, that absolute security for one means absolute insecurity for all.

The underlying and inexorable logic of the process of qualitative improvement calls for increasing resources, both material and intellectual, to be devoted to the ever widening spiral of the nuclear arms race. Predictably enough, military budgets are soaring high above the levels of previous years; and coincidentally the term 'disarmament' has been all but dropped from the political lexicon of the super-Powers. Disarmament has been progressively replaced by euphemistic expressions, such as non-armament, arms limitation and, currently, arms control.

It would seem that all that matters is preventing the ineffective utilization of resources in the maintenance of obsolete systems and concentrating, instead, on the development and deployment of new, more effective and more deadly weapons and weapon systems. In that sense, arms control aims at nothing but the effective management of the arms race; it assumes and presupposes that nuclear weapons are indeed an essential, inseparable part of the conceptions of peace, security and stability of the world at large.

For us, on the contrary, it stands to reason that the continuing escalation of the nuclear arms race to ever higher levels of destructiveness is a constant threat to peace, security and stability, even for the very Powers directly responsible for this state of affairs. The net result of the nuclear arms race has been diminished security, not only for the super-Powers themselves but for the whole community of nations and for every individual on earth.

It is therefore all the less understandable that the super-Powers that took the initiative of proposing a treaty for the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons have not so far taken any concrete measures to abide by their commitment to negotiations aimed at effective disarmament.

(Mr. de Souza e Silva, Brazil)

Just as the super-Powers are entitled to consider the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons as a threat to the peace and security of the international community, all the more is the international community entitled to consider the endless improvement and accumulation of nuclear weapons as a threat to its own survival.

Such an interaction of equivalent rights and duties between nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States has not yet found its proper place in a legally binding instrument in which inequalities of power would not be sanctioned by inequalities of obligation.

Just over two years ago the General Assembly met in a special session devoted to disarmament. Five weeks of hard negotiations resulted in a document which, notwithstanding its shortcomings, embodies the aspirations of the world community to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Principles and guidelines were laboriously negotiated and finally agreed upon and a new international machinery geared to that objective was established within the United Nations system. In two years' time the General Assembly is due to celebrate a second special session on disarmament, which will review the progress made since the adoption of the Final Document of the first special session. The Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, discussed at the Disarmament Commission last spring, is to be adopted during the current session of the Assembly, while the Committee on Disarmament has just started negotiating the drafting of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, to be approved by the 1982 special session on disarmament.

It would seem that we do not lack either the conceptual framework or the solemn reaffirmation of purposes and principles for disarmament negotiations. Yet, we might be led to do nothing more than once again assiduously to reiterate those purposes and principles, lest the international community be allowed to forget its dedication to the cause of disarmament.

(Mr. de Souza e Silva, Brazil)

The Final Document of the tenth special session represents in the eyes of the Brazilian delegation the expression of a solemn commitment by all States Members of this Organization, under a common set of principles, to the achievement of well-defined goals through an agreed Programme of Action, to be implemented by means of an established machinery that started to function, amid renewed hopes, two years ago. To improve the formulation of those purposes, principles and goals, to refine the Programme of Action already laid before us, to seek ways and means to perfect the machinery that has barely started to move - all these seem to us to be the proper tasks for the next special session on disarmament in 1982. For the time being, we can only hope to improve on the most essential ingredient for the success of our common endeavours, namely, the reaffirmation in unequivocal terms of the individual and joint commitment of Member States to take action towards implementing the priority decisions contained in the Final Document. What we need, in short, is the political will to transform into tangible reality what we have already unanimously agreed upon: specific measures of disarmament which should be implemented "over the next few years" according to well-defined priorities that place nuclear weapons at the very top of a list of items on which multilateral negotiations are long overdue. The Committee on Disarmament, whose work the First Committee is going to review under several items of our agenda, has succeeded in promoting a healthy departure from past practice by adopting a business-like approach to some of the matters before it. We thus welcome the setting up of working groups to deal with some of the topics in the agenda of that negotiating body. We cannot fail to notice, however, that no similar progress has been achieved precisely on the two items to which the General Assembly has assigned top priority, namely, a nuclear-test ban and nuclear disarmament. Despite the adoption of new methods of work which seem to have assured a good start in the negotiations on chemical weapons and on radiological weapons, the Committee on Disarmament has been unable so far to deal effectively with the questions related to nuclear weapons except in the most general and academic terms, as its predecessors had done before.

The recent history of disarmament agreements points to the inescapable conclusion that the international community seems more prone to agree on the

(Mr. de Souza e Silva, Brazil)

prohibition of weapons for which there is no longer any effective use of for which there is no technological possibility of immediate application. Obsolescence or inapplicability appears to be the guiding principle in selecting categories of weapons on which to impose bans or restrictions.

We have arrived at a crucial moment in the history of our endeavours to achieve international agreement on measures of disarmament. In the Final Document we have agreed that the nuclear-arms race is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, that we must halt the nuclear-arms race and proceed to disarmament, and that the alternative is to face annihilation. We have further agreed on the priorities to be followed and on the establishment and operation of the machinery designed to bring about the expected results. There is no more urgent task now than simply making use of that machinery, but efforts will be to no avail unless we remain committed not only in solemn declarations, but also in our continued dedication and action, towards the achievement of those objectives.

The Brazilian delegation is convinced that this concern is shared by the world community at large, in particular by the developing countries, which do not possess formidable arsenals capable of destroying the planet several times over and which are not striving to achieve positions of strength, but which are intent on ensuring for their peoples the realization of basic human aspirations, such as freedom from the threat of hunger and disease and the fear of instant extinction. The time is past for the setting up of principles and guidelines. We have already agreed on those principles and guidelines in solemn documents which constitute the best possible expression of our common endeavour. The time is now ripe for the strengthening of our commitment to action, and the only way we can strengthen this commitment is through action itself.

The Brazilian delegation will participate in the forthcoming substantive work of this Committee with the aforementioned considerations as its guiding principles. They stem from the continued dedication of my Government to the cause of disarmament and to the cause of upholding the sovereign right of States to shape their future with no discrimination whatsoever. We look forward to contributing to the furtherance of these goals through the strengthening of the commitment of Member States, in particular the nuclear-weapon Powers, to the achievement of disarmament as a necessary condition for a meaningful peace and security for all nations.

Mr. KOMIVES (Hungary): In my statement today I should like to deal briefly with some questions of nuclear disarmament, new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, and chemical weapons.

The Hungarian Government continues to attach the highest importance to the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and to nuclear disarmament in full consistency with the priorities set by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Today's world is facing the further sophistication of nuclear weapons, the decision of NATO to deploy new modern medium-range missiles in western Europe, the American doctrine of limited nuclear war and the constant danger of a nuclear holocaust which could be caused by technical failure or human error. These factors further accentuate the importance and urgency of reaching tangible results in curbing the nuclear-arms race and of making headway in nuclear disarmament.

Hungary, as a European socialist country, attaches great importance to the early ratification of SALT II, which would serve the vital interests of the two negotiating Powers and also the interests of the whole world. We consider of paramount importance the avoidance of a new stage in the nuclear-arms race in Europe, the danger of which has been caused by the NATO decision. Against this background, Hungary whole-heartedly supported the proposal of the Soviet Union for negotiations embracing also the United States forward-based nuclear systems and welcomed the commencement of the negotiations between the USSR and the United States at Geneva on 17 October. Progress in military détente in Europe would have extraordinary positive effects not only on the old continent but also on the world at large. The best way of attaining this goal would be through a conference as proposed by the States members of the Warsaw Treaty and reaffirmed again during the last meeting of the Foreign Ministers of those States held in Warsaw on 19 and 20 October. The Ministers emphasized that a decision to hold a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe would be of major importance.

(Mr. Komives, Hungary)

The existing dangerous situation makes more urgent than ever before negotiations on nuclear disarmament, as proposed many times by the Socialist countries, including Hungary, aimed at ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing stockpiles of them until they have been completely destroyed. The immediate task before us is to intensify the efforts to initiate negotiations on these questions with the participation of all nuclear-weapon States. The Committee on Disarmament should continue to consider the establishment of an ad hoc working group for this purpose. The Hungarian delegation hopes that our Committee will take appropriate action in this respect.

The most urgent task in curbing the nuclear arms race is to reach agreement on a comprehensive test-ban treaty; this opinion is widely shared by many delegations. Hungary welcomed the report submitted by the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States to the Committee on Disarmament on the status of their negotiations on a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapon test explosions in all environments. In this connexion, the acceptance of the new Soviet initiative concerning the declaration of a moratorium on nuclear tests could speed up the process of reaching agreement on a comprehensive test ban.

Hungary, which was among the first to sign and ratify the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), continues to attribute great importance to the strengthening of the NPT régime. The recent Second Review Conference on the NPT, although it could not adopt a final declaration, proved the general recognition of the need for the universalization of the Treaty and for the further enhancement of its effectiveness.

My delegation reaffirms its full support for the strengthening of the system of political and international legal guarantees for the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

In connexion with security guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States against the threat of use of nuclear weapons, which has been dealt with for quite some time in an ad hoc working group of the Committee on Disarmament, the conclusion of an international convention would be



(Mr. Komives, Hungary)

the best solution. We have to continue our search for a common formula for a declaration by nuclear-weapon States acceptable to all, which could be included in a convention or any international instrument of a legally binding character. In this process the Security Council could play an important role, as provided for in part III of the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union, to which my delegation gives its full support.

The elaboration and adoption of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would be, in the opinion of the Hungarian delegation, an important step in our efforts to curb the nuclear arms race, prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and strengthen the NPT régime.

The report of the Secretary-General, submitted in accordance with resolution 34/87 C, shows that many countries support the idea of elaborating and concluding an international agreement on this question. The best way of making progress would be to entrust the Committee on Disarmament with the elaboration of such an agreement. The Hungarian delegation, together with like-minded delegations, is working to prepare and submit a draft resolution on this question and hopes that it will receive favourable consideration by our Committee.

The prohibition of the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons has been on the agenda since 1975 as a result of a Soviet initiative. The importance and urgency of the prohibition of these weapons were clearly reflected in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly. The new developments in some Western countries concerning the neutron bomb further accentuate the urgency of the prohibition of these weapons.

(Mr. Kcmives, Hungary)

The Hungarian delegation, like many others, prefers a comprehensive solution of the problem and a comprehensive prohibition of the development of such weapons. It notes with satisfaction that this question received increased attention during the last session of the Committee on Disarmament.

My delegation continues to hold the view that the establishment of an appropriate framework is necessary for dealing with the complex issues involved. Against this background, the Hungarian delegation supported and continues to support the proposal of the Soviet Union aimed at the establishment of an ad hoc group of experts in the framework of the Committee on Disarmament to deal with the elaboration of a comprehensive agreement and to consider the question of concluding special agreements on individual weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. My delegation hopes that the Committee will take appropriate action for the resolution of this important question, and I should like to express our readiness to co-operate in such an endeavour.

Turning to the question of radiological weapons, my delegation regrets that the Committee on Disarmament was unable to elaborate the text of such a treaty, despite the expectation of many delegations that hoped that this goal was within reach. They thought this because the joint USSR-United States proposal on major elements of a treaty prohibiting radiological weapons submitted to the Committee on Disarmament in July 1979 received a favourable response in that Committee.

The consideration of the main elements of a treaty proved to be useful. The ad hoc working group reached the stage at which negotiations on a concrete text would be possible, which could lead to completion of the elaboration of a treaty next year. In the opinion of my delegation, our Committee has to work to this end by the adoption of an appropriate resolution.

(Mr. Komives, Hungary)

The efforts to elaborate a convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction resulted in two important developments last year: first, the establishment of an ad hoc working group in the Committee on Disarmament and, second, the submission of the joint USSR-United States report to the Committee on Disarmament on their bilateral negotiations.

The ad hoc working group has made significant advances in defining the issues to be dealt with in the negotiations on a chemical weapons convention. At the same time, we have to state that much remains to be done. My delegation has already had the opportunity to welcome the joint USSR-United States report on the progress in their bilateral negotiations aimed at working out a joint initiative on the prohibition of chemical weapons. The report reaffirms the commitment of the two Powers to pursue negotiations to that end, reflects the progress achieved so far and enumerates the outstanding issues.

The Hungarian delegation hopes that the Committee will take appropriate action to facilitate and intensify the activities in this very important field of disarmament.

Mr. de LAIGLESIA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): We are holding the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly this year at a time of grave tension in international relations, which would at first glance appear to be the least propitious time to speak of disarmament. On the contrary, however, the increase in tension is a necessary reminder of the desirability of continuing to search for solutions to the problems posed by the arms race in all its aspects.

In my statement in this general debate on disarmament questions on 23 October I referred exclusively to the item on conventional disarmament, to which my delegation attaches such great importance.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

Today, as I stated on that occasion, I should like to address my remarks to some of the items on the agenda of the First Committee, an agenda which we must acknowledge offers virtually nothing new.

Before I take up those items, I should like to make some general remarks. Nobody in this room will be surprised to hear me assert that the disarmament process is slow and at times discouraging. But if we wish to make headway, we must not lose sight of the fact that our objective should be the adoption of realistic gradual measures that take into account the changing international situation, so that we do not get bogged down in rhetorical declarations devoid of content. In that connexion, it is essential to keep in mind at all times the imperative need for security and the close relationship between measures of détente and defence measures. The presentation of unrealistic proposals whose objective would appear to be one of propaganda rather than the search for solutions is not helpful to our work.

To begin with, I should like to draw attention to and make some brief observations on the item relating to the membership of the Disarmament Committee, whose periodic review is provided for in paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament, and was also referred to again in resolution 33/91 G, which was sponsored by Spain together with a large number of countries. The second operative paragraph of that resolution states:

"Requests the Committee on Disarmament to consider the modalities of the review of the membership of the Committee and to report on this subject to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session"<sup>1</sup>

The report of the Committee in response to that request of the General Assembly includes a paragraph - paragraph 73 - which only contains information concerning the practice followed on previous occasions when the membership of the negotiating body was changed.

The relevant paragraphs of the Final Document reflect undeniable progress towards the democratization of the disarmament machinery. The resurrection of the Disarmament Commission is a translation into practical terms of the principle of universality set forth in paragraph 14 of the Final Document. The part of that same document which relates to the work of the multilateral negotiating

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

body, at that time rebaptized the Disarmament Committee, also constitutes positive recognition of the fact that disarmament is the common concern of mankind. The Final Document seeks to combine two equally valid principles: that of the desirability, for essentially practical purposes, of the negotiating body's being of limited membership with that of the legitimate interest of all States in disarmament negotiations, which affect us all. Thus the provisions on the participation of non-member States in the work of the Committee were subsequently included in its rules of procedure.

The Spanish delegation considers that the restricted nature of the composition of the Committee on Disarmament, whose usefulness we recognize, should not serve as a reason for permanently excluding from the Committee countries which, like my own, feel they can make a positive contribution to the work of the Committee as full members.

The wording of paragraph 73 of the report of the Committee to the General Assembly would appear to indicate that the only possible way of reviewing the membership of the Committee would be by enlarging it, as happened on the other occasions when the resolutions mentioned in that paragraph were adopted. We should devise some effective formula which would make it possible to reconcile the two concepts to which I referred earlier, namely, that of respect for the necessarily restricted nature of the Committee, on the one hand, and the legitimate right of all States to participate at any time as full members in that negotiating body, on the other hand. We trust that the Committee will more fully and specifically discharge its commitment to proceed in due course to the consideration of its membership and that its report to the special session devoted to disarmament will not, as on the present occasion, be confined to indicating the practice followed so far, but rather, will contain constructive proposals.

While that specific aspect of the work of the Committee cannot be regarded by us as satisfactory, we must however welcome the fact that at its 1980 session the Committee was able to remove the obstacles to the study of some of

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

the items on its agenda through the establishment of working groups and in the one dealing with chemical weapons, in particular, this has made it possible to identify the elements of the future convention that will ban such weapons, a convention to which my delegation attaches particular importance. In keeping with that concern of my country and making use of the provisions on the participation of non-member States, I had the honour to intervene in the debate which took place on the question of chemical weapons on two occasions.

As for the deliberative body, the Disarmament Commission, I should like to reiterate our conviction that its usefulness in the disarmament process would be enhanced if the agenda were to focus on a few specific items and if, as stated in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, an effort were made to ensure that in so far as possible decisions on substantive questions were adopted by consensus.

With respect to nuclear disarmament our position is well known. The need to make headway in that field should not in any way affect the development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, which are becoming daily more important in the context of the problems that today beset the production of energy.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

We regret that the strategic arms limitation process is paralysed, although we note with satisfaction the opening of negotiations aimed at limiting the emplacement of medium-range nuclear weapons. We hope that the tripartite talks on the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests will come to a speedy conclusion. In this connexion we regard as positive the report submitted by the three negotiating Powers to the Committee on Disarmament on 30 July 1980 and contained in document CD/130.

It is important to create the machinery necessary to prevent the introduction of new types of weapons of mass destruction into military arsenals. The impressive development of technology, which is one of the most outstanding phenomena of our time, enables us to foresee that in the near future it will be possible to construct infinitely more deadly weapons than those in existence today. We believe that we cannot remain indifferent to this situation and that it is desirable to adopt measures on the subject. However, these should be fundamental in nature: they need to be as explicit as possible and in keeping with the form which new weapons of mass destruction might take, for their technologies may differ considerably. That is why very general or simply declaratory legal instruments would, in our view, be totally ineffective.

I referred earlier to our continued interest in the abolition of chemical and biological weapons. We consider that in any agreement concluded, the question of verification will be of fundamental importance. The delegation of Spain was able to support initiatives aimed at strengthening the verification machinery of the convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and their destruction during the review conference which was held last March.

With regard to chemical weapons, I also stressed the importance of verification in my last statement in the Committee on Disarmament.

For all these reasons, Spain, which since 22 August 1929 has been a party to the Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, notes with concern reports of the alleged use of chemical weapons in certain armed conflicts

which are under way at present and is willing to consider with keen interest any proposal which might come before the First Committee aiming at clarifying, objectively and impartially, the truthfulness or falsehood of those allegations.

At this session, our Committee will have to take up two particularly important items. I refer to the adoption of the declaration of the 1980s as the second Disarmament Decade and to preparations for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

At the last substantive meeting of the Disarmament Commission, the draft text of the declaration of the second Disarmament Decade was discussed thoroughly. My delegation regrets that the Commission's report to the General Assembly contains certain paragraphs in square brackets which reflect disagreement on certain points; we trust that we will be able to arrive at wording which will be to everyone's satisfaction. One of the most controversial points was the one relating to the setting up of time-frames for the achievement of disarmament objectives. We agree with other delegations that it is not realistic to set precise dates in so complex a process as the one which we are attempting to promote. This process in fact, is closely linked with the development of international relations and it will depend on those relations whether the pace of our work can be speeded up or, as happened this year, whether situations will arise which have serious effects on international peace and security and one of whose most serious consequences is to cause an interruption of the disarmament process.

We are approaching the second special session devoted to disarmament, which will probably be held before the summer of 1982. My delegation wishes to stress its interest in that session and its willingness to collaborate directly in its preparatory work. The General Assembly will have to take decisions on a large number of items. Careful preparation, taking into account the criterion of realism to which I referred at the beginning of this statement, will make it possible not to betray the hopes placed in the session.

I would not want to conclude without expressing the Spanish delegation's satisfaction at the successful result of the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. The adoption



(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

of a general agreement, and of the three protocols on the use of non-detectable fragments, land-mines and booby traps and incendiary weapons is a truly positive step in the progress towards a more humanitarian regulation of the law of war. I should like to congratulate Ambassador Adeniji, the representative of Nigeria in the Committee on Disarmament, whose efforts have contributed effectively to the results obtained.

Mr. AL-DOY (Bahrain)(interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, my delegation is pleased to associate itself with other delegations which have congratulated you on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. We share the greatly deserved confidence which those delegations have placed in you. We wish also to congratulate the other officers on their elections to their important posts.

(Mr. Al-Doy, Bahrain)

The First Committee, as is customary at each General Assembly session, has the responsibility of considering questions relating to disarmament - questions which take priority among the many tasks undertaken by the United Nations. Responsibility for disarmament rests, first and foremost, upon all Member States, and in particular upon the five nuclear-weapon States. Hence, these latter States must assume greater responsibility than the rest of us in the field of the maintenance of international peace and security by reason of the rights and privileges which they enjoy in the Security Council under the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter.

What world public opinion is concerned about is the expenditures devoted today to armaments, which have attained enormous figures greatly exceeding the sums spent on health, education and housing, which are the foundation of human societies. Nevertheless, although everyone is aware of that, the arms race intensifies year by year. Today, more than \$500 billion is spent each year on armaments. The two super-Powers alone account for 51 per cent of that figure. Meanwhile hundreds of millions of human beings are suffering from hunger.

This unbridled race in military expenditures has serious consequences for the efforts being made to establish a new international economic order. The State of Bahrain, a small developing peace-loving country, has devoted its efforts and directed its economy towards the attainment of civil goals such as the building of schools and hospitals, the carrying out of housing projects and everything that is conducive to raising the living standards of its people and improving its well-being.

(Mr. Al-Doy, Bahrain)

The prohibition on developing, producing and stockpiling chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stocks of such weapons are an important step towards disarmament. The elimination of weapons of this type - which are regarded as weapons of mass destruction that are easy to produce - would, if it were achieved, represent an important accomplishment of the First Committee, bearing in mind the fact that discussion of chemical and bacteriological weapons is a priority item on its agenda.

The nuclear arms race has achieved vertiginous speed, as is mentioned in the report of the group of experts who have been entrusted with the task of conducting a comprehensive study of this question. This has only one explanation: the lack of confidence among States.

With regard to item 41 of the agenda on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, my delegation believes that the intensification of military rivalry between the great Powers, particularly the two super-Powers, despite resolution 2832 (XXVI) adopted by the General Assembly in December 1971 declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, is a cause of grave concern for the coastal and hinterland countries of the Indian Ocean. We wish the conference on the Indian Ocean proposed for 1981 every success. There is no doubt that if that conference were successful it would have achieved its fundamental objective, that of strengthening the security of the coastal and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean.

The State of Bahrain has always supported the establishment of denuclearized zones in Africa, the Middle East, southern Asia and Latin America. As a peace-loving State, we support the idea of security guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against countries which do not possess such weapons. We are also in favour of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

(Mr. Al-Doy, Bahrain)

The fact that South Africa possesses nuclear weapons, in addition to the report concerning nuclear co-operation between Israel and South Africa, is a source of profound concern for both the African States and the Arab States. My delegation attaches particular importance to item 36 of the agenda on the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, and also to item 49 of the agenda on Israeli nuclear armament.

Before concluding my statement, I cannot fail to mention the last session of the Committee on Disarmament held this year in Geneva, which, in spite of the difficulties it had to face, succeeded in setting up four working groups. We hope that this important achievement will be followed by others in the course of the 1981 session.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): The Committee will recall that on 17 October I had the privilege of making a statement on behalf of the members of the European Community in which I dealt with two items on our agenda, the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva and the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Today I have again the honour to speak on behalf of the Nine, and I shall deal with the following issues: the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, to be held in 1982, and, more or less in connexion with that special session, the topics of regional disarmament, confidence-building measures, conventional disarmament and military budgets. Finally, I shall have something to say on behalf of the Nine on the Soviet proposal contained in document A/C.1/35/L.1.

The States members of the European Community consider the item related to the preparation of the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament as one of great importance.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

The Mine believe, therefore, that it is timely to set out now some of their preliminary ideas concerning the objectives and methods of the special session on disarmament and its preparation.

The Final Document adopted by the first special session on disarmament has guided the work of the international disarmament bodies which were created or restructured under its auspices. It has remained the most important document on disarmament elaborated by the United Nations to date, and it has lost none of its relevance. The Final Document resulted from long, careful and sometimes painstaking preparation in which many diverging views had to be reconciled. Its adoption by consensus was an achievement of great significance and the Final Document should not be amended or replaced.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

As we embark on preparations for the second special session, the Nine will be guided by the principle that that session should be built on the valuable work of the first session and experience since that time. This would clearly include the contributions to disarmament made since the adoption of the Final Document in other bodies, within their fields of competence. In the view of the member States of the European Community, the second special session might, furthermore, adopt an approach consisting in the following elements.

The Committee on Disarmament has already undertaken to prepare a comprehensive programme on disarmament - which in our view should propose measures that could enhance and facilitate the Final Document's implementation - that will be submitted to the special session. The Nine express the hope that that programme will be concluded well before the second special session on disarmament. Those amongst the Nine who are members of the Committee on Disarmament will contribute actively to that end.

Furthermore, there are a number of United Nations disarmament studies that are being carried out with the help of qualified experts and they may be expected to provide recommendations for concrete measures that could be valuable contributions to the implementation of the Final Document. For example, the expert studies on military budgets, conventional weapons, regional disarmament, an international satellite monitoring agency, disarmament and development, confidence-building measures and other institutional arrangements come to mind. It is the belief of the Nine that this approach will allow the second special session to make a constructive contribution to the disarmament process, which is of fundamental importance to all of us.

I shall now put forward a few ideas on the organization and preparation of the forthcoming second special session.

In view of the task to be accomplished by the special session a preparatory committee will have to be established and entrusted solely with the preparation of the second special session on disarmament. The first substantive meeting of that preparatory committee could take place in May/June 1981, connected in time to the meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the duration of which would be somewhat shorter than

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

usual next year. After that first meeting of the preparatory committee one more preparatory meeting or, perhaps, if the need arises, two more preparatory meetings could be envisaged. As far as participation in the work of the preparatory committee is concerned, the Nine would favour, in principle, a limited membership on the basis of equitable geographical representation; at the same time, the Nine believe that no State which wishes to participate should be excluded.

That was what I had to say on behalf of the Nine concerning the second special session on disarmament. I shall now continue to make some remarks, also on behalf of the Nine, concerning some of the specific studies and topics that I have already mentioned in passing.

The Nine have taken note with satisfaction of the Secretary-General's report containing the study prepared by a group of governmental experts on regional disarmament, appointed in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 33/91 E of 16 December 1978. We are encouraged by the fact that that geographically diverse group of experts was able to reach a consensus on the contents of the study.

The comprehensive and self-contained treatment of the subject of regional disarmament, especially the survey of conceivable disarmament measures which may lend themselves to a regional approach, constitutes a valuable contribution to the effort to achieve meaningful disarmament measures. The Nine support the draft resolution on this subject which will be submitted by several delegations, including States members of the European Community, and trust that the suggestions it contains will be approved by the General Assembly.

At its thirty-fourth session, last year, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to carry out, with the assistance of qualified governmental experts, a comprehensive study on confidence-building measures.

In proposing agreements on confidence-building measures certain European States have encouraged the development of confidence amongst States by showing greater openness and clarity in the field of security, especially in its military aspects. European States have gained encouraging experience with measures to reduce mistrust, avoid misunderstanding and prevent miscalculation and misinterpretation of the attitudes and actions of other States.

The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe agreed on a series of measures at Helsinki in 1975. But these were designed

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

only to cover regional conditions and should represent merely a first step in the European context. We note with appreciation the progress report submitted by the Secretary-General on the study that is being undertaken at present. The outline of the contents of the forthcoming study shows that confidence-building by the application of measures carefully designed to meet the particular needs and conditions of various regions of the world might be possible. Agreements on effective measures within the framework of appropriate policies could contribute to a strengthening of the security of States. This would be a very significant step in our common efforts to pave the way to real disarmament measures.

The nine member States of the European Community welcome the work done so far by the study group. We are confident that the study that we shall have before us next year will give us useful guidance for our further work.

The Nine have repeatedly stressed the need to include conventional disarmament in the over-all disarmament process if our common goal of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control is to be attained. In their first statement in the general debate in this Committee on 17 October the Nine announced that one of its member States, with the support of all others, would introduce a draft resolution giving effect to paragraph 85 of the Final Document of the first special session on the subject of carrying out a study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces, as a logical follow-up to the conclusion reached in the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its second substantive session in the spring of this year.

On 24 October the representative of Denmark introduced the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.2. It is the firm conviction of the Nine that the General Assembly should now decide to carry out the study on all aspects of the conventional arms race.

On several occasions the member States of the European Community have stressed the importance that they attach to the question of the reduction of military budgets and to the search for means which would allow defence



(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

expenditures to be compared effectively. This would permit a balanced and gradual reduction of expenditures in the initial stage of the major military States and later of all States.

The Nine are aware that the exchange of reliable information on military expenditures, especially if carried out on a regular basis, and greater transparency of military budgets would be valuable assets in the improvement of confidence among States. For this reason we have followed with particular attention the work of the Ad Hoc Panel for the elaboration of a standardized and verifiable reporting instrument for the determination of military expenditures. Indeed, several member States of the European Community have participated in the 'test run' of the reporting instrument.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

We are confident that the General Assembly will endorse the report to be presented on this matter by the Secretary-General. Moreover, in the view of the line the Panel should continue the valuable work it has accomplished so far in order to refine further and to implement on a regular basis the proposed reporting instrument and to begin a study of the question of comparability of military expenditures among various States and in various years as well as of the fundamental problem of verification which will arise in connexion with future agreements on the reduction of military budgets.

We should like to appeal to countries of other regional groups, and especially to those with different budgetary systems, to participate actively in this endeavour to make military budgets more comparable. Only through truly representative participation by countries from all regions will it be possible to achieve this goal, which is a necessary prerequisite for an agreement on the reduction of military budgets in full respect for the need for undiminished security.

Those were some general remarks I wished to make on behalf of the Nine concerning some studies and topics.

I should like now to address myself very briefly to one aspect of the Soviet initiative entitled 'certain urgent measures to reduce the danger of war'.

That draft proposal is, in the opinion of the Nine, based on an entirely faulty analysis and it therefore leads to recommendations which are questionable, to say the least.

I shall, however, for the moment deal only with part I of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.1.

This part is directed against any increase in the membership of military alliances which by implication is seen as increasing the danger of war.

The text encounters two fundamental objections: the first objection is based squarely on the Charter of the United Nations and, in particular, the provisions regarding the inalienable right of self-defence and the conditions in which that right may be exercised. The other objection concerns an erroneous appraisal of the facts that constitute the present international situation.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

As to the first objection, the proposals contained in part I of that draft resolution would run counter to the United Nations Charter and they are in conflict with the sovereign rights of States. I refer in particular to Article 51 of the Charter concerning the inherent right of individual and collective self-defence. It is clear that if States, whether or not organized in regional groups, are entitled to act together in self-defence, as the Charter says, then they are entitled to make arrangements in advance to this end, so that, when the need arises, their inherent right of self-defence can be exercised collectively against an armed attack.

Part I of the document, however, would rule out this possibility for any State which does not already belong to a military alliance and would therefore, in our view, not be in accord with Article 51 of the Charter.

A second objection is that the draft proposal also claims that there is a link between the "danger of war" and the existence of military alliances. The view of the Nine - not all of which belong to a military alliance - is that the existence of alliances in itself does not increase the danger of war.

Indeed, I must point out that these days the main centres of real tension - the Middle East, Afghanistan, southern Africa, Kampuchea, the Persian Gulf and the Horn of Africa - are situated in regions which are in fact not covered by military alliances. On the other hand, it is relevant to note that, in some of the zones of conflict that I have mentioned, there do exist bilateral arrangements with one of the super-Powers that go by the name of "Treaties of Friendship and Co-operation".

For those reasons, among others, the proposal submitted by the Soviet Union is considered unacceptable to the Nine States members of the European Community, whether they themselves belong to a military alliance or not.

In conclusion, the Nine consider it worth while to stress once again and in this context that security is a prerequisite for all disarmament efforts. It follows therefrom that disarmament measures and measures designed to enhance security should be realistic and should embody provisions for strict and effective international control. Measures that fail to meet those requirements contribute nothing to genuine disarmament, whereas they are at the same time dangerously misleading to those who seek to safeguard their security through the process of disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to take this opportunity to welcome the presence among us of the leader of the Swedish delegation to the Committee on Disarmament, Mrs. Thorsson. We shall have the privilege of listening to her this afternoon, since Sweden is inscribed as the first speaker for our meeting then.

Before adjourning the meeting, I would inform the Committee that the Bureau has considered the question of the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions and decided to recommend to the Committee that it should be set for Friday, 14 November, at noon. The Bureau also recommends that the Secretariat apply this deadline strictly, except in the case of draft resolutions which are revised by the sponsors as a result of consultations or those which may emerge after a negotiating process during which elements of draft resolutions submitted previously are combined.

If there is no objection, I shall consider that the Committee wishes to adopt those recommendations.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.