

CD/PV.103  
10 February 1981  
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND THIRD MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Tuesday, 10 February 1981, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. F. de la Gorce (France)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. A. MAATI

Argentina: Miss N. FREYRE PENABAD

Australia: Mr. R.A. WALKER  
Mr. T. FINDLAY

Belgium: Mr. A. ONKELINX  
Mr. J.-M. NDIRIFALISSE  
Miss G. VANDENBERGH

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

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV  
Mr. R. DEYANOV  
Mr. K. PRAMOV

Burma: U SAW HLAING  
U THAN HTUN

Canada: Mr. D.S. McPHAIL  
Mr. G. SKINNER  
Mr. C. CACCIA  
Mr. B. THACKER

China: Mr. LIANG Yufen  
Mr. PAN Ju-Sheng  
Mrs. GE Yi-Yun

Cuba: Mr. L. SOLA VILA  
Mrs. V. BOROWDOSKY JACKIEWICH

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. M. RUZEK  
Mr. P. LUKES  
Mr. A. CIMA  
Mr. L. STAVINOHA

Egypt:

Mr. E.A. EL REEDY  
Mr. I.A. HASSAN  
Miss W. BASIM

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. TERREFE  
Mr. F. YOHANNES

France:

Mr. F. DE LA GORCE  
Mr. J. DE BEAUSSE  
Mr. M. COUTHURES

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER  
Mr. H. THIELICKE  
Mr. M. SCHNEIDER  
Mr. M. KAULEFUSS  
Mr. P. BÜNTIG  
Mr. G. PFEIFFER  
Mr. N. KLINGLER

Hungary:

Mr. I. KOMIVES  
Mr. C. GYORFFY

India:

Mr. A.P. VENKATESWARAN  
Mr. S. SARAN

Indonesia:

Mr. S. DARUSMAN  
Mr. E. SOEPRAPTO  
Mr. P. QASIM  
Mr. KARYONO

Iran:

Mr. D. AMERI

Italy: Mr. V. CORDERO DI MONTEZEMOLO  
Mr. A. CIARRAPICO  
Mr. B. CABRAS  
Mr. E. DI GIOVANNI

Japan: Mr. Y. OKAWA  
Mr. R. ISHII  
Mr. K. SHIMADA

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

Mexico: Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES  
Mr. A. CACERES

Mongolia: Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG  
Mr. S.-O. BOLD

Morocco: Mr. A. SKALLI  
Mr. M. CHRAIBI

Netherlands: Mr. R.H. FEIN  
Mr. H. WAGENMAKERS

Nigeria: Mr. O. ADENIJI  
Mr. J.O. COKER  
Mr. W.O. AKINSANYA  
Mr. T. AGUIYI-IRONSI

Pakistan: Mr. M. AHMED  
Mr. M. AKRAM

Peru: Mr. A. THORNBERRY

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA  
Mr. B. RUSSIN  
Mr. S. KONIK  
Mr. J. CIALOWICZ  
Mr. T. STROJWAS

Romania:

Mr. L. MALITA  
Mr. O. IONESCU  
Mr. T. MELESCANU

Sri Lanka:

Mr. H.M.G.S. PALIHAKKARA

Sweden:

Mr. C. LIDGARD  
Mr. L. NORBERG  
Mr. S. STRÖMBÄCK  
Mr. J. LUNDIN

Union of Soviet Socialist  
Republics:

Mr. B.P. PROKOFIEV  
Mr. L.A. NAUMOV  
Mr. V.A. PERFILIEV  
Mr. L.S. MOSHKOV  
Mr. V.M. GANJA  
Mr. V.V. LOSHCHININE  
Mr. A.G. DOULYAN  
Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO  
Mr. S.N. RIUKHINE

United Kingdom:

Mr. D.M. SUMMERHAYES  
Mr. N.H. MARSHALL  
Mr. B. NOBLE  
Mrs. J.I. LINK  
Mr. E. YEO

United States of America:

Mr. C. FLOWERREE  
Ms. K. CRITTENBERGER  
Mr. J.A. MISKEL  
Mr. H. WILSON  
Mr. S. FITZGERALD

Venezuela:

Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT  
Mr. O.A. AGUILAR

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. VRHUNEC  
Mr. B. BRANKOVIC

Zaire:

Mr. LONGO BEKPWA  
Mr. OSIL GNOK

Secretary of the Committee and  
Personal Representative of  
the Secretary-General:

Mr. R. JAIPAL

Deputy Secretary of the  
Committee on Disarmament:

Mr. V. BERASATEGUI

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): Mr. Chairman, I must, of course, warmly congratulate you on your assumption of the chairmanship of our Committee for the month of February, but just as warmly I have to congratulate you on the extremely efficient manner in which you have been guiding us since last week in our consideration of procedural matters which need to be taken care of at the beginning of our session. I am sure I am not the only one who hopes that the results of our first week augur well for the rest of our work in the weeks and months ahead. May I express my delegation's gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Terrefe of Ethiopia, for the solid work he did for us last August, notably in the delicate task of securing the adoption of our report to the General Assembly.

Finally, I wish to join those who have preceded me in welcoming amongst us this year Ambassador El Reedy of Egypt, Ambassador Mansur Ahmad of Pakistan, Ambassador Malita of Romania and Ambassador Bagbeni of Zaire, while regretting the departures of their respective predecessors.

Japan has pleaded time and again that the task of the greatest urgency in the field of disarmament is the achievement of nuclear disarmament. However, we have maintained the view that, in order to make progress towards nuclear disarmament, the only realistic approach is to lay one brick upon another and gradually accumulate concrete measures which are actually feasible under the international situation prevailing at the moment. While doing so, we must for ever bear in mind the need not to upset the framework of the security balance in any given region or the global framework of international security. It goes without saying that it is the nuclear-weapon States which have the foremost responsibility to move forward in the direction of nuclear disarmament and that it is those States which must take specific steps to apply the brakes to the development and production of even more nuclear weapons. May I inform this Committee that Mr. Masayoshi Ito, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, stated in his foreign policy speech to the two Houses of the Diet on 26 January 1981 that "Japan is resolved, as a nation dedicated to peace and as a Party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, to play a greater role in promoting disarmament and especially nuclear disarmament".

The promotion of nuclear disarmament is also of the highest importance in preserving and strengthening the non-proliferation régime based on the Non-Proliferation Treaty. In this context, we must recall that, at the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty held in Geneva last summer, virtually all countries stressed the urgency of reaching agreement on a comprehensive nuclear test ban -- a question that has been pending on the disarmament agenda ever since 1963 -- which would represent one specific step in the direction of nuclear disarmament and the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime. My Government once again urges the three States engaged in tripartite negotiations on a comprehensive test ban to strengthen their efforts towards a speedy conclusion of their negotiations. At the same time, my delegation wishes to appeal to all the distinguished delegates around this table, and to the Governments they represent, to agree that the question of a comprehensive test ban be taken up for consideration at this session of the Committee on Disarmament as the agenda item of the highest priority. From that point of view, the Government of Japan strongly hopes that

(Mr. Okawa, Japan)

a consensus can be arrived at in this room -- a consensus including the representatives of all the nuclear-weapon States -- to undertake a substantive consideration of the CTB question at this session of our Committee, including, inter alia, the institutional and administrative aspects of the envisaged international seismic data exchange and the verification system in general. My delegation hopes that such a consensus would cover the methodology of the Committee's substantive considerations, including the possibility of establishing a working group as a subsidiary organ of the Committee on Disarmament. It goes without saying that the work on the CTB to be undertaken in this Committee should be conducted in a manner and to an extent that would be complementary and not prejudicial to the ongoing trilateral negotiations.

A further step in strengthening the non-proliferation régime is the achievement of universal adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It has recently been reported that the Government of Egypt has taken the decision to begin the process of ratifying that Treaty. The Government of Japan welcomes this news and wishes to pay tribute to the Government of Egypt for its statesmanlike decision, since the adherence of Egypt to the Non-Proliferation Treaty would be of the highest significance in the context of international efforts towards universalization of the Treaty and the denuclearization of the region of the Middle East. My Government wishes to take this occasion to appeal to the two nuclear-weapon States and the remaining non-nuclear-weapon States who have so far stayed outside the NPT régime to follow the momentous example of Egypt at the earliest possible opportunity.

In a more general context, the state of international tension is continuing in the wake of various regional confrontations, conflicts and military intervention that have been witnessed in the course of the last few years. This is to be regretted. However, it is important from the point of view of achieving strategic stability between East and West and promoting nuclear disarmament that the East-West dialogue in the field of disarmament and arms control should not be allowed to stagnate, but rather that it be promoted and accelerated. It is in this sense that my Government wishes to express its emphatic hope that the Soviet Union and the United States will continue their talks -- the so-called SALT process -- on the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons and the mutual restraining of the never-ending qualitative improvement of those weapons.

Our work in the Committee on Disarmament must also move ahead and we must follow up on the results of our work at last year's session. My delegation appreciated the fact that last year we were able to establish four ad hoc working groups and that each of them was able to do some useful work in its respective field. My delegation therefore requests that the four working groups of last year be re-established and recommence their work without delay, from the beginning of this session, as each of them recommended in its report to the Committee last year.

In particular, my delegation hopes that an Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons will be established without delay and that it will be enabled to continue and advance the work which was undertaken by its predecessor last year. We would welcome a more positive and precise mandate being agreed upon by consensus for this Working Group, but if that were to create difficulties, the Working Group should at least start working immediately, under a mandate identical to that of last year, while discussions could be held separately on the elaboration of a new mandate.



(Mr. Okawa, Japan)

My delegation considers this to be the most practical way in which to proceed. We would, of course, support the continuation of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament and the creation of two other working groups to deal with negative security assurances and radiological weapons, respectively, which would continue the work of their predecessors under identical mandates. I thus fully endorse the constructive suggestion on this matter that we heard last week from Ambassador Venkateswaran, my distinguished colleague from India. As to the other disarmament matters which figure on our agenda, we look forward to their continued consideration at this session of the Committee.

With the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament looming ahead of us for next year, the responsibility of the Committee on Disarmament is of even greater significance at its 1981 session. We have begun our work in a most efficient manner under your inspired guidance, Mr. Chairman, and my delegation very sincerely hopes that we shall be able to continue in this manner, without having to devote too much time to procedural questions and moving ahead into the consideration of matters of substance as quickly as possible. It is my happy feeling that all delegations around this table share the same sentiment and are willing to try to make progress at this session in the true spirit of international co-operation.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank Ambassador Okawa for his statement and I should like to express my great gratitude for the very kind and friendly remarks he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. MALITA (Romania) (translated from French): At the beginning of my statement I should like to thank you for the words of welcome which you, as well as my colleagues, have addressed to me. I should like to assure you of my most sincere desire to maintain and develop the co-operation already established in the Committee with my predecessors.

Allow me to express the satisfaction I feel on joining the Committee at a time when the Chair is occupied by the representative of a great country which encourages reflection upon and research into the vital problems of mankind, among which disarmament occupies an important place. Your style, imbued as it is with flexibility and tact, reveals the negotiator. You are, Mr. Chairman, one of that breed of great French diplomats who have been raised on the wise counsels of Monsieur de Callières, written in 1716.

It was he who said that the good negotiator should aim above all at long-term success based on good faith, remembering that he will have many an issue to negotiate in the course of his career.

In this connection I wish to stress the fact that our Committee is a negotiating forum. Of course, diplomacy has a parliamentary side to it, with the fine rhetoric and the immediate impact through the mass media that this implies. But, unlike many other forms of co-operation between States, our Committee is also something like a laboratory for working out solutions to the grave and pressing problems created by the arms race.

Such an endeavour calls for the virtues and skills necessary in any negotiating effort, namely, perseverance, imagination in the search for acceptable solutions and the eschewing of polemics. To this should be added the fact that ours are multilateral negotiations, which necessitates in addition a respect for equality, fairness and democracy, principles which, moreover, the General Assembly, at its special session on disarmament, incorporated into the Committee's new structure.

(Mr. Malita, Romania)

However, we must not lose sight of a factor of the highest importance, that of time. For, at this stage in the negotiations, no one could express satisfaction with the rate at which they are proceeding. The first session was dominated by the elaboration of the rules of procedure; the second was devoted to the establishment of negotiating machinery through the setting up of working groups, a process which took up a great deal of time. The session that has just begun must speed up the rate of its work if it is to meet the demands of international life.

The Romanian delegation wishes clearly to state its belief that it is urgently necessary to proceed, without further delay for procedural or any other reasons, to effective and authentic negotiations -- to the real consideration of the problems on our agenda.

We believe that the Committee must do everything in its power to explore possibilities that might lead to solutions and to find formulas likely to command a consensus.

The general interest of mankind as a whole places the highest responsibility upon us, as the General Assembly at its last session made clear.

Reference is sometimes made to the favourable or less favourable conditions in which the work of our Committee is taking place -- to the temperature, as it were, of the political climate. In that connection I should like to stress that all the processes which characterize or form part of contemporary society combine to plead for the immediate cessation of the arms race, the scale of which has gone far beyond the limits of reason.

In the first place, present weapons systems are a source of insecurity. Their huge quantity, their immense destructive power that makes them capable of annihilating mankind, this whole vast panoply of explosive material that makes us the inglorious holders of a record for per capita armaments expenditure -- a figure far higher than any per capita national income figure or, for that matter, the amount of cereals per inhabitant -- all this can only inspire and maintain a psychosis of fear and insecurity both among governments and among the peoples of the world at large.

Can we speak of security while there is the risk of the outbreak of a conflagration at any moment as a result of unwanted escalation, error, miscalculation or accident?

Technological progress means a constant increase in the speed and precision of weapons. It means also, by the same token, a constant reduction in the time available for decision and in the safety margin, along with all the possibilities for technical errors mentioned by H.E. Alfonso García Robles, the Ambassador of Mexico. New refinements tend to make credible the possibility of the utilization of nuclear weapons.

For all these reasons, the Romanian delegation considers that we are faced with a threat to general security and with ever-increasing risks, bearing in mind that policies of force and domination, of pressure and diktat are still being espoused.

Secondly, the arms race is harmful to world economy. No in-depth analysis of the crises by which the world is beset today, such as the energy crisis, the raw materials crisis or the financial crisis, can overlook the vast sums being spent on arms.

In many countries, the increase in military expenditures is greater than the increase in national income. The 500 billion dollars swallowed up by the arms race each year serve only to intensify the crisis, increase economic instability and help to maintain and aggravate underdevelopment.

(Mr. Malita, Romania)

As is pointed out in the 1978 report by the United Nations Secretary-General on the "Economic and social consequences of the arms race and of military expenditures", the gigantic sums spent on arms are so many resources diverted from the solution of the problems of mankind, among which development is the first.

Thirdly, the proliferation and refinement of weapons is profoundly harmful to international life through the maintenance of attitudes based on force.

Existing armaments systems inevitably offer themselves as the means of resolving disputes, either by threats or by outright wars. The reduction of armaments must go along with the strengthening and refining of the instruments for the peaceful settlement of disputes provided under the Charter of the United Nations.

All these factors, military, economic and political, have created a new awareness among governments, parliaments, professional groupings and social movements, all of which are calling for a rapid improvement in international relations and for the cessation and reversal of the arms race.

References have been made to the influence of certain political factors or external events on the work of our Committee. I should like to draw attention to the other side of the coin, that is, the influence the Committee could exercise in opposing the mentality of force and the attempts to use force or the threat of force, a mentality engendered by the development of a large number of warlike institutions and systems.

Any good news that may come from our laboratory, any prospect of a solution coming from this quarter, will facilitate the task of political leaders throughout the world, alarmed by the increasing insecurity, deficits and inflation as well as by the crisis in development resources.

Any progress within our Committee will be appreciated even more by the peoples of the world, resolved to defend their right to existence, to life, to survival.

As the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, stated recently: "Our country will always strive tirelessly for the attainment of the great goal of disarmament, and, in the first place, nuclear disarmament. The worthy achievements of modern science and technology must not be used for destruction and war but for the well-being and happiness of the peoples. All the nations of the world must rise resolutely in defence of the fundamental human right -- the right to life, to peace, to a free existence."

Throughout the disarmament negotiations, Romania has always regarded nuclear disarmament as a matter of high priority and has emphasized that it was in this field that the most urgent and far-reaching measures were required. That position remains unchanged, the more so as developments in the nuclear weapons field amply demonstrate that nothing short of their total eradication will provide a definitive answer to problems of security.

This position finds a solid basis in the conclusions of the report of the Group of Experts on a Comprehensive Study on Nuclear Weapons, which emphasizes that "nuclear weapons are the most serious threat to international security" (document A/35/392, p. 153).

The resolutions of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, transmitted to the Committee and extensively quoted during our discussions, lay upon us precise obligations.

(Mr. Malita, Romania)

It is my delegation's sincere conviction that the Committee must respond to those appeals, which have been repeated ever since the foundation of the United Nations.

A failure to negotiate on the subject of nuclear weapons would be unjustifiable in any disarmament negotiating forum. The Romanian delegation therefore declares itself in favour of an immediate start to concrete negotiations on nuclear disarmament in this Committee.

The conditions necessary for that purpose already exist.

First, all five nuclear-weapon States, as well as a number of non-nuclear States, are taking part in the Committee's work.

Secondly, these topics already appear on the Committee's agenda and have formed the subject of an impressive number of specific proposals.

Thirdly, working groups have proved to be the mechanism best suited for tackling well-defined subjects.

That is why my delegation strongly supports the proposal for the establishment of an ad hoc working group on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament, which should hold discussions with a view to identifying the problems to be negotiated and drawing up a clear programme for the opening and conduct of structured talks capable of leading to the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and to the outlawing of such weapons.

We consider it necessary that the Working Group responsible for devising effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons should continue its work. On the basis of the results achieved last year, the Group should concentrate on working out a formula acceptable to all nuclear-weapon States whereby those States will undertake never and under no circumstances to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons, or force in general, against States which do not have such weapons.

The Romanian delegation also supports the proposal of the countries members of the Group of 21 and other countries for the establishment of a working group to undertake negotiations on the substance of an agreement on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

In the light of our position of principle, we also support the proposal made by H.E. Gerhard Herder, Ambassador of the German Democratic Republic, for the establishment of a structure for the elaboration of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.

We should also like to stress that the Committee ought to be in a position to report progress to the General Assembly at its session this year on the subjects of non-resort to nuclear weapons, which was mentioned by the Indian delegation, and cessation of the manufacture of fissionable materials for military purposes, to which the Australian delegation has referred.

As a European country, Romania is deeply alarmed by the military situation in this region of the world, which houses 80 per cent of the world's arsenals, and by the prospect of a new escalation of nuclear arms on the continent of Europe. We earnestly hope that the meeting now in progress at Madrid will decide to convene a conference on confidence-building measures and disarmament in Europe, which should elaborate concrete measures towards the cessation of the arms race and the reduction of the military potential existing on this continent.

(Mr. Malita, Romania)

Nuclear disarmament questions have, of course, formed the subject of negotiations in other forums, and I refer to the strategic arms limitation talks between the USSR and the United States, known as SALT. Romania welcomed the conclusion of the SALT II agreements and we hope that these agreements will be ratified in the near future, for that will be an important step forward, opening the way to further measures aimed at effectively halting the nuclear arms race.

The concentration of our efforts on nuclear disarmament in no way means that we should ignore the urgency of measures aimed at the prohibition of other weapons of mass destruction, and first and foremost chemical weapons. The Romanian delegation is in favour of the continuation of efforts to draft an international convention on this subject. The useful work done last year within the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons, as well as the informal meetings with experts, in our view offer a basis from which the Committee can proceed to a higher stage, that of negotiations on the drafting of the text of an international agreement on the complete and effective prohibition of chemical weapons. This qualitative aspect should be reflected in the Working Group's activities; the conclusion of the Soviet Union-United States negotiations in this connection could greatly contribute to the attainment of this objective.

As at the last session, we intend to make a constructive contribution to the preparation of the text of a treaty prohibiting radiological weapons, on the basis of the joint draft submitted by the delegations of the USSR and the United States of America and the proposals put forward by other States in the course of the previous negotiations.

There is something paradoxical about the fact that the development of science and technology, which bring so many benefits to mankind in all spheres, is also a driving force in the arms race.

The use of new discoveries for the purpose of producing ever more destructive weapons cannot fail to cause us concern. At the stage we have reached in our consideration of this question, it is important for us to take a decision as to the manner in which we are to continue our work. In view of the highly technical nature of the subject, we support the proposal for the setting up of an ad hoc group of scientific experts with a mandate to study the problems caused by new types of weapons and the question of the conclusion of an agreement or agreements aimed at the effective prevention of the use of science and technology for the development of weapons of mass destruction.

The Romanian delegation considers that pending the conclusion of a general agreement on this subject, States which have the necessary technological potential should undertake to take appropriate steps at the national level for the prevention of the utilization of the attainments of science and technology for destructive ends.

As H.E. Olu Ideniji, the Ambassador of Nigeria, rightly pointed out, the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, as required of us by the United Nations, is of special urgency this year in view of the preparations in progress for the second special session of the United Nations devoted to disarmament. This task reflects the urgent need to formulate, in a concrete and binding manner, a strategy and a practical negotiating programme aimed at mobilizing all efforts in favour of general and complete disarmament, and in the first instance nuclear disarmament. The inclusion in the document, in addition to concrete disarmament measures, of provisions likely to contribute to the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and to increasing its effectiveness in the co-ordination and the supervision of the efforts undertaken in various negotiating forums ought, given present international conditions, to be a major objective of our endeavours.

(Mr. Malita, Romania)

At this point in my statement I should like to sum up the Romanian delegation's position with regard to the various proposals made in the Committee. We believe that all these initiatives reflect the real advantages to be derived from using the working instruments which the ad hoc groups are considered to be. It should be stressed, however, that our discussions in this connection ought not delay the immediate commencement of work by the four Groups which were already in operation last year.

The matter of setting up flexible and practical subsidiary bodies of the Committee for the purpose of considering solutions or bringing us up to date on certain problems, should not be raised to the level of institutional and political questions, as has sometimes been the case in the past. A negotiating forum like ours should adopt a much freer approach towards the problems with which it is concerned. It is in that spirit that the Romanian delegation intends before long to raise the question of the freezing and reduction of military budgets. We attach special importance to this problem, which is written into the Committee's decalogue. The argument concerning the "maturing" of certain subjects cannot and should not discourage us from examining them; we are convinced that negotiation itself helps to mature a subject.

I should also like to emphasize that according to the terms of the "Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade", adopted by General Assembly resolution 35/46 of 3 December 1980, "... it is essential that not only Governments but also the peoples of the world recognize and understand the dangers in the present world armaments situation, so that world public opinion will be mobilized on behalf of peace and disarmament. This will be of great importance to the strengthening of international peace and security, the just and peaceful resolution of disputes and conflicts and effective disarmament". In our view, the manner in which the Committee on Disarmament could contribute towards a closer link with public opinion, by ensuring that it is better informed about the Committee's activities, should also be a subject for our attention. The Romanian delegation intends, at an appropriate time, to submit concrete proposals on this point.

We appreciate the broadening of the debate on disarmament among men of science and the objective and lucid sense of responsibility they are displaying in face of the dangers engendered by armaments and the use of science for military ends. In that context, we welcome the establishment of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research and we express the hope that the Institute will direct its work towards the major objectives defined in United Nations documents. Among the small and medium-sized developing countries the need is felt for scientific research capable of providing effective support to disarmament efforts.

As H.E. Mrs. Inga Thorsson, the distinguished representative of Sweden, pointed out, this year's session of the Committee on Disarmament is taking place under the sign of the second special session of the United Nations devoted to disarmament, whose task it will be to make a public evaluation of the results we have achieved. If those results are deemed inadequate, the reasons for this, including the Committee's work structures, might well be subject to very close scrutiny.

The conclusion to be drawn from all this is that, in conformity with General Assembly resolution 35/152J our Committee, as the single multilateral negotiating body on disarmament, should play the central role in substantive negotiations on priority questions of disarmament by combining its efforts with those undertaken in other forums.

In concluding these introductory remarks, allow me to emphasize that any delay in solving the problems before us will lead to situations of still greater complexity. We all agree that much simpler solutions might have been found in the early stages of modern weapons systems. Time does not ease the negotiators' task. My delegation is sincerely convinced that we have not reached irreversible situations. That is why it will spare no effort at this stage to try to help make our negotiations meaningful and fruitful.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank Ambassador Malita for his statement and I am especially grateful to him for the very kind and friendly terms in which he spoke of me. I should add that I was particularly touched by his reference to Mr. de Callières. Times have changed, but there is no doubt that the precepts contained in his work still retain a great deal of their value.

Mr. McPHAIL (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I should like to add my voice to that of others who have already expressed their pleasure at your assumption of the chairmanship of this Committee. The way you have been conducting our discussions leads us to think that this session of the Committee on Disarmament may prove to be more productive than we would have dared to hope. At the same time, my delegation is encouraged by the general desire that has been apparent in the Committee for the speedy completion of consideration of the agenda. We believe that the part you have played in this process has been crucial, and we should like to congratulate you on it.

I should also like to associate myself with my colleagues in welcoming to the Committee the new representatives of Egypt, Pakistan, Zaire and Romania. My delegation is convinced that the personal contributions of these representatives will be of value to the Committee in its deliberations.

My statement today will be brief. I want simply to survey in outline form the prospects for this year's session of the Committee as we see them. If I refer to the role and objectives that should be expected of this forum at this session, I do so without any intention of recounting today the history of past deliberations of the Committee on Disarmament, or for that matter of proposing any new measures. Instead, I do so at this juncture in the history of the Committee, and bearing in mind the events outside these chambers which inevitably affect our work, in order to stress the view of my Government that it is incumbent upon us to adopt the most practical and business-like approach possible to our work, and to aim at what realistically we might expect to achieve.

I accordingly hope that the Committee this year will proceed on the basis of three fundamental considerations:

- (1) Our proceedings should go forward on a basis of what is possible in the period leading up to the second special session on disarmament in full recognition of the fact that the Committee on Disarmament does not work in a vacuum, but is influenced by the international environment. In this regard we need to be sensitive to this environment, and if we are to achieve progress our aims for this session, and for others, must be fine-tuned accordingly.
- (2) We should therefore limit our objectives to realistic proposals lending themselves to items where prospects of agreement are high or where we have reasonable chances of achieving consensus. Only through registering progress can we be confident that the credibility of the CD will be strengthened.
- (3) In this regard, I suggest that it is particularly important that this Committee show progress now. We welcome the forthcoming and flexible attitudes expressed by many delegations and their determination to avoid the lengthy treatment of organizational and procedural questions which consumed so much time at the session of the Committee on Disarmament in 1980.

(Mr. McPhail, Canada)

With these considerations in mind, I agree with those speakers who have urged that working groups be convened as soon as possible; I also agree with those who have suggested that the four working groups established last year-- the working groups on negative security assurances, chemical weapons, radiological weapons and the comprehensive programme of disarmament-- should be re-established or continued on the basis of their mandates of last year. New mandates if eventually needed or desirable can be taken up by the Committee on Disarmament in parallel with the substantive work of those working groups, and when that work demonstrates the desirability of change. This is the kind of business-like and flexible approach appropriate to a negotiating forum of this kind.

I would now like to prognosticate on the outcome of those working groups, if as we hope, they are able to commence work at once:

(a) The chemical weapons and radiological weapons working groups: our assessment is that conditions are favourable for progress in these working groups if all parties maintain a sense of realism.

(b) Comprehensive programme of disarmament: the work of this working group is most relevant to preparations for the United Nations General Assembly's second special session on disarmament, and should proceed firmly and quickly, bearing in mind the work programme established by the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

(c) Negative security assurances: this working group has performed a valuable if difficult function of clarifying the issues and differences involved. The time may now be right for early consultation outside the working group framework by those most directly involved to determine whether at this stage, and how, further progress within the working group will be possible.

As for the proposed establishment of a working group on a comprehensive test ban, we believe that the effectiveness of any working group on this or any other question depends upon the adoption of a realistic mandate acceptable to all and particularly to those most directly concerned. This should be borne in mind in our deliberations on the creation of this working group, which we wish to see established at the earliest possible date. I repeat, however, that we want an effective working group, and that means there must be a readiness on all sides to consider the mandate question seriously and realistically. My Government holds firmly to the belief that we are not here to score debating points.

On the basis of these considerations and prognostications, which I know are shared by a great many other members of the Committee, I hope that it will be possible at this year's session of the Committee on Disarmament to move ahead in a business-like and constructive manner, that we will register substantive progress before the second special session in 1982, and that we shall build on the glimmering of progress recorded last year in the substantive efforts of our working groups, to make the Committee on Disarmament the true negotiating forum on disarmament matters it is intended-- and expected by the world-- to be.

Finally, and in the spirit of the remarks I just made concerning the interest in our work of those usually outside this Committee, I want to say the following. A week ago, we had a manifestation of the interest of youth on the occasion of the presentation of a book on disarmament written specially for them. Today I want to



(Mr. McPhail, Canada)

draw the attention of the Committee to a different and certainly no less significant manifestation of such interest. I am pleased to tell the Committee that we have duly informed the Secretary of the presence within the Canadian delegation today and for the next two weeks of two parliamentary advisers: Mr. Charles Caccia and Mr. Blaine Thacker, who represent respectively the Government party and the Official Opposition in the Canadian Parliament. Mr. Caccia in particular has been involved in disarmament and security questions in the Inter-Parliamentary Union and as adviser at the Madrid Conference. They are here to familiarize themselves with the work of the Committee and look forward to its plenary discussions and to the opportunity to meet members of other delegations for informal exchanges of views on the subjects before us.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank His Excellency Ambassador McPhail for his statement and I should also like to express to him all my gratitude for his very kind words about myself. I take this opportunity to welcome Mr. Charles Caccia and Mr. Blaine Thacker and I wish them an interesting stay among us.

Mr. PROKOFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): We extend greetings to you in the post of Chairman of the Committee as the representative of a country which has done much to reduce tensions in Europe and other parts of the world. The Soviet delegation hopes that, as Chairman at the initial stage of the Committee's activities this year, you will direct all your outstanding experience and knowledge of international affairs towards ensuring that our common endeavour gets off to a good start and that our work is business-like and productive.

The session of the Committee on Disarmament now beginning is notable in many respects. From the point of view of working time, it is really the last full session before the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, scheduled for 1982. This places a special responsibility upon all States represented in the Committee. On their political will, their readiness to reach real agreements in the disarmament sphere, will depend-- among other things-- the judgement passed on the Committee's activities at the special session.

The start of our Committee's work coincides with the resumption of the Madrid meeting, whose object is to reach agreements in the interests of the security and peaceful future of the European peoples, agreements which should, in particular, open the way for the convening of a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe. Multilateral negotiations on the joint reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe are continuing in Vienna. We believe that the accomplishment of positive results in the Committee on Disarmament and constructive, business-like negotiations within the Committee would be conducive to progress in those important international forums as well.

I should also like to draw attention to the fact that the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and congresses of other parties of the fraternal socialist countries are to be held during the period of the current session of the Committee on Disarmament. The socialist countries have always played and are playing an active, constructive part in all the most important areas of our multilateral body's activity and in solving problems of disarmament as a whole. To mention only the past year, the socialist countries have to their credit a broad

(Mr. Prokofiev, USSR)

programme of specific measures for the strengthening of peace and détente put forward at the May meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, business-like proposals on the same subject drawn up in October 1980 at a meeting of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, and initiatives by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries at the thirty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly, in the Committee on Disarmament and in other disarmament negotiating forums.

The decisions of the forthcoming 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the congresses of other parties of socialist countries, which always devote considerable attention to questions of strengthening peace and détente and reducing the danger of war, will without doubt make a fresh contribution towards the struggle of the peoples for the curbing of the arms race.

As is well known, the Soviet Union has constantly singled out the problem of disarmament, both as a whole and in its various aspects, as being of prime importance among the problems of contemporary international life whose solution brooks no delay. "The foreign policy of the Soviet Union," L.I. Brezhnev emphasized in his New Year's message of greetings to the Soviet people, "is pursuing clear and noble aims. We want peace for all peoples. Our allegiance to the ideals of freedom, justice and progress is unshakeable. The Soviet Union resolutely champions détente and the strengthening of co-operation, and opposes a firm 'no' to the arms race and to the complications and conflicts engendered by imperialist policies".

We are firmly convinced that the world can find genuine security, not through an endless succession of ever more terrifying and, by the same token, ever more expensive means of warfare, but by restraining the pace and the scale of the arms race until it is completely halted. Proceeding from the principle that there are no international problems that could not be solved through negotiations with reasonable regard for mutual interests, our country makes concrete and practically realizable proposals in the disarmament field. During the period since the Second World War, the USSR has put forward more than one hundred proposals of this kind, from those relating to individual measures -- and this applies particularly to the banning of atomic and, later, of thermonuclear weapons -- to general and complete disarmament.

At the thirty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly the Soviet delegation put forward, as is known, a broad programme of urgent measures aimed at reducing the danger of war. In the interests of improving the effectiveness of work in specific areas of the struggle for peace and the security of peoples, the Soviet Union submitted to the session of the General Assembly a memorandum entitled "Peace, disarmament and international security guarantees". The most important among the more than 40 resolutions on disarmament questions approved by the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session are based on proposals by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries dictated by a concern for the improvement of the political climate throughout the planet and the deepening of the process of détente. As the results of the General Assembly's work in this sphere demonstrate, a significant majority of States are resolutely in favour of placing disarmament on a track leading towards practical solutions and of taking without delay steps -- not, perhaps the most radical steps, but real ones nevertheless -- on the path towards the elimination of military confrontation. The conviction is growing throughout the world that the 1980s must become the decade of genuine advances in the limitation of the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race.

(Mr. Prokofiev, USSR)

And this needs to be done without delay, for, as the Memorandum of the Soviet Union submitted at the thirty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly points out, the arms race is in certain fields "approaching a point beyond which it may become impossible to curb it effectively by means of agreements based on mutual verification". This applies, first and foremost, to the development of strategic weapons. As is generally recognized, the success of the SALT process forms the core of international security as a whole. It is not by accident, after all, that one of the resolutions of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly contains an urgent appeal not to delay any further the implementation of the SALT-II treaty. The entire responsibility for the fact that the treaty has not yet entered into force rests with the United States. The provisions of the SALT-II treaty touch upon the most important aspects of the security of the Soviet Union and the United States. Our country, as has been repeatedly stated at the highest level, finds completely unacceptable an approach which would place one of the parties in a position of advantage in relation to the other. In his telegram of greetings to Mr. R. Reagan, the new President of the United States, L.I. Brezhnev said that the Soviet Union favours a positive development of relations between the USSR and the United States and their constructive co-operation in solving urgent international problems, which, together with the efforts of all other States, would best serve the ends of improving the international situation and strengthening peace.

The Soviet Union's unwavering desire to unravel the tight knots of conflict situations in various corners of our planet is supported by concrete initiatives. The international community received with profound interest and attention, in particular, the new important proposals on ways of ensuring peace and security in the Persian Gulf area advanced by L.I. Brezhnev during his recent visit to India. These proposals, which provide for the conclusion of an appropriate agreement between the countries of the region, the Soviet Union, the United States of America, other Western Powers, China, Japan and all States interested in the matter, offer a real possibility for the attainment of lasting peace in one of the world's most explosive areas.

It goes without saying that the present state of international affairs cannot fail to arouse the concern of all those who hold dear the interests of peace and the security of peoples. The actions of the forces of militarism, aggression and oppression threaten to bring to nought all the positive results achieved during the past decade towards the development of mutual understanding, trust and peaceful co-operation among peoples and States. The fly-wheel of the continuing lethal armaments race is spinning more and more uncontrollably. Mankind has no loftier or more noble task than that of halting this process, preventing a world catastrophe, preserving détente and proceeding on the path of strengthening international peace and security, the path of disarmament.

We consider that the Committee on Disarmament, which remains a viable, representative and effective body in the disarmament field under present conditions, when the machinery of a number of bilateral and multilateral disarmament negotiations has ceased to function, is called upon to play a role of considerable importance in this matter. As one of the initiators of the establishment of this multilateral negotiating body, the Soviet Union has, throughout the entire period of existence of the Committee on Disarmament, repeatedly submitted various proposals both of a general and of a specific nature for the Committee's consideration. Many of these have been put into effect in specific multilateral agreements halting the arms race in certain fields.

(Mr. Prokofiev, USSR)

This year, too, the Soviet delegation, together with the delegations of other countries, intends to work actively towards the productive consideration of items on the agenda for the current session, so that the greatest possible headway may be made. The Committee's agenda is very heavy. It includes such important items as the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, the prohibition of chemical weapons, the prohibition of radiological weapons and of new types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction, the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, the preparation of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, the strengthening of security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States and other problems. These questions are at different stages of consideration; with regard to some of them, a sufficiently solid basis for the attainment of agreement already exists, while in respect of others Committee members are still groping for approaches and business-like negotiations have not really yet begun. We are aware that all these questions are extremely serious and that they touch upon many aspects of a political, military and technical nature and therefore call for comprehensive and thorough examination.

In a recent article published in the review "Kommunist", A.A. Gromyko, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, wrote: "If a possibility is found which, when realized, will open up the prospect of solving any question in this field, it will be enough to call, 'Eureka!' and the Soviet Union will be prepared to react positively to such an idea or proposal, no matter from whom it may emanate. The Soviet Union claims no monopoly in putting forward such initiatives. Any State can advance them. All that is needed are good intentions."

Despite the existence of considerable difficulties (which, incidentally, are sometimes artificially created), the Soviet delegation, remaining within the bounds of realism, believes that, given goodwill and the appropriate desire on the part of participants in the Committee, significant progress can be achieved in our common work and the consideration of specific items can culminate in concrete agreements. We think that what matters most is to concentrate from the very outset on the substance of the matter in hand and not to disperse the efforts of Committee members on questions of secondary importance or even on trumped-up issues unrelated to our agenda.

The Soviet delegation proceeds from the consideration that last year, when all the nuclear Powers took part in the Committee's meetings and it was operating with an expanded membership, good preparatory work was done, on the whole, for the achievement of practical results at the current session of the Committee. The resolutions of the thirty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly directly concerning our multilateral negotiating body and directly addressed to it should play a major role. A positive example in this respect was given by 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, held last autumn. That Conference, as is known, culminated in the elaboration of a general convention and of the corresponding protocols attached to it in respect of "excessively injurious" types of conventional weapons.

We should also like to remind the Committee that its files contain a number of concrete proposals submitted by the Soviet Union over the years; these, naturally, are still valid and relevant. It goes without saying that the Soviet delegation is prepared, as always, to treat with due attention all other initiatives or proposals aimed at the constructive consideration and solution of the tasks before us.

Pending more detailed statements of our position on separate agenda items, we should like in this connection to make a few comments of a general nature today. Bearing in mind that the nuclear arms race carries the greatest threat to peace, the Soviet Union together with other socialist countries submitted proposals in February 1979 for negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear

(Mr. Prokofiev, USSR)

weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed (CD/4). However, because of the obstructionist line adopted by some States, negotiations on this issue have not yet started. In this connection we cannot fail to recall that both the resolution on "Nuclear weapons in all aspects" of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly and the resolution of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly recommending, in particular, the establishment of an ad hoc working group on this problem, call for negotiations on this subject. The Soviet delegation expresses the hope that at the present session the deadlock will be broken and negotiations on nuclear disarmament will begin, in the course of which account will be taken of the various views expressed on this subject and those contained in paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In our view, there exist definite possibilities for progress in the matter of strengthening security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States. The Soviet delegation, as before, favours the conclusion of a multilateral convention in this sphere, while at the same time accepting the possibility, as an interim measure, of achieving appropriate agreement in the form of a Security Council resolution. Such an approach, as is known, is reflected in a resolution of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. We are, of course, ready to co-operate actively with other States in the search for a universally acceptable formula of guarantees.

In this connection, it is appropriate to recall that the Soviet Union has stated more than once that it will never use nuclear weapons against those States which renounce the manufacture and acquisition of such weapons and have no such weapons in their territories.

Within the complex of nuclear disarmament questions, that of the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests is particularly acute. The Soviet Union has consistently taken the line that the Committee on Disarmament should play an active part in the solution of this urgent problem. Bearing in mind the well-known resolution of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, we believe that it would be advisable to set up an appropriate working group, whose activities could be productive on condition of the participation in it of all the nuclear Powers. We consider that such a group should concern itself with the examination of all aspects of the problem of nuclear-weapon tests with a view to the early conclusion of a treaty, to which all nuclear Powers would be party, on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. At the same time, our country attaches great importance to the tripartite negotiations on this question and is ready to contribute to their successful conclusion in every way possible. We take the view that consideration of this question within the Committee on Disarmament need not interfere with the process of the tripartite negotiations.

At its thirty-fifth session, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution requesting the Committee on Disarmament to proceed without delay to talks with a view to elaborating an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. This question is becoming particularly urgent today, when a genuine danger exists of nuclear weapons spreading over the entire globe. Our Committee can play an important role in the elaboration of measures to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons in any form. We have proposed that this item should be included in the agenda of the current session of the Committee.

The Soviet delegation intends to take an active stand in favour of the prohibition of new types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction on a wide scale. The Soviet Union's approach of principle to this problem is a consistent and unchanging one; we favour the conclusion of a comprehensive treaty, but, at the same time, we are willing to reach agreement on the prohibition of individual new types and new

(Mr. Prokofiev, USSR)

systems of weapons of mass destruction. Bearing in mind the views expressed by various countries, it would be useful to set up an ad hoc group of experts with a suitable mandate within the framework of our Committee.

When examining the question of radiological weapons, one of the new types of weapons of mass destruction, the Committee should, in our view, concentrate on completing the elaboration and preparation for signature of a treaty prohibiting radiological weapons, as one of the resolutions of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly calls upon it to do. A solid basis for the completion of this task exists in the form of the basic elements of a treaty prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons and also the comments and suggestions made by various delegations in 1979 and 1980. We urge that the conclusion of a treaty on radiological weapons should not be shelved for an indefinite length of time.

The Soviet delegation wishes to draw attention to attempts to revive plans for the production of neutron weapons and their deployment on the territories of western European countries. Such attempts cannot but arouse the deep alarm and concern of the world community. In this connection we should like to recall that the Soviet Union, together with other socialist countries, submitted in March 1978 a draft international convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear neutron weapons, the danger of whose appearance in the arsenals of States is again increasing.

The Soviet Union continues to be in favour of prohibiting neutron weapons by means of a treaty at the international level.

A great deal of work lies before the Committee in the field of the prohibition of chemical weapons. A certain amount of progress was made in the Working Group last year; however, as the Group's report indicates, not all questions were duly considered owing to shortage of time. It would be advisable if this Working Group were to continue its activities and to concentrate its efforts more particularly on those issues on which a general consensus had already emerged. We believe that during the consideration of problems relating to chemical weapons, account will be taken of the General Assembly's appeal for the completion, as a matter of high priority, of the text of an international convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction.

I should also like to mention the question of the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, which has been included in the Committee's agenda. Attaching great importance to the elaboration of such a programme, the Soviet delegation believes that, in accordance with a practice which has proved its worth, it would be expedient for this question to be considered within the framework of a working group.

Those are some of our delegation's views on a number of points relating to our agenda and the organization of our work which we wished to express during the general debate.

The Committee on Disarmament, which has resumed its work, occupies a special place among the many bodies for negotiations on disarmament. All the nuclear-weapon Powers and States with the largest military potential participate in the Committee. Its agenda covers the widest spectrum of disarmament problems. There can be no doubt that, as in past years the international community will watch the Committee's work with close attention and hope. It is our common task not to disappoint the hopes of the world's peoples, who expect genuine progress in the field of limitation of the arms race and disarmament.

The Soviet delegation, for its part, is prepared to engage in business-like negotiations and constructive co-operation with all delegations in the interests of fulfilling the responsible and noble tasks facing the Committee on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union for his statement and I thank him also for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. VRHUNEC (Yugoslavia): Mr. Chairman, permit me to extend my most sincere congratulations for your taking up of the duties of Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament. You represent a country with which Yugoslavia maintains traditionally good and friendly relations and which is known for its initiatives in the field that we are discussing here. The role of Chairman in the forthcoming intensive work of the Committee is considerable and important. We are confident that with your well-known diplomatic skill and experience, you will contribute to the achievement of corresponding results.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the representative of friendly Ethiopia for the successful work he has done as Chairman of our Committee.

I avail myself of this opportunity to greet our new colleagues, the representatives of Egypt, Zaire, Pakistan and Romania, and to wish them much success in their work.

No one today denies any more that disarmament is one of the most significant problems of the international community. This has, after all, been stressed many times and is reflected in the conclusions of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The accumulation of weapons and the spending of enormous resources in order that humanity can destroy itself many times over today is in itself absurd and incomprehensible. All the more so if one recalls that millions of people in numerous developing countries live on the brink of famine and poverty. The scope of the arms race has come into conflict with the most basic human beliefs and aspirations, degrading all that which is most humane and vital in man. No excuse of a security or ideological nature can justify this. This is why it is clear that the opening of the process of genuine disarmament presupposes the most urgent taking of measures to halt the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race.

Nevertheless, we see that despite all these facts, contemporary mankind has not been able so far to bring an end to the arms race and begin a process of real disarmament. On the contrary, we are witnessing its acceleration, the sophistication of existing weapons and systems and the use of scientific achievements for the production of new, more destructive weapons of mass destruction. Military budgets of almost all countries, especially the nuclear Powers, are constantly increasing, while some of them even dare assert that there is a lack of resources required for development, particularly for the needs of the developing countries.

As early as 1976, when he proposed the convening of a special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament at the fifth conference of non-aligned countries, President Tito said:

"The continuation of the arms race, which has already acquired gigantic proportions, is increasingly becoming one of the main sources of instability, tension and threat to peace and security in the world."

Unfortunately, the situation has become even worse since then.

(Mr. Vrhunec, Yugoslavia)

There are those who would like to justify this race with assertions that there is no confidence between States. However, how can there be confidence in a situation in which everyone is arming himself? Furthermore, it is claimed that stable international relations and an ideal military balance should be established first, and only then could disarmament come about. It is justified to ask the question whether the opposite is not more correct -- that the opening of the process of genuine disarmament creates the conditions for the improvement of international relations and the establishment of a more stable balance of powers in the world. On the other hand, some stress that disarmament is possible only when parity in armament is reached, and the like. All such or similar assertions lead to a constant aggravation of international relations, a disquieting state of affairs in many areas of social activity, a stagnation in economic development throughout the world, particularly in the developing countries, the continuation of power politics, interference in the internal affairs of other countries, the exercise of political and economic pressure on small and less developed countries, a lack of solutions to the existing crises and the creation of new hotbeds of crisis, etc. In addition to this, some countries do not respect the decisions of the United Nations General Assembly, particularly of the tenth special session, which they solemnly accepted. Neither do they respect the opinions and aspirations of a vast part of mankind. If this continues, we will increasingly find ourselves in a situation of going around in a vicious circle and, through the stockpiling of weapons, of being closer to general catastrophe.

The strengthening of world peace and international security and the development of international co-operation, based on peaceful coexistence, with respect for the independence of countries and the promotion of the economic development of all peoples, is the only alternative for all of us. This is the only approach which will accord the right place and role to genuine disarmament and its concrete implementation without delay -- of this Yugoslavia is deeply convinced. Therefore, we are deeply concerned with the policy of those circles which try to justify the arms race by advocating that it is in the interest of peace and security. The advocates of such positions must be clearly warned about all the negative effects caused by such behaviour and the historical responsibility they assume towards the whole of mankind. This is why the over-all problem of disarmament should be approached in a much more resolute manner, with more confidence, optimism and real political will to start this process without further delay. All of us here who are, by the concurrence of events, in charge of this task, as well as the governments that we represent, should take up this work, conscious of the historical responsibility that we face.

Since the very beginning, the non-aligned countries, and among them Yugoslavia, have attached the greatest importance to the development of the process of disarmament. They strive to make this process universal and to make possible the most active participation in it of all countries, regardless of their size or military strength. Proceeding from its authentic principles, the non-aligned movement considers that international relations are indivisible and that peace and security can be ensured and developed further only through a universal process of relaxation of tensions and by way of a general democratization of international relations. It is only on these bases that it is possible successfully to solve the two main problems of our times: peace and security through disarmament, and the equitable economic development of all countries through the creation of the new international economic order. In these efforts, the non-aligned countries are prepared to assume their part of responsibility, which is otherwise manifested in the over-all work of the United Nations as well as



(Mr. Vrhunec, Yugoslavia)

this Committee. Nevertheless, the main responsibility certainly rests with the protagonists of the arms race and first of all with the nuclear super-Powers. They are primarily responsible for the tension in the world and the use of power politics, the broadening of the spheres of interest of military alliances and the accumulation of weapons, nuclear in particular.

Progress in international relations is closely linked with the process of disarmament. On the other hand, its implementation would in itself bear upon the removal of the atmosphere of fear and distrust and would open the way to general coexistence and co-operation on an equitable basis, in all areas of man's activity. This is why disarmament, as today's imperative, does not have any alternative but should rather be understood as a unique process which should encompass all the necessary elements conducive to the adoption and implementation of specific disarmament measures as soon as possible. The ways to achieve this are varied, but they should all have one goal -- the reaching of corresponding agreements.

Both the multilateral and the bilateral negotiations that have been conducted so far have shown certain, but very modest results. This is insufficient, and progresses rather slowly. It is indispensable to accelerate the present negotiations as soon as possible and to open new fields of negotiation. All countries opted for this at the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, which was devoted to disarmament. At that session, we established principles that were adopted by consensus and which should serve as permanent landmarks in the process of the attainment of the final aim -- general and complete disarmament under effective international control. We also established then the mechanisms for the consideration of disarmament on a democratic basis, which offer a possibility for broad action, with the engagement of all Members of the United Nations.

A part of that mechanism is, surely, our Committee as well. All of us here are aware of its role and significance. As the only multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament, our Committee has a very clearly defined mandate and responsibility for carrying out the task accorded to it by the Final Act of the special session on disarmament. With the aim of the further affirmation of the Committee on Disarmament, we attach particular importance to two basic characteristics: (1) that its work is carried out on consistent equitable bases and the democratic recognition of the rights of all States members of the Committee on Disarmament, both large and small, belonging to blocs, non-aligned or neutral, in order that they may fully participate in the Committee's work and engage themselves with regard to all the relevant questions; and (2) that negotiations concerning specific questions are conducted directly and effectively, with a view to the earliest possible attainment of international agreements on the creation of instruments for the prohibition of various types of weapons.

This is the third year that the Committee is working. We must analyse the results achieved so far and ask ourselves, first, whether we have fulfilled the expectations of the international community and carried out the responsibilities set at the tenth special session, and secondly, what are our immediate obligations with regard to the forthcoming special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament which has been envisaged for 1982.

(Mr. Vrhunec, Yugoslavia)

As the answer to the first question, my delegation would like to underline the following: during the past period the Committee has carried out a praiseworthy activity and intensity of work in which a solid basis for work has been created. However, we have not achieved yet a single specific substantive result, which is far from the responsibilities assumed. The slowness of specific negotiations is such that we must ask ourselves why this is so and what should the Committee undertake in order to speed up the negotiating process. We cannot consider as progress in the Committee's work the fact that we have reached agreement only on the rules of procedure, the programme of work, the agenda and the creation of four working groups. The yardstick for the results of the Committee's work can only be the reaching of specific and concrete agreements on the essential questions being considered, and this has not been achieved. In order to achieve such results, we must show political will and the readiness to reach international agreements on the basis of democratic consideration, without attempting to impose solutions which have as their aim the solution of the problem within narrow circles of particular group interests or the interests of those who hold the monopoly in armaments, nuclear in particular. In this process we must take care to preserve the authenticity of the Committee's work. For there is no doubt that world events influence the work of the Committee on Disarmament. However, we cannot allow these events to be the hindrance or excuse for hampering the Committee's work. On the contrary, the successful solution of disarmament problems which are on the Committee's agenda will be of even greater importance in certain situations of crisis that pose a threat to peace and international security and will also have a positive impact on the solution of problems concerning other international issues.

The road which our Committee chose last year, represents a good direction for the realization of the set goals. This is why my delegation strives for the urgent resumption and continuation of the work of the working groups which were in operation last year. The question of the renewal of the old mandate or the formulation of a new one should not obstruct the work of these working groups. According to need, this question can be considered in parallel, during the work of the Committee. However, what should be carried out right away is the greatest possible intensification of the negotiating work of all four working groups and the immediate creation of two additional ones, for the CTB and nuclear disarmament. In its final statement, delivered at the closing of last year's session of the Committee, the Group of 21 clearly indicated that the Committee should proceed in the cited manner this year. The position of the non-aligned and neutral countries is clear. The proposal for the creation of two new working groups is, in fact, based on the request of a great majority of United Nations Members and has been expressed in numerous resolutions of the General Assembly regarding the need to halt the nuclear arms race and stop all nuclear testing, in all environments. This is the only way in which we can intensify the work of the Committee, through substantive negotiations, and fulfil all the responsibilities that stand before us until the next special session. We shall thus justify the confidence in the Committee shown by the decision on its creation and at least partly fulfil what is expected of us.

(Mr. Vrhunec, Yugoslavia)

I would like to express my delegation's satisfaction over the fact that the Committee on Disarmament has already succeeded in reaching consensus on the agenda and programme of work for this session.

The rules of procedure we adopted at the first session in 1979 are, undoubtedly, suitable, and there is no need to consider them once more. They also clearly regulate the question of our Committee's work, as well as the participation of non-members in it. I do not deem it necessary to cite particular provisions which deal with this. Nevertheless, I would like to emphasize that we must not permit our Committee to find itself in the situation it was in last year -- that substantive negotiations are delayed by discussions on procedure and that solutions are sought outside the framework of the adopted rules of procedure, on unacceptable bases.

The Yugoslav delegation, together with other non-aligned and neutral countries members of the Committee, will resolutely strive, this year also, for the most intensive possible working character of the session, and we shall endeavour to participate in the negotiating process in a manner of utmost co-operation. However, what is unacceptable for us is any further postponement of work and the avoidance of substantive negotiating for one reason or the other. We shall not reconcile ourselves to the Committee's failure to achieve any substantive results again this year. On our part, we shall give support to all proposals envisaging an active and constructive approach to the solution of certain questions. It is up to the protagonists of the arms race to give their contribution in order that the Committee can achieve the best possible results. To this effect, Yugoslavia firmly believes -- since there is no other way out of the dilemma with regard to peace, independence and progress -- that our work will be governed by wisdom and the will to put an end to armaments. We shall do all that is within our power -- in the Committee on Disarmament, at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe held in Madrid, in the United Nations and on any other occasion and in any other area where it may arise -- to encourage and immediately initiate a specific and comprehensive process of disarmament so that it will not be too late tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank his Excellency Ambassador Vrhunec for his statement and I should also like to thank him very sincerely for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): Mr. Chairman, seeing you preside over the meeting of the Committee on Disarmament gives my delegation immeasurable satisfaction for quite a number of reasons. First of all, you are, as all members of the Committee have found out these past two years, a diplomat of great talent and distinction; you are a fine gentleman whose word -- as I have personally found out several times -- is always his bond, and you are a devoted worker in the cause of disarmament. Secondly, your chairmanship of the Committee is -- in my view -- as it were, the completion of the institutional agreement which was reached at the first special session devoted to disarmament when the way was cleared for the participation of the nuclear weapon States, China and France, which then did not participate in the multilateral negotiating body. Sir, you have within a week of your accession to office, proved your great leadership ability and my delegation promises to co-operate with you throughout your term of office.

Allow me to convey to your predecessor in office, Ambassador Tereffe of Ethiopia, the gratitude of my delegation for his valuable service to the Committee. Allow me also to welcome to our midst the distinguished Ambassadors of Egypt, of Pakistan, of Romania and of Zaire. I look forward to working closely with them.

In deference to and as my own contribution to the business-like approach which, under your wise leadership, the Committee appears to be resolved to adopt to its work this session, my opening statement will be quite brief.

At its thirty-fifth session, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. The intention of the Declaration was not just to add another document to those in the archives of the United Nations. At least that was not the intention of my delegation when we took the initiative. Rather, it should be seen as a further expression of the grave distress of the General Assembly at the ever-growing insecurity of the world arising from the spiralling accumulation of armaments on the one hand, and the fast depletion of the world's resources not as an investment for present and future generations, but as glorification of the war machines in a few countries. The Declaration embodied the aspiration of mankind that the end of the 1980s would see a world much more secure through effective disarmament measures and much more economically equitable through progress towards the New International Economic Order.

The first major event during the Decade will probably be the second special session devoted to disarmament in 1982. Indeed, paragraph 24 of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade required that its implementation should be included in the agenda of the second special session devoted to disarmament. In the Declaration, the General Assembly stated: "The accomplishment of those specific measures of disarmament which have been identified in the Final Document as worthy of priority negotiations by the multilateral negotiating organ would create a very favourable international climate for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". The Declaration then went on to enumerate again those items. They are: a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty; a treaty on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction; a treaty on the prohibition of the development, production and use of radiological weapons, and effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, taking into consideration all proposals and suggestions which have been made in this regard.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

In joining the consensus in the General Assembly for the adoption of resolution 35/47 on the second special session devoted to disarmament, my delegation believed that the second special session should not be seen as a routine review conference of parties, as if the Final Document of the first special session is a convention and an end in itself. On the contrary, we see the decisions on this second special session as providing an impetus for specific measures of disarmament, to be negotiated with increased intensity and seriousness, particularly in the Committee on Disarmament. The Committee will thereby -- and this is the hope of my delegation -- provide a substantive input to the success of the second special session. What is more important, the Committee will thereby retain some credibility in its efficacy as the single multilateral negotiating organ.

It is with this dual purpose in mind that I would hope we will approach our work during this session of the Committee. We should ask ourselves at this very beginning of the one full session which we will have before the second special session how the Committee can measure up to the task of making an effective contribution on the one hand and retaining its credibility as the single multilateral negotiating organ on the other. The Committee -- in the view of my delegation -- will have to achieve results in the area of nuclear disarmament as a very first precondition. The threat to the very survival of mankind is daily made more real by the increase in the quantity and sophistication of the nuclear arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States. In a study commissioned in 1968 by the United Nations General Assembly on the Effects of the Possible Use of Nuclear Weapons and the Security and Economic Implications for States of the Acquisition and Further Development of these Weapons, it was stated:

"The solution of the problem of ensuring security cannot be found in an increase in the number of States possessing nuclear weapons or, indeed, in the retention of nuclear weapons by the Powers currently possessing them.... Security for all countries of the world must be sought through the elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear weapons and the banning of their use, by way of general and complete disarmament".

Twelve years later, in 1980, another study commissioned by the General Assembly, entitled "Comprehensive Study on Nuclear Weapons", which was submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session, noted that the important technological and other developments which have taken place since 1968 have made the danger of nuclear disaster even more awesome. For one thing, the total number of nuclear warheads in the arsenals of the nuclear-weapon Powers may be in excess of 40,000, with a total strength of 13,000 million tons of TNT or the equivalent of 1 million Hiroshima bombs. Moreover, the number of strategic warheads in the arsenals of the nuclear Powers has increased from 4,500 to 9,200 for the United States and from 1,000 to about 6,000 for the USSR. Then, of course, there has been the development of the anti-ballistic missiles, of multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles (MIRVs), cruise missiles, mobile land-based missiles and lately, the neutron bomb, of which we have heard so much. Research and development are still proceeding fast and there is no end in sight. Side by side with the technological development is the alarming popularization of the theory that a nuclear war can in fact be survivable and may even be fought and won. Thus the theory of the balance of mutual destruction which for long has been the main rationale for the upward spiral of accumulation of nuclear weapons may soon give way to a strategy of deliberate launching of nuclear war based on the calculation of acceptable levels of retaliatory destruction. One of the psychological

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

barriers to any conceivable nuclear holocaust has been the hope that except by accident, neither of the two super-Powers would consciously launch a nuclear war on the other. The Congressional Report to which both the distinguished Ambassador of Mexico, Ambassador García Robles, and the distinguished Swedish Minister of State, Mrs. Inga Thorsson, made extensive reference in their statements on the opening day of our current session is alarming enough. The number of false alarms of imminent nuclear attacks given out by the American Early Warning System cannot be peculiar to that system. It can be presumed that the USSR also has had its share of false alarms. In a period of a reasonable level of mutual trust between the two super-Powers, false alarms may be contained, or so we hope and pray, anyway. In a period of tension, mutual suspicion and recrimination reminiscent of the cold war days, there may not be the opportunity to -- and I use an American expression here -- second guess a succession of false alarms.

It is bad enough to have to live with the argument of the deterrent effect of the accumulation of nuclear weapons. If it does act as a deterrent, we will not know until present nuclear arsenals have been dismantled as a result of disarmament agreements and there has been no nuclear war. Inasmuch as the further accumulation of nuclear weapons continues, however, inasmuch as the "modernization" of weapons systems continues, we can only presume that deterrence will work. The nagging question, however, will always haunt us. Thus, how much further destructive capacity is required on either side of the nuclear divide before it is considered sufficient to deter? Deterrence rests inevitably on parity or balance between the forces at the disposal of the States concerned, and parity or balance in turn rests on the subjective perception by each side. It depends on a premise which is constantly changing and which can be quite difficult to evaluate. The present impasse on the ratification of SALT II, is an instructive example. It was negotiated by the highest political and military experts on both sides. Yet, in one of the two participating States, controversy immediately arose as to whether SALT II does assure parity. Indeed, it has been asserted that it does give advantage to the other side and this has provided justification for its non-ratification. The lesson to be drawn, therefore, is that security based on ever higher levels of nuclear armaments will ever remain unstable, unsatisfactory, and downright dangerous not only to the nuclear-weapon States themselves but to the world at large.

The gradual shift, therefore, towards the doctrine of flexible response or limited nuclear war offers no consolation whatsoever. This doctrine, based on what some refer to as deterrence by denial, such as the threat of use of tactical nuclear weapons in a limited battlefield conflict, forgets the probability of escalation to full-scale nuclear exchange. Herein, in my view, lies the greatest danger of the development of the neutron bomb or, to use the technical term preferred by its advocates, the enhanced radiation and reduced blast bomb. Apart from the cynicism of those who developed the bomb in hoping that destruction of human lives will be acceptable to an enemy as long as equipment and property are left intact, the development of this bomb will blur that threshold between a conventional and a nuclear war. The beginning of a nuclear war will no longer rest on the probability of a computer error but on the probability of deliberate decision of the political and military authorities. To emphasize the dense population in Europe where the neutron bomb is likely to be deployed is one thing, but this should not make us forget the greater danger of escalation to a nuclear exchange of world-wide proportion from which none of us will have a hiding place.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

The question that comes to mind with developments such as that of the neutron bomb and others is whether man has not lost control over nuclear-weapon technology. It seems clear that in many cases the sheer momentum of military research and technology stumbles on new weapon systems which have not been conceived of, in anticipation of military or security needs. Of course, once the discovery of any weapon is stumbled upon, pressure for production becomes inevitable and justification by military strategists can always be made.

Enduring international peace and security, it has to be emphasized again, requires the prevention of the danger of nuclear war, not through the false theory of deterrence whose upper ceiling will never be reached, but through nuclear disarmament. To use the words of the experts who undertook the comprehensive study on nuclear weapons, "the concept of the maintenance of world peace, stability and balance through the process of deterrence is perhaps the most dangerous collective fallacy that exists".

If it is to discharge its responsibility as the single multilateral negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament would have to embark immediately on negotiations on nuclear disarmament, in accordance with paragraph 50 of the Final Document. Working papers on which the Committee can base its work have been submitted. What is left is a consensus within the Committee to set up the machinery for negotiation through the establishment of a working group. This decision, in the view of my delegation, can no longer be delayed.

An indispensable basic step for preventing the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the development of new types of such weapons and preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons is a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. This is not only a priority item on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament, it should, in my view, constitute the main contribution of the Committee to the success of the second special session devoted to disarmament to be held in 1982.

It is superfluous to stress again the central importance of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty in efforts to halt both horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Group of 21 has in this Committee presented several proposals on the necessity of embarking on concrete negotiations through the setting up without delay of an ad hoc working group to negotiate the prohibition of all nuclear test explosions by all States for all time. It is a matter of regret that such positive initiatives have not yet been seized by the Committee.

At its thirty-fifth session the General Assembly, in resolutions 35/145 A and B, specifically requested the Committee on Disarmament to undertake and urged all members of the Committee to support the creation of an ad hoc working group to initiate substantive negotiations on a comprehensive test ban treaty as a matter of the highest priority at the beginning of its 1981 session. Resolution 35/145 B further calls upon the Committee to exert all efforts to draft a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty that can be submitted to the General Assembly not later than at its second special session on disarmament.

The failure of the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT to adopt a document is still fresh in our memories. It is the hope of my delegation that the promise to support the establishment of a working group on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty which all three nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty made informally

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

during the Review Conference will be maintained. After all, the failure of the Review Conference arose out of the non-implementation of Article VI on negotiations for nuclear disarmament. If the NPT is to continue to play a role in the régime of non-proliferation, then it must not be subjected to further reverses such as occurred at the Review Conference. The commencement of negotiations on a basic and vital measure such as the CTBT should not be seen as a concession made by some Parties to the NPT to other Parties. It is part and parcel of the obligation which all Parties to the Treaty assumed. Similarly, support for a working group on a CTBT will not be a concession by some members of the Committee on Disarmament to others; it will be a recognition by all members of their duty to give credence to the negotiating role of the Committee. World opinion demands a CTBT as a measure which must not be delayed any longer.

Mr. Chairman, the business-like approach to our work this session will, I hope, result in substantial progress in negotiations on a convention on chemical weapons, on a convention on radiological weapons and on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. With serious negotiations and given the political will, these items on which the Committee has already established working groups, should be concluded and submitted to the General Assembly not later than the deadline for the submission of the comprehensive programme of disarmament. In order to have the chance of achieving this desired result, we should assure fertile preliminary negotiations, we should embark on negotiations of substance and we should bear in mind a phrase which one of my distinguished colleagues here very often uses: that the best can sometimes be the enemy of the good.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank Ambassador Adeniji for his statement and I express to him my warm gratitude for his kind words and the too flattering, certainly, but very friendly remarks he made with respect to me. We have come to the end of the list of speakers for this morning. I think it is too late to go on to other matters and we have not received any further requests to make statements in plenary. In view of the hour, I propose to adjourn the meeting and -- if the Committee agrees -- to hold another plenary meeting this afternoon at 3.30 p.m. to discuss and take appropriate decisions regarding the adoption of the agenda and programme of work and regarding the participation of States not members of the Committee. If there are no objections to this proposal, I shall take it that the Committee is in agreement.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.