

COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.131
25 June 1981
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIRST MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 23 June 1981, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. I. KOMIVES (Hungary)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. A. SALAH-BEY
Mr. M. IATI
Mr. M. MEDKOUR

Argentina: Mr. J. CARASALES
Mr. J.F. GOMENSORO
Mr. J.M. OTLGUI
Miss N. NASCITBENE

Australia: Mr. R.A. WALKER
Mr. R. STEELE

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

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

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. SOTIROV
Mr. R. DEYANOV
Mr. K. PRANOV
Mr. P. POPTCHEV

Burma: U NGWE WIN
U THAN HTUN

Canada: Mr. D.S. McPHAIL
Mr. G. SKINNER

China: Mr. YU Peiwen
Mr. YU Mengjia
Mr. LI Changhe
Mr. PAN Jusheng

Cuba: Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mr. PREDO NUMEZ MOSQUERA

Czechoslovakia: Mr. M. RUZEK
Mr. P. LUKES

Egypt: Mr. EL S.A.R. EL REEDY
Mr. I.A. HASSAN
Mr. M.N. FAIFY
Miss W. BASSIM

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. KAULFUSS
Miss H. HOPPE

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. G. PFEIFFER
Mr. N. KLINGER
Mr. H. MULLER
Mr. W. ROHR

Hungary: Mr. I. KOMIVES
Mr. F. GAJDA
Mr. C. GYORFFY
Mr. A. LAKATOS

India: Mr. S. SARAN

Indonesia: Mr. S. DARUSMAN
Mr. E. SOEPRAPTO
Mr. F. QASIM
Mr. ACHDIAT

Iran: Mr. D. AMERI
Mr. J. ZAHIRNIA
Mr. H. SHARIFI

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

Japan: Mr. M. TAKAHASHI
Mr. K. SHIMADA

Kenya:

Mexico: Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLIES
Mrs. Z. GONZALEZ Y REYNERO

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

Morocco: Mr. A. SKALLI
Mr. M. CHRAIBI
Mr. M. ARRASSEN
Mr. L. ABDELHAMID

Netherlands: Mr. H. WAGENMAKERS

Nigeria: Mr. W.O. AKINSANYA
Mr. T. AGUIYI-IRONSI

Pakistan: Mr. M. AKRAM

Peru: Mr. A. THORNBERRY

Poland:
Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. J. CIALOWICZ
Mr. T. STROJWAS

Romania:
Mr. T. MELESCANU

Sri Lanka:
Mr. A.T. JAYAKODDY

Sweden:
Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. L. NORBERG
Mr. G. EKHOLM
Mr. J. LUNDIN
Mr. BERGLUND

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:
Mr. B.P. PROKOFIEV
Mr. V.M. GANJA
Mr. M.M. IPPOLITOV
Mr. S.N. RIUKHINE

United Kingdom:
Mrs. J.I. LINK

United States of America:
Mr. F.P. DESIMONE
Miss K. CRITTENBERGER
Mr. J. MISKEL
Mr. S. FITZGERALD
Mr. R. SCOTT

Venezuela:
Mr. O.A. ACUILAR

Yugoslavia:
Mr. B. BRANKOVIC

Zaire:
Mr. O. GNOK

Secretary of the Committee
and Personal Representative
of the Secretary-General:
Mr. R. JAIPAL

Deputy-Secretary of the
Committee:
Mr. V. BERASATEGUI

Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, as this is the first time I am speaking at a plenary meeting, allow me to extend to you my delegation's most sincere congratulations on your presiding over the debates of the Committee on Disarmament during the month of June. Needless to say, you may rely upon our co-operation and support at all times.

Allow me to congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Pfeiffer, on the way in which he guided our work.

I should also like to welcome our new colleagues, Ambassadors Carasales of Argentina, Jayakoddy of Sri Lanka and Jalali of Iran: we are sure that we may look forward to a period of fruitful collaboration with them.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to address the Committee last Thursday, but I was unable to attend the meeting and therefore although, according to our programme of work this week should be devoted to the subject of nuclear-weapon tests, I should like, with your permission, to refer to other topics of interest to my delegation.

In the first place, I wish to say that, as soon as it learned of the underhand attack perpetrated by the Israeli air force against a civilian nuclear installation of Iraq, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Cuba expressed its most vigorous condemnation of that criminal action which violated the most elementary rules of international law. My delegation wishes to place its condemnation of that action on record, and to stress that the Committee on Disarmament cannot remain impassive in the face of such an act of vandalism: at the very least, we should begin to consider, with all due urgency, what position we should take. For that purpose we have before us the document submitted by the Group of 21 and the statements made by other groups of States.

At the meeting of the Security Council convened as a result of these events, the Cuban Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Malmierca, declared that the United States was directly responsible for the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear power station, and for the dangerous deterioration of the situation in the Middle East. He also stressed that if that aggression remained unpunished, all the peoples of the Middle East would be exposed to similar actions and a dangerous precedent for world peace would be established.

We should be mindful of the fact that this act of aggression is not an isolated incident, but rather part of an entire strategy towards the region, as is further shown by the indiscriminate attacks against Lebanon, the Palestinians and the Arab deterrent forces, and the threats made against Syria and other States in the area.

At the request of Iraq, Cuba convened an emergency meeting of the non-aligned countries to discuss the case. At the plenary meeting which they have just held at the United Nations, those countries condemned the Israeli aggression and called upon the Security Council to apply against Israel the sanctions provided for in chapter VII of the Organizations' Charter.

At the same meeting, the movement of non-aligned countries also requested all States, and especially the United States, to put an end to all military, political and economic assistance to Israel, in order to prevent it from continuing to pursue its policy of aggression against the Arab and Palestinian peoples.

(Mr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

I have begun my statement with this subject because I know that many delegations have already expressed themselves in a similar manner and attach great importance to this matter, as does the Cuban delegation.

We have heard various views as to what a statement in plenary meeting ought to be, and how useful such meetings are. My delegation considers that plenary meetings are very useful, especially if we discuss questions of substance and do not waste too much time dilating upon general aspects.

In keeping with this position, I intend to be very brief in presenting the Cuban delegation's ideas with regard to the work of the Committee. I should like to say first of all that my delegation is glad to note that the Committee was able to adopt its programme of work for the summer part of this year's session at an early date. To be frank, I should have preferred it if we could have decided at this stage to end our discussions at the end of August, but I know that a consensus is necessary and I recognize that the formula reached is extremely flexible and constitutes a good basis for the conduct of our work.

My delegation attaches particular importance to the fact that the working groups began their work on Tuesday last, 16 June. We are all agreed, or at least so it has always seemed, that the best machinery available to the Committee for advancing in the fulfilment of the mandate entrusted to it is that of working groups.

In this connection, my delegation wishes to emphasize once again the need for the Committee to decide to set up the other two working groups proposed by the member countries of the Group of 21 with the support of the socialist countries. I am referring to the working group on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, and the working group on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, proposals contained in document CD/180 and CD/181 respectively.

We can, by the attitude we adopt with respect to the establishment of these working groups, but even more by the efforts we make to see that they are set up without delay, demonstrate our political will in the matter of disarmament negotiations.

My delegation firmly believes that these two working groups, on items which have obvious priority in the work programme we have adopted, should be set up at the present session, so that we can tell the United Nations General Assembly that the Committee considers them subjects fit for negotiations, in conformity with the views of the international community. There would be no justification whatsoever for any other course of action.

One question we cannot pass over in silence is that of the broadening of the terms of reference of the Working Group on Chemical Weapons. This is recognized in the work programme we have adopted, and my delegation is ready to co-operate in the search for a formula acceptable to all to ensure the best possible prospects for our negotiations on this item.

At the beginning of the summer part of the Committee's session for this year, the international situation is still clouded. The reasons remain the same as those I mentioned in my statement to the Committee on 14 April last.

(Mr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

However, as is clear from your opening speech on 11 June, the Committee cannot wait for this situation to improve in order to consider the many proposals before it and to endeavour to achieve tangible results.

This is all the more important since this Committee is the only forum in which disarmament negotiations are still under way. We thus bear a major responsibility before world public opinion.

Furthermore, as many speakers have already pointed out, we shall be devoting a large part of our spring meetings next year to preparations for the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which is why we must make the greatest possible effort at this session to reach some concrete agreement, particularly with regard to the four items which are at present the subject of negotiations in the working groups.

In this connection, I should like briefly to state my delegation's position with respect to each of those items.

With regard to new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, we are in favour of the adoption of a general agreement for the prohibition of the development of such weapons, without any prior identification of those weapons since, logically, that would presuppose that they existed. However, we recognize the importance which the adoption of partial agreements on this matter would have, and we are prepared to continue working in this direction.

As regards so-called negative guarantees, we are in favour of the adoption, as soon as possible, of an international instrument prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States having no such weapons on their territories or under their jurisdiction or control. We firmly believe that this is a very broad approach and could prove acceptable.

With respect to chemical weapons, we consider it very important that a convention should be adopted which provides, among other things, for the destruction of stocks of such weapons, the prohibition of their development, production and stockpiling, and the fostering of co-operation for peaceful purposes among States parties.

With regard to the comprehensive programme of disarmament, we should merely like to stress the urgency of the need for its adoption so that it can be considered by the United Nations General Assembly at its forthcoming special session devoted to disarmament. As is stated in paragraph 109 of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, the comprehensive programme of disarmament should encompass all measures thought to be advisable in order to attain the goal of general and complete disarmament in a world in which international peace and security prevail and in which the new international economic order is consolidated.

My delegation believes that when we are considering these measures we ought not to neglect those which some seek to relegate to a secondary level, such as the dismantling of foreign military bases and the cessation of acts of hostility and aggression against other States.

In conclusion, we earnestly hope that, at this part of our session as during the spring part of the session, a constructive atmosphere will prevail within the Committee. That offers the best way for us to carry out the mandate entrusted to us and to fulfil the responsibility we have assumed towards our peoples.

THE CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Cuba, Ambassador Sola Vila, for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. SALAH-BEY (Algeria) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, allow me first of all to extend to you, in the name of the Algerian delegation, my congratulations on your assumption of the chairmanship of the Committee on Disarmament for this month. I have no doubt that thanks to your experience, to your extensive knowledge and also to the respect which you yourself and your country command in the Committee on Disarmament, you will help us make headway in our work.

Our thanks go also to Ambassador Pfeiffer, the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, for the way in which he presided over our work during the month of April.

Last week the Committee adopted its programme of work for the second part of its 1981 session. My delegation would now like to express a number of views concerning the mandate entrusted to us.

The second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament to be held in the near future will assuredly be the occasion for an evaluation of the progress made in the work of the Committee on Disarmament. The relatively modest results achieved during the spring part of the Committee's session offer a small but adequate basis for the achievement of more substantial progress.

The questions of the cessation of the nuclear arms race, nuclear disarmament and, in connection with this fundamental issue the halting of nuclear tests are among the main concerns of world opinion. On the initiative of the Group of 21, the Committee on Disarmament held a number of informal meetings during the first part of its session, in the course of which questions were discussed which are considered essential not only by my own delegation but also by all the countries represented in the Group of 21.

My delegation regrets that the Committee has not yet been in a position to take a positive decision with regard to the proposals submitted by the Group of 21 for the establishment of two working groups on items 1 and 2 of the Committee's agenda. In the case of item 1 of the agenda, I had the privilege to propose, on behalf of the Group of 21, the terms of the mandate which could be entrusted to a working group on a nuclear test ban.

Since a specific proposal for the mandate of a working group on a nuclear test ban has been formally put before the Committee on Disarmament, my delegation hopes that, through informal consultations or at informal meetings, the Committee will take steps to decide to set up a working group on a nuclear test ban and to draw up the terms of reference for it.

The second proposal of the Group of 21 concerns the creation of a working group on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. This proposal has not yet been the subject of an agreement within our Committee. Nevertheless, in the course of a series of informal meetings the Committee on Disarmament has begun to consider some important aspects of this question.

(Mr. Salah-Bey, Algeria)

It was also my privilege to present, on 16 April, on behalf of the Group of 21, various important issues which might be examined in the course of multilateral negotiations. This rapid assessment of the essential areas in which it appears that significant progress might be made has been deliberately confined to items 1 and 2 of the Committee's agenda in view of the particular importance which my delegation attaches to these two fundamental questions.

The agenda for the summer part of the Committee's session also includes the consideration of questions relating to the organization of our work. In earlier statements my delegation has stressed the fact of this Committee's being a multilateral negotiating body. While it is clear that substantive discussions and progress towards disarmament can be facilitated by the adoption of procedures and measures relating to the organization of the Committee's work, nevertheless my delegation considers that these discussions should not cause us to lose sight of our real objective or to waste the time which many delegations agree in finding limited in view of the breadth of the tasks entrusted to the Committee.

The work of the Committee on Disarmament cannot be divorced from the context of the international situation which has certainly not improved since the opening of the Committee's 1981 session. An exceptionally serious incident has just demonstrated to international opinion and particularly to all States members of the Committee on Disarmament just how far the policy of military force and the will for political domination can lead.

On 7 June last, the Zionist air force attacked and destroyed a peaceful nuclear facility in Iraq. My country's Head of State described this aggression as an act of international banditry.

My delegation believes that this extraordinary serious incident should be approached from two standpoints.

The first is the condemnation of Zionist aggression. The entire international community, and just recently the Security Council, have condemned this criminal act. The Arab countries, and my country in particular, which have constantly opposed Israel's policy of fait accompli, are today not particularly surprised by its recent behaviour which carried to its apogee a permanent policy of cynicism and destruction.

The second aspect of this affair more directly concerns the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation has noted with satisfaction the position expressed in this connection by the Group of 21 and hopes that the Committee will adopt a position in line with the statement of the Group of 21 presented on 17 June.

The Zionist attack was psychologically prepared by international campaigns waged by various information media with the concealed objective of prohibiting access by certain countries to nuclear technology. It would seem that, according to the reasoning underlying this attitude, some countries, Israel and South Africa in particular, claim that they have the right to acquire nuclear technology and to manufacture and possess nuclear devices.

(Mr. Salah-Bey, Algeria)

In this connection, the position adopted by my country with regard to the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty has been substantiated, since not only have the nuclear-weapon Powers failed to live up to their undertakings regarding the development of technical co-operation in the field of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes but in addition we see that a country, assisted in different ways at the international level, presumes to exercise sole responsibility for setting the limits to a neighbouring State's economic and technological development.

Finally, the attack on a nuclear facility for peaceful purposes gives peculiar relevance to the consideration of the discussions of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons based on the Swedish delegation's proposal for the prohibition of attacks on civilian nuclear facilities.

The present difficulties and dangers of the international environment should encourage the Committee on Disarmament to intensify its efforts to clear the way for substantial progress in the field of disarmament.

An incident of exceptional gravity has just shown to what aberrations a policy of force and domination may lead. Other incidents, possibly accidental, could at any moment engulf our peoples in uncontrollable processes of armed conflict. My delegation's wish is that the countries now possessing considerable military and nuclear power should genuinely express their will to negotiate with a view to general and complete disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Ambassador Salah-Bey of Algeria for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. DE SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): Mr. Chairman, my statement today will be brief, not because item 1 of the Committee's agenda lacks any importance, but because it has already been the subject of exhaustive examination, for more than two decades, by many organs of the United Nations. I am not going to make, for the record, a recapitulation of all resolutions, reports, studies and other documents from many authoritative sources which deal with the cessation of further tests of nuclear weapons; neither do I propose to recall in detail, once again, the commitments undertaken by the nuclear-weapon Powers, in several international documents, to engage in serious negotiations to achieve a nuclear test ban. Some of those texts, as is the case of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, commit all five nuclear-weapon Powers together with the remainder of the membership of the United Nations; others, like the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963, set out legally binding obligations to achieve the conclusion of a treaty banning all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time. Still another international instrument, which has not received the adherence of many non-nuclear-weapon States, but which is continually referred to by its few nuclear-weapon Parties as a very important treaty, whose provisions must be scrupulously respected, contains in its article VI an obligation that has been interpreted by its non-nuclear members, at the periodical reviews of that agreement, as setting out a clear obligation for the nuclear-weapon Powers to achieve the discontinuance of their tests of nuclear-weapons, as a means to impede the continuing vertical proliferation of those weapons.

(Mr. De Souza e Silva, Brazil)

Such commitments, expressed in the form of legal international obligations, and the repeated call of the community of nations for the cessation of all tests of nuclear weapons seem, however, to have been completely forgotten by those who undertook the obligations they spell out, sometimes in return for the relinquishing, by non-nuclear-weapon States, of sovereign rights of vital importance to the security of the latter.

In this situation, there is little else that the community of nations can do but to express, in the most clear terms, its profound dissatisfaction, and indeed its indignation, at this state of affairs, even at the risk of repeating itself endlessly to deaf ears.

The latest attempt by the non-nuclear-weapon nations which do not belong to either of the two military alliances to impress upon the nuclear-weapon Powers the importance and urgency that the former attach to the multilateral negotiation of a treaty prohibiting the further testing of nuclear weapons was the document issued at the close of the first part of this year's session of the Committee on Disarmament. Document CD/181 calls specifically upon the Committee to establish an ad hoc working group on item 1 of the agenda and proposes the wording of a mandate for that working group; moreover, it poses specific substantive questions to the trilateral negotiators of a test-ban treaty. As all members of the Committee are aware, only two nuclear-weapon Powers have refused to agree to the establishment of the proposed subsidiary body.

Many years have elapsed since the commitments I mentioned above were undertaken; more than a year has gone by since the Group of 21 first proposed the establishment of a working group on item 1, and almost two months have passed since the presentation of document CD/181. The trilateral negotiators, among which are the two nuclear-weapon Powers that oppose the consensus otherwise existing in the Committee, have been asked simple, straightforward questions, dictated by a genuine desire to tackle an issue which touches directly and fundamentally on the vital security interests of all States. The cessation of the further testing of nuclear weapons does not belong exclusively to the province of the three negotiators, or even to that of the five nuclear-weapon Powers; indeed, all nations in the world have a legitimate interest in a treaty that would ban all nuclear-weapon testing in all environments for all time.

My delegation would be unfaithful to the responsibility resting upon all Members of the United Nations were it not to recall at this opportunity the need for agreement on the start of urgent multilateral negotiations on item 1 of our agenda. At the recent session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, which unfortunately could not achieve agreement on all the other items on its own agenda, a consensus text on nuclear disarmament was painstakingly negotiated, once again demonstrating the importance attached by the international community to that question, to which the nuclear test ban is so closely related. The report of the Disarmament Commission on nuclear disarmament states, among other things, that the "special responsibility" incumbent upon the nuclear-weapon Powers entails "the respect for the security concerns of non-nuclear nations, the refraining from any action conducive to the intensification of the nuclear arms race and above all the pursuit of concrete measures of nuclear disarmament".

(Mr. De Souza e Silva, Brazil)

It is the exercise of that responsibility that all Members of the United Nations expect from the three negotiating Powers and particularly from the two States that have so far opposed the consensus on the establishment of a working group on item 1 within the Committee. My delegation is convinced that these States will not shirk their special responsibilities, and that they will have utilized constructively the recess of the Committee to evolve, at long last, their response to the unanimous concern of the non-nuclear-weapon nations with regard to the multilateral negotiation of a nuclear-weapon test ban. They are the ones who should be making statements this week, under item 1 of the agenda.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): Comrade Chairman, taking the floor today for the first time at the second part of our 1981 session, I am happy to see you, the representative of a brotherly socialist country, as the Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament for the month of June. Congratulating you and wishing you every success in the chair, I am also expressing my personal conviction that thanks to your skill and experience the Committee will this month make further progress in the disarmament dialogue. I also wish to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Ambassador Pfeiffer of the Federal Republic of Germany for his remarkable performance in the chair of this Committee last April. My delegation welcomes the new representatives in the Committee on Disarmament: Ambassador Carasales of Argentina, Ambassador Jalali of Iran and Ambassador Jayakoddy of Sri Lanka. We wish them all the best in their new posts and offer them our full co-operation.

Since we closed the spring part of our session, the international political environment has not improved. On the contrary, just a few days before we resumed our deliberations, the international community learned with dismay of an unprecedented act of aggression committed by Israel, this time against Iraq: the bombardment of the nuclear centre near Baghdad. I join my delegation's voice to the expressions of protest and indignation raised in this room by other delegations and groups of delegations from the beginning of our session. The bombing of the Iraqi nuclear centre by Israeli planes was an unparalleled act of terrorism and international piracy. The Government of Poland has strongly condemned the attack. The Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in a statement issued after the Israeli attack, declared: "Polish public opinion, Polish society and the Polish Government indignantly condemn this overt act of aggression as a violation of all norms of international law, and hold the Israeli authorities and the forces backing and helping them in the pursuit of this aggressive policy totally responsible for its consequences."

My delegation notes with satisfaction that the Committee on Disarmament, through the representatives of all of its groups, has condemned that act of piracy. The resolution in this respect unanimously approved by the Security Council reflects a universal condemnation of this Israeli aggression by the whole community of nations.

I have no doubt that it is in just such situations that the Committee should demonstrate its will and strength through the unity of approach and action of its members in conducting the disarmament dialogue and thus leading up to the diminishing of international tension. My delegation notes with satisfaction in this context the fact that the Committee managed to agree, in a relatively short time, on its

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

programme of work as well as on the commencement of activities of its four existing working groups. This reflects, in my view, the will of the members of the Committee to accelerate the pace of its work and to increase its effectiveness, calls for which have been heard from many speakers since the beginning of the present part of our session. It also fully corresponds with the main lines of the instructions that my delegation arrived with at this session. On our part, we shall spare no efforts to contribute, to the utmost of our possibilities, in the strengthening of such sound tendencies in the Committee.

If I put it this way, it is partly because of the criticism from some Polish mass media which asked me this straight question: has the Committee on Disarmament, acting for the last three years with its enlarged membership, been able to achieve any concrete, positive result, or has it been for these three years marking time, without any significant progress? I think that the Committee is universally judged in such a way. Sharing the impatience of public opinion, I summarize my reply to the above question by stating my view that in our Committee there is enough will and dedication from the overwhelming majority of its members to make this unique, world-wide negotiating forum an effective mechanism for specific actions on the restraint of the mad arms race and on opening the way towards gradual disarmament. It is the more necessary today as the worsening of the climate of international relations, instead of alarming and bringing the representatives of all interested countries to the negotiating table, serves them as a pretext for increasing armaments and imposing the arms race. Could it be that it is reasoned according to this logic: international tension for armaments and armaments for increasing tension? Poland, the other socialist countries and all countries which do not seek the future of their economies and the future of the world in the arms race, aims at reversing that dangerous way of thinking, and replacing it by the following logical sequence: détente for disarmament and disarmament for détente. Being guided by such a formula, the Polish delegation offers its full support to the demands to intensify the Committee's work and to seek all possible means of increasing the effectiveness of its activities. We shall, as we have always done, adhere to our principles as far as these goals are concerned; at the same time, we shall be very flexible in our approach as far as the methods of achieving tangible results are concerned.

In accordance with our principles, we fully share the view that the Committee should produce specific results for the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. The question arises whether the elaboration of a comprehensive programme on disarmament, to which we have been formally obliged, or the draft convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons, possibly to be worked out, indeed exhaust all our physical and political possibilities for producing results that we could present at the second session?

In the framework of its approach, my delegation believes that the Committee should proceed immediately to concrete negotiations on nuclear disarmament and a comprehensive nuclear test ban. As you know, socialist countries from the first moments of the debate in the Committee on Disarmament in February 1979 considered as a matter of highest priority the question related to the cessation of the nuclear

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

arms race and to nuclear disarmament. Let me emphasize at this moment that my delegation fully supports and calls for the establishment of an ad hoc working group in this respect. We welcome in this context the statement by the Group of 21 contained in document CD/180 and particularly its call for the establishment of such a working group. Let me also express the hope that such a group will finally be established very soon, during this part of the session. It is indeed high time.

With regard to item 1: nuclear test ban, my delegation favours the Committee's active role in this respect. We strongly support the proposal by the Group of 21 to set up within the framework of the Committee an ad hoc working group with the participation of all nuclear-weapon Powers. Needless to say, the establishment of working groups on these two extremely important items on the Committee's agenda would constitute the best guarantee for putting the deliberations conducted so far in a specific organizational form.

We intend to be flexible with regard to the question of the adjustment -- or broadening, as some put it -- of the mandates of existing working groups, including the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons. We do not to be sure, think, that the results of the negotiations in any working group would depend substantially on the contents of its mandate. It is equally possible that with a good and broad mandate the Group might be unable to make any progress or -- on the contrary -- that within the presently available, relatively limited mandate, the Working Group on Chemical Weapons might be able to make progress in business-like negotiations. In other words, it is not the mandate which will provide the panacea to cure our non-efficiency. I wish to recall, however, that the Polish delegation has been pronouncing itself from the very beginning in favour of a broad mandate for the Working Group on Chemical Weapons so that it can conduct business-like negotiations on the prohibition of this lethal weapon. Let me also point out that, as a matter of fact, we are in the first phase, if not in the middle of the real negotiation process. Thanks to the skill and great personal dedication of both Chairmen of the Working Group on Chemical Weapons, Ambassador Okawa and Ambassador Lidgard, we have come -- as all of us know -- to the negotiation of elements of a future convention. Not all of us, however -- as the exchange of views during informal meetings shows very well -- are yet prepared to enter into the last phase of the negotiation process: the drafting of the text of the said convention. Guided by a sense of realism, the Polish delegation would wish to continue to seek for a mandate which could be adequate to the real possibilities of all delegations. At the same time, things should continue to be done in a way which would not impede, and in any case not lead to a suspension of the activities of the Working Group. We consider the working papers put forward by the Chairman as a very good basis for the process of negotiation of elements of the draft convention. Therefore we pronounce ourselves for the straight continuation of discussions in that forum. Let me also once again express the opinion that the resumption of the bilateral Soviet-American talks in this respect would greatly facilitate the elaboration by the Committee of a convention prohibiting chemical weapons.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

As far as the Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons is concerned, the Polish delegation maintains the view expressed in the statement made in this room on 14 April. While realizing that the prohibition of radiological weapons has only relative meaning in comparison with such primordial problems as nuclear disarmament or the prohibition of chemical weapons, we are at the same time of the opinion that there is a chance for reaching agreement on the text of a treaty which could convince Governments and international public opinion that here in Geneva we are not spending time, money and energy in vain. As the delegations of socialist countries put it in document CD/182, we shall continue to work perseveringly for the earliest achievement of a final agreement on the text of a treaty, the importance of which is underlined both in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and in numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly.

The delegation of Poland wishes to express its support for the proposals put forward by the Hungarian delegation in document CD/174 on the setting up of an ad hoc group of qualified governmental experts on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

My delegation undoubtedly attaches the utmost importance to the discussions conducted by the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament. As all of us here know only too well, the elaboration by the Committee of a really comprehensive programme of disarmament and its submission to the General Assembly at its second special session on disarmament next year is one of the most urgent musts of the Committee on Disarmament. We agree that considerable work will have to be done if the programme is to be adopted more or less within a year from now. My delegation hopes that the discussions on the identification and acceptance of the measures to be included in the comprehensive programme will create favourable and realistic conditions for their realization in the future. May I add that, in the view of the Polish delegation, the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, the reports of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade provide an essential framework for elaborating the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

It is not my intention at this moment to summarize the position of the delegation of Poland on all the items on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament. Having expressed in general the views of the Polish delegation on some of them, I wish to point out once again that the very urgent and most important task of this Committee is to conduct in good will negotiations on the most pressing problem of our times: disarmament. The more we do now, during this session, the more confidence we shall deserve from the nations of the whole world in the future.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to thank the distinguished representative of Poland, Ambassador Sujka, for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Since, as the General Assembly explicitly recognized at its first special session, the existence of nuclear weapons and the continued arms race are a threat "to the very survival of mankind", it is not surprising that the General Assembly should have declared at that same session that "all the peoples of the world have a vital interest in the success of disarmament negotiations" and that "all States have the right to participate in those negotiations, for which it was expressly provided that this Committee on Disarmament would be the "single multilateral negotiating forum".

All of us here know, however, that the two vetoes which have been hampering the Committee's work in this direction since last year have had the effect of nullifying those provisions of the Final Document. That is why my delegation has believed, since the beginning of the 1981 session, that in view of the impossibility of making a more effective contribution it should at least help to ensure that the Committee is duly informed of the results of the deliberations of other international bodies which have the good fortune of not being prevented from dealing with what is theoretically one of the two priority items on our agenda: the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament.

It was for this reason that, in February, we asked the Secretariat to reproduce in a working paper the declaration approved, at the conclusion of its third session held in Vienna from 6 to 8 February, by the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, which is presided over by Mr. Olof Palme, the former Prime Minister of Sweden, and has a membership of nearly 20 eminent persons from countries of Europe, Asia, Africa and the two Americas, including a number of high-ranking officials of the States members of NATO, among them a Prime Minister, and of the Warsaw Pact and the third world.

The working paper in question appeared as document CD/143, and the declaration reproduced in it was devoted to a consideration of "The SALT process: the global stakes". Among its conclusions were some which I shall read out, for I feel that it would be useful to recall them because they have even greater relevance and force today than they had when they were first formulated:

"The overriding purpose of the SALT process is to help prevent nuclear war. Nuclear weapons have confronted mankind with unprecedented dangers; civilization as we know it can literally be destroyed in moments. There are grounds for criticizing the SALT process. It is cumbersome, and slow. Its accomplishments have been limited. But it is the only existing means to deal with the most pressing threat to man's survival. If the process comes to an end, what little progress had been made in containing the risk of nuclear war would be set back immeasurably. It would mean a return to the futile propaganda wars of the 1950s in place of serious discussions of practical limitations on weaponry. And it would mean removal of one of the most important initiatives to ease the risk of nuclear war.

"...

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

"For these reasons, the Commission believes it is essential for the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union to follow through on their pledges to resume the SALT negotiations. Because of these pledges and the global stakes involved, the Commission hopes that the United States and the USSR will continue their 12 year effort to negotiate limits of nuclear weapons at the earliest possible opportunity and that both sides should show maximum restraint in the interim. This is not only in the interest of the United States and the Soviet Union, but of the whole world."

It is for the same reasons as motivated us in February that my delegation has now requested the circulation of working paper CD/188. The working paper reproduces the two declarations approved by the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues at the conclusion of its fourth and fifth sessions, concerning, respectively, the urgent need for the resumption of negotiations on so-called "theatre nuclear weapons" or medium-range nuclear weapons, and the Treaty concluded between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on 26 May 1972, during the first stage of the SALT talks, bearing the title "Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems".

In the first of these declarations, approved on 26 April last here in Geneva, the Commission began by expressing its "serious concern about the present state of affairs in the field of arms control and disarmament". It pointed out that "along with resumption of the SALT process, the most important step to arrest the present adverse trend would be negotiations on the limitation of theatre nuclear forces", and called on "the United States and the Soviet Union to start such negotiations without any loss of time". It plainly stated its conclusion that "failure to begin talks and make progress soon towards the control and reduction of these weapons would result in aggravating the present dangerous situation in Europe, with repercussions for the rest of the world", and ended by emphasizing that "the sides along with their respective allies should proceed with a sense of urgency consistent with the standard of equality and equal security".

The second of these two declarations was approved only a little over a week ago, as it emerged from the meeting held in Moscow from 12 to 14 June. On that occasion, the Independent Commission reaffirmed, in the same terms as those used at its fourth session, "its serious concern about the present state of affairs in the field of arms control and disarmament", and made a detailed study on the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, taking particular note of the significance and scope of its provisions as well as of the fact that next year the parties will "together conduct a review" of the Treaty, as provided for in its article XIV.

The outcome of this study was the conclusions set forth in the second declaration quoted in working paper CD/188, the most important of which are as follows: the ABM Treaty "provides the foundation of strategic stability necessary for the continuation of SALT in such a manner that substantial reductions and important qualitative limitations of nuclear weapons may be achieved"; the broadening and modernization of intercontinental ballistic missile defence systems

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

would offer only marginal benefit towards that end, and would require abrogation or major modification of the ABM Treaty; with regard to anti-ballistic missiles for the defence of cities and populations against a massive nuclear attack, there was still no technology which could be described as effective.

The Commission therefore considered that "a negotiated settlement reducing substantially the levels of strategic forces would be a much more effective way of promoting peace and stability", and consequently that "the United States and Soviet Union should continue to preserve the letter and spirit" of the ABM Treaty, which it considered a "most important document".

My delegation is convinced that it will be impossible to continue indefinitely preventing the Committee on Disarmament from carrying out what must, according to the provisions of the Final Document, be considered its primary task -- the conduct of multilateral negotiations on disarmament, giving nuclear disarmament its proper priority. We venture to hope that information such as that provided in the two working papers submitted by the delegation of Mexico -- CD/143, of 11 February 1981, and CD/188, circulated today, which I have introduced in this brief statement -- may contribute, if only in some small degree, to underscoring the desirability of accepting the proposal of the Group of 21 set forth in document CD/180, of 24 April 1981, concerning the setting up of an ad hoc working group on item 2 of the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament: "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament".

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.