

FINAL RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST PLENARY MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 4 February 1982, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Mohammad Jafar Mahallati (Iran)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:

Mr. H. MATI
Mr. A. TAFFAR

Argentina:

Mr. V. BEAUCE
Miss N. MASCHIBENE

Australia:

Mr. T. FINDLAY

Belgium:

Mr. A. ONKELINX
Mr. J.M. NOIRFALISSE
Miss. R. de CLERCQ

Brazil:

Mr. S. de QUEIROZ DUARTE

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. TELLALOV
Mr. I. SOTIROV
Mr. K. PRANOV
Mr. P. POPCHEV

Burma:

U HIAUNG HIAUNG GYI
U THAN HTUN

Canada:

Mr. G. SKINNER

China:

Mr. TIAH JIH
Mr. YU MINGLIANG
Mr. FENG ZHENYAO
Mr. HU XIAODI

Cuba:

Mr. P. MUÑEZ MOSQUERA

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. J. STRUCKA
Mr. E. ZAPOTOCKY
Mr. A. CHA

Egypt:

Mr. I.A. HASSAN
Mr. H.N. FAHY
Miss W. BASSIM

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. TERREFE
Mr. F. YOHANNES

France:

Mr. J. de BEAUSSE

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. H. THIELICKE

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. H. WEGENER
Mr. N. KLINGLER
Mr. W.E. VON DEM HAGEN
Mr. W. ROHR

Hungary:

Mr. I. KOMIVES
Mr. C. GYORFFY

India:

Mr. S. SARAN

Indonesia:

Mr. CH. ANWAR SANI
Mr. E. SOEPRAPTO
Mr. HARYOMATARAM
Mr. B. SITHANJUNTAK

Iran:

Mr. M.J. MAHALLATI
Mr. M. NOSTRATI

Italy:

Mr. M. ALESSI
Mr. B. CABRAS
Mr. C.H. OLIVA
Mr. E. DI GIOVANNI

Japan:

Mr. Y. OKAWA
Mr. M. TAKAHASHI
Mr. K. TANAKA
Mr. T. ARAI

Kenya:

Mr. C.G. MAINA
Mr. D. NANJIRE
Mr. J. MURIU KIBOI

Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES
Mrs. Z. GONZALEZ Y REYNERO

Mongolia:

Mr. S.O. BOLD

Morocco:

Mr. M. HALFAOUI

Netherlands:

Mr. H. WAGENMAKERS

Nigeria:

Mr. G.O. IJEWERE
Mr. W.O. AKINSANYA
Mr. T. AGUIYI-IRONSI

Pakistan:

Mr. N. AHMAD
Mr. H. AKRAN
Mr. T. ALTAF

Peru:

Mr. J. BENAVIDES

Poland:

Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. T. STROJWAS

Romania:

Mr. M. MALITA
Mr. T. MELESCANU

Sri Lanka:

Mr. T. JAYAKODDY

Sweden:

Mrs. I. THORSSON
Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. H. BERGLUND
Mr. G. ANDERSSON
Mr. S. THEOLIN

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: . Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. B.P. PROKOFIEV
Mr. V.M. GANJA
Mr. V.V. LOSHCHININ
Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO
Mr. M.M. IPPOLITOV
Mr. V.A. KROKHA

United Kingdom: Mr. D. SUMMERHAYES
Mr. L.J. MIDDLETON
Miss J.E.F. WRIGHT

United States of America: Mr. L.G. FIELDS
Mr. M. BUSBY
Miss K. CRITTENBERGER
Mr. J. LEONARD
Mr. J. MISKEL
Mr. R.F. SCOTT
Miss L.M. SHEA
Mr. J. GUNDERSEN

Venezuela: Mr. R.R. NAVARRO
Mr. O.A. AGUILAR

Yugoslavia: Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC

Zaire: Mrs. C. ESAKI EKANGA KABEYA

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

Deputy Secretary of the
Committee on Disarmament: Mr. V. BERASATEGUI

The CHAIRMAN: In the Name of God The Most Compassionate, The Most Merciful, I declare open the one hundred and fifty-first plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. ALLOSI (Italy) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, my delegation wishes first of all to extend to you its warm congratulations on your assumption of the office you are to fill during the month of February, and to assure you of its full co-operation during this period which is of particular importance for the organization of the Committee's activities.

At the same time I wish to associate myself with all the delegations which have expressed their appreciation to Ambassador Sani for the competent manner in which he presided over our work during the preceding period.

Finally, my delegation wishes to associate itself with the warm expressions of esteem which have been addressed to Ambassador Fein. I have had the privilege of witnessing his activity during only a very brief period, but it has nevertheless been long enough for me to appreciate the contribution that he has made to the Committee.

The established practice of prefacing statements in the general debate in the Committee on Disarmament with comments on the international political situation reflects an awareness of the fact that any effort in the very sensitive field of disarmament is affected by the quality of the relations between States and by the climate of confidence, or lack of confidence, among them.

We therefore consider it quite legitimate to refer here to the deep disquiet caused by the recent events in Poland. This is yet another source of tension in addition to other crisis points, particularly that created by the continuing foreign military occupation of Afghanistan. Our intention is not to distract the Committee's attention from the genuine problems of disarmament, but on the contrary to situate the latter in their proper context. Nor can we accept the argument that events of this kind are purely the internal affairs of a State. The principles whose violation my Government has deplored and continues to deplore -- respect for human rights, observance of the right of all peoples to determine their internal and external political status without foreign interference and freely pursue their political, economic, social and cultural development -- these principles are the heritage of the entire international community. In the particular case of Europe, the Final Act of Helsinki, which solemnly binds the 35 signatory countries, indissolubly links the effective respect for those rights with security and the development of normal friendly relations. The Madrid Conference which is to resume its work in a few days' time will allow my Government the opportunity of once again deploring the repressive measures adopted in Poland and of repeating its call for the revocation of such measures.

Even though events such as those I have mentioned are bound to have an adverse effect upon efforts towards disarmament, those efforts must nevertheless be pursued unremittingly and without hesitation.

In this connection I should like to point out that the opening of the 1982 session of the Committee on Disarmament is marked by two elements of potential progress: the resumption of negotiations relating to nuclear disarmament between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and the approach of the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The opening last November of bilateral negotiations on medium-range nuclear forces within the framework of the strategic arms control process between the two Powers possessing the largest arsenals, is of great importance. Although the international political climate has deteriorated, these negotiations are continuing.

(Mr. Alessi, Italy)

The Italian Government fully shares the United States' approach in embarking on these negotiations, an approach which was elaborated in the course of intensive consultations among the members of the Atlantic Alliance.

The conclusion of a treaty limiting the number of medium-range nuclear missiles to the lowest possible level, and preferably the "zero level", is an optimum objective, which is entirely in keeping with the nature of the negotiations and the aspirations of the peoples of Europe, especially the younger generations, which have forcefully expressed, wherever they have been free to do so, their deep concern.

The negotiations on medium-range nuclear forces should initiate a process which can be extended to other categories of weapons and to other measures, with the over-all maintenance of a balance of forces and reciprocal security. We hope that bilateral negotiations on the reduction of strategic arms will soon begin and lead to substantial reductions in strategic nuclear arsenals.

The second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will certainly represent a major occasion for taking stock of the achievements of the disarmament effort. The four years of activity of the Committee on Disarmament will represent a significant part of that balance sheet.

At the start of this session, we should ask ourselves how and to what extent our Committee can contribute to the success of the second special session. At the organizational level, our first concern should be to re-establish without delay all the working groups which functioned last year. The question of the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons can be settled separately, without delaying a decision on the principle of the re-establishment of the Group itself.

Our joint reflection upon the organization and methods of work of the Committee and the search for consensus on the improvements to be made should also be pursued. I should like to take note in this connection of the interesting suggestions made by the distinguished representative of the Netherlands, Ambassador Fein, in his statement last Tuesday. As for the substance of the items to be placed on our agenda, the Committee should above all pursue the consideration of the nuclear questions, and give them the priority they deserve.

While recognizing the real difficulties standing in the way of the conclusion of a verifiable treaty completely banning nuclear tests, I would not wish to miss this opportunity of reaffirming the importance which my Government attaches to that objective. It is an element of what must be a broader approach; but nevertheless a particularly significant element which the international community has for many years singled out, and to which it rightly attributes the highest degree of urgency. We remain convinced that the Committee and the Group of seismic experts can provide a practical counterpart to the efforts made by the States parties to the trilateral negotiations. We are prepared to support any solution at the organizational level which is likely to advance our work, including the setting up of a working group.

We believe that the work of the Group of seismic experts is of very great practical importance. That is why, in our plenary statement on 13 August 1961, we referred to the desirability of broadening the Group's mandate to enable it to discuss the substance of the question of the identification of seismic events.

(Mr. Alessi, Italy)

Another priority subject on which our Committee should make a decisive contribution is that of chemical weapons. The Committee ought to be in a position to provide, at the time of the second special session, proof that its negotiating capacity is equal to the task entrusted to it. To that end, we must embark on a new stage in our negotiations and begin the drafting of a convention on the basis of the elements worked out last year.

At its thirty-sixth session the General Assembly renewed, by a significant majority, the mandate conferred upon the Secretary-General to carry out an impartial investigation, with the assistance of qualified medical and technical experts, concerning the alleged use of chemical weapons in different parts of the world. At a time when respect for certain international agreements and the pertinent rules of customary international law is called into question, it seems to us more urgent than ever to complete the system of measures prohibiting an entire category of particularly odious weapons of mass destruction with a treaty on the complete and effective prohibition of chemical weapons and on the destruction of stocks of such weapons, which would eliminate once and for all any danger of their use.

All the delegations which have spoken so far have expressed their conviction that a revision of the Working Group's mandate is justified. A formulation must be found on which a consensus is possible. The final report of the Working Group for the 1981 session contains, in the section entitled "Recommendations and conclusions", useful suggestions for solving this problem.

The comprehensive programme of disarmament, which will be one of the key elements of the forthcoming special session, must also be given an important place in our work.

Italy, as one of the sponsors of General Assembly resolution 2602 E, adopted in 1969, which lies at the basis of today's negotiations, hopes that the second special session will mark the completion of the work begun more than 12 years ago. During the month of January the Working Group, which has the benefit of the experienced and distinguished guidance of Ambassador Garcia Robles, began discussions which have proved extremely useful, if somewhat unbalanced owing to the very stinting participation of one group of delegations. The statement made by the distinguished representative of Czechoslovakia on 2 February last serves in part to fill this gap: we are awaiting the further development of the ideas he put forward, particularly as concerns the questions of the nature of the Comprehensive Programme, the division and duration of the phases, the transition from one phase to the next, the machinery for the review of the implementation of the programme, and so forth.

Allow me to say that my delegation, while remaining open to solutions which may be found by common agreement, continues to prefer a comprehensive programme divided into three phases. Each of the phases would include various measures on the basis of a functional criterion. The first phase would thus include the measures considered necessary to halt the arms race, with the maintenance of security levels undiminished. The third and final phase would consist of the measures for the complete elimination of arms and armed forces; while the middle phase would comprise the measures necessary to link the point of departure to the point of arrival, that is to say, measures providing for the gradual, balanced reduction of the different types of arms and armed forces. A more detailed breakdown of this structure -- into sub-phases, for example -- could be carried out by review conferences or other review machinery set up to monitor and promote the implementation of the comprehensive programme.

(Mr. Alessi, Italy)

Other important questions traditionally appear on the Committee's agenda and will doubtless continue to appear thereon. My delegation intends to use the time set aside specifically for the consideration of those items to give its views on them. However, I should like to take this opportunity to express the hope that this year a suitable place will be given in the agenda and programme of work of the Committee for a new item concerning further measures to be adopted to prevent an arms race in outer space.

One of the special features of the discussions at the thirty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly was, in fact, the interest shown in the problems of arms control and disarmament in outer space. The many speeches made on this subject highlighted the conviction that the international community should urgently take further efforts to prevent an arms race in this new sphere of man's activity.

This interest led to the adoption of two resolutions which, for the first time, indicate the General Assembly's desire that the Committee on Disarmament should deal with this question, which is wholly in keeping with paragraph 30 of the Final Document.

Resolution 36/97 C, of which Italy was a sponsor, in its paragraph 3 requests the Committee on Disarmament "to consider, as from the beginning of its session in 1982, the question of negotiating effective and verifiable agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space". It would be perfectly appropriate to envisage an initial exchange of views, in plenary, during this part of the session.

After such a survey or preliminary consideration of this very complex and sensitive issue, we shall be in a better position to decide on the most suitable procedures for taking concrete steps to follow up the discussions in the General Assembly. The rapid development of space technology in recent years raises clear and precise threats: some applications are no longer in the domain of scientific hypothesis but have already begun to be included in military arsenals. These must be identified, and efforts must be made to remedy this situation through the speedy negotiation of concrete, verifiable and effective measures.

That, in our view, is the meaning of the request made by the General Assembly to the Committee, the multilateral negotiating body in matters of disarmament, and the role which it could play in this field.

It would be vain to think it possible to resolve at once and effectively all the problems involved in the prevention of an arms race in space by means of some few articles of a treaty of a general character. Such an approach would merely delay our efforts and draw us away from our objective.

In this connection resolution 36/97 C, to which I have already referred, suggests the path to be followed: in its paragraph 4 the Committee on Disarmament is requested "to consider as a matter of priority the question of negotiating an effective and verifiable agreement to prohibit anti-satellite systems, as an important step towards the fulfilment of the objectives set out in paragraph 3 above".

It is generally acknowledged that the most threatening development, and the one that calls for the most immediate action, is the development of anti-satellite weapons systems. If this development were to remain uncontrolled, the basis for an arms race in outer space would already exist. This prospect should spur us to make a determined effort to avert, before it is too late, the real and immediate risks which exist in this field.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Italy for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. Chairman, my delegation joins others in congratulating you upon your accession to the Chair. Our first formal and informal meetings have already permitted us to appreciate the courtesy and fairness with which you preside over our work. My delegation is looking forward to working under your guidance. We are confident that we will all benefit from the earnest and noble objectives which you bring to your high office. My delegation also recalls with gratitude the exceptional contribution which our previous Chairman, Ambassador Anwar Sani, made to our work.

From the vast array of topics that are of immediate relevance to this session of the Committee on Disarmament, I should like to select only three for this initial statement. I intend to touch briefly upon the political environment in which we commence our work, on some aspects of the chemical weapons problem, and finally on the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

This Committee is convening at the half-way mark between the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly and its second special session devoted to disarmament. It is wise at this juncture to assess both the tasks ahead, in view of the forthcoming special session, and our past record in the bilateral and multilateral fields. I need not be specific. Looking through the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, we must all acknowledge that only fragments of the Programme of Action set out in that document have been achieved. Naturally, there are praiseworthy achievements, like the United Nations Convention on particularly inhumane weapons, and many other concrete steps and elements. But the remaining challenges are formidable; the lack in our achievement is all too manifest. In this situation it is useless to attribute blame and level accusations. Indeed, it is now more important to look at the state of attainment of our work, unsatisfactory as it may be, and to plan ahead in a sober fashion, assessing the possibilities of what can be done in the few remaining months. Work in the Committee on Disarmament must be concentrated on essential items, and procedural debates must be cut to the bare minimum. We must all make an extraordinary effort not to come to the second special session on disarmament empty-handed, but we must remain realistic in terms of attainable goals.

Realism is also the key word for the second special session itself. Lofty objectives must be measured against reality; review and appraisal of achievements in the past period must lead to careful planning for the next few years. Reasonable prospects for concrete results within this period will have to take precedence over the promulgation of over-ambitious ideas.

While the Committee on Disarmament is an autonomous international forum, the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly has, of course, an important bearing upon the work of this session. Apart from other relevant results the General Assembly, in one important new field, namely, measures to prevent an arms race in outer space, has given this Committee a new and significant assignment which my delegation is looking forward to debating at an early point as a follow-up to resolution 36/97 C, of which my country was a sponsor.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic of Germany)

Turning now to the larger political environment in which we have to work, my delegation joins others in expressing grave preoccupation with the international security situation. We all agree that the chances for substantial progress towards arms control and disarmament depend, essentially, on confidence among States and a consistent policy of restraint and moderation in the pursuit of external interests.

Yet we cannot but state that there is a further substantial deterioration in East-West relations, and the climate of confidence has been seriously affected.

Soviet military occupation of Afghanistan continues unabated in defiance of the condemnation by an overwhelming majority of the international community, as repeatedly evidenced in resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

There are no indications of a change in the attitude of the Soviet Union, which is responsible for this violation of the principle of self-determination and non-use of force in international relations.

On the contrary, there are signs that military repression in Afghanistan is on the increase, causing the suffering of an untold number of victims, especially among the rural population. My delegation has taken note with the utmost concern of reports concerning the use of chemical agents.

Another more recent event has shaken the basis of mutual confidence and the prospects for peaceful co-operation.

Obviously, I refer to the imposition of martial law in Poland. Its consequences and repercussions signify a clear breach of the Final Act of Helsinki. What has happened in Poland is not just an internal affair. On the contrary, the violation of the 1975 Helsinki document, of fundamental human rights and of the international legislation of the ILO make the tragedy of the Polish people a matter of legitimate concern for the entire international community.

The responsibility for this breach of international commitments and for the decision to reverse the process of renewal and reform in Poland lies with the Polish military authorities, but no less with the Soviet Union.

What has happened in Poland is more than just a turbulence in political atmospheric conditions: it reveals a general unwillingness to respect the principles of human rights, as enshrined in the United Nations Charter and the Final Act of Helsinki, and to accept peaceful evolution.

Contrary to assurances given by the Polish military régime, there have been no signs of improvement. A long shadow falls on the prospects for the arms control process. Inevitably, the security climate in Europe is directly affected. It is imperative that the climate of confidence be restored. Confidence is a prime prerequisite for our very task as negotiators in the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic of Germany)

My Government, in full agreement with the Final Act of Helsinki, has repeatedly urged the Polish leaders to lift martial law in order to re-establish the Polish people's civil rights, to release those who are arrested and to resume a genuine dialogue with the Catholic Church and legitimate representatives of the independent trade union in Poland. We also request that Poland be enabled to solve its problems autonomously and without external interference.

If these overriding requirements are met, mutual confidence will revive and the prospects for progress in terms of concrete results in disarmament and arms control will be substantially enhanced.

Grave as the events in Poland are, they are not the only threats to the international security climate. The military balance in Europe still gives rise to undiminished concern.

The Federal Republic of Germany therefore welcomes the fact that the negotiations here in Geneva between the United States of America and the Soviet Union on intermediate-range nuclear forces have been resumed after the Christmas recess. We are convinced that a positive outcome of these negotiations will contribute to greater international stability and progress in other arms control endeavours. We fully support the far-reaching American proposal -- thoroughly prepared within the Western Alliance -- aiming at a zero level outcome for all land-based intermediate nuclear missiles on both sides.

A treaty which honours this unique offer would eliminate the weapons category of greatest concern. We feel that such an outcome would be the most promising and tangible way of strengthening international peace and security. We welcome the commitment on both sides to spare no effort to reach agreement. In the same spirit, my Government attaches a high value to continued negotiations in this Committee.

Turning to the second part of my intervention, I should like to highlight once more the importance which my delegation attaches to the question of chemical weapons. In my country, a comprehensive chemical weapons prohibition is a matter of concern not only to the Government but to all political parties represented in the German Bundestag. On 3 December 1981, the Federal Parliament unanimously adopted a resolution urging the immediate conclusion of a chemical weapons convention to operate under effective international control.

Looking at the achievements of the Committee during its 1981 session -- and that means at the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons -- we can pride ourselves on having produced, under the efficient leadership of Ambassador Lidgard of Sweden, a considerable degree of specificity in what comes very near to being treaty language. However, progress is so far less apparent in the field of verification. But verification is the centrepiece on which the ultimate success of our negotiations depends and on which, therefore, we should focus particular attention during this year's debate.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic of Germany)

Experience of agreements lacking a proper verification mechanism, such as the Geneva Protocol and the Biological Weapons Convention, stresses the need for a comprehensive solution to this question.

My delegation has on many occasions set out its views on the essentials of an effective international verification system. Let me just recapitulate:

Verification must follow a regular, pre-established procedure so as to be non-discriminatory and take place in a businesslike and co-operative atmosphere;

It must provide for impartial investigations into events which require clarification; and

It must protect legitimate economic interests.

In order to advance work in this direction, my delegation will, during this session, introduce a working paper which will set out in greater detail the mechanisms and procedures which are, in our view, necessary for an effective verification of a chemical weapons convention. This working paper will, inter alia, specifically deal with the problems of binary weapons. In particular, we intend to propose a way whereby -- contrary to certain allegations that the non-production of binary weapons is not verifiable -- verification can also be extended to and include binary weapons.

The vital contribution of the comprehensive programme of disarmament to the success of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament need not be underscored. From the documents it appears evident that the Committee on Disarmament must come to terms with the CPD issue, and that at least a negotiable text, with or without a limited number of alternative options on specific problems, must be ready for the larger New York audience by the time this Committee winds up its spring session. The matter is urgent, and the credibility of this Committee is at stake.

The CPD Working Group which met through most of January has done good work and, while no firm results are in sight on most issues, it has deepened the insight and understanding of all delegations concerned. My delegation is grateful to the participants and to the Working Group's Chairman, Ambassador García Robles of Mexico. The work accomplished in January allows us to identify the areas where consensus is well within reach, and, conversely, those areas where major controversies loom which we must jointly settle in the next few weeks.

From the viewpoint of one of the sponsors of document CD/205, the only complete draft programme before the Committee at this time, my delegation is under the impression that the following three issues of principle have arisen and need creative negotiating in a spirit of compromise:

1. Nature of the CPD

It is obvious that the CPD will need a mode of adoption and promulgation commensurate with its overriding significance for the success of the second special session on disarmament. It must, at the same time, correspond to

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic of Germany)

its basic purpose as a politically relevant framework for a comprehensive negotiating process. It is, however, equally obvious that an instrument of this kind is unsuitable for a normal process of international ratification. Even the advocates of a "legally binding" CPD have so far been unable to show how this binding effect could technically be achieved. Our search for an adequate solution in the spirit of compromise should therefore go in the direction of endowing the CPD, when adopted by the General Assembly at its second special session, with a special degree of solemnity in order to raise political commitment. My delegation is ready to help in the search for such modalities in a positive and constructive way. You will recall that the sponsors of document CD/205 have proposed the inclusion of a paragraph in the resolution to which the CPD would be annexed, "calling upon all States to declare that they will respect the objectives, principles and priorities set out in the programme and express their firm will and determination to implement the programme through the negotiation of specific and verifiable arms control and disarmament agreements."

2. Designation of disarmament measures

One major difference between the catalogue of measures proposed in CD/205 and the corresponding catalogue proposed by the Group of 21 in CD/223 is the degree of specificity. There is also a basic difference in approach. In most instances, when document CD/223 describes a particular negotiation measure, the tenor of the description already implies the desired outcome of these very negotiations. It does not limit itself to indicating the main thrust of negotiations, but anticipates detailed results, thereby prejudging the future decisions of Governments and negotiators. I submit that this is a dangerous course, since no delegation is in a position at this time to predict the outcome of future negotiations and since nobody can reasonably and responsibly declare himself bound in great detail over what may easily be a time-span covering 20 years or more. In most cases this approach also runs counter to the agreed "Elements" of the CPD as adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission. This document makes it clear that the CPD should only constitute a framework for substantive negotiations, but should not substitute itself for results that require a concrete negotiation process.

My delegation is under the urgent impression that this approach begs the question and will not be conducive to consensus on any list of disarmament measures. It is perfectly legitimate for each delegation and regional group to attach specific objectives and hopes to a given negotiation item; but it would be futile to press such individual views on all potential partners to a negotiation right from the beginning. Realistically, a consensus on the list of measures will be achieved only if all delegations agree to couch their particular predilections in shorter and more neutral language, taking a cue from the "Elements" of the CPD as adopted by the Disarmament Commission.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic of Germany)

5. Calendar of events

While both the western and the non-aligned groups of countries appear to structure the CPD in terms of several phases, there is a marked tendency on the part of the authors of CD/223 to provide for a tightly planned negotiation calendar with detailed prescriptions as to what should be negotiated and achieved in later stages, quite independently from the outcome of preceding negotiation phases. In the Working Group, the co-sponsors of CD/205 have pointed out in detail why this sequence of several phases has little potential for becoming operational. This criticism should not be construed as a flat refusal to accept a rational structure of the CPD process over time. The contrary is true. No doubt, there must be a dynamic time function build into the CPD. But in the view of my delegation, this structural element must be found rather in the periodicity of review meetings than in the magic and automatism of a calendar which future events could render useless and futile. My delegation is open as to the number and rhythm of such reviews.

Review meetings with their accompanying public attention and dynamic impact will certainly do more to maintain the momentum of the multilateral and bilateral negotiating process, each time, than a mechanical calendar of negotiating assignments which, if overtaken by reality, would embarrass its former authors. Let me therefore submit that the calendar issue, one of the most important points of controversy in the negotiations on a CPD, needs a fresh and unbiased approach, a new injection of realism, to yield useful results. Maybe the time has come to go back to our common point of departure, that is, to start anew from the agreed text of the Elements, and to examine how they can best serve to work out satisfactory solutions.

Let me pass on to, and conclude with, a more general remark on the CPD. In our view, the comprehensive programme can develop an impact on multilateral and bilateral disarmament only if the international community can truly rally behind it. Negotiations can get under way and yield results only if the framework in which they are to be imbedded meets the security interests of all concerned. There must be a constant incentive to abide by the programme and to realize its potential fully on a step-by-step basis. This incentive function will be lost if participants come to consider it as unrealistic. In the end, the worth of the CPD will be measured not by the degree of noble intentions embodied in it, but by the real momentum it creates and by the negotiations which it facilitates and fosters. On the human level, I could well sympathize with those who, suffering from the frustrations of an excruciatingly slow movement in world disarmament affairs, want to go on record with an ideal CPD, showing the elevated nature of their own feelings and projections. That, alas, would not help us to get on with the arms control issues on hand. The key word is credibility. Only a CPD which keeps attainable goals and schedules in mind can meet this test. For my Government, arms control and disarmament rank high on the priority scale. It will endeavour to make its contribution to the CPD in this very spirit, and beyond that, unceasingly work for peace and security.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of the Federal Republic of Germany for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Japanese delegation I wish to express my warm congratulations to you as our new Chairman for the month of February. I wish to express also my equally warm compliments to Ambassador Seni who has served us so effectively and conscientiously since the month of August last year. May I also extend a very cordial welcome to our new colleagues around this table.

May I present my sincere condolences to the Italian delegation and through them to the family of the late Ambassador Cordero di Montezemolo. I shall miss the Ambassador all the more because we have been neighbours in this Committee and I have had the pleasure of sitting next to him on many occasions during the past two years.

In saying goodbye to our esteemed colleague, Ambassador Fein, I cannot but express my delegation's respects to him, and our deep appreciation of the outstanding contribution he has made to the work of this Committee during his four years in Geneva.

Only a few months lie ahead of us before the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament will be convened in New York. And as we begin our work in the first part of the 1982 session of the Committee on Disarmament, I cannot help stressing the role and the responsibility of this Committee in contributing to the success of that special session.

Under our Constitution, which is dedicated to the cause of peace and the three non-nuclear principles -- not possessing nuclear weapons, not producing them and not permitting their introduction into Japan -- the fundamental policy of Japan has been to avoid becoming a militarily significant State and to devote its national energy and resources towards world peace and prosperity. We have been consistently adhering to this policy for the past 36 years, since the end of the war -- supported by the strong aspiration towards world peace and stability that has been nurtured among the Japanese people over those years.

The Japanese people are convinced that arms control and disarmament can play and should play a substantial role in building and achieving peace and stability in this world. In this sense, arms control and disarmament are matters of genuine national concern. Indeed, Japan considers that arms control and disarmament should be matters of world-wide concern, and the nation is united in praying that this is the case.

However, when we look around ourselves, we find that, quite contrary to our aspirations, the world in which we live, the actual international situation, is deteriorating year by year. What is happening in Poland is seriously affecting the

(Mr. Okawa, Japan)

international situation as a whole, and Japan hopes that the disturbing state of affairs in that country can be normalized as soon as possible. Japan also has strong apprehensions that the current course of events there will even further destroy what remains of mutual trust among nations -- the very foundation for disarmament negotiations.

On the other hand, the monumental accumulation of nuclear weapons and the interminable arms race continue unabated. This agonizing trend, coupled with the aggravating international political situation, is of grave concern to the peoples of the world and we simply cannot stand aside, doing nothing. This is why the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly is commanding such strong interest and expectations among the Japanese people and indeed the peoples of other countries as well. The Japanese nation is determined to spare no efforts in order to lead the second special session on disarmament to a successful conclusion.

In his opening address on 25 January 1982 at the current regular session of the National Diet, Prime Minister Suzuki himself indicated his intention to attend the special session and stated the following:

"There is no hope for human happiness if East and West continue to vie with each other in accumulating armaments. We must face reality and recognize that it is the balance of power that sustains peace and stability; we must work to maintain that balance. At the same time we must continue our efforts to hold this balance at as low a level as possible.

"The issue of disarmament and arms control is one which the whole world should work for together, and true peace will be unattainable unless we direct the surplus resources generated by disarmament to co-operation with the developing countries and the development of the world economy.

"The second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament this June will be a timely opportunity for the further strengthening of such international efforts."

This keen interest in the second special session is by no means limited to the Japanese Government. A non-partisan group of members of the Diet, over 200 strong, which formed the Parliamentary Association for the Promotion of International Disarmament in May last year, is actively preparing for the special session. A large number of Japanese non-governmental organizations are busily engaged in a wide range of activities in preparation for the special session, and are planning to send a large group of their representatives to New York to observe and to address the special session, as was the case in 1978 when the first special session was held.

The Committee on Disarmament has to respond to the expectations of our people. But the time at our disposal is limited. In order to be able to contribute

(Mr. Okawa, Japan)

to making the forthcoming special session a truly meaningful exercise, our Committee must make good use of the 11 or 12 weeks we have at our disposal and try to achieve maximum success under the circumstances.

In the first place, the Committee should limit its discussion of procedural matters to the minimum and embark on substantive matters at the earliest possible date.

With regard to subsidiary bodies, the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament should naturally resume its work immediately.

The CPD Working Group has already been meeting since early January under the distinguished chairmanship of Ambassador García Robles, and these extra meetings have proved to be very useful. The elaboration of a CPD is of course an extremely complicated and difficult task, and with regard to both the various measures to be incorporated in it and the establishment of so-called "stages" or "phases", my delegation feels that it would be wiser to avoid too ambitious an approach and to try to draft a programme that would be feasible and workable. It goes without saying that work in this Working Group should be pursued as a matter of priority, considering the fact that the adoption of a CPD is one of the principal objectives of the special session.

The Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons was able to make substantial progress last year under the energetic leadership of Ambassador Lidgard, and this is an additional reason for my delegation to continue to urge that its mandate be revised to enable it to make even further progress this year. However, the drafting of a new mandate should by no means be allowed to become an obstacle to the continuation of the substantive work of the Working Group; therefore, while we discuss the text of such a new mandate, the Working Group should on a temporary basis recommence its work under the previous mandate.

Turning to the Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons, the problems at issue were boiled down to a considerable extent under the conscientious chairmanship of Ambassador Kömives of Hungary. This Working Group should avail itself of the approaching special session of the General Assembly to generate a momentum to wind up its work with despatch. It was proposed last year that a prohibition of attacks against civilian nuclear facilities should be incorporated into the text of the radiological weapons convention: this problem is of great interest to my country. The realistic approach to solving our difficulties would be to devise some other formula -- a separate instrument of some kind -- to deal exclusively with this matter. If it could be thus disentangled from the radiological weapons convention, the drafting of the latter could theoretically be speeded up. Once that convention is out of the way we would be free to devote greater attention and efforts to the more urgent matters, such as nuclear disarmament.

As to the Ad Hoc Working Group on Security Assurances, my delegation feels that a much greater degree of understanding was achieved last year on the various

(Mr. Okawa, Japan)

concepts involved, thanks to the painstaking efforts of Mr. Ciarrapico of Italy, and we think this Working Group should be allowed to continue its work under the mandate it had last year.

In addition to these four working groups, the Japanese delegation wishes to call once again for the establishment of a new working group on a comprehensive test ban, in order that we may work effectively for the realization of a CTB. I very sincerely hope that a consensus may be reached in the Committee on this matter. I am well aware that the setting up of a working group is not the only way of addressing any specific item in our Committee. However, the achievement of a comprehensive test ban is of paramount importance; and it is a concrete and tangible proposal. That is why my delegation is of the view that the question of a CTB should be dealt with systematically and with concentration — and the most effective way of doing so would be, in our view, in a special working group established for that purpose.

In accordance with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly last year, this year the Committee on Disarmament is also to consider further measures to prevent an arms race in outer space. My Government has a deep interest in this question and my delegation hopes to be able to make a positive contribution to our discussions on this item.

Before concluding, I wish to welcome the recent opening of negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America on the limitation of intermediate-range nuclear forces. Those two States have begun these important talks in spite of the deterioration in the international situation in recent years, and they are all the more to be commended. Although the negotiations are perforce taking place outside the Committee on Disarmament, they are being held in this same city of Geneva. Their progress can have salutary effects on multilateral negotiations in our Committee -- at least this delegation certainly hopes so. And so we express the hope that the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States will be gracious enough to inform this Committee from time to time, and as they see fit, of the progress they are making in their bilateral negotiations. My delegation also looks forward with great anticipation to the early commencement of the other set of bilateral negotiations -- those on the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons -- which will be of such vital importance to us all.

In concluding, I wish to repeat our earnest hope that the Committee on Disarmament will approach its work during this session with a full recognition of its great responsibility vis-à-vis the approaching second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. My delegation is determined to make its utmost contribution to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Japan for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Mr. STRUCKA (Czechoslovakia) (translated from Russian): Mr. Chairman, the Czechoslovak delegation has come to the spring session of the Committee on Disarmament with clear instructions from its Government to engage in business-like and constructive negotiations in this important and, as yet, the only international forum for the conduct of multilateral negotiations on global disarmament questions.

At its thirty-sixth session, the United Nations General Assembly adopted nearly a score of resolutions entrusting specific responsibilities to the Committee on Disarmament. It may be said without overstatement that the Committee is faced with a colossal task if it is honourably to discharge all its duties.

In these circumstances, every effort must be made to set about substantive work without delay and to organize the entire activity of the Committee in such a way that literally every minute is spent usefully. The delegation of Czechoslovakia notes with great satisfaction that it is precisely in this way that you, Mr. Chairman, intend to organize our work. In your efforts to achieve positive results in the Committee's activities, as I already had the opportunity of saying in my earlier address, the delegation of Czechoslovakia will give you its full support.

We wish to support you not merely with words. At the first plenary meeting of the Committee, the Czechoslovak delegation presented the agreed position of the group of socialist States on the question of the contents of the comprehensive programme of disarmament. I should like to remind you that in conformity with paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 36/92 F, the Committee on Disarmament should complete, during the first part of its session in 1982, the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament and submit the programme in time for consideration and adoption by the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament, which is to open in only 122 days' time. This is our concrete contribution to the performance of one of the many tasks facing the Committee. The delegations of the socialist countries are prepared to take a similarly constructive approach to the discussion of the other agenda items. This is fully in keeping with General Assembly resolution 36/92 D, adopted on the initiative of Czechoslovakia, which, in its second operative paragraph, "calls upon member States to be guided in all disarmament negotiations by the generally recognized principles of international law and to submit and constructively to consider, with full responsibility and in the spirit of co-operation, proposals and initiatives aimed at promoting speedy progress in disarmament negotiations and facilitating the achievement of mutually acceptable concrete disarmament measures". I should like to believe that other delegations, too, intend together with us to seek solutions for the problems before us and to present concrete results to the United Nations General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Strucka, Czechoslovakia)

We deeply regret the fact that the delegation of some countries are seeking to divert the Committee's attention from the conduct of constructive and fruitful negotiations and to entangle us in sterile political confrontations. Attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries in this forum are out of place, and call for unmitigated censure. The delegations which have decided to follow that path should realize that they thereby jeopardize the Committee's performance of the tasks facing it, for which they must bear the full responsibility. As the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, L.I. Brezhnev, said yesterday when receiving representatives of the consultative council of the socialist international for disarmament "... diplomacy calls not for entangling situations but for disentangling them. The Gordian knot of conflict situations and controversial issues in the world today cannot be cut with any sword. The sole path to that end is the path of patient and constructive negotiations, negotiations ensuring the genuine reduction and elimination of weapons".

Allow me to recall one more provision of General Assembly resolution 36/92 D to which I referred earlier, in which the General Assembly calls on States "... not to hinder possible progress in negotiations on disarmament by the discussion of unrelated issues".

Despite the fact that the statements of a number of delegations on Tuesday and today, particularly that of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, contained attempts to disrupt the normal course of the Committee's work, it is nevertheless to be hoped that this the only multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament will embark without undue delay on the business-like discussion of the items on its agenda. We do not doubt that this is the wish of the overwhelming majority of delegations in the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: As is usually done at each plenary meeting held on Thursdays, I have requested the secretariat to circulate an informal paper containing a time-table for meetings to be held during the coming week. In addition to the two weekly meetings of the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament on Monday and Thursday afternoons, it is suggested that two informal meetings of the Committee be held to continue consideration of the questions listed in the informal paper. Those meetings would be held on Wednesday afternoon and Friday morning. If there are no objections, I will consider that the Committee agrees with the time-table.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no other comments, I intend to adjourn this plenary meeting.

The next plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament will be held on Tuesday, 9 February, at 10.30 a.m. As agreed by the Committee, an informal meeting will be held tomorrow, Friday, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.