

# COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.154  
12 February 1982  
ENGLISH

---

FINAL RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOURTH PLENARY MEETING  
held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Friday, 12 February 1982, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Mohammad Jafar Mahallati (Iran)

GE.82-60383

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. M. MATI

Argentina: Mr. J.C. CARASALES  
Mr. V. BEAUGE  
Miss N. NASCIMBENE

Australia: Mr. R.W. STEELE

Belgium:

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

Bulgaria: Mr. K. TELLALOV  
Mr. I. SOTIROV  
Mr. K. PRAMOV

Burma: U NGWE WIN  
U THAN HTUN

Canada: Mr. G. SKINNER

China: Mr. TIAN JIN  
Mr. YU MENGJIA  
Mr. YANG MINGLIANG  
Mrs. WANG ZHIYUN

Cuba: Mr. L. SOLA VILA  
Mr. P. NÚÑEZ MOSQUERA

Czechoslovakia: Mr. J. STRUCKA

Egypt: Mr. I.A. HASSAN  
Mr. M.N. FAHMY  
Miss W. BASSIM

Ethiopia: Mr. F. YOHANNES

France:  
Mr. F. de LA GORCE  
Mr. J. de BEAUSSE  
Mr. M. COUTHURES

German Democratic Republic:  
Mr. H. THIELICKE  
Mr. M. KAULFUSS  
Mr. J. MOEPERT

Germany, Federal Republic of:  
Mr. H. WEGENER  
Mr. N. KLINGLER  
Mr. W. ROHR

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

India:  
Mr. A.P. VENKATESWARAN  
Mr. S. SARAN

Indonesia:  
Mr. CH. ANWAR SANI  
Mr. E. SOEPRAPTO  
Mr. HARYOMATARAM  
Mr. B. SIMANJUNTAK

Iran:  
Mr. M.J. MAHALLATI  
Mr. S. MOHAMMADI

Italy:  
Mr. M. ALESSI  
Mr. B. CABRAS  
Mr. E. DI GIOVANNI

Japan:  
Mr. T. OKAWA  
Mr. M. TAKAHASHI  
Mr. K. TANAKA  
Mr. T. ARAI

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

<u>Mexico:</u>	Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES Mrs. Z. GONZALEZ Y REYNERO
<u>Mongolia:</u>	Mr. D. ERSEMBILEG Mr. S.O. BOLD
<u>Morocco:</u>	Mr. S.M. RAHMALI Mr. M. HALFAOUI
<u>Netherlands:</u>	Mr. H. WAGENMAKERS
<u>Nigeria:</u>	Mr. G.O. IJEWERE Mr. W.O. AKINSANYA Mr. T. AGUIYI-IRONSI
<u>Pakistan:</u>	Mr. M. AHMAD Mr. H. AKRAM Mr. T. ALTAF
<u>Peru:</u>	Mr. J. BENAVIDES
<u>Poland:</u>	Mr. B. SUJKA Mr. G. RUSSIN Mr. T. STROJWAS
<u>Romania:</u>	Mr. T. MELESCANU
<u>Sri Lanka:</u>	Mr. T. JAYAKODDY Mr. S. PALIHAKKARA
<u>Sweden:</u>	Mrs. I. THORSSON Mr. C. LIDGARD Mr. C.M. HYLTIENIUS
<u>Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:</u>	Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN Mr. B.P. PROKOFIEV Mr. V.M. GANJA Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO Mr. M.H. IPPOLITOV Mr. G.V. BERDENNIKOV Mr. S.B. BATSANOV

United Kingdom:

Mr. L.J. MIDDLETON

Mr. CHICK

Miss J.E.F. WRIGHT

United States of America:

Mr. L.G. FIELDS

Miss K. CRITTENBERGER

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-fourth plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament. I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of Pakistan, Cuba and Kenya. The representative of the United States of America will speak at the end of the meeting in exercise of his right of reply.

In that connection, I would like to clarify for the record one aspect of the procedural question raised yesterday. At its one hundred and fifty-second plenary meeting on Tuesday, 9 February, the Committee decided that, in view of the meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament and the long list of speakers for the plenary meeting on Thursday, 11 February, two different plenary meetings would be held, one on Thursday, 11 February, and the other on Friday, 12 February. At the beginning of yesterday's plenary, I recalled that decision. I was therefore correct in giving the floor at the end of that first meeting for rights of reply.

The situation was different from that of the previous week, when the plenary meeting that started in the morning continued in the afternoon of the same day. The morning meeting was suspended and the afternoon meeting was a resumption of the earlier meeting. That is why I gave the floor at the end of that meeting for rights of reply.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Mr. Chairman, with regard to your clarification, the Soviet delegation would request that in future lists of speakers should not cover two meetings at once. The list of 10 speakers given yesterday was intended to cover two meetings, something never before done in the practice of the Committee. Lists of speakers cover one meeting and not two. The fact that this list of 10 speakers was meant for two meetings also led to the misunderstanding which you have now cleared up. I would request that the secretariat's attention should be drawn to this.

Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, may I begin by saying that the delegation of Pakistan was grieved to learn of the passing away of our colleague, Ambassador Montezemolo. I would request the distinguished representative of Italy to accept our heartfelt condolences and to convey them to the bereaved family.

May I take this opportunity to place on record our tribute to one of our most distinguished colleagues, Ambassador Fein of the Netherlands, and to wish him the best in his new and important responsibilities at the Hague. I would also like to extend a warm welcome to representatives who have joined us for the first time in the Committee this year. My delegation looks forward to co-operating closely with all of them.

We sincerely appreciate the very important and effective role played by Ambassador Anwar Sani of Indonesia when he guided the work of the Committee on Disarmament during the closing month of its last session and the opening phase of the current session. It was a difficult task which Ambassador Sani carried out with great skill.

(Mr. Ahmad, Pakistan)

As we open the fourth annual session of this Committee, it is most gratifying for the Pakistan delegation to see in the chair a distinguished representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The peoples of our two countries share a common faith, culture and history. They share the aspiration to order their national life in accordance with the precepts of Islam. I am confident that our two countries will continue to co-operate in establishing a climate of durable peace and security in the larger region of South West Asia on the basis of strict respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter, especially those concerning the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States.

It is self-evident that the international community has a vital stake in achieving a political solution to the tragic conflict in Afghanistan on the basis of the immediate withdrawal of foreign forces from that country. This would enable the Afghan people to determine their own destiny and form of Government and thus create the conditions necessary for the more than 5 million Afghan refugees in Pakistan and Iran to return to their homeland in safety and honour. Pakistan remains committed to the evolution of such a political solution for which efforts are being made currently under the aegis of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

The people and Government of Pakistan sincerely desire to live in lasting peace and friendship with all neighbouring countries. The importance of the current consideration of an agreement between Pakistan and India for an exchange of mutual guarantees of non-aggression and non-use of force is self-evident.

Pakistan is deeply concerned about the climate of confrontation and acrimony which characterizes relations between the two superpowers at the present time. It is axiomatic that international tensions can be removed only if States scrupulously follow the principles of the United Nations Charter. An endeavour to achieve rapid and appreciable progress in halting and reversing the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, must also be made since the arms race itself contributes to building up international tension.

Pakistan therefore welcomes the initiation of the Geneva talks on medium-range nuclear weapons and hopes that both negotiating parties will make every effort to ensure that an early agreement is reached, representing a real and significant step towards nuclear disarmament. Similarly, Pakistan hopes that the United States and the Soviet Union will soon agree to the commencement of negotiations on strategic nuclear weapons with the objective of achieving real and meaningful reductions in their strategic arsenals.

The importance of these two sets of inter-linked negotiations for the success of the entire process of disarmament is self-evident; equally clear is the primary responsibility of the two parties for the initiation of the process of genuine disarmament. At the same time, we would do well not to underestimate the political opportunity presented by the forthcoming second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Despite the current inhospitable political

(Mr. Ahmad, Pakistan)

climate, this session can give an impetus to setting in motion the disarmament process. Nor should we underestimate the important part which the Committee on Disarmament can play in ensuring that the opportunity of the second special session is not missed. My delegation therefore agrees with those speakers who have suggested that our work during the next 12 weeks must be aimed principally at ensuring that the Committee makes an optimum contribution to the success of the special session.

The conclusion of a nuclear test ban treaty would undoubtedly contribute immensely to the success of the second special session. But hopes of this happening have dimmed. It should be possible at the very least for the Committee to establish a working group on the CTB at the current session and to make some progress towards the treaty which can be reported to the special session. There is, of course, a direct link between nuclear disarmament and a test ban treaty. But it was our impression that the test ban was an immediate rather than long-range objective of all Governments of nuclear and non-nuclear States. We would do well to ponder, at this stage, the risks which any further delay in concluding a test ban treaty would entail. It would also be relevant to recall once again the link between measures to halt the vertical as well as the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Another issue on which this Committee has been asked to conclude an agreement for submission to the second special session is negative security assurances. My delegation was most gratified at the overwhelming support for Pakistan's resolution on this subject at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. In accordance with the recommendation made in that General Assembly resolution, my delegation is prepared to undertake further intensive efforts to search for a common approach or a common formula "including in particular those considered during the session of the Committee on Disarmament held in 1981". May I recall that these include principally the one proposed by the Netherlands and the three formulations informally suggested by my delegation. The discussions last year, however, have made it amply clear that an agreement would become possible only if the nuclear-weapon States reconsider their divergent positions and respond in a more forthright and credible way to the security concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon States. The General Assembly has appealed, "especially to the nuclear-weapon States, to demonstrate the political will necessary to reach agreement on a common approach and, in particular, on a common formula which could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character". I can do no better than to reiterate this appeal. As Ambassador Fein put it, "the ball is in the court of the nuclear-weapon States". We look forward to a serious and considered response from them, not merely a reiteration of positions which are conceived only in the context of their narrow self-interest and nuclear doctrines.

My delegation would welcome the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons. We hope that it will be given a new mandate which will enable it to commence the concrete task of negotiating the text of a chemical weapons convention. This goal has become all the more urgent in the light of persistent reports about the use of chemical weapons in some parts of the world and other reports regarding decisions taken to augment and modernize chemical weapons stockpiles. Further delay or ambiguity regarding the conclusion of a chemical weapons convention could well erode the existing international consensus on the subject and add the spectre of general chemical warfare to the nuclear shadow which already hangs over mankind.

(Mr. Ahmad, Pakistan)

My delegation is prepared to work diligently to conclude a convention prohibiting radiological weapons in time for the second special session. However, we remain fully convinced by the Swedish argument that the only feasible means of using radioactivity for hostile purposes, at present, is through the destruction of or damage to nuclear facilities. This issue must be addressed squarely in the radiological weapons convention. The Committee should not spend its limited time and resources on preparing a treaty which has no significance for the present or the foreseeable future.

It has been said that the comprehensive programme of disarmament would constitute the "centre-piece" of the second special session. The Working Group on this item has conducted considerable and important work under the able and experienced stewardship of Ambassador Garcia Robles. As yet, however, we do not see the light at the end of the tunnel.

The main positions involved in the negotiations so far are basically defined in document CD/223, submitted by the Group of 21, document CD/205, presented by some West European countries, and the agreed position of the socialist States expressed on their behalf by the representative of Czechoslovakia on 2 February. While in the process of evaluating the socialist presentation, my delegation notes with satisfaction their own assessment that "the proposals submitted by the Group of 21 largely coincide with the agreed position of the socialist countries ...". Unfortunately, there is rather a considerable divergence in concept and substance between the position of the Group of 21 and that of the West European delegations.

I would like to take this opportunity to elaborate somewhat on the rationale underlying the position of the Group of 21 and to answer some of the criticism which we have heard directed to document CD/223.

The "measures" to be included in the comprehensive programme of disarmament constitute the most substantive part of the programme. Paragraph 109 of the Final Document states that "the Committee on Disarmament will undertake the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament encompassing all measures thought to be advisable in order to ensure that the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control becomes a reality ...". The measures proposed in document CD/223 reflect this agreement. They encompass measures firstly, to halt the arms race, secondly, to reduce the level of armaments and, ultimately, to achieve the final goal of general and complete disarmament. In contrast, document CD/205 provides only for measures in the first stage which, according to its sponsors, would be restricted to ongoing negotiations. As for the rest, it provides a list of issues on which subsequent negotiations would be undertaken, but without any indication of their substantive content or sequence. In our view, a programme would be less than comprehensive if it did not encompass all the measures necessary to achieve general and complete disarmament.

It has been said in criticism of document CD/223 that the measures provided therein are too detailed and specific. I would like to draw attention to paragraph 9

(Mr. Ahmad, Pakistan)

of the Final Document, which states that "for disarmament ... to become a reality, it was essential to agree on a series of specific disarmament measures". In many parts, document CD/223 repeats and only slightly elaborates upon the provisions already agreed upon in the Final Document. This is particularly so with regard to the measures in stage 1. Perhaps the only substantive addition contained in this section of document CD/223 is the elaboration of paragraph 50 of the Final Document relating to the process of nuclear disarmament by defining the objectives of various negotiations. It is our understanding that disarmament negotiations are always held with a view to a predetermined and more or less definite objective. As the distinguished representative of India stated last Tuesday, if we are to leave everything to be determined by the negotiating parties themselves, there is perhaps no need for a CPD. Those who favour the identification of measures in more cryptic form base themselves, inter alia, on the proposition that the CPD is to constitute a "framework" for negotiations. However, a framework for negotiations should not be confused with an outline of negotiations, which is what is suggested in document CD/205. We are prepared to "take the cue" from the elements of the CPD proposed by the Disarmament Commission, as recommended by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, but we cannot restrict ourselves to these "elements" since the Committee has been asked precisely to "elaborate" the programme. In any case, most of the "elements" are a summary of provisions more elaborately reflected in the Final Document.

As regards the question of stages or phases of the CPD, paragraph 9 of the Final Document states that the "programme, passing through all the necessary stages, should lead to general and complete disarmament". We felt this was quite evident. There is also no difficulty in identifying the measures with which the programme should begin and those with which it should end. What it is necessary to determine is a logical sequence for the intermediate stage or stages.

I must confess that we were rather surprised to see that the sponsors of document CD/205 did not deem it possible to provide for anything in their programme except measures in the first stage. The paper in fact does not even contemplate any measures in the final stage which are implied by the very objective of the CPD, i.e. to achieve general and complete disarmament, and it enumerates the intermediate measures only in outline with no indication of sequence. On the other hand, the specific measures, contained in document CD/223 in four stages, reflect agreed disarmament priorities and a rational sequence from beginning to end. We do not claim, however, that this is not susceptible to improvement or to a categorization which may be somewhat different.

Much has been made of the impracticability of introducing "time-frames" for the implementation of the CPD and its various stages. By definition, a programme implies a planned sequence of actions to be undertaken over a period of time. For example, the Programme of Action contained in the Final Document of the first special session does contain a time-frame. Paragraph 44 says that that Programme "enumerates the specific measures of disarmament which should be implemented over the next few years ...". Of course, these "next few years" have passed and not much has been done to implement these measures; but this does not mean that "time-frame" indicated in paragraph 44 was "impractical" or "unrealistic". Rather, it signifies the failure of certain States to live up to their solemn commitments under the Final Document.

(Mr. Ahmad, Pakistan)

Since the measures in the first stage of the CPD will, by and large, include the unimplemented measures of the Programme of Action contained in the Final Document, there is already an indication of the time-frame in which these are to be implemented, i.e. the next few years. We can argue whether this means three, five or seven years. Moreover, with regard even to some of the measures in the second stage, a "time-frame" has also been indicated. The Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade enumerates those measures which should be achieved by the end of the decade. Extrapolating from these already accepted "time-frames" and bearing in mind the more ambitious periods envisaged in the 1962 draft treaties of the United States and the Soviet Union on general and complete disarmament, the Group of 21 has suggested the accomplishment of the CPD in four stages over the course of two decades.

The Group of 21 is, of course, not so unrealistic as to believe in the "magic and automatism of the calendar" in the disarmament field, just as we are not convinced about the "magic of the marketplace" in the economic sphere. Criticism of the Group for proposing "rigid" or "inflexible" time-frames is, I hope, the result of a misunderstanding rather than a deliberate misinterpretation of our position. The time-frames we have suggested for the CPD and each of its stages are, as we have stated repeatedly, "indicative", i.e. they connote what we regard as the desirable period for the implementation of certain measures. It may turn out that these measures are not achieved during the indicative period due to various reasons, for example, the absence of mutual trust and confidence among the States concerned. But this does not mean that the indicative time-frame for their achievement was "unrealistic" or undesirable. On the contrary, the existence of a time-frame would act as an impetus for negotiations, representing as it would the agreed expectation of the international community.

Moreover, there is nothing to prevent the realistic readjustment of the time-frame for any subsequent stage in the programme in light of the progress made in its implementation. This could well constitute an important task of the mechanism which is to be established to review the implementation of the programme. My delegation is therefore happy to note that the distinguished representative of the Federal Republic of Germany has accepted the need for a "dynamic time function [to be] built into the CPD" and envisages a role for the review mechanism in this process. Perhaps there is room for compromise on this point.

Another contentious issue is the nature of the CPD or, more specifically, the kind of obligations or commitments it would create for States. The Pakistan delegation has repeatedly expressed the view that the CPD should create legally binding obligations. We base our proposition on the conception which has been attached to the CPD ever since it was proposed in the wake of the stalemate over the draft treaties for general and complete disarmament proposed by the Soviet Union and the United States. This understanding of the CPD, as something that would create obligations for States, has been repeatedly confirmed by the resolutions of the General Assembly and, in particular, in the Final Document of the first special session. For example, paragraph 109 of the Final Document states: "Negotiations (and I stress the word 'negotiations') on general and complete disarmament shall be conducted concurrently with negotiations on partial measures. With this purpose in mind, the Committee on Disarmament will undertake the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament ...". Negotiations, especially negotiations

(Mr. Ahmad, Pakistan)

in this Committee, are, without exception, directed towards achieving agreements which would legally commit States. The distinguished representative of the Federal Republic of Germany has said that "even the advocates of a legally binding CPD have so far been unable to show how this binding effect could be technically achieved". The normal procedure would be for the Committee on Disarmament to negotiate and adopt the CPD, just as the CCD negotiated such instruments as the non-proliferation treaty, after which it would be approved by the General Assembly, either by consensus or a majority vote, and commended to States for signature and ratification in accordance with their national procedures.

My delegation is prepared to give full consideration to other views on this point. However, we would seriously question the value and necessity of a document which does not create concrete and binding obligations for States to implement the comprehensive programme. Mere "solemnity" in the adoption of the CPD cannot create confidence among States that interlinked responsibilities will be discharged by other States. And without such a clear commitment, the CPD is likely to meet a fate similar to previous solemn declarations and programmes adopted in the United Nations. To pretend otherwise is to deceive each other and perhaps to deceive ourselves and our peoples.

It is, of course, quite evident that the CPD will be implemented "only if the international community can truly rally behind it" and if it reflects "the security interests of all concerned". However, it must be realized that the international community is composed today mainly of the non-aligned and developing countries, which represent two-thirds of humanity. Their security interests have been ignored, not for decades, but for centuries. If the process of disarmament conceived in a CPD is to be "realistic", it must respond to their security interests, now and in the future. It must provide the assurance of balance and security not only to those who are maintaining this through the deployment of significant levels of armaments; but also to that large majority of States which is relatively unarmed and militarily vulnerable. Sooner or later, a new and more equitable balance of power will evolve, not so much between East and West, but between North and South. Disarmament, obviously, should be the preferred path to the achievement of such a balance. But if it becomes evident that militarily powerful States are not prepared to give up their military advantage, whether to preserve balance with each other or to exercise domination over weaker States, it is likely that the arms race will become truly global in character and immensely more dangerous in its threat to the survival of mankind. Unfortunately, history seems set upon this course; the challenge before us is to reverse it. This is the "reality" we must confront.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Pakistan for his statement and for the kind reference he made to my country. I, too, am confident that the peoples of our two countries will continue their close co-operation in accordance with the precepts of Islam.

Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, as this is the first time my delegation is speaking at a plenary meeting of the Committee, allow me to extend to you our most sincere congratulations on seeing you, Ambassador Mahallati, the representative of revolutionary, non-aligned Iran, preside over the work of the Committee on Disarmament during the month of February. We are sure that, under your guidance, the work of the Committee will follow a sound course and, needless to say, you may rely at all times on the co-operation of the Cuban delegation.

Allow me likewise to congratulate your predecessor as Chairman, Ambassador Sani of Indonesia, on the very wise manner in which he guided the Committee when concluding its work for 1981.

I should also like to add my voice to the words of condolence extended to the delegation of Italy on the death of Ambassador Montezemolo.

Finally, allow me to welcome on behalf of my delegation the new representatives of Australia, Bulgaria, Burma, Czechoslovakia, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Nigeria and the United States of America, from whom we hope the Committee's work will benefit.

The Cuban delegation is opposed to the raising in this multilateral negotiating forum in the field of disarmament, unique of its kind, of political matters which are unrelated to the substance of its work and, far from being helpful, slow down the process of negotiation and tend to divert the Committee from its true functions.

It should be stressed, in particular, that some of the speakers whom we have recently heard, supposedly analysing the international situation and its possible effects on the Committee's work, are the very ones who remain shamefully silent in the face of the massacre of tens of thousands of people in Central America.

In El Salvador, in particular, the genocidal Junta which has usurped power from the legitimate interests of that heroic people has murdered more than 32,000 people since January 1980 with unqualified support from Washington. It is no accident that, according to press reports, for every nine Salvadorian soldiers, there is one United States officer in El Salvador.

Some of the speakers who have claimed to evaluate the international situation are those who remain silent before the provocative and aggressive attitude of the United States in the Caribbean Sea and who support the staging of threatening and intimidatory military manoeuvres in that area, as well as the continuing and illegal acts of military, political and economic hostility and aggression carried out by the United States Government against the States of the region.

These same speakers are the ones who, in one way or another, support the occupation of Namibia and the outrages committed by South Africa in southern Africa and who once again remain silent in the face of the annexation of territories in the Middle East and the aggression against the Palestinian people by the Zionist régime.

It must be acknowledged that the meetings of the Committee on Disarmament which we are now holding are taking place in a steadily worsening international atmosphere whose roots must be sought in the continuing arms race and the steady growth of military budgets.

(Mr. Lolo Vils, Cuba)

The international community has seen how some States are striving to continue the armaments spiral; how they introduce new types and systems of weapons of all kinds in their arsenals, despite the growing repudiation of public opinion; how they develop and expand new military concepts and doctrines, such as those of "limited nuclear war", which, in the long run, serve only to increase the danger of a nuclear holocaust; and how they pursue policies aimed at avoiding co-operation among States and at fomenting confrontation and intrigue.

In these circumstances, the disarmament negotiations are of enormous importance and this is why we must spare no effort to avert the danger of nuclear war and ensure stable and lasting peace and international security.

In this context, my delegation attaches great importance to the negotiations aimed at bringing about nuclear disarmament. The priority of this item was not only recognized in paragraph 45 of the Final Document of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, but the necessity and urgency of averting the danger of nuclear war and achieving nuclear disarmament appear as constant throughout the Final Document.

Because of their undeniable impact on the progress of the arms race and the dangers of nuclear weapons for the survival of mankind, the priority items in the Committee's programme of work itself continue to be the nuclear weapon test ban and the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament.

In this connection, at the last plenary meeting of the Committee, on 9 February, we heard a distinguished representative say that there is no arms race, that it is the product of some kind of propaganda.

Is it possible that there are people who believe that progress can be made on the road to peace with an attitude of that kind? How can there be such a step backwards in relation to the Final Document of the 1978 special session of the General Assembly on disarmament? How can there be such shameless disregard for everything that is stated in the Final Document concerning the need to halt and reverse the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race?

On a number of occasions, reference has been made in this Committee to the need for political will on the part of all States participating in the Committee; political will is, however, something that we cannot create here in this forum; it is something that we must bring with us from our own countries.

The priority which has always been given to the items of nuclear disarmament and the nuclear test ban must be made clear by the Committee at the very start of its work.

When considering the establishment of the Committee's subsidiary bodies for its spring session this year, these priorities must undeniably be taken into account and we therefore firmly support the establishment without delay of two working groups to deal with matters relating to the nuclear weapon test ban and with nuclear disarmament, respectively. Needless to say, all States which possess nuclear weapons must participate in those working groups, in view of the responsibility they bear; and we hope that they will adopt the attitude which their status as nuclear-weapon States requires.

(Mr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

Perhaps it is necessary to point out once again that the establishment of working groups as subsidiary bodies of the Committee has been recognized as one of the most effective means of carrying on work within this forum.

In this connection, my delegation supports the immediate establishment of the working groups which will continue advancing on the road already opened up in previous years to agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons, the prohibition of radiological weapons and the granting of security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States.

My delegation welcomes the fact that the Committee has already decided, at the very start of its 1982 session, that the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament will continue to work under the guidance of Ambassador Garcia Robles. This provides an immediate guarantee that this negotiating body will succeed in presenting a draft programme for adoption at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

My delegation is also of the opinion that the Committee on Disarmament is under an obligation to seek ways of complying with the requests by the United Nations General Assembly that it should begin negotiations with a view to concluding a convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear neutron weapons and with a view to drawing up a treaty prohibiting the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space.

Although at future meetings we shall speak in detail on the items before the Committee, I should like to make a few brief comments on the procedure to be followed for their consideration.

The need to prepare a convention prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and providing for the destruction of existing stocks of such weapons is becoming increasingly pressing in view of the escalation of the chemical arms race, as is made clear by the recent decisions of the United States Government to authorize the continuation of the manufacture of such weapons.

Last year, the relevant Working Group made considerable progress, which should be continued this year so that such a convention may be adopted with the necessary urgency.

The adoption of urgent measures to prevent the development of chemical weapons, including binary weapons, calls for the establishment of a working group with an appropriate mandate that will enable it to enter into the substance of the preparation of the convention in question.

My delegation hopes that, this year, a decision to this effect can be taken at an early date.

With regard to the preparation of a treaty prohibiting radiological weapons, there can be no justification whatsoever for any further delay.

In the relevant resolution of the General Assembly, the Committee on Disarmament is called upon to continue negotiations so that the text of the agreement may be submitted to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament.

(lfr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

The elaboration of a treaty prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons, particularly at the spring session of the Committee on Disarmament for this year, would not only comply with the General Assembly's request, but would also constitute a very positive element in relation to this Committee's work.

With regard to the granting of security guarantees for non-nuclear weapon States, my delegation considers that the Committee on Disarmament should not delay its work by considering compromise proposals, which will not enable it successfully to adopt an international instrument on this major question.

Declarations, identical in substance, by all nuclear-weapon States should not be viewed as a goal that we must set ourselves, but, rather, as one possible interim measure that may be taken pending the adoption of the above-mentioned instrument.

I now feel obliged to make a few brief remarks on the preparation of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament.

Firstly, it has been amply acknowledged in this Committee that, in view of the forthcoming second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, this is one of the special tasks that we have to carry out.

The adoption of the CPD at the special session would impart great momentum to the disarmament negotiations and make it possible to channel them more securely towards the goal of general and complete disarmament.

In my delegation's opinion, the comprehensive programme of disarmament consists of a set of interrelated disarmament measures which must be implemented in a series of phases over a specific period of time.

The implementation of the comprehensive programme of disarmament should not only ensure the success of disarmament negotiations in all forums, but also make a substantial contribution to the maintenance of an international climate of understanding and co-operation among States, in which the strengthening of international détente will be permanent and peace and security will be enjoyed by all on an equal footing. In this respect, we place special emphasis on the implementation of the New International Economic Order.

In its resolution 36/92 F, entitled "Report of the Committee on Disarmament", which my delegation sponsored together with a large group of member countries of the Committee, the United Nations General Assembly not only requested the Committee on Disarmament to intensify its negotiations on priority questions, but also invited members of the Committee involved in separate negotiations on priority questions of disarmament to intensify their efforts to achieve a positive conclusion of those negotiations.

It is in this context that my delegation welcomes the start of the negotiations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe which began on 30 November last year.

(Mr. Sola Vila, Cuba)

In keeping with the importance which my delegation attaches to the negotiations taking place outside this framework and in view of the positive impact they will have on the Committee's negotiations, we consider it both necessary and urgent to resume the bilateral and multilateral talks which were taking place on the control and limitation of arms and have now been unjustifiably suspended.

The resumption of those negotiations would not only allow the international community to see a glimmer of hope for all the disarmament negotiations, but would also, we are convinced, help a great deal to smooth the way for the Committee's work and the achievement of the results expected of it.

In conclusion, I would merely like to say that my delegation has placed all its hopes on the success of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly which is to be held in June and July this year in New York and will be the second session that important forum has devoted to disarmament questions during its 36 years of existence.

This special session should represent a step forward in relation to the session held in 1978 and its results should serve to foster the implementation of the Final Document adopted at that session. Needless to say, our Committee bears no small responsibility in the achievement of that objective and that is why our efforts must commence forthwith.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Cuba for his statement and for the kind reference he made to my country.

Mr. MAINA (Kenya): Mr. Chairman, since I am taking the floor in the plenary of the Committee for the first time during this session, I would like to offer my congratulations to you for assuming the chairmanship of the Committee for this month. We commend the way you have been guiding our deliberations and my delegation will extend to you full support and co-operation.

May I also pay tribute to my distinguished friend, Ambassador Anwar Sani of Indonesia, for the role he played as leader of the Committee since August 1981. My delegation missed the summer session of the Committee for reasons beyond our control, but the reports of the work done show that we missed an exciting session.

May I also offer sincere condolences to the delegation of Italy and, through it, to the family of the late Ambassador Vittorio Cordero di Montezemolo. He was a valuable colleague in the Committee on Disarmament and those who had the opportunity to work with him will miss his friendship and the contribution he made to the work of this Committee.

We are meeting at a time when the international political and security situation is precarious and full of tension. There is every indication that the events shaping up in the world today could lead to serious consequences unless these developments are arrested and defused. We cannot sit in this Committee and say nothing about these developments, since they are directly related to our work. We cannot see any justification for silence. We cannot believe that our work here can produce any results when the principal parties declare everywhere, even in this Committee, that they are promoting armaments, the very thing this Committee is dedicated to eliminating.

It would have been very impressive and exciting to observe the way in which the two superpowers manipulate and seek to shift the blame between them for current developments, if it were not so terribly tragic. My delegation accepts the

(Mr. Maina, Kenya)

proposition that this is not the proper forum for raising all the problems that have contributed to the present tensions in the world. We also know that, if it were necessary to do so now, each one of us in this Committee could allocate the blame to different parties, as we see fit. But allocating blame is not the role or function of this Committee.

Constrained by these considerations, my delegation was wondering what to make of the very important statement by the distinguished delegation of the United States of America and the equally impressive response of the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union earlier this week. Leaving out the unhappy fact that neither of them can claim a good, clean record in international relations over the last 30 years, we felt that another message, more important in the work of this Committee, was perhaps coming through both interventions. I refer to the dispute over the balance of forces between the two camps. There was first a claim that a balance of forces was arrived at, but that it has now been upset; hence the need to rectify the situation by producing more armaments. Then came a denial that there had been an upset. Figures were produced to support the contention that the balance of forces continues to exist. Neither the alleged balance nor the data used to assess the balance is under international control or verification. These two elements are at the heart of the work of this Committee and it is pertinent to ask whether the climate and time are opportune for this Committee to formulate an international mechanism for verification, even if control comes later. This would be a constructive approach to the current dispute and tense calls everywhere to increase armaments and prepare for war. If embarked upon, it could defuse the current situation and possibly produce the first tangible confidence-building measure so basic to the work of this Committee.

In singling out this one theme in the important statements by the two delegations, we have not underrated the other elements in those contributions to our debate. We cannot, in any way, divert attention from the basic obligations of all States under the Charter of the United Nations, to mention but one.

In this first statement, I would merely wish to add a few remarks to what many delegations have already said regarding our work. This Committee has already been in existence for three years now. It is a matter of disappointment that it will have nothing to show in June in the way of a completed international treaty covering any aspect of our work. Nothing we can say regarding the difficulties of our work or comparisons with the predecessors of the Committee on Disarmament will assuage the disappointed hopes of the international community when the Committee on Disarmament was created nearly four years ago. This does not in any way gainsay all the dedicated work that the Committee has done so far but it does underline the need to give top priority to the preparation of our report to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. There is no need, at this late hour, to expand the agenda or to spend too much time discussing procedures, not even the lively issue of the creation of new working groups, before progress is made in the work of the existing groups. Our human resources, as a delegation, are quite limited and I believe other delegations are in a similar situation. My delegation therefore urges the Committee to consider this fact in determining priorities of work and the timing of each programme of activity.

May I conclude my remarks by stating that my delegation is full of optimism and hope in the work of this Committee. We are not discouraged in any way by what appears to us to be but passing dark clouds on the international scene. We believe sooner or later that we shall have a breakthrough in our search for the road to disarmament. We think we have no alternative but to keep going with a determination

(Mr. Maini, Kenya)

that never sags in our efforts. The elements necessary for success appear to us to be all there. What appears to elude our grasp, for now, is the skill to put them all together.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Kenya for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now call on the representative of the United States of America to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): I wish to take note, at the outset of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, of your comment this morning concerning the continuation of yesterday's meeting and of the explanation you gave concerning the ruling you made yesterday.

It is not the practice of my delegation to delay the important work of this Committee by frivolously exercising its right of reply. In fact, we have heretofore deliberately avoided taking the floor in the interest of economizing the Committee's valuable time. Thus, I will not waste any more of our time today by dignifying the baseless and ludicrous charges against my country just made by the Cuban representative. However, I am constrained to reply briefly to the vicious and unsubstantiated accusation made yesterday by the representative of Mongolia.

The distinguished representative of Mongolia called Mr. Rostow's speech "crude, gross and slanderous". This was an attack of a personal nature on an official of a Member State who came as a guest to this Committee to present the views of the United States of America. This attack violates every code of decorum in the collegial bodies, such as our Committee, with which I am familiar. It is demeaning, not only to a guest of this Committee, but to the Committee itself. I noted, however, that the representative of Mongolia did not and, indeed, could not refute any of the substantive points made in Mr. Rostow's statement.

The representative of Mongolia expressed surprise that the delegation of the United States, like many others in recent days, should mention the aggression in Afghanistan and the loss of human rights in Poland in the context of the work of this Committee. I frankly marvel at this statement, which implies that the international community should ignore these threats to world peace. We certainly do not ignore these shameful acts.

I would like briefly also to set the record straight on three other subjects. First, I would remind the representative of Mongolia -- and indeed the representative of Cuba -- that the United States has repeatedly and resolutely opposed the abhorrent doctrine of apartheid and that it condemns racism in any form. The United States has never been, and never will be, in sympathy with any form of racism. In fact, we fought our bloodiest war -- our Civil War -- to rid our nation of the scourge of slavery and thereafter embodied in our Constitution a prohibition against this base form of racism and took steps in that Constitution to assure the equal rights of every citizen. Secondly, I would point out that, even as we are talking in this room today, the United States is actively engaged in consultations to bring peace to the region of southern Africa and independence to Namibia.

Finally, I would recall for the benefit of the representative of Mongolia that the United States has condemned Israeli actions in the Golan Heights in all appropriate fora.

I hope we will not be diverted again from our important work in this Committee by unfounded charges and insults to officials who come before this Committee to present their Government's views.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia): Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to burden members of the Committee with another long statement, but my delegation feels obliged to state its position again, as regards the statement we have just heard from the distinguished representative of the United States of America.

We listened to the United States representative's statement, in which he once again made a number of attacks on my country, with unfounded accusations. However, if the substance of that statement is examined, it can be seen that the United States representative was able to refute hardly any of the points put forward in our statement yesterday. In fact, who will deny that the aggressive policy of Israel, supported and encouraged by the United States of America, has for decades now been one of the main sources of tension not only in the Middle East but throughout the world. At its emergency special session held only a few days ago, the United Nations General Assembly in adopting a decision condemning the aggressor, i.e. Israel and its United States protectors, once again clearly demonstrated that because of the continuing acts of international piracy committed by Israel, the Middle East is one of the hottest spots on our planet.

Who will dispute that outrages have been committed for a number of years by the South African racists who receive unlimited moral — and not only moral — support from many western States, and especially the United States of America? It seems to us that a great deal could be said about this by our colleagues from the African countries.

The Mongolian delegation in its statement yesterday confined itself to mentioning these two areas in which the situation has truly given cause for serious concern. But it is not only in those two areas that the United States pursues its activities aimed at crushing national liberation movements, disrupting international co-operation and supporting reactionary dictatorial régimes. The delivery of United States weapons to the Kuomintang clique in Taiwan, in keeping with the "two Chinas" theory, is nothing more than an attempt to create yet another hotbed of tension in the world. The Mongolian People's Republic, one of the peace-loving States of Asia, is a neighbour of the People's Republic of China. We have considered and we continue to consider that there is only one China — the People's Republic of China. Recently the situation in the Far East region has been aggravated by the fact that the United States of America, through delivering weapons to Taiwan, is increasing tension in the area. In his statement today my colleague from Cuba, Ambassador Solá Vila, has already revealed the role of the United States in supporting terrorist anti-national régimes in Latin America, in particular that of the Salvadorian junta, which is slaughtering the Salvadorian people in large numbers, using American weapons and with the participation of so-called American advisers. Thousands and thousands of Salvadorians have perished at the hands of the junta, which is holding on to power only through the financial, military and political assistance of the United States. In recent days angry and vigorous protests have been heard throughout the world against the inhuman acts of terror being committed in El Salvador by the Salvadorian junta with the support of the United States of America. Lastly, it is not possible to ignore the continuing interference of the United States in the internal affairs of Asian countries, including Iran, and the attempts to change the course of events in that country to the advantage of the United States. In my opinion, all this is clearly related to the questions of the non-use of force, the inadmissibility of expansion, non-interference in the internal affairs of countries and international terrorism.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

We did not wish to deal with other questions which would divert the attention of the Committee from its tasks, but we were obliged to do so, I repeat, because the distinguished representative of the United States and several representatives of other countries, preferred to involve the Committee in a discussion of the causes of international tension, in an attempt to create confusion. I wish to stress, in this connection, that the Mongolian delegation, like other delegations which are seeking to make progress in the sphere of disarmament, firmly opposes the linking of these questions with the disarmament negotiations and with the achievement of genuine results in them. We appeal to the delegations of the United States of America and of other countries to allow the Committee to deal with the issues for the solution of which it was in fact established.

Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, José Martí said that words were made to tell the truth, not to cover it up. The facts contradict the words used in the reply. Which member of the Security Council vetoed the just sanctions called for against Israel and South Africa for their continuing violations of the United Nations Charter? I again state that this Committee is not a forum for polemics. We neither fear nor shrink from polemics, but, in our view, there are other places in which to engage in them. Our Committee was set up to negotiate. Out of respect for all its members, including the United States delegation, that is all I have to say for now.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Mr. Chairman, the Soviet delegation would like to refer to a matter which we consider important, namely, the incident which occurred yesterday and which seriously upset and disturbed us. I am referring to the threatening shouts of a visitor at the meeting. I could not understand what he was shouting nor in fact could I make out exactly in what language he was shouting, but he obviously perturbed the Committee's work. In view of the conditions of terrorist violence in this part of the world, we feel that consideration should be given to security measures and measures to ensure normal conditions for the Committee's work. I do not know whether any supervision is normally exercised in the United Nations over the behaviour of visitors. In any case, we would ask the secretariat to take the necessary steps to ensure that such incidents do not recur, because not only do they disturb the normal working of the Committee but they could also in a general way represent a threat to any one of the persons sitting around this table. Some of my colleagues said that the man appeared to be not in perfect health, and perhaps he got here by accident. We do not think this is the best place for sick people.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia): Mr. Chairman, I would like to express the Mongolian delegation's support of the comments just made by the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union.

As you know, the Mongolian delegation is perhaps the smallest in the Committee on Disarmament and we have to take part in many international conferences, including the current session of the Commission on Human Rights. Heated debates take place there in fact and whenever I enter the room, I see two, three and even more security officers stationed there. Every time they check not only my identity badge but also my personal identification papers. As a result, yesterday after that incident, I drew the secretariat's attention to this and requested that the visitors sitting in the public gallery should be called to order.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

I fully support the comments made by the representative of the Soviet Union. The Committee on Disarmament is, of course, an important international forum and its members represent Governments. I think that for the normal functioning of this body, it is essential for appropriate security measures to be taken. I would like to draw this to your attention, Mr. Chairman, and to that of the secretariat.

Mr. JAIPAL (Personal Representative of the Secretary-General and Secretary of the Committee on Disarmament): Yesterday, immediately after this unfortunate incident, in fact while it was happening, I dispatched by deputy to go outside and, with the help of the Security officer, to intercept the man and find out his identity. His particulars have been obtained. He was evidently a tourist from France who had come here with his wife and child. He apologized for the incident and was found to be unarmed. However, we have asked the Chief of Security to tighten up security measures here -- because they were obviously not adequate yesterday -- and I think that is going to be done. If you like, we shall ask the Security Unit to provide the same sort of strict security check that is applied in the Commission on Human Rights. I do not think that should be difficult, but, certainly, control over access to the public gallery has to be stricter.

The CHAIRMAN: Today, the secretariat has circulated an informal paper containing an indicative time-table for meetings to be held next week. Of course, since much will depend on the results of our discussion of organizational matters, the time-table is tentative and we may subsequently have to adjust it. If there is no objection, I will consider that the Committee adopts the informal paper.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one brief remark and a suggestion. For reasons beyond my control, I will have to be away from Geneva on Thursday, 18 February, as of 2 p.m., so it will be impossible for me to be here that day for the meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, which, as you know and as indicated on the list prepared by the secretariat, usually meets on Thursdays at 3 p.m. I would like to know whether the informal meeting of the Committee now scheduled for Wednesday, 17 February, at 3 p.m. could be held on Thursday, 18 February, at 3 p.m., so that the Working Group on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament could meet on Wednesday, 17 February, at 3 p.m., rather than on Thursday, 18 February, at 3 p.m.

Mr. MAINA (Kenya): Mr. Chairman, I took note of your remark that the programme might be adjusted, but I am concerned about the items appearing for Wednesday and for Friday. The items we are supposed to dispose of today after our plenary meeting are the establishment of subsidiary bodies and the participation of States non-members of the Committee. About this, you are going to provide a new draft of what the programme is going to be like and some of these items have been disposed of. I hope that the remark that the programme is to be adjusted refers to this particular aspect; otherwise, we would be prolonging decisions or putting off decisions on some very simple items.

Mr. de SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil): Mr. Chairman, my delegation has no objection to the proposed programme of work, on the understanding that it is a tentative one, because the inclusion here of one item of the draft agenda, namely, the nuclear test ban, might imply that the agenda has been adopted, but this is not the case, at least not for my delegation.

The CHAIRMAN: As I mentioned, the ~~time-table~~ is tentative, so there is no problem. If there is no objection to the proposed informal paper, we will adopt it.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: As agreed by the Committee, I will convene an informal meeting five minutes after the adjournment of this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, 16 February, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.