



---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 36TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MULLOY (Ireland)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

Draft resolutions were introduced by:

Mr. Venkateswaran (India) - A/C.1/35/L.34  
Mr. Sujka (Poland) - A/C.1/35/L.38  
Mr. Djokic (Yugoslavia) - A/C.1/35/L.32  
Mr. Espeche Gil (Argentina) - A/C.1/36/L.40

---

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

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

**Distr. GENERAL**  
**A/C.1/35/PV.36**  
**21 November 1980**

**ENGLISH**

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

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

Mr. EILAN (Israel): I should like to make some additional remarks in the discussion on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.8 submitted by my delegation on the subject of the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and also to refer to statements made in the course of the debate on draft resolutions under item 38 of the agenda.

I have already spoken of the negative response to Israel's offer on the part of Iraq, Syria, Jordan and some other Arab States. I had the occasion to point out the dangerous implications of using compliance with resolutions - or I might say recommendations - of the General Assembly on the part of Member States as a yardstick as to whether or not they are fit to negotiate and be a signatory to international conventions. I explained then that that would exclude a good part of the United Nations membership from the process of negotiations as envisaged in Article 33 of the Charter.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

I should like now to refer to another, no less dangerous, aspect of the refusal of some Arab States to respond to the substance of operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.8, which is

"to convene at the earliest possible date a conference with a view to negotiating a multilateral treaty establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East". (A/C.1/35/L.8, para. 2)

Through all the hostile statements concerning our proposal that have been made until now there runs one central argument which can be summarized as follows: unless and until each and all demands of the rejectionist front are met as far as the situation in the Middle East is concerned, no consultations of Member States of the region can take place with a view to establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone. The Iraqi statement went even further. The Iraqi representative denied Israel's right to be here at all in this Committee.

As that statement was made in discussing draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.8 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, it can only be understood to mean that Iraq rejects the possibility of ever agreeing to Israel's participation in the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. That is, of course, the real meaning of the statements made hitherto by some Arab representatives.

The wider implications of what they have said run counter to the central philosophy of nuclear disarmament as expounded in the United Nations for over 30 years. If the total acceptance by one party to a dispute or political controversy of all demands made on it by its opponents were to become a sine qua non condition for disarmament negotiations, this Committee would not be in a position to urge some Member States to expedite the conclusion, for instance, of the negotiation of the comprehensive test-ban treaty. If that principle were to be accepted it would set a dangerous precedent and would jeopardize negotiations about the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other regions of the world. It would also spell inevitable doom for the future of nuclear disarmament, in terms of both vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

Israel's offer to the Arab States of the region and to States adjacent to the region is an unlinked deal. As I stated in my last intervention in this Committee, on 18 November,

"... Israel appeals to the Arab States and to States adjacent to the region to come together to discuss the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, irrespective of and without prejudice to any political or legal claim". (A/C.1/35/PV.33, p. 22)

That offer was turned down. No rhetoric, no explanations, no excuses, nor the repetition of odious and mendacious clichés can do away with that central fact. Israel said, "Let us set aside, temporarily at least, our differences for the sake of saving the region from a nuclear calamity." Most Arab States in this Committee have replied, "No."

The whole world knows that Iraq and Libya are making enormous efforts to acquire the nuclear option for the price of oil. Do the rulers of those countries ever realize that the particles that make up nuclear fall-out know not the difference between Jew and Arab, between Moslem and Christian? Those who have refused Israel's offer in this Committee must bear a heavy responsibility in the eyes of mankind.

Israel submitted draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.8 in the hope, however remote, that Member States of the region would for once overcome blind hostility and respond positively to Israel's initiative. Any discussion on the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone must, as a prerequisite, if it is to succeed, have a certain measure of readiness to reach agreement of Member States concerned, whatever the reservations and differences of approach. That is why Israel never voted against the Egyptian proposal in spite of certain reservations, and that is why Israel is going to support draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6 this year.

The adamant refusal on the part of so many Arab States to respond to Israel's calls for the denuclearization of the Middle East leaves us with no choice at this time but to withdraw draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.8. We do so with great regret. We shall, however, persevere. The task we have set ourselves is too serious to be abandoned because of the exigencies of a parliamentary situation. Our offer still stands.

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): In this statement the Albanian delegation wishes to comment on certain aspects of the question of transforming the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace and some of the ideas contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean (A/35/29), which the representative of Sri Lanka introduced to this Committee a few days ago.

The tense and dangerous situation that persists in the Indian Ocean is, for understandable reasons, a source of concern not only for the coastal and hinterland countries of that ocean but for all the peace-loving peoples of the world. The idea of the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean was born of the justifiable anxiety which the growing rivalry and military presence of the imperialist Powers - and of the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, in particular - caused for many countries and peoples. That anxiety was and is justified. We sympathize with the aspirations and just demands of the democratic countries of the Indian Ocean zone to have an end put to the danger that threatens them.

We appreciate at their true worth the evaluations and conclusions contained in the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace as well as in other documents adopted later on the basis of it. We support in particular the conclusions dealing with the rivalry of the two imperialist super-Powers as the main factor in the creation of the tense situation that exists in the Indian Ocean. We also support the repeated request for the reduction and removal from the Indian Ocean of the military presence and naval bases of the imperialist Powers and any other facilities given to the military establishments of those Powers on the territory of countries around the Indian Ocean. Given the complex situation that exists in the Indian Ocean we believe it necessary to continue to denounce the main causes that are at the root of that situation. In our view it is more than ever important to emphasize that it is the aggressive policies of the imperialist Powers, and first and foremost the super-Powers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, which create new tensions and conflict and all the uncertainties that exist in the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

In the document prepared during the discussions on the Indian Ocean it is repeatedly stated, and rightly so, that United States-Soviet rivalry is the main obstacle to an improvement of the situation in the Indian Ocean. A number of facts bear this out.

The two imperialist super-Powers, because of their continued interference and relentless rivalry, have created around the Indian Ocean hotbeds of tension and war, for instance in the Horn of Africa, the Middle East, the Persian Gulf, Indo-China and elsewhere. Recently, the situation has deteriorated considerably and those dangers have increased as a result of the military occupation of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union, the aggressive activities of the United States against the Iranian revolution, the armed conflict between Iraq and Iran brought about by the two super-Powers, and so on.

At present we are witnessing a resurgence of the aggressive actions of the United States of America and the Soviet Union aimed at increasing and strengthening their military presence in the Indian Ocean. The United States of America, acting on the basis of its well-known imperialist doctrine of interference through force everywhere in the world, claims to have vital interests in the Indian Ocean that it must defend, and endeavours thus to justify the increase in the number of warships and the intensification of its efforts to expand existing military bases while acquiring others. It has openly threatened to use force and unleash wars of aggression and is preparing for war. It considers the Indian Ocean to be one of the regions most suitable for its rapid deployment forces.

The Soviet social imperialists, for their part, claim to have interests to defend in the Indian Ocean and that they have the right to be militarily present in that region. By way of justification they make much of the need to maintain a large naval force in order to prevent a possible strategic threat that could be directed from the south between their territories. They seek to set up and expand a network of naval bases, to turn Afghanistan into a giant military base, to provide air support for their naval forces in the Indian Ocean and to use their Afghan base as a springboard for coastal attacks.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

In these circumstances it is essential, we believe, to remain vigilant and strongly to oppose the designs and aggressive acts of the imperialist Powers in order better to serve peace and stability in the Indian Ocean zone and throughout the world.

There are many reasons for saying that it would be illusory to think that if the two super-Powers, or the great Powers, come to an understanding about the modalities and extent of their military presence, peace and stability would benefit. The Soviet-United States talks of the recent past did not seek to reduce the danger represented by their military presence nor to reduce that presence. Those talks, quite to the contrary, were a means of bargaining between the United States and the Soviet Union the failure of which we should not regret nor would we want them to be resumed.

We have noted that in the course of the work of the Committee on the Indian Ocean - as indicated in document A/35/25 - this year its activities have faced major difficulties. We believe that this is a consequence of the participation of the imperialist super-Powers in its work after the Ad Hoc Committee's membership was increased. There is no doubt that the imperialist super-Powers consider that work as an additional opportunity to camouflage their military and political designs, as well as their growing aggressive rivalry in the Indian Ocean region. It is to that end that they will seek in the future to make use of all meetings devoted to creating a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

My delegation wishes to state that it will not join in a consensus - if there is one - in endorsing the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.29 and will not participate in the vote if that draft resolution is put to a vote.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.34 on the declaration of the 1980s as the second Disarmament Decade.

Representatives will recall that, in its resolution 34/75, the United Nations General Assembly directed the Disarmament Commission at its substantive session in 1980 to prepare the elements of a draft resolution

(Mr. Venkateswaran, India)

entitled "Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade" and to submit the same to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session for consideration and adoption. During its session from 12 May to 6 June 1980 the Disarmament Commission was able to prepare a document on which substantial agreement was achieved. The text of the declaration is available in document A/35/42, which contains the report of the Disarmament Commission.

However, since there was some divergence of views that persisted on paragraphs 12 and 14 of the draft text of the elements of the declaration, the Disarmament Commission was unable at its last session to arrive at a consensus on the document, and those portions were left within square brackets for subsequent discussion.

During the last fortnight the Chairman of the First Committee convened a contact group of interested delegations and charged it with the task of harmonizing the divergent positions on those two paragraphs, so that the General Assembly could have before it an agreed consensus text of a draft declaration of the 1980s as the second Disarmament Decade for consideration and adoption. I am glad to inform the Committee that the contact group was able to evolve mutually acceptable language for paragraphs 12 and 14 of the draft text of the declaration. The results of those efforts are contained in the annex to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.34 which has been circulated in the First Committee. I earnestly commend that draft resolution, along with the agreed text of the declaration, to members of this Committee for consideration and adoption by consensus. I need hardly add that documents of universal application are best adopted by consensus - and this is clearly one such document.

The compromise that has been worked out is the result of very intensive discussions and deliberations, and I should like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to all the delegations which have participated in this exercise for their spirit of accommodation and goodwill that eventually made it possible for us to fulfil the task entrusted to the United Nations Disarmament Commission by the General Assembly. The intensive nature of our discussions on the draft declaration bears testimony to the seriousness with which all delegations have approached this important question.

(Mr. Venkateshwaran, India)

While introducing draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.34 on the "Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade," I should also like in particular to draw the Committee's attention to the section entitled "Recommendations" contained in part IV of the report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, document A/35/42. Subparagraphs 19 and 20 of paragraph 19 of that report refer to the need for mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of peace and disarmament. The United Nations and its specialized agencies have an important role to play in this regard. The second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will take place in 1982. It would seem therefore appropriate for all efforts to be made to mobilize public opinion with a view to contributing to the successful outcome of that session. A concrete way in which this could be done would be to request the Centre for Disarmament, in co-operation with the Department of Public Information, to prepare a programme of information activities that could be carried out in the years 1981 and 1982 and continued thereafter throughout the remainder of the decade. In keeping with the recommendations contained in paragraph 19 of the report of the Disarmament Commission,

"the United Nations, in particular its Centre for Disarmament, should intensify and co-ordinate its programme of publications, audio-visual materials, co-operation with non-governmental organizations and relations with the media." (A/35/42, para. 19 (20))

The focus of these activities in the next two years, I would submit, should be on the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

It is our sincere hope that the declaration of the 1980s as the second disarmament decade, agreed to by consensus, will provide a useful framework within which urgent questions of disarmament can be constructively pursued during the current decade so that concrete results are achieved. Since the consensus text represents the common will and aspirations of the entire international community, we may hopefully look forward with optimism to the implementation of the recommendations contained in the declaration.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): I wish to express the gratitude of my delegation to the representative of India, Ambassador Venkateshwaran, for his introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.34, entitled "Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade." Thanks to the leadership which he provided in the small informal group convened by the Chairman, the areas of disagreement which could not be resolved by the United Nations Disarmament Commission when it negotiated the elements of the declaration in May have now been resolved. It is fitting that India's term as Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission should culminate in the adoption by the General Assembly of another important document whose negotiation the General Assembly entrusted to the Commission. Need I recall that at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly this Committee also adopted another important contribution of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, that is, the elements of the comprehensive programme for disarmament.

In introducing General Assembly resolution 34/75 last year, I observed that there had been a universal expression of disappointment that the purposes and objectives of the first Disarmament Decade proclaimed by the General Assembly in 1969 had not been realized. In fact, the decade of the 1970s witnessed an unprecedented escalation of the arms race in terms of accumulation of armaments and the expenditure which is annually assigned to it, mostly at the expense of social and economic programmes. We have not yet seen a beginning of the end of the arms race. Last year, the generally quoted figure for expenditure on armaments was \$450 billion; this year it has escalated to \$500 billion, up from the figure of \$180 billion in 1970. The prospects that the upward spiral will continue are very real unless those countries in the two military alliances that are associated with the two super-Powers, which account for 80 per cent of the military expenditure, resolve to take seriously their commitment to halt and reverse the arms race and proceed to genuine measures of disarmament.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

In taking the initiative two years ago that has now resulted in the draft declaration before this Committee, my delegation was, as it still is, gravely distressed at the greater insecurity confronting the world with the growing accumulation of armaments on the one hand, and the even greater depletion of the world's resources on the other, not as an investment for present and future generations, but as a glorification of the war machines of a few countries. It was not the intention of my delegation at that time to propose the addition of yet another declaration to the many in the archives of the General Assembly. Rather, it was our fervent belief that as long as the arms race continues, so long will the United Nations need to leave no stone unturned in drawing world attention to the many-sided danger which it represents.

Only two years ago, the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament adopted a Final Document which was acclaimed as an embodiment of the collective wisdom of the international community, genuinely concerned - perhaps I should even say frightened - at the sure road to extermination which human inventiveness in the perfection of the machine of war implies, especially in its nuclear aspect. Today we are proposing the adoption of another instrument which is no carbon copy of the Final Document, which does not seek to rival the Final Document in its comprehensiveness, but which has a distinct message of its own.

"In spite of the positive and encouraging outcome of the special session devoted to disarmament, the decade of the 1980s has started with ominous signs of deterioration in the international situation ... "

(A/C.1/35/L.34, Annex, para. 4)

Thus states the declaration before us. And it continues:

"It is clear that, if the emerging trend continues, and meaningful efforts are not made to check and reverse this trend, international tensions will be further exacerbated and the danger of war will be greater than foreseen at the time of the special session on disarmament." (ibid.)

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

It is indeed ironic that while intensive discussions which, for the major part, yield little result.

"are under way in various forums on global economic problems and on the depletion of resources available for coping with present international economic problems ... military expenditures by major military Powers are reaching ever-higher levels, involving the greater diversion of resources which could have helped to promote the well-being of all peoples." (ibid.)

What a happy coincidence it is that on this very day when the representative of India has formally placed before the First Committee the declaration of the 1980s as the second Disarmament Decade the plenary General Assembly will also be taking a decision on launching the global round of economic negotiations.

The activities earmarked for the second disarmament decade are intended to ensure that the 1980s witness discernable progress towards the goal of general and complete disarmament. Those activities have been selective, and, given the determination and political will of Governments, particularly the two most advanced military Powers, the end of the 1980s should see a world more secure through effective disarmament measures and a world more economically equitable through progress towards the New International Economic Order.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

The first major event in the Second Disarmament Decade will be the second special session devoted to disarmament in 1982. Paragraph 24 of the Declaration before us recommends that the implementation of the Declaration be included in the agenda of the second special session. Thus, even before the mid-term review envisaged for 1985, we should by 1982 witness a trend indicating that the Decade will indeed be what it is intended to be - a decade of disarmament. All efforts should therefore be exerted to act on those items of utmost priority listed in paragraph 12 of the Declaration. This would require intensive negotiations by Governments.

In addition, the mobilization of world public opinion on behalf of peace and disarmament should be intensified and sustained. The United Nations, in keeping with its central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament should spare no efforts in this regard. Among the activities envisaged in paragraph 20 of the Declaration, the United Nations Centre for Disarmament should sponsor seminars in the different regions of the world at which issues relating to world disarmament in general and to the various regions in particular will be extensively discussed.

In the report prepared by the Group of Governmental Experts on Regional Disarmament submitted to the Secretary-General in document A/35/416, the experts emphasized the importance of the mobilization of public opinion in favour of disarmament. In paragraph 231 of that report, they asserted that:

"Constructive action by an informed public opinion can only result if there is a sound understanding of the issues involved and of the respective points of view ...At the regional level this can be facilitated by exchanges of various kinds...and contacts at all levels: government, nongovernmental organizations, and individuals in professional and private capacities." (A/35/416, para. 231)

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Those were the words of the Group of Experts on Regional Disarmament in the section of their study devoted to a survey of conceivable measures. I am sure that it will be the wish of the General Assembly that such a pertinent recommendation for action by a group of governmental experts drawn from all regions should be pursued, especially as it conforms also to the collective wisdom of the representatives of Member States as contained in the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade.

It is the view of my delegation that, in order for them to be effective, at least three such regional seminars should be held before the second special session devoted to disarmament, scheduled for 1982. Two seminars should be held in 1981 and one in 1982, before the convening of the second special session. Such intensive efforts on the part of the United Nations - which will, of course, be continued throughout the Decade after the special session - will bear fruit through the generation of the appropriate enthusiasm and constructive input from peoples whose very existence, after all, is at stake in disarmament negotiations.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I simply wish to associate my delegation with the statement which has just been made by the representative of Nigeria. Mexico too considers, as he himself has stated with respect to his own country, that the holding of three regional seminars on disarmament before the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should be regarded as an almost indispensable component of the activities envisaged for the second Disarmament Decade.

Since I have the floor, however, I should like to add a few remarks which follow from the statement we heard a few moments ago from the representative of Israel.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

A country like mine which, as is well known, attaches very special importance to the establishment of nuclear-free zones, appreciates a statement such as the one made this morning to the effect that Israel is compelled to withdraw the draft resolution it had submitted to us in document A/C.1/35/L.8 that in no way means that Israel withdraws its proposal, nor that it has changed its position as reflected in that draft resolution. Israel, we were told, will in fact vote in favour of the Egyptian proposal which seeks the same objective.

Mexico's position on other delicate and all-important aspects of the Middle East question, such as the occupied territories and the fate and rights of the Palestinian people, is well known. But in this Committee which deals with disarmament, and without the slightest illusion on the part of my delegation that a nuclear-weapon-free zone can be established in abstracto and in disregard of the other problems I have mentioned, we none the less wish to state for the record that we consider that, as far as disarmament is concerned, attitudes such as the one stated this morning by the representative of Israel are a step in the right direction.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): In reaffirming the full support of the Romanian delegation for draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.34, I should like to endorse the idea and the proposals put forward by the representatives of Nigeria and Mexico to the effect that in the period before the second special session devoted to disarmament arrangements should be made for three regional seminars. We fully share the view that such seminars, in which detailed consideration will be given to matters relating to world disarmament in general and to the region concerned in particular, will prove extremely useful in promoting a greater appreciation by the peoples of the world of the serious dangers arising from the unbridled arms race and in mobilizing world opinion in favour of the cause of peace and disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call upon the next speaker on our list, I should like to inform the Committee that, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.34, the Secretary-General has received from the Director of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) a communication containing recommendations made by the World Congress of Education on Disarmament, to be circulated to the members of the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session. Those proposals are issued as a supplement to UNESCO's views on the Disarmament Decade which appeared in May 1980 in document A/CN.10/Add.4. The new proposals have been circulated in document A/CN.10/10/Add.13.

Mr. RASOLONDRALIBE (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): First of all I should like to congratulate and thank Ambassador Balasubramanian, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, who was kind enough to introduce both the report and the draft resolution prepared by his Committee.

The report submitted this year follows the tradition of other reports produced here, in that it is partial and therefore does not fully reflect all the opinions expressed in the Committee. Following this statement I shall express support for those views. But at this time I should like to refer briefly to the draft resolution. We joined in the consensus for its adoption in the Committee, although not entirely satisfied with some of the wording used in one of the preambular paragraphs.

Having said that, I should like to recall that in the course of his statement in the general debate on 25 September last the head of the Malagasy delegation stated before the General Assembly the views and concerns of my country regarding the maintenance and strengthening of peace in the Indian Ocean, and inter alia stressed the following ideas.

First, the establishment in the Indian Ocean of a zone of peace under a contractual legal régime is an essential element of global peace that would also be based on the interdependence of different forms of security, be they military, political or economic.

Secondly, the search for a new status for the Indian Ocean rests upon the concerted re-affirmation of a group of directly or indirectly concerned nations of their willingness to harmonize the promotion of their interests in the name of a peace based on an equal and guaranteed security, as well as on the respect for international law and practice.

Thirdly, co-operation which recognizes the responsibilities and interests of all parties is fundamental if we wish to eliminate all risks of confrontation and conflagration.

Fourthly, the mutual acceptance of respective interests permits of no grading of such interests, but presupposes on the contrary their integration in the search for the common good which some among us call the new international order.

(Mr. Rasolondraibe, Madagascar)

We thought it useful to recall those few ideas during the consideration of the report and the draft resolution submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. In fact, while we emphasize, as do those two documents, the importance of the enlargement of that Committee and the extent and usefulness of the exchanges of views which took place this year for the first time, we also consider that all this would have been in vain, that the deliberations would soon have been deadlocked, had they not been guided and inspired by principles such as those we have just mentioned.

We attach the greatest importance to those principles, because they condition the achievement of a consensus and the possibility of harmonizing divergent positions. The will of their authors to adhere to such principles appears, in our view, to be the most important criterion for evaluation of the declarations, decisions and proposals of our partners around the Indian Ocean.

Apart from the reaffirmation by the States in that region of their concerns regarding their security and their attachment to the full implementation of the purposes and principles of the declaration in resolution 2832 (XXVI), which in no way could be the object of redefinition, the most outstanding statements that have marked the recent proceedings of the Committee were the following: first, those according to which, because of the present international situation, which is characterized by the Afghanistan crisis among others, "we could not seriously envisage the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace"; and, secondly, those which reflect the fact that their authors have not fully adhered to resolution 2832 (XXVI). The result of this was, on the one hand, that it was not possible as expected to set at that session the date for the conference in Colombo in 1981 and, on the other hand, that the Committee must still face serious difficulties concerning the fulfilment of its mandate.

Is it justified to say that because of the Afghanistan question and the present state of international relations it is premature to convene the Colombo conference?

(Mr. Rasolondraibe, Madagascar)

With respect to the so-called Afghanistan affair, we hope, like everyone else, that a political solution will be found urgently which would restore good relations between that country and its neighbours and would respect the sovereignty of the Afghan people. The quest for such a solution, however, must proceed from an approach distinct from and independent of the efforts relating to the zone of peace, as is the case with other questions that affect or could affect peace and security in the Indian Ocean. We are referring to the question of Palestine, the conflict between Iraq and Iran and the situation in southern Africa, which is characterized by repeated aggressions on the part of the racist régime against its neighbours.

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean was not given a mandate to resolve such problems, which could influence its work but which in no way would justify either a delay or a blocking of the continuation of that work. After all, negotiations on medium-range nuclear missiles have been resumed in Geneva despite the Afghanistan affair. Why could the same not be done as far as the conference on the Indian Ocean is concerned?

To postpone once again the implementation of the Declaration in resolution 2832 (XXVI) on the pretext that the international situation is inappropriate for it would be tantamount in a way to neglecting to treat a wounded arm because the rest of the body was suffering from fever. Of course, ideal conditions for action do not exist and perhaps will not exist tomorrow, if we take into account recent events, such as the delay in the ratification of the strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT II), the automatic increase of military expenditures, the manufacture and installation of new medium-range nuclear missiles, the proclamation of a new strategy providing for the limited or partial use of nuclear weapons, the search for military superiority at all costs or the establishment of a rapid deployment force designed to operate in what are called zones of vital interest and equipped with the most sophisticated conventional and nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Rasolondraibe, Madagascar)

Without any doubt, these decisions have, and will continue to have, an effect on the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, where their unilateral character would seem, a priori, to be difficult to reconcile with the collective endeavour we are proposing in order to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. Time alone can tell us whether we are right or wrong to do so, but we have not lost hope that our partners will demonstrate the necessary flexibility for the pursuit and success of this collective effort.

We say this because we have noted in the Committee that no one has attempted to challenge the fundamental political considerations underlying the concept of a zone of peace, and we believe, therefore, that there is some common ground between the parties which could be explored in greater depth with a view to its expansion.

Nevertheless, we agree with the finding in the report that positions on certain fundamental points are far apart. That is what we had in mind when we spoke of statements showing that those who made them had not yet fully adhered to the spirit and letter of resolution 2832 (XXVI). I shall now refer to the legal and political arguments adduced in those statements.

Turning first to the legal arguments, we were reminded that the forces deployed in the Indian Ocean are there pursuant to the exercise of a freedom recognized by international law, namely the freedom of navigation on the high seas.

The Democratic Republic of Madagascar, along with all the members of the Ad Hoc Committee, recognizes that the primary aim of a zone of peace must be to guarantee the freedom and security of civilian shipping. Under the proposal made by the President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, contained in his telegram of 22 June 1980 to the Secretary-General, which I shall have occasion to examine in detail, this question of civilian shipping must enjoy the highest priority in any endeavour to convert the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. That is, after all, in the interests of everyone - in particular, of island countries such as mine.

(Mr. Rasolondraibe, Madagascar)

The freedom and security of civilian shipping, I repeat, is an essential element in the continued development of good-neighbourly relations among littoral States, and between these and other States. The Head of State of Madagascar even goes so far as to propose that oil tankers should benefit from special guarantees yet to be defined in view of the strategic importance which some attach to petroleum products. On this point, therefore, our position is absolutely clear.

At the same time, we wonder how far we have to respect the principle of freedom of navigation in the case of warships. This freedom has frequently been abused, since the Indian Ocean has apparently long been made a kind of colonial waterway. The permanent deployment of forces there is tantamount to an appropriation of the high seas - a situation quite different from innocent passage. Some of the forces deployed there have had occasion to operate against a country of the region in circumstances which, in terms of the decree of 24 May 1980 handed down by the International Court of Justice, are detrimental to respect for judicial settlement in international relations.

Can we remain indifferent when the exercise of a misunderstood freedom leads to the creation of a balance of terror in our region, threatening our security, and apt at any moment to break out into a conflagration of which our own peoples would be the first victims?

The countries of the region would, it seems to us, be well justified in calling for limitation of a freedom exercised without particular regard for their interests. But they are not doing so.

(Mr. Rasolondraibe, Madagascar)

Instead, they are invoking precedents whereby States - particularly the major Powers - have voluntarily renounced the military use of other spaces, such as the seabed and ocean floor, as well as the moon and other celestial bodies. A similar renunciation could be applied to the Indian Ocean, if not, indeed, to all maritime activities. But we know that such an act transcends the authority of jurists, being more properly the province of politicians.

Still from the legal standpoint, it has been conceded that the introduction of foreign military forces into the Indian Ocean is not in itself an act of self-defence; hence it does not fall within the purview of Article 51 of the Charter, which otherwise would have brought it within the purview of the Security Council.

But, as has been pointed out, it is a measure preparatory to exercise of the right of self-defence, which neither Article 51 nor any other provision of the Charter forbids. It authorizes States, we are told, to take such preparatory measures as long as they do not constitute, resort to force per se.

According to that interpretation, which is designed to fend off any possible challenge to foreign military presence in the Indian Ocean, each State's right to choose its own ways and means of ensuring its security would be limitless. But is that the case everywhere and for everyone?

This calls to mind a certain crisis of the 1960s, in which a revolutionary country of the Western Hemisphere was told that it did not have the right to install certain types of weapons on its own territory, regardless of the Charter. That crisis was revived last year by the presence of certain troops.

Two questions arise in this connexion. First, if there are rights - and we know that it is very difficult to speak of rights here, because that would be within the realm of interpreting the Charter - are we to limit only the rights of the weak and not those of the strong?

(Mr. Rasolondraibe, Madagascar)

The second question, which is broader and more important, in our view, concerns that interpretation of the Charter which would suggest that it authorizes the vertical and horizontal arms race and provides no legal basis for any disarmament efforts, including the proposal for regional disarmament in the form of the conversion of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. Is such an interpretation correct?

In calling for implementation of resolution 2832 (XXVI), the countries of the region are aiming only at an implementation of the Charter be truly in keeping with the interests of international peace and security.

In the circumstances, what weight are we to attach to certain political arguments adduced in the Ad Hoc Committee to justify the major Powers' military presence in the Indian Ocean?

We reject the concept of balance, of course, since the search for such a balance is not subject, apparently, to any qualitative, quantitative, global or regional limitations. Forward defence, the policy of containment, zones of vital interest: these are concepts which we cannot possibly endorse.

We reject the veiled threats of those who say that it would not necessarily be to everyone's benefit for the major Powers to withdraw from the region. But their presence is not to everyone's advantage, and it seems to us that current events in Iraq and Iran, distressing as they may be, offer a valuable lesson, in the sense that they demonstrate the limits and the risks of such foreign military presence: limits, in the sense that the foreign forces deployed in the region were not and are not of any use in the prevention or halting of the conflict; risks, to the extent that the temptation to intervene is great for one and all. So why should there be a foreign military presence in the Indian Ocean, and why should we be made to fear the risks entailed by a hypothetical "security vacuum"? Can a vacuum be worse than the opposite?

One delegation sought in the Ad Hoc Committee to ridicule the attachment of the countries of the region to the concept of "collective security without military alliances" - an essential element, in our view, of resolution 2832 (XXVI).

(Mr. Rasolondraibe, Madagascar)

In the same spirit, that delegation offered the protection of its country and justified its presence in the Indian Ocean by reiterating its interest in the stability of the region, and its desire to be in a position to respond to any request for military aid if and when the security of other States were threatened, as well as its determination to confront every crisis and to ward off every act of aggression. In short, that is the role of a great imperialist Power with world-wide responsibilities.

(Mr. Rasolondraibe, Madagascar.)

The duty of the coastal countries seems to us to be to reject advances aimed at weakening their faith in and their attachment to the principles of non-alignment and to transform them into pawns or regional policemen, to draw them into the dangerous interplay of alliances, to involve them in struggles for power which have nothing to do with them and to cause them to renounce the commitments which they have undertaken to adhere to the United Nations system in spite of its imperfections or limitations, for the defence of their interests.

It has been ingenuously proposed to us that we accept vague assurances that the forces deployed in the Indian Ocean are not there to threaten or to violate the sovereignty, independence or territorial integrity of our countries. The military operation of 24 April 1980, criticized as we have seen by the International Court of Justice, taught us that we can no longer be content with those vague assurances. We want something better and we willingly endorse the view that a zone of peace represents an effort to improve the system of security for the countries of the area provided for under the Charter.

It is to expedite the establishment of that improved system of security that we reiterate our support for the convening of a United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean to be held in Colombo on the date scheduled in 1981. It was in order to establish the elements of this improved security system in an international convention that the President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, Mr. Didier Ratsiraka, decided to invite to Antananarive a summit conference of countries concerned about peace and security in the Indian Ocean, a conference to be held towards the end of 1981 or at the beginning of 1982.

In addition to the efforts undertaken within the framework of the United Nations, the initiative of the Malagasy President, which was made public on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the democratic revolution of June 1975, is justified by the urgency which our countries attach to the necessity for halting the race for a presence in the Indian Ocean and by our feeling of insecurity in the face of the inexorable deterioration of the situation.

(Mr. Rasolondraibe, Madagascar)

The choice made by the Democratic Republic of Madagascar in calling at this stage for the elaboration of an international instrument with binding force constitutes a reaffirmation of a consistent position which my country has taken since 1975. We were encouraged to see this idea taken up by other delegations and particularly by the President of the Conference of Littoral and Hinterland States in 1979. There is no doubt that those countries have a real desire to conclude such a convention.

It goes without saying that such a convention would be in keeping with the interests of the coastal States, which want to secure precise and sound guarantees for their security in a system which would exclude as far as they were concerned any subordination of their interests to specific strategic interests. It would also satisfy those countries that took exception to the declaratory procedure adopted in 1971.

The rather theoretical discussions in the Committee which my delegation has wished to recall illustrate the difficulty of the negotiations the parties must engage in before they can succeed in harmonizing their interests.

But, as the President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar stressed in the message of 22 June addressed to the Secretary-General,

"We are convinced that the co-operative effort for which we are calling and the legally binding convention which would emerge from it are the only peaceful means of preventing this confrontation that is looming inexorably while guaranteeing respect for the vital interests of all the parties directly concerned." (A/C.159/L.32, Annex, p. 2)

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): In my brief statement today, I should like to introduce to the First Committee a draft resolution on one of the most crucial and pressing disarmament issues which faces the international community at present: the complete and effective elimination of all chemical weapons from the arsenals of States and the destruction of stocks of those weapons.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

Thanks to the close co-operation and assistance which my delegation received from the delegations of Canada, Japan and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and because of the spirit of understanding and accommodation displayed by many other delegations, I have the honour of presenting the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.30, among whose sponsors are the delegations of 31 Member States. This number, of course, includes Canada, whose name was inadvertently omitted from the list.

As can be seen the draft resolution in question is largely procedural and is self-explanatory. Indeed, it concerns an issue which, by any standard, is not unfamiliar to the international community. First addressed well over half a century ago, the question of chemical weapons has been under constant and active consideration in the United Nations General Assembly for the past 12 years. In point of fact there are probably few other disarmament issues which, in the process of discussion and negotiation, have been explored more thoroughly or been the subject of more documents and proposals than the issue of chemical weapons.

The long process of intensive and dedicated consideration of the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons has been most useful. For one thing, it resulted in making the international community fully aware of both the difficulties and the opportunities which lie ahead and which must be addressed with goodwill, determination and an open mind if we are to succeed in working out, at an early date, an effective agreement on chemical weapons acceptable to all.

My delegation deems it only fair to underline the special credit which must go in that regard to the Committee on Disarmament for its efforts in 1980, including those pursued within the framework of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons under the able and dedicated leadership of its Chairman, Ambassador Okawa of Japan.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

By turning to a pragmatic, in-depth examination of specific issues to be dealt with in a negotiating process ultimately leading to the elaboration of an effective and complete ban on chemical weapons, the Committee undertook an ambitious and probably successful effort to reconcile a multilateral approach to the prohibition of chemical weapons with the continued bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

While, regrettably, an agreement on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction has not yet been elaborated, we subscribe to the view of those delegations which feel that in 1980 a solid foundation has been laid on which to continue and advance in 1981 the efforts aimed at banning chemical weapons.

Those basic sentiments underlie the preambular and operative paragraphs of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.38.

... In particular, operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution conveys an unmistakable sense of the urgency of continuing, as of the beginning of the Committee's 1981 session, negotiations on a multilateral chemical-weapons convention as a matter of high priority.

I speak for all 33 sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.38 when I commend it for adoption by consensus by the First Committee. As in the past, such an endorsement of the document would represent an eloquent manifestation of the urgency and importance that the General Assembly attaches to the early and successful conclusion of a multilateral agreement on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction.

I should also like to take this opportunity to express to the sponsors of the draft resolution, as well as to other delegations, our appreciation of their valuable contribution, co-operation and support in the elaboration of this draft.

In conclusion, speaking for my own delegation, I should like to stress that, of course, we have full sympathy for and understand the

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

sense of disappointment and the impatience of many delegations over what they consider to be an unsatisfactory rate of progress in the field of the prohibition of chemical weapons. We happen to believe, however, that the surest and shortest route towards the goal we all cherish leads not so much through setting specific time-frames but rather through dedicated and constructive co-operation by all States in the necessary spirit of goodwill and with an open mind.

The chances for such co-operation in turn call for the promotion of a political climate conducive to effective negotiation efforts, which we all hope to see resumed in 1981.

As will be appreciated, such a climate is crucially important in any disarmament negotiations. In the particularly complex and delicate field of chemical-weapons negotiations such a climate is virtually a sine qua non condition.

Any action, irrespective of its motives, which would objectively tend to disrupt and upset the climate of confidence and determination could not but adversely affect the chances of early progress in the field of chemical disarmament.

My delegation is confident that the prevailing mood in this body is one of positive and constructive action capable of generating the necessary momentum in the field of chemical-weapons negotiations in 1981.

Finally, I would point out that Ireland and Italy also have been omitted from the list of sponsors given in document A/C.1/35/L.38, and would ask that this necessary change be made to include their names as well as that of Canada.

Mr. SKINNER (Canada): I should like to associate myself with the statement of the representative of Poland, Mr. Sujka and to indicate again that we should be grateful if the necessary changes could be made so that Ireland and Italy, as well as Canada, are included among the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.38.

I should like to address myself to agenda item 48 (g), on confidence-building measures and the study report. Canada welcomes the report on the progress achieved by the study group concerned with this important subject. We consider confidence-building measures as possibly lying on the periphery of issues which are addressed by the Committee, but only in the narrow sense that the subject deals with the normal peace-time activities of military forces, and not with their limitation and even less with their diminution.

That view has been expressed by the majority of those Member States who have replied to the Secretary-General's request for their views on confidence-building measures, and I believe that that was in consequence of resolution 33/91 B, which sought to give tangible expression to the ninety-third paragraph of the Final Document of the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament.

Many felt it necessary to stress that confidence-building is not a substitute for arms limitation and disarmament. We understand that view. On the other hand, few would argue with the idea that measures that require positive actions in the military sphere, such as notifying certain military activities, would foster a more propitious climate for the pursuit of arms limitation among the States concerned.

Confidence-building measures are, therefore, an integral part of the building of international security, and it continues to be the over-all goal of this Committee to build international security at lower levels of military confrontation.

Confidence-building measures, as they are called, have so far found practical effect in two regions of the world in particular - in Europe, and in the Middle East. In both areas they deal exclusively with military measures. It is not surprising, therefore, that the majority of States that have replied to the Secretary-General on this subject are from those two regions and speak

(Mr. Skinner, Canada)

of confidence-building measures within their experience. But to deduce from such a sample that international security can be achieved only through the building of military confidence is to misapprehend the dynamics of international relations.

Since Canada is a signatory to the Helsinki Final Act I should like to refer to our experience with confidence-building measures within that framework. They have a specific and narrow meaning in the European context, but it is the much-belaboured phrase "détente in Europe" that carries with it the broader concept of the structure of the security of that region based upon the whole spectrum of inter-State relations. The Final Act is itself the best evidence of that concept.

(Mr. Skinner, Canada)

The so-called decalogue of principles guiding relations among participating States could be characterized in part as constituting political confidence building, including that in the military sphere. The building of confidence in the economic sphere is embodied in various measures set forth in the second chapter, together with an explicit acknowledgement in the preamble, that these efforts contribute to the reinforcement of peace and security.

The third major section of the Final Act, representatives will recall, deals with measures intended to foster contact among persons of different countries - social confidence building one might say. Thus, in the European example we see confidence-building measures in both their narrow and broad perspective.

The study of confidence-building measures commissioned by last year's session of the General Assembly in resolution 34/87 B has had to come to grips with this problem of definition. Obviously, if the building of confidence were to be taken in its broadest sense, then the group of experts should be studying nothing less than the measures needed to implement the four purposes listed in Article 1 of the United Nations Charter. But this is clearly not the intention either of the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament, when it addressed the subject of confidence-building measures or this Committee which has sought to be faithful to the Programme of Action of that session.

Nevertheless any attempt to restrict the scope of the study of confidence-building measures is bound to be arbitrary. This problem might be minimized if we keep in mind that real confidence is generated by actions rather than declarations. This is the essence of what the Canadian Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, meant when he spoke before the special session on this distinction. Just as declarations of good intent are no substitute for real disarmament, confidence built on what a country says it will or will not do in the future is illusory, since the promise need only be broken once.

(Mr. Skinner, Canada)

The discussion of confidence-building measures in the United Nations has quite rightly noted the relevance of differing regional experiences. This means in effect that the building of confidence between States in a particular region where any confrontation is not as marked in the military sphere as it is in Europe will have a different emphasis on measures for improving its own security relationships. Regional statements of principles governing relations among its member States reflect this fact. I am thinking of course about the Declaration of Ayacucho, for example, which places stress on economic integration. Concrete steps in that region towards this goal clearly build security as between the States involved and should be recognized as doing just that.

The European countries - and we consider ourselves among that group - represented on the Group of Experts are understandably preoccupied with the military aspects of confidence building. The Helsinki Agreement and the follow-up meeting in Madrid dictate that in Europe it is above all in the military sphere that confidence is dangerously lacking. However, the group's mandate is not confined to Europe; all regions of the world - except, curiously, the Middle East - are represented on it, and experts from the non-European regions have directly observed in the working group that military confidence is not the only kind. In some parts of the world political, economic and social confidence are needed even more. For the moment, perhaps the focus is on the military aspects of confidence-building measures, on Madrid and on the specific military measures which already have application in Europe. But sooner or later, if the United Nations is successful in becoming more deeply involved in building international security, we will have to broaden our field of vision and see what it is that undermines security in situations where fear and apprehension are not always directly traceable to the existence of large armed forces.

The task before the expert group charged with the study of confidence-building measures was to find a balance, therefore, between too narrow and too broad a definition of the study's scope. The experts have been directed under the terms of resolution 34/87 D to take their cue from both the replies to the Secretary-General contained in document A/34/416 and Add.1 and

(Mr. Skinner, Canada)

the relevant statements made during last year's session of the General Assembly. A careful examination reveals the near-unanimous view of the authors that experience of confidence-building measures to date has been almost exclusively in the military field. It should not be surprising therefore that the outline for the study as presented in the progress report before us is strongly pointed in this direction.

We have also noted the view of some States that there does not exist in their region the necessary basis on which confidence among its members can be built. We do not wish to challenge that view, since quite obviously if the political will does not exist to implement measures which will build greater security then confidence simply will not grow. But from the point of view of developing a balanced study which reflects the experience of differing regional approaches, such views do not provide much food for thought.

It is perhaps too late to reflect in this study the complete and necessary interrelationship of military and non-military measures that might be employed to build security in any particular region. If this is so, it is also perhaps to be regretted but the result will not thereby be totally wasted. Valuable experience has been gained in Europe which will have application to military confrontation anywhere in the world, to a greater or less degree.

Although the outline before the Committee breaks no new ground on military confidence-building it is nevertheless comprehensive, and the final report will, we hope, serve the purpose of educating the interested public in this conservative but realistic step towards arms limitation and disarmament.

My delegation is open to the totality of experiences of other regions. It may well be that, as time passes and in the light of the conclusive studies commissioned by this Organization, non-military approaches to building security may eventually achieve greater articulation and be the focus of attention.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is the representative of Yugoslavia who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.32.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): On behalf of the group of sponsors consisting of Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cuba, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Togo, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Mali, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Venezuela, Zaire and Yugoslavia, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.32 on the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The debate in the First Committee has again confirmed that the Member States attach great importance to the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and, in particular, to the measures contained in the Programme of Action.

The members of the international community were prompted by the special session to become actively involved in the consideration and solving of the problem of disarmament. That session launched new initiatives and charted the course to be followed in implementing those programmes and actions. However, taken as a whole, the actual results with regard to the realization of the priority tasks which we determined and accepted unanimously at the special session have failed to materialise.

Our draft resolution is motivated, once again, by the profound belief of the sponsors that it is indispensable to implement, as a matter of urgency, the recommendations and decisions of the special session. That would be the best way to overcome the present unabated arms race and to create conditions for the start of a process of genuine disarmament, which is one of the essential prerequisites for strengthening peace and security in the world and for ensuring the free development of all States.

The preambular paragraphs underline the fact that genuine disarmament is one of the most urgent tasks of the international community and that all the peoples of the world are vitally interested in the success of disarmament negotiations. It is there reaffirmed that the United Nations has a central role

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament. It is noted with satisfaction that the first special session devoted to disarmament resulted in greater involvement by Member States in efforts aimed at halting the arms race and launching a process of disarmament, and that some initial results in the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the first special session have been achieved, primarily through a revitalization of the multilateral negotiating machinery.

At the same time, however, the preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 1 express deep concern over the continued arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race, which constitutes a growing threat to international peace and security and over the lack of tangible results with respect to the implementation of the measures set forth in the Programme of Action of the special session on disarmament, as well as over the constantly growing military budgets which bear negative consequences for the unhampered development of States, particularly developing countries.

Operative paragraph 2 calls upon all States, especially nuclear-weapon States and other major military Powers, to take immediate steps leading to effective halting of the arms race and disarmament.

Operative paragraph 3 urges all States to intensify their efforts to bring to a successful end the negotiations which are currently going on in the Committee on Disarmament and other international forums, in accordance with priorities set forth in the Programme of Action that was adopted at the special session.

Operative paragraph 4 calls upon all States to refrain from any actions which have or may have negative effects on the implementation of the relevant recommendations and decisions of the special session.

Operative paragraphs 5 and 6 invite all States which are engaged in disarmament negotiations or arms limitation negotiations outside the United Nations framework to keep the General Assembly informed of the results of such negotiations and to implement the agreements achieved so far in order to create favourable conditions for further progress.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

Finally, it is proposed to include in the draft provisional agenda of the thirty-sixth regular session of the General Assembly an item entitled "Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

In view of the importance of implementing as soon as possible the recommendations and decisions of the first special session on disarmament with regard to the basic objectives contained in and advocated by the draft resolution, I wish to express the conviction of the sponsors that the draft resolution will meet with the full support of the Committee and will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. KOSTENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)(interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR today wishes to speak on two draft resolutions already submitted to the Committee of which it is a sponsor. I should like to turn first of all to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.12, entitled "Nuclear weapons in all aspects".

From the very first day nuclear weapons appeared, the Ukrainian SSR has favoured the banning of this extremely dangerous weapon of mass destruction. In the present circumstances, the Ukrainian SSR, like other socialist countries, deems it necessary to begin talks immediately in order to achieve agreement providing, among other things, for a cessation of the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, a cessation of the manufacture of fissile material for military purposes and a gradual reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery up to and including their total elimination.

Last year, our delegation sponsored a resolution at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly in which the Assembly appealed to the Disarmament Committee, the basic multilateral organ for negotiations in the field of limiting the arms race and achieving disarmament, to continue this year its consideration of the item "Nuclear weapons in all aspects," and to

(Mr. Kostenko, Ukrainian SSR)

hold preparatory consultations and, ultimately, negotiations on the question of halting the nuclear arms race and bringing about nuclear disarmament.

We note that this year the Committee on Disarmament made further efforts to put into practical effect the proposal made by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in 1979 for negotiations on halting the manufacture of nuclear weapons in all aspects and the gradual reduction of stockpiles of those weapons, as shown in Disarmament Committee document CD/4, dated 1 February 1979.

There was widespread support among members of the Committee, particularly among representatives of the neutral and non-aligned countries, for the proposal to set up a special working group on the question of halting the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament. In the course of the Committee's discussions, the representatives of India, Mexico, Nigeria and a number of other countries put forward some useful considerations which warrant the most careful attention. At the same time, we cannot pass over in silence the unconstructive attitude of other nuclear Powers which in practice blocked not only the talks on such an important problem, but even the creation of this working group in the Disarmament Committee.

(Mr. Kostenko, Ukrainian SSR)

In the future, even more difficulties will arise, and it will become even more complicated to begin the talks which are now proposed. The experience of the last 35 years provides eloquent proof of this.

The Ukrainian delegation believes that, within the framework of the Committee on Disarmament, where as of this year all nuclear Powers are represented, there must be an intensification of efforts to find solutions to the problems of halting the nuclear arms race and of nuclear disarmament. Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.12, inter alia, calls upon the Committee on Disarmament, as a matter of priority and for the purpose of an early commencement of the negotiations on the substance of the problem to undertake consultations in which to consider inter alia the establishment of an ad hoc working group on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament with a clearly defined mandate. Concrete proposals for giving practical effect to the consultations and subsequently the negotiations themselves on halting the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament are entirely in keeping with the provisions of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, and of its paragraph 50 in particular, and we hope that it will enjoy widespread support among delegations.

I shall now speak on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.18, on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. The essence of this draft resolution lies in the renewed request by the General Assembly that the Committee on Disarmament, in the light of its existing priorities, continue negotiations, with the assistance of qualified governmental experts, with a view to preparing a draft comprehensive agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, and draft possible agreements on particular types of such weapons.

(Mr. Kostenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Five years have elapsed since the Soviet Union raised this very important question in the United Nations. The Socialist States are of the view - and this was reconfirmed in the Declaration of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty of 15 May this year - that the prohibition of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction belongs to the group of problems which no State or Government can possibly have sufficient grounds for refusing to negotiate on.

In recent times it has become possible to identify the attitude to this important problem of other groups of States also. In spite of the widely held view on the inadmissibility of the use of scientific and technical developments for the purposes of creating new types of weapons of mass destruction, there still is no agreement among States on how to prevent this in practice. The Ukrainian déléation is firmly convinced that, given a constructive approach, it would long ago have been possible to achieve a comprehensive agreement on the prohibition of the development of new means of mass destruction.

Progress could also be achieved through the creation of the special special Group of Experts. The mandate proposed for such a group was, in fact, defined this year, and the idea is to set it up within the framework of the Committee on Disarmament and for it to be convened on a periodic basis. It would deal both with the preparation of a draft comprehensive agreement and consideration of the question of concluding special agreements on individual aspects of weapons of mass destruction.

We note with satisfaction that additional proposals put forward in the Committee on Disarmament by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were positively received by the members of that body. Indeed, it is a fact after all, that not all countries - indeed far from all countries - possess the necessary scientific and technical potential which would enable them themselves to take an objective view of whether new types of weapons of mass destruction are being developed and created. But through

(Mr. Kostenko, Ukrainian SSR)

a competent international body under the Committee on Disarmament States would receive reliable information on this. We should like to express the hope that the draft resolution proposed by a group of countries prohibiting new types of weapons of mass destruction will receive the support of many delegations.

Mr. ESPECHE GIL (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like on this occasion to introduce very briefly draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.40, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission".

As members are aware, the Commission met at United Nations Headquarters from 14 May to 6 June 1980. During that session, the Commission considered a series of items that appear in the report submitted to the General Assembly in document A/35/42, the contents of which are familiar to representatives. By this draft resolution the General Assembly would endorse the report of the Disarmament Commission and the recommendations therein, thus ensuring the conditions necessary for the continuation of the Commission's work in 1981 and the consideration by the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session of the corresponding report.

Bearing in mind all these considerations, and in view of the fact that the report of the Commission was submitted subject to the subsequent approval of some of its parts relating to the Disarmament Decade, on which agreement was achieved recently and in connexion with which a separate draft resolution will be submitted, my delegation has the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.40 on behalf of the following sponsors: Bangladesh, Cuba, Cyprus, Egypt, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Uruguay and Yugoslavia, and my own country Argentina.

This draft resolution, in short, is similar to the one that was adopted by consensus by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session. For this reason, and because of its merits, my delegation believes that this text too could be adopted by the same procedure of consensus.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to make a few brief comments with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.14, entitled "United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament".

My Government has from the very outset whole-heartedly supported the idea of establishing a United Nations programme of fellowships. We feel that this endeavour is highly suitable to improve the co-operation of States in the field of arms control and disarmament now and in future. The fact that the fellows originating from various countries situated in different regions of the world study and work together during six months every year is, as such, a most valuable and important contribution to the building of confidence and mutual understanding, the value of which can hardly be overstated.

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

The positive interest my Government takes in this programme has been proved by the invitation, in September of this year, of all the fellows and the co-ordinator of the programme to the Federal Republic of Germany. For further details, I would refer representatives to the report of the Secretary-General on the programme, which is before the Committee as document A/C.1/35/531. I should just like to point out that it has indeed been a pleasure for my authorities to host so illustrious a group of young diplomats. Based on the experience we have had with the programme of fellowships, my delegation would like this programme to be continued.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): I want to make a very brief statement on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.10, on "Reduction of military budgets" in order to correct a minor linguistic deficiency in the English text of that draft resolution and to avoid any ambiguity. By the way, I see that in the Spanish text the language is as we had intended it to be, so my remarks refer only to the English text.

On the second line of operative paragraph 4 (b) - "expenditures among different States and in different years ... - the word "in" should read "between". This correction does not, of course, change the meaning of the text.

The CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat will take due note of the correction.

Before calling on representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply, might I recall the relevant provisions of General Assembly decision 34/401 in this regard:

"The number of interventions in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation at a given meeting should be limited to two per item.

"The first intervention in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation on any item at a given meeting should be limited to 10 minutes, and the second intervention should be limited to five minutes."

I now call on the representative of Iraq.

Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I have listened very carefully to the allegations made by the representative of the Zionist entity some time back. My delegation wishes to state that ever since 1974 the General Assembly has been adopting resolutions on the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. Together with other Arab delegations, it has voted in favour of those resolutions, as have other freedom and peace-loving countries that are also attached to the concept of security. In fact, only one member of the international community has always refused to vote in favour of such resolutions which aimed merely at strengthening peace and stability in a region of vital importance to the international community - the Middle East - and that member is none other than the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine, the same Zionist entity which is the only one to have ignored or disregarded all United Nations resolutions relating to the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East.

In the course of this meeting he submitted a draft resolution, based on propaganda and deception, and of no practical value because of its disregard for all the bitter truths existing in the Middle East, and of which the Zionist entity is the fundamental cause. It ignores a basic question which has been of concern to the international community for a third of a century: namely, the problem of the Palestinian people who were expelled by the Zionist entity - that same entity which, through force, has taken possession of their lands.

We are convinced that the Zionist entity, in submitting that draft resolution, sought to achieve two main objectives: the first, to try to portray the Zionist entity in a more favourable light as it is well known for being the only one in the region to have defied the will of the international community by refusing to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to place its nuclear establishment under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards.

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

As a result, we have no illusions as to the expansionist designs of that entity.

The Arabs, on the other hand, have acceded to the Treaty and respect all its provisions. That is why the Zionist entity had to improve its image in the eyes of the world, and we must therefore stress two elements that have exerted a direct influence on the Zionist draft resolution.

First, the Zionist entity, for a long time now, has been a nuclear State, possessing at least 25 atomic bombs. Secondly, the Arabs, thanks to their new awareness and their increased means, have entered the atomic era and embarked on the use of nuclear power for peaceful purposes. This has frightened the Zionist entity - not because the new situation poses a military danger to Israel, but simply because henceforth the Arabs will be using modern scientific and technological methods to develop their countries and exploit their resources. This removes one of the primary causes of Arab weakness. From now on they will be able to make use of science and technology. Proof of the Zionist entity's fears is the fact that the Zionist air force attempted to attack the nuclear reactor which Iraq uses for peaceful purposes, and did so by taking advantage of the war launched by the racist authorities in Iran.

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

Israel has thus attempted to take advantage of that situation. I am astounded by the statement made by the President of the Zionist entity one month before the war broke out. He stated:

"Israel will not permit the continuation of the Iraqi nuclear programme. We have friendly countries that will come to our assistance to achieve our objective."

That statement was published in a number of American newspapers.

That is one example of Israeli craftiness but there is another, equally blatant example, namely that the Zionist entity, in submitting its draft resolution at this point, is attempting to confirm something that has no basis, namely, that the danger in the Middle East stems from that nuclear development, and that therefore it is necessary to conclude an agreement among the countries in the region. Is that true? Far from it: the historical facts are there to refute that idea and to confirm that the real danger arises from the fact that Israel alone in the region has nuclear weapons.

As regards what has been stated about Iraqi nuclear weapons and the Zionist propaganda against the peaceful nuclear programmes of Iraq, my delegation wishes to remind members of the Committee of the statement of Mr. Fischer, the Assistant Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). He stated that IAEA had responded to the campaign against Iraq - Iraq, which is one of the countries that has acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. He also noted that the International Atomic Energy Agency had published a detailed statement in The Times of London in which it pointed out the good intentions of Iraq which is doing its utmost to apply the Agency's safeguards and guarantees.

The Chairman of the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Mr. Goldschmidt, has published a statement containing the names of States members of the Agency in which he revealed the intentions behind the attack on Iraq. Moreover Mr. Fischer, the Assistant Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, stated his readiness to reply to any question relating to the use by Iraq of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

Those statements constituted an edifying rebuttal to the allegations of the Zionist entity in its attempt to discredit the nuclear programme of Iraq, which is directed solely to peaceful uses.

I should like also to recall to members of the Committee article IV of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which stresses the right of peoples that cherish justice and peace to enjoy the benefits of nuclear technology for peaceful and social purposes. Thus Iraq fully adheres to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and has submitted its facilities to IAEA control while the Zionist entity refuses to accede to the Treaty and refuses any international control.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): My statement in exercise of the right of reply is going to be extremely short and factual. All I want to do is to quote from a United Press International dispatch from Paris of 7 November 1980 published in The New York Times:

"Diplomatic sources said here today that Iraq had halted inspections by the United Nations of French-supplied highly enriched uranium until further notice.

"A spokesman for the United Nations International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna confirmed that Iraq had rebuffed a routine inquiry about a proposed inspection at the site of two French research reactors just outside Baghdad, saying it would not be possible because of the war with Iran." (The New York Times, 8 November 1980, p. 4)

This is a statement which speaks for itself and I wish to add nothing to it.

Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic: The Zionist representative is lying once again. He believes that the members of this Committee present in this room are unaware of the circumstances obtaining in the region right now. Everyone knows that there is a war between Iraq and Iran. In the circumstances we do not believe that we could have done what the representative of the Zionist entity has said. We all know that there are international sources competent to deal with this question. Those sources confirm that Iraq is ready to submit its nuclear installations to international verification, but at a time when we are being attacked on a daily basis by the racist authorities of Iran we cannot concede the accuracy of what was said in The New York Times, which is known for its Zionist tendencies.

The CHAIRMAN; I should like to announce the following additional sponsors of draft resolutions: Costa Rica, Barbados, Bangladesh, Bolivia, A/C.1/35/L.7; Barbados, Bangladesh, Zaire, A/C.1/35/L.14; Sierra Leone, Barbados, Viet Nam, Egypt, Zaire, A/C.1/35/L.15/Rev.1; Madagascar, Ecuador, Mali, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Sierra Leone, Egypt, Zaire, A/C.1/35/L.16; Ecuador, Ireland, Egypt, A/C.1/35/L.20; Ecuador, Costa Rica, Malaysia, Bhutan, A/C.1/35/L.22; Madagascar, Viet Nam, A/C.1/35/L.25; Costa Rica, Bangladesh, A/C.1/35/L.26; Chad, Ivory Coast, Burundi, A/C.1/35/L.30; Chad, Ivory Coast, Burundi, A/C.1/35/L.31; Ecuador, Qatar, Poland, A/C.1/35/L.35; Benin, Ivory Coast, Sudan, A/C.1/35/L.37; Bangladesh, A/C.1/35/L.11 and L.19; Benin, Democratic Yemen, A/C.1/35/L.36; Democratic Yemen, A/C.1/35/L.44; Canada, A/C.1/35/L.10; Canada, Viet Nam, Ethiopia, Ireland, A/C.1/35/L.38; Egypt, Ecuador, A/C.1/35/L.21; Qatar, A/C.1/35/L.41; Qatar, Zaire, A/C.1/35/L.42; Qatar, Congo, Sudan, A/C.1/35/L.32; Sudan, A/C.1/35/L.28; and finally, Bahamas, A/C.1/35/L.41.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.