

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION  
*Official Records\**



FIRST COMMITTEE  
43rd meeting  
held on  
Wednesday, 25 November 1981  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 43RD MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39, 41, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55 AND 135 (continued)

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week 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.

81-64254

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/36/PV.43  
5 January 1982

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: Today we shall take action upon the draft resolutions in the following order, after some rearrangements made at the request of the sponsors: draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.20, A/C.1/36/L.5, A/C.1/36/L.2, A/C.1/36/L.3, A/C.1/36/L.17, A/C.1/36/L.18, A/C.1/36/L.19, A/C.1/36/L.23, A/C.1/36/L.27, A/C.1/36/L.34, A/C.1/36/L.41, A/C.1/36/L.43, A/C.1/36/L.45 and the draft resolution in document A/36/29.

After we have taken action on the 14 draft resolutions there will still remain two items. One is the report on the alleged use of chemical weapons, on which the draft resolution has not yet been introduced, and the other is draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.42. At the sponsors' request, that will be voted upon last. A number of delegations have approached the Chair with a wish that the report on the alleged use of chemical weapons and the draft resolution on that report be considered at a later date to give them time to study the report and the implications of the resolution.

(The Chairman)

I remind members of the Committee that, at its 2nd meeting on 7 October 1981, a time-table and a programme of work were adopted. It was agreed that the Committee would have a general debate on items 57 and 58. The Committee decided that it would have a general debate on those two items from 27 November to 3 December. The Committee also decided it would act upon the relevant draft resolutions on 4 December.

Upon completion of the consideration of those two items we could perhaps take up consideration of the report on the alleged use of chemical weapons and, as the last item, draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.42. This would, I assume, first, give all delegations ample time to consider the report and the draft resolutions to be introduced later in the day, and it would give us time to devote our energies and efforts to consideration of the items dealing with international security.

The General Assembly has scheduled 9 December as the date by which the report of the work of the First Committee is to be submitted to it by our Rapporteur. I assume we shall have ample time to consider the two remaining disarmament items on Friday, 4 December or Saturday, 5 December, if need be. I want to make it very clear that I do not wish to set any irrevocable deadline for the conclusion of consideration of the two items. We shall decide that in due course.

AGENDA ITEMS 39, 41, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55 and 135 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20, which is related to agenda item 55 (d) - General and complete disarmament; non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the 31st meeting of the First Committee on 16 November 1981. A/C.1/36/L.20 has 18 sponsors, as follows: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lac People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam.

I call on those delegations that have expressed a desire to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): Sweden will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20. I have been instructed to make the following explanation of vote.

As the Swedish delegation stated in its explanation of vote on the corresponding resolution last year, the Swedish Government attaches great importance to measures aimed at preventing the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. It considers that such measures can constitute a significant contribution to the non-proliferation efforts and to progress in the field of nuclear disarmament.

In conformity with this view, Sweden strongly supports existing international instruments by which the parties concerned are committed to refrain from actions that would lead to the stationing of nuclear weapons on territories where there are no such weapons at present.

The question of non-stationing is, however, extremely complex since it concerns the general military situation in the world, fundamental aspects of existing security arrangements and the doctrines and force postures of the leading military Powers. It seems to us that progress in that field can be achieved only in the context of real disarmament agreements. Against that

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

background, the Swedish Government has some doubts and reservations about the idea of seeking the solution of a complex problem by dealing with only one of its aspects in an international agreement.

In this context, it is unavoidable for the Swedish delegation to take note of the fact that one of the sponsors of the present draft resolution, the Soviet Union has recently been shown to act in a way which sharply contradicts the very idea underlying this resolution, that is, to prevent the stationing of nuclear weapons on territories where at present there are no such weapons.

The Soviet Union is well aware of Sweden's unilateral pledge not to acquire nuclear weapons and not to allow nuclear weapons controlled by other States to be stationed on Swedish territory. The Soviet Union is certainly aware of our wish to have the nuclear weapons stationed in the Nordic and Baltic area withdrawn. If the present draft resolution is meant to be a serious effort, one would expect all sponsors to act in conformity with the objective of their proposal.

But Sweden, as well as the whole world, recently learned that a Soviet submarine had not only violated Swedish territorial waters and penetrated into a military restricted area, but also, as was later found, in all probability carried nuclear warheads on board. The Soviet Union, a sponsor of a proposal aimed at preventing the stationing of nuclear weapons on new territories, has thus been shown to allow itself to penetrate, with nuclear weapons, into the territorial waters of a friendly, non-nuclear neighbouring State. This raises a very serious problem of credibility and consistency.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): In the last two years my delegation has abstained in the vote on the draft resolution regarding the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. On those occasions, we explained our reasons for taking such a stand. This time I should merely like to recall some of those reasons.

It is beyond doubt that the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States can be an important step forward in efforts to limit the nuclear arms race geographically and to prevent

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

further vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. Consequently, Yugoslavia has always supported all initiatives and actions aimed at achieving those objectives. It was among the first countries to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to other international instruments in the field of disarmament. It has also endorsed the creation of nuclear weapon-free zones or zones of peace in various parts of the world where the necessary conditions exist for such zones, and it advocates the establishment of a similar zone in the Mediterranean, an area where the incessant stockpiling of nuclear weapons poses an ever more dangerous threat to peace and security in the region.

In operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20 the Committee on Disarmament is requested "to proceed without delay to talks with a view to elaborating an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present". However, we interpret the concept of non-stationing more broadly than is implied in that paragraph. The non-stationing of nuclear weapons cannot be limited only to the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States where there are no nuclear weapons. It should also encompass the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States where there are such weapons at present. Otherwise, it would mean that we accept the status quo with regard to the stationing of nuclear weapons - or allowing them to be stationed - on the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States. The non-stationing of nuclear weapons should extend to all other areas and spaces where there are no such weapons at present, such as international air and maritime space. Only thus will it be possible to contribute effectively towards the achievement of the objectives of the draft resolution. Otherwise, precisely those areas which are the object of the most intense nuclear arms race would remain outside the purview of international legal regulation and would be exposed in the future to a constant accumulation of nuclear weapons and their further unhampered geographic proliferation. Therefore, the framework for non-stationing of nuclear weapons, as laid down in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution calling for international legal regulation thereof, is inadequate and too narrow. The convention under consideration should deal with the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States and in other areas and spaces where there are no such weapons at present, as well as with the

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States where such weapons are stationed at present.

For those reasons my delegation is not at this time in a position to support the limited approach to the consideration and solution of the question of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons. It will, therefore, abstain in the vote on this draft resolution.

Mr. de la FUENTE (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Peru is obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20, as we did last year, because we do not agree with the approach taken in the draft. My country's position is well known. We are a signatory to the nuclear test-ban treaty for Latin America - the Treaty of Tlatelolco. We favour the creation of nuclear-free zones in other parts of the world, as has been done in Latin America.



(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

Furthermore, aware of the threat to the survival of mankind posed by the mere presence of nuclear weapons on the territory of any country, my delegation considers that the present draft resolution, if adopted, would mean the legalization or legitimization of the presence of nuclear weapons on the territories of countries where such weapons are already stationed. We would thus be taking a subjective and unrealistic position, which would surely not be in keeping with the seriousness of the efforts we should be making to achieve genuine general and complete disarmament.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20. That draft resolution calls for the negotiation of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present, but fails to include the specific requirement of the withdrawal and elimination of nuclear weapons from the territories of States where they already exist, within the context of effective measures of nuclear disarmament.

An international agreement such as that contemplated in the draft resolution could, a contrario sensu, confer legality on the existence of nuclear weapons on the territories of countries that already possess them. This concept is unacceptable to my delegation.

Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20, which is before our Committee, contains elements with which we have been familiar for many years. This draft resolution is likely to prevent States from exercising their right of collective self-defence as provided for in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

Furthermore, it seems to us that it would be useful to reverse the logic, particularly of the fifth preambular paragraph, for it is precisely to achieve a withdrawal of the nuclear weapons of another State that the countries of the defensive alliance to which Belgium belongs have been forced into a decision to deploy such weapons on the territories of some of its members. It must be recalled that this decision was combined with an offer to negotiate, which we sincerely hope will come to a successful conclusion with the talks which will begin early next week in Geneva.

It will readily be understood that these considerations are sufficient to explain why Belgium will vote against the draft resolution.



Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): Ireland will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20, entitled "Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present". Ireland has no wish to see nuclear weapons spreading more widely, or being stationed in countries where they are not now stationed. I believe our general position on disarmament issues and on other draft resolutions in this Committee will have made that quite clear.

We are, however, aware that the question of where the weapons of the two major Powers should be stationed, and under what kind of control, is a matter of contention between the alliances of which those major Powers are members. We note that the sponsors of the present draft resolution are mainly members of one of those alliances and we feel that the draft resolution itself must be seen against the general background to which I have referred.

For that reason, and notwithstanding our strong general position on the spread of nuclear weapons to other areas, we feel it necessary to abstain on this draft resolution, since we feel that voting in favour of it could be seen as taking sides in a way which we would consider unacceptable in this connexion on strategic issues between the two alliances, given that Ireland is not a member of either, or of any other military alliance. Ireland, in fact, abstained on comparable draft resolutions in 1978, 1979, and 1980.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda.

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Algeria, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Cyprus, Djibouti, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lebanon, Mauritania, Morocco, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Republic of Cameroon, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20 was adopted by 67 votes to 17, with 38 abstentions.\*

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Japan): My delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20 for the following reasons: my delegation is of the view that in the current circumstances in the world any measures imposing restrictions on the deployment of nuclear weapons, as is proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20, might destabilize the international military balance and thereby prove detrimental to the maintenance of peace and security. Furthermore, the means of effective verification on the stationing or non-stationing of nuclear weapons which are vital to such an agreement are far from clear in the proposal. My delegation believes it more important that instead the nuclear-weapon States proceed step by step to realize concrete and effective nuclear disarmament measures. My delegation would like once again to appeal to them to adopt such an approach.

As a matter of national policy, Japan itself has consistently upheld the three non-nuclear principles which are by now well known to the world. From a global perspective, however, my delegation, for the reasons I have just stated was not able to support the draft resolution.

\* Subsequently, the delegation of Benin advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The Finnish delegation voted for draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20 on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. In explanation of vote I wish to make the following points.

First, we support the objective of achieving a world-wide zone of countries that are permanently free from nuclear weapons. That, however, is an objective that requires a carefully considered and balanced arrangement of obligations and responsibilities, including appropriate security assurances. In view of the over-all goal of nuclear disarmament as the ultimate priority, both in global and regional terms, we believe that there should be no new owners of nuclear arms, no new types of nuclear weapons should be developed and no new deployment should be undertaken in areas where they have not hitherto existed.

Secondly, in our view it follows from the concept of State sovereignty that only the Government of the country concerned, be it small or big, aligned or non-aligned, can be qualified to interpret its own security needs. This should be kept in mind in particular when the possibility of an international agreement is examined, as is mentioned in operative paragraph 1.

Thirdly, for its part Finland has forgone the option of nuclear weapons and has consistently worked for their prevention. Consistent with its national position as a small, neutral country, Finland will not receive on its territory nuclear weapons on behalf of other countries. My Government has endeavoured to strengthen the non-proliferation régime and has supported the concept and practice of nuclear-weapon-free zones, as well as other measures aimed at lessening the danger posed by nuclear weapons.

Furthermore, my Government has made proposals that aim at entirely excluding the Nordic countries from any nuclear speculation. This requires security assurances by the nuclear-weapon States involving respect for the non-nuclear-weapon status as well as non-use guarantees.

In voting for draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20 for the reasons I have adduced, my delegation takes exception to operative paragraph 2, as well as to the last preambular paragraph, inasmuch as those paragraphs are intended to prejudice the outcome of the talks due to begin in Geneva next Monday on the so-called theatre nuclear weapons. The outcome of those talks is crucial not only for the parties involved in them, but for all nations in Europe. The

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

Government of Finland has emphasized time and again that these negotiations should be conducted in good faith and with the security of Europe as the only goal.

The talks envisaged in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution would inherently involve a wide range of issues. We hope that those talks would reflect the principles I have just mentioned and be conducted in accordance with the order of priorities already agreed upon and without prejudice to other items on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20. However, our affirmative vote on this draft is without prejudice to India's well-known and consistent policy calling for the total elimination of all nuclear weapons, wherever they may be deployed. We look upon the proposal contained in the draft as only one aspect of the problem of achieving nuclear disarmament and not as an end in itself.

As far as the question of taking up this proposal in the Committee on Disarmament is concerned, our position has already been made clear in our statement in explanation of our vote on a similar resolution last year. Consideration of this item in the Committee, we had pointed out, would depend on the priorities assigned to the various agenda items by the Committee itself. Our position in this respect remains unchanged.

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Albania did not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20. The reasons are well known. We just wish to state that this draft resolution, like others similar to it, pursues goals contrary to nuclear disarmament and is aimed at using nuclear blackmail in the service of the imperialist Powers. Albania has always been opposed to the positions of the Soviet Union and United States and objects to pressure being put on other countries in the name of so-called guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon countries. Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20, in our opinion, is part of the rivalry between the nuclear Powers to secure advantages over the adversary.

Mr. ELFAKI (Sudan): The delegation of Sudan voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20. We did so because of our consistent commitment to disarmament - nuclear and otherwise -- and our belief that any efforts to that effect should be supported.

Our affirmative vote, however, should in no way be construed as acceptance of the present existence of nuclear weapons on some territories or acceptance of any attempt to legalize such existence.

Mr. MEGALOKONOMOS (Greece): Greece is in principle in favour of the general ideas included in the draft resolution we just adopted. As our Prime Minister declared a few days ago, the Greek Government intends to propose the creation of a non-nuclear-weapon zone in our area - the Balkan countries.

Nevertheless, we abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20 because we think that its wording emphasizes one aspect of a more general problem that should be examined in a global way. Another reason for our hesitation concerns the fact that whatever progress we could make in such a difficult area should be founded on the sovereign will of every country freely to decide on questions concerning its own defence, either collective or individual.

Mr. WRIGHT (Niger) (interpretation from French): Niger is and will remain firmly determined to support any measures by the United Nations to reduce or put an end once and for all to the nuclear arms race and to nuclear dissemination and proliferation. That is why our delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution.

However, our affirmative vote must not leave the slightest doubt whatever about the determination of the Government of Niger not to be dictated to by any foreign Power as to what means should be adopted to guarantee and ensure its own security.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.20.

We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.5. This draft resolution relates to agenda item 39 - "Second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament: report of the Preparatory Committee for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". The draft resolution is entitled "Preparations for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

The draft resolution has 43 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the twenty-eighth meeting of the First Committee on 10 November. The 43 sponsors are Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burma, Cuba, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Finland, Greece, Sudan, Qatar, Canada, the Philippines, Italy, Ireland, Sierra Leone, Congo, Uruguay, Mongolia and Panama.

The sponsors have suggested that the draft resolution be adopted without vote. If no delegation wishes to explain its position and I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution without vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.5 was adopted.



The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.5.

We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2. This draft resolution relates to agenda item 135, entitled "Prevention of nuclear catastrophe: declaration of the General Assembly".

The draft resolution has four sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the USSR in the First Committee on 24 November. The sponsors are the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Angola, Mongolia and the German Democratic Republic. A recorded vote has been requested.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania): My delegation stated its position and viewpoint as regards item 135 of this session's agenda on 12 November before this Committee. Now that we are about to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2, entitled "Prevention of nuclear catastrophe: declaration of the General Assembly", which is sponsored by the Soviet social-imperialists, we wish to state that we consider it useless and futile to participate in this vote.

Just as we stated in the course of the debate in this Committee that we would have preferred item 135 not to figure at all on our Committee's agenda, we think the same about the draft resolution connected with that item. We are not in need of a draft resolution that aims not at real disarmament and at preventing war in general and nuclear war in particular, but which has, rather, an utterly demagogic character.

In this draft resolution, we are told about the horrors of war and how they would pale in comparison to what is inherent in the use of nuclear weapons. Do they think that we small peoples and nations, democratic countries and peoples who have been victim of two world wars, do not know this? If so,



(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

then why do we - the majority here, who do not even possess any nuclear weapons - have to be told that it is a crime to be the first to use nuclear weapons? In our view, it smacks of sheer hypocrisy to come and say this to us.

We all know that it is the imperialist Powers - the two super-Powers above all - which possess huge arsenals of war and a great number of nuclear weapons. We also know that it is they that are leading the world towards a third world war and will be using nuclear weapons first against the peoples, which would amount to a real catastrophe. Can we then accept that one or both of them should come here to give us lessons in morality about the significance of the non-first-use of nuclear weapons? We will not be fooled into believing such a big lie. Nor do we accept their megalomania, that it is owing to the good reason of the statesmen of nuclear-weapon States that we can expect the risk of the outbreak of nuclear conflict to be eliminated. Were we to expect that much from their good will and sound reason, we would not have had such bloody wars and aggressions as those of Viet Nam, Afghanistan, and many other conflicts.

There is no doubt that this draft resolution serves no good purpose, nor will it help in any way to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. It is only aimed at disguising the ugly features of its authors and at lulling the peoples' vigilance. In our view, imperialist war - nuclear war included - will be prevented only when the peoples will stand up to halt the criminal hand of the imperialists, and especially of the two imperialist super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): The Bahamas delegation, in studying carefully and listening attentively to comments on all of the draft resolutions before this Committee, finds that the common theme underlying the texts is that

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

mankind is concerned about the fate of the world and alarmed at the rate of escalation and the detrimental consequences of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race.

Despite all the appropriate United Nations jargon contained in consensus as well as other draft resolutions, it is unclear to my delegation whether there is a seriousness of purpose towards implementing measures that could halt and/or reverse the arms race, thereby averting a nuclear catastrophe.

Generally, my delegation has ambivalent feelings about the language contained in several draft resolutions but has supported and will continue to support any exercise the main thrust of which is geared towards nuclear and conventional disarmament. What is disconcerting, nonetheless, is that in some cases agreement has been reached on two or more draft resolutions on the same item. My delegation was heartened by the merger of A/C.1/36/L.25 and A/C.1/36/L.26 and recommends that fine example as a first step towards the successful realization of a disarmed world.

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

I trust that my colleagues this morning will overlook this rather circuitous route I have taken in order briefly to comment on the text of the declaration proposed by the Soviet Union, contained in document A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2.

While representatives might have a difference of opinion on the substance or the intent of the draft declaration, no one can disagree with the view, particularly at this time when there is great dissatisfaction with the status of the nuclear build-up by the nuclear and near-nuclear States, that there is an urgent need to find a solution to the dilemma before the obvious race for superiority becomes irreversible. In this regard the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2 must be commended.

However, it seems to my delegation that it is somewhat incongruous to talk of first use or first strike in a Committee that is dedicated to disarmament. The language of the text seems to highlight an imagined or real ideological and political confrontation between the two super-Powers which the mere adoption of this draft resolution would not erase. If it were so, my delegation would welcome dozens of similar texts.

On the other hand, Member States, particularly small developing ones like my own, should not be put in a position of seeming to have to take sides on an issue that ought to be not only adopted by consensus but implemented expeditiously.

The Bahamas delegation would have wished to see expressed a wider range of views on this matter before it was brought before the Committee in the form of a declaration. In this way, Member States would have had a chance to examine in depth the pros and cons of a very important issue and to assess the manner in which an acceptable text might have been drafted. Such action would have erased the nagging doubts, in my mind at least, that efforts to prevent a nuclear catastrophe are genuine in nature and exemplify true political will on the part of the nuclear Powers to bring an end to the arms race.

I hasten to say that the Bahamas delegation is not in a position to question, and indeed does not question, the seriousness of this declaration, but would say simply that there is still a certain degree of lack of clarity which, regrettably, prevents affirmative support, and the Bahamas will abstain when draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2 is put to the vote.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): The Indian delegation has consistently held the view that very urgent measures taken by the international community are required to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war. Along with a large number of other non-aligned countries, India has been proposing that, pending the achievement of nuclear disarmament, which alone can provide the most effective guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, there should be a total prohibition on the use of such weapons.

Our position of principle in this regard is reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.29, which has already been adopted by the Committee.

My delegation noted the contents of the original draft resolution in document A/C.1/36/L.2, entitled "Prevention of nuclear catastrophe", which was submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union. We had sympathized with its intent which was to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war. However, we had found it difficult then to go along with the original draft resolution, since it did not conform to some of the basic elements of the position taken by India and other non-aligned countries on the question. First, we regard any measure for the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons as only a first step towards the universally accepted goal of nuclear disarmament. Secondly, we believe that any use of nuclear weapons would be a crime against humanity and a violation of the United Nations Charter. In these two respects the earlier Soviet draft resolution was clearly deficient, and we would therefore have found it difficult to give it our support.

However, we are glad to note that, in the revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2, which has been introduced by the representative of the Soviet Union, our major preoccupations have been duly taken care of. We are therefore in a position now to support the thrust of the draft resolution which seeks to prevent a nuclear disaster.

It must be added, however, that India regards the prohibition on the first use of nuclear weapons as only one aspect of the larger issue of a total ban on the use of nuclear weapons. We support the Soviet initiative because its larger aim is the same as that held by India and other non-aligned countries. Our positive decision has also been greatly facilitated by an explicit endorsement in the revised draft resolution of the fundamental positions of principle held by the non-aligned countries.

(Mr. Venkateswaran, India)

The problem of preventing a nuclear war goes beyond the individual security concerns of nations and theories of deterrence and military strategy. Initiatives for reducing the risk of nuclear war deserve our serious consideration and should not fall victim to narrow conceptions of national security or alliance strategies. We owe it to the world and to future generations to give a reasonable chance to all possible measures to avoid a disastrous nuclear conflict.

It is in that spirit that my Government supports draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2, and will vote in favour of it.

Mr. KABIA (Sierra Leone): The Sierra Leone delegation has asked to speak to make a few comments on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2.

My delegation is on record for its total and unequivocal support for total and complete disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament, and we shall support any measure leading to genuine disarmament.

Our intention and our pronouncement on the matter have always been based on realism and on a genuine desire to achieve the goals of disarmament. We follow with great concern and intensity all talks and negotiations on disarmament matters, be they bilateral or multilateral, or the deliberations and the work of the Committee on Disarmament. We shall also follow with keen interest the forthcoming talks between the United States of America and the Soviet Union on disarmament issues starting next week. We shall monitor the progress of these talks to see if the terms and objectives of disarmament are being achieved.

The Sierra Leone delegation is of the opinion that all actions likely to lead to a first strike of the use of nuclear weapons would be committing a crime against humanity. Therefore, we should avoid such actions. As a delegation, we are concerned not only about first-strike actions but also about the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. As has been stated earlier, we support the total eradication of all weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons.

With that explanation, my delegation feels that it is in a position to support the draft resolution before us.

Mr. SYLLA (Senegal) (interpretation from French): As we have had occasion to say and to demonstrate in numerous votes on the subject, my delegation has always been, and still remains, in favour of global nuclear disarmament and always supported the principle of non-recourse to nuclear weapons and also the adoption of effective interim measures pending the conclusion of agreements on this question.

The day before yesterday this Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.29, on the "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war", and my country voted in favour of it.

Viewed from the general standpoint of nuclear disarmament, the draft resolution now before us certainly has some merit, because it advocates, in operative paragraph 4, the stopping and reversal of the nuclear arms race through negotiations on the basis of equality. However, the merit of the draft resolution is clearly diminished, inasmuch as it confines itself to condemning those who would be the first to use nuclear weapons, thus stopping well short of what we consider to be the true problem, that is, the banning of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in particular and the use of force in general.

(Mr. Sylla, Senegal)

In addition to this, the draft resolution, as worded, to a very large extent reproduces the language used in previous resolutions, particularly that of resolution 35/152 D, adopted last year and that of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.29, which was adopted by the Committee two days ago.

Permit me very quickly to quote operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.29:

The use of nuclear weapons would be a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and a crime against humanity'. (A/C.1/36/L.29 para. 1(a)) In the view of my delegation, this text covers perfectly well the concerns which we perceive in the substance of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2. It merely reproduces this idea but reduces its scope considerably. My delegation therefore feels that it would not add much to the cause of nuclear disarmament if we voted in favour of this draft resolution. We shall therefore abstain in the voting.

Mr. MORBER (Hungary): In our explanation of vote before the vote, I should like to present Hungary's position on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2.

During the work of this Committee several delegations pointed out that the present international situation is characterized by increased tension, the spreading arms race and the constant and increasing danger of a nuclear war. New imperialistic doctrines are emerging on the admissibility and acceptability of the use of nuclear weapons. Those who advocate these ideas are not acting responsibly with regard to the fate of their own people and that of all mankind. Given the over-all situation of the world, with the existing power of nuclear overkill, there is not a single country on our globe which could avoid the horrible effects of a nuclear war.

Hungary belongs to a defensive alliance, the Warsaw Treaty Organization, which has no purpose other than that of defence. The first use of nuclear weapons is incompatible with socialist political-military concepts, just as it is incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations. We hold the view that a first resort to nuclear weapons would be the gravest crime against humanity. Consequently, we condemn the military doctrines which try to justify their first use.



(Mr. Horber Hungary)

The Hungarian delegation is of the opinion that new steps ought to be taken to decrease the danger of an outbreak of a nuclear catastrophe, and it is our firm view that an effective ban on the first use of nuclear weapons would be the first step, and at the same time a major step, towards eliminating this danger.

The proposals contained in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2 are of a universal nature affecting all the regions of the world and expressing the vital interests of all peoples. They are consonant with the real interest of all countries, regardless of their respective social systems, and seek to restate and reaffirm the relevant principles of the Charter of the United Nations within the context of the international situation which obtains in the world at present.

The proposals contained in this draft resolution are therefore of particular importance. They urge mankind not to allow itself to slide down into a nuclear abyss and not to permit the irreversible to happen. They are based on sober consideration, taking realities into account and reflecting an earnest desire for preserving peace, and therefore fully coincide with the interests and aspirations of the Hungarian people.

Consequently, the Hungarian delegation whole-heartedly supports draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2 and will vote for it.

Mr. SHITEMI (Kenya): The Kenyan delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2. The title of the draft resolution, together with the preambular part and operative paragraphs 4, including the Mexican amendment, and 5 express to our satisfaction the sentiments we share.

But precisely where we part ways with the sponsors of the draft resolution is in the operative paragraph that requests us, among other things to proclaim that those who resort to the first use of these horrible weapons would be committing the gravest crime. Of course they would. Who in this chamber does not know that? Who in this chamber has not pondered over this possibility with terrible forebodings? Even so, why single out for special proclamation first use instead of the only logical and defensible position of non-use, unless this is, of course, for propaganda purposes?

(Mr. Shitemi, Kenya)

The greater crime was and continues to be the massive nuclear arms build-up. If these horrible weapons had not been manufactured in the first place, there would be no first use. Now that they exist here and now, we should be proclaiming loud and clear as a top priority their non-use and their ultimate total destruction and not, I dare say, these pious sentiments of non-first use.

Kenya will therefore abstain in the vote on this draft resolution.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2. Its declaratory character as a whole and the ambiguity of some of its positions raise serious doubts about the timeliness and the usefulness of the initiative. We are convinced that the moral condemnation of the first use of nuclear weapons has little practical meaning if it is not conceived on a basis of the unequivocal prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons as a position of principle. Otherwise, the use of nuclear weapons in any circumstances that could not be clearly defined as first use would be legitimized by implication.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The Argentine delegation has carefully examined draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2.

As is well known, the Republic of Argentina has repeatedly affirmed its total opposition to nuclear weapons in all their forms and manifestations and its absolutely negative position with regard to any possibility of the use of these weapons. In that context, the ideas contained in the draft resolution are in themselves acceptable to my delegation. However, we should bear in mind that the objective of the initiative is not the adoption of just another resolution, but rather that the General Assembly should approve a solemn declaration on a subject of such importance for the future of mankind, namely, the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe.

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

Declarations of this type, which of themselves have only relative practical value in international disarmament and security, if they are to have true importance and significance should enjoy the unanimous support, or at least the very widespread support, of the international community. This prerequisite is fundamental for the declaration not to become just one more resolution to be disregarded or ignored by those to whom it is addressed.

In the course of the debate on this question, it has been revealed that there are deep divergences on the sense and scope of the draft declaration, and this obviously creates doubts as to its true impact.

In these circumstances, the Argentine delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2. We should like to place on the record, however, that the principles it contains do not give rise to any objection on the part of my delegation, and we take pleasure in expressing this thought to the sponsors.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): My delegation has been on record over the years as supporting any measure to stop the nuclear arms race. In particular, in our statement in the general debate long before this resolution came up we said that any use of nuclear weapons was a crime, and a fortiori we included any first use of nuclear weapons. We consider the concept of a limited nuclear war as offering the prospect of survival and victory to be unrealistic, and we condemn it as promoting the idea of a nuclear war which will inevitably result in a nuclear conflagration.

Secondly, the concept of victory arising from a first strike is, in our opinion, a crime against humanity, because the first strike will lead to a conflagration, and in our view any use of nuclear weapons is a crime against humanity -- and a fortiori where it is a first use.

As the two concepts of a limited nuclear war and victory resulting from a first strike have been floating around for some time now, and as they bring us much nearer to a nuclear conflagration, my delegation believes that it would not be consistent with its principles and its statement in the general debate if it did not support the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev 2. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Chile, Democratic Kampuchea, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Malaysia, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Zaire, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2 was adopted by 67 votes to 18, with 37 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The Finnish delegation abstained on the draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2 on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe. In explaining my vote, I wish to state the following. Effective measures to eliminate or limit the threat of nuclear war require a minimum of understanding between the Powers which have those weapons at their disposal. The debate and the vote on the draft resolution demonstrate that that is not the case in the issue which the draft resolution addresses. On the contrary, deep divisions persist between the nuclear Powers on this issue. They stem from mutual suspicion and reflect the differing perceptions of the security requirements of those Powers and the military alliances.

The stand of the Finnish Government on nuclear weapons is clear. As one aspect of the prohibition of the use of force in accordance with the Charter, we are against the use of nuclear weapons. We are against all nuclear weapons, the spread of those weapons and their introduction to new areas. We are for nuclear disarmament, the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and non-use guarantees by nuclear-weapon States. We have tried to make an active contribution to those aims, and we shall continue to do so.

Mr. LEHNE (Austria): The Austrian delegation fully shares the conviction expressed in the first two paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2. We also firmly believe that to diminish the threat of an outbreak of nuclear war is the highest objective and most urgent task of the international community. But we have serious doubts whether the adoption of the draft resolution brings us any closer to this goal.

In the present situation of a high level of tension and an accelerating arms race, nuclear disarmament appears to us to be the only promising approach to diminish the risk of nuclear war. It is not through proposals or solemn declarations that the nuclear-weapon States can contribute to international security, but through an early agreement on significant limitations and reductions of their nuclear arsenals.

With regard to the concept of non-first-use of nuclear weapons, the Austrian delegation would like to emphasize that the prohibition of the use and threat of the use of force contained in paragraph 4 of Article 2 of the Charter covers all levels of force and all types of weapons. To formulate specific prohibitions of the use or first use of nuclear weapons can serve only to dilute the universal validity of this essential principle of the Charter. If all nations fulfill their obligations under paragraph 4 of Article 2, we need not fear nuclear war. If they do not, how can we hope that they will abide by prohibitions of the use of nuclear weapons?

For those reasons, the Austrian delegation had to abstain on the draft resolution.

Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovak delegation voted in favour of the Declaration on preventing a nuclear catastrophe, which has just been adopted, as we did with regard to other positive proposals designed to reduce the danger of war.

Voting positively on this important document, we should like to underscore once again our conviction that the task of preventing the outbreak of a nuclear war, the growing danger of which at present can hardly be doubted, is fully within the reach of States Members of the United Nations. In the course of the deliberations in our Committee the Czechoslovak delegation has already stressed that it regards the Declaration as an exceptionally timely international document of a profound political, moral and substantive significance.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

The practical value of the document consists in the fact that it shows a clear and navigable way towards removing the immediate danger of a nuclear conflict. Earlier this week, during his visit to Bonn, the Chairman of the the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, stated:

"In politics, situations occur in which a single false step can be fatal."

In our opinion, those words deserve the utmost attention.



(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

The Czechoslovak people and other peoples of the world were taught the painful lesson by history that one cannot completely rely on bare statements that peace at the current time is not threatened. The fact is that such proclamations may reflect wishful thinking rather than reality. Before the Second World War there were also quite a few politicians who, faced with the growing militarization of international life and with the obvious preparations for war, were reassuring the world public from the rostrum of the League of Nations with a deceptive feeling of security. Very soon they were proved wrong - at the cost of many tens of millions of human lives. Let this experience be not only a lesson but also a warning to us. After all, as is stressed in the draft declaration, "all the horrors of past wars ... would pale in comparison with what is inherent in the use of nuclear weapons".

It is of course possible to invent reasons and compile arguments against the draft declaration. We have had the opportunity to hear some of them in our Committee. However, is that the right course? We believe it is not. In today's situation the United Nations needs documents such as this - documents which tell the whole truth and which, without setting unrealistic and too distant objectives, also show practical ways of eliminating the existing danger.

We, on our part, believe that this practical way consists in taking concrete measures that would prevent the first use of nuclear weapons, as contained in the draft declaration just adopted. These totally realistic measures, figuratively speaking, cut off the most dangerous shoots growing out of the arms race. Beyond that, they, as we hope, can free the way towards other, more radical measures, including the complete and unconditional elimination of the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons and, above all, the total prohibition of these weapons in general and the elimination of their stocks. We wish to express our satisfaction that that important prerequisite, also has found fully adequate reflection in the text of the draft declaration.

We are therefore convinced that the draft declaration on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe reflects the fundamental interests and ideas of the overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations.

Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan): In its efforts towards achieving the universally accepted goals of disarmament, Pakistan has always attached primary importance to the total prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and to their limitation, reduction and eventual elimination. Towards that end we have consistently supported all measures, whether interim or long-term, regional or global in their scope. While emphasizing fully the total prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, Pakistan has also supported all efforts in that direction in the First Committee and in the Committee on Disarmament.

We consider that a declaration on the non-first use of nuclear weapons is a concept which, although falling short of the objective of total prohibition, can be a step in that direction. In this connexion we have always appreciated the unilateral declarations in the past about the non-first use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances. My delegation therefore agrees with the concept underlying the draft declaration contained in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2. We also agree with the thrust of its operative paragraph 4, which refers to the supreme duty and direct obligation of the leaders of nuclear-weapon States to act in such a way as to eliminate the risk of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict and calls for negotiations aimed at achieving that objective.

However, my delegation has problems with the language of the rest of the draft declaration which in our view detracts from its high purpose and its practical value. Our positive vote for draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2 is therefore an affirmation of the principle and the concept of non-first-use of nuclear weapons. It does not imply in any way our satisfaction with the language of the draft declaration contained in the draft resolution.

Mr. OSAI (Nigeria): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2 because of our genuine desire for general and complete disarmament with verifiable international guarantees. We believe that in order to save present and future generations from the scourge of another war mankind must endeavour not to develop and produce weapons of mass destruction, which no doubt would lead to the total annihilation of man himself. As we have always said in this Committee and all other international forums, the concept of a balance of terror which has led to the escalation of all military arsenals, particularly those of the super-Powers, is totally unacceptable to this delegation.

(Mr. Osah, Nigeria)

It is the view of this delegation, however, that the concept of first use, as contained in operative paragraph 1, is too restrictive and would tend to give a stamp of approval to any other user on the pretext that it was retaliating. We would have preferred a total prohibition and in that regard we wish to caution that, in future, such draft resolutions should be fully negotiated by all interested delegations, particularly if they are to be given the status of a solemn declaration. Our affirmative vote should therefore be seen as indicative of our total support for all disarmament measures.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): For an explanation of our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2, I wish to refer to my delegation's corresponding statement on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.29, which is largely relevant in this context too. Sweden shares the general view that a nuclear war will lead to a world-wide catastrophe. In order to prepare for a fruitful, in-depth discussion of this highly important matter at the second special session devoted to disarmament we have, together with other countries, sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43 on the prevention of nuclear war, which we hope will contribute to this purpose.

Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2. The central purpose of the draft resolution seeks to concentrate on deploring and preventing any decision taken for the first use of nuclear weapons. Our positive vote on this draft resolution does not deflect from our view that this and all disarmament proposals and measures should clearly be seen in the over-all context of the universally accepted goal of general and complete disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament.

Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): Jordan has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2 inspired by its unalterable conviction that any resort to nuclear war is a crime against humanity. That can never be repeated enough. It is, therefore, the more surprising that the voting has taken the form of polarization and politicization on an issue on which we are all universally agreed. Even though this resolution has been presented by the Soviet Union, I am sure that it could have been and might have been presented by the United States, by France, by any country.

As a non-aligned country, we have always been committed to the principle of the non-use of nuclear weapons, which would be a crime against humanity. I am sure that this feeling is shared by all countries and peoples in the world as we have seen expressed in increasing volume throughout the world.

There is one other consideration. I know that the super-Powers are sufficiently aware of the lethal consequences of destroying the world, but there are in some regions, particularly in my own region, a country which still think that a nuclear option is a feasible one. In the case of the two super-Powers, at least they have a system of deterrents. In our case it is nuclear annihilation or nuclear blackmail. In any event, since we are talking globally and not regionally, my only comment on the draft resolution, even though we supported it unreservedly without any value judgement and without casting aspersions on one super-Power or the other, is that operative paragraph 2 reads that "There will never be any justification or pardon for statesmen who would take the decision to be the first to use nuclear weapons". The question arises, would there be anyone alive to pardon or to accuse those who had first used nuclear weapons for the crime they had committed? I regret to say that there would not be anyone to do so.

Still it is my firm conviction that we should have many such resolutions. We are trying to formulate a world consensus in support of adopting an active attitude towards this deadly nuclear threat. Therefore, I cannot see why there should be polarization or politicization. I would vote for a hundred resolutions, no matter which country introduced them, so long as they reassert the basic fact that nuclear war is a crime against humanity.

It is also true that during the past several months we have been hearing some talk about limited war, and so on, which I believe is sheer nonsense. There can never be limited nuclear war because it would almost certainly escalate into global and total destruction.

Mr. ELFAKI (Sudan): My delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2, and in explanation of vote I should like to state that we support the principles underlying the draft resolution, particularly after the sponsor's acceptance of the Mexican amendment. However, the rather hurried way and the abrupt manner in which these principles have been formulated and presented made our abstention inevitable. We would have preferred that such an important issue and declaration be subjected to intensive consultations in order to ensure its acceptance by consensus or by an overwhelming majority. We share the views expressed by many delegations that such major issues of disarmament should be dealt with objectively and without the least element of distrust or propaganda.

Mr. YANGO (Philippines): My delegation is firmly opposed to the use of nuclear weapons and, therefore, voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2. We are in favour of nuclear-weapon-free zones all over the world, which could finally eliminate the use of nuclear weapons.

In the view of my delegation draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2 is in line with the principle which my delegation holds strongly against not only the non-use of nuclear weapons but also against the very development, production and stockpiling of nuclear weapons.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): The delegation of Ireland feels very strongly about the issues raised in the draft resolution put forward by the Soviet Union and contained in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.2. We believe quite simply that nuclear war would be disastrous to humanity. It follows very obviously that we do not ever want to see the first use or any use of nuclear weapons, and we believe firmly that the leaders of all countries should so act as to

(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

prevent such a catastrophe.

It will be clear from the statement we made earlier in the general debate in this Committee that we also support fully the sentiments in operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution, and in particular the call on the leaders of nuclear-weapon States to stop the nuclear arms race and reverse it by joint efforts through negotiations conducted in good faith.

Nevertheless, after consideration we have felt it necessary to abstain on the draft resolution before us. I should like to explain quite clearly why we have done so, in order to avoid any possible misunderstanding. It is evident that the danger of nuclear war now facing humanity and threatening its very survival derives from a nuclear arms race between two super-Powers, which has gone on over several decades. We set out in our statement in the general debate our view of that race and of the fears and suspicions which fuel it and give it momentum. We believe most strongly that it must be stopped and reversed, but we also know that leaders on either side of this arms race have developed and worked out particular strategic approaches based on their capacities and on their assessment of the areas of their own strength and weakness in this deadly competition. We find some of these theories and strategies, in so far as they publicly revealed, both frightening and dangerous, and we hope that those who rely on them will consider carefully the awful responsibilities they bear.

What we are faced with here is a proposal which contains some ideas with which we agree, but, nevertheless, a proposal presented before this Assembly by one of the two super-Powers engaged in this deadly race. We do not wish to question here the good faith of those who have put forward the proposal. We fully accept that they, like all of us, are appalled at the thought of nuclear war. We cannot, however, ignore the fact that the proposal has come from one side in a complex, dangerous and continuing confrontation in which a wrong move by either side would trigger disaster. Furthermore, we are aware that the ideas underlying the proposal are seen by the other side in this nuclear standoff as unbalanced, because they would give the advantage in over-all strategic terms to the country which has put forward the proposal.

(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

For this reason we are reluctant to enter into a contest of solemn proclamations in this Assembly, however much we may be in agreement with particular parts of such a proposal. Quite apart from the terms of this particular draft resolution and its contemporary context to which I have just referred, I might add that Ireland has consistently over the years placed the emphasis on the need for practical concrete measures rather than mere declarations in the disarmament area.



(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

As long ago as 1961, Ireland voted against a draft resolution which sought to declare the use of nuclear weapons a direct violation of the Charter and contrary to the rules of international law and the laws of humanity. On that occasion, the Irish representative said:

"We must express the gravest doubts as to the value of a declaration of this kind. Each nuclear Power may declare now that to use its nuclear weapons would be contrary to international law, but if its very survival were at stake it would not hesitate to use the most potent weapons available to it regardless of what declarations it had subscribed to." (A/C.1/PV.1193, p. 37)

He argued that we were not concerned with more limited measures such as prohibiting the use of poison gas, but with the very question of survival or annihilation of nations, and he said:

"It is contrary to the nature of things to expect any nuclear Power to respect a declaration of this kind." (Ibid., p. 38)

Again in 1978, and since, we have voted against such draft resolutions, not because we disagree with their sentiment, but because we consider that such an approach is impractical at best and, at worst, could create the illusion of security and thus deflect the attention of the international community and world opinion away from the need to negotiate the actual reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons.

We therefore clearly share the strong doubts already expressed by a number of other delegations, notably that of Austria, which have spoken before us, regarding the value of the proclamatory approach adopted in the present draft resolution. To avoid any misunderstanding, I should like again to summarize briefly our position on the present draft resolution. The Government of Ireland believes that the first use, or any use, of nuclear weapons would be disastrous for humanity, and we think that the build-up of such weapons must be halted and reversed as a matter of the greatest urgency. At this point, I cannot do better than quote the full text of operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution before us:

"It is the supreme duty and direct obligation of the leaders of nuclear-weapon States to act in such a way as to eliminate the risk of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict. The nuclear-arms race must be stopped and reversed by

(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

joint effort, through negotiations conducted in good faith and on the basis of equality, having as their ultimate goal the complete elimination of nuclear weapons".

We strongly believe that the course of action recommended in that paragraph, that is, serious negotiations, is the way to stop and reverse the arms race. It is precisely because that is our belief, and because of the proclamatory character of the text, that we have found it necessary in the circumstances I have explained to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to explain its vote, we shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1. The Committee also has before it an amendment proposed by Brazil and contained in document A/C.1/36/L.55. That amendment has been accepted by the sponsor of the draft resolution.

This draft resolution relates to agenda item 55, "General and complete disarmament: Study on conventional disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Denmark at the 28th meeting of the First Committee on 10 November. A recorded vote has been requested.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to inform the Committee on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1 as further revised are set out in documents A/C.1/36/L.51/Rev.1 and Add.1.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): The Bahamas delegation is of the opinion that there is no disagreement in principle regarding the necessity of a study on conventional weapons. Given this premise, any undue delay in carrying out the mandate of resolution 35/156 A could only lessen the possibility of initiating appropriate steps for effecting a better understanding of those measures that could curb the arms race in all its aspects. The operative part of the amended text before us presents a positive first step, and I trust that the other stages of action can be effected as soon as possible.

My delegation concurs with the views expressed yesterday on this draft resolution by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, particularly in the latter part of his remarks when he referred to the need for preserving a mandate for the expert group. I wish to emphasize that the experts referred to in the text need not be bound solely by guidelines issuing from the United Nations Disarmament Commission, but should also incorporate their own views, which cannot but make the final report more comprehensive.

Finally, the Bahamas delegation, in its support for the general purport of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1, sees no contradiction with that of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.4, which this Committee adopted without vote. In this regard, my delegation is convinced that an affirmative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1 would be tantamount to strengthening the mandate and the purpose of the Commission, as well as, more importantly, enhancing the feasibility of achieving general and complete disarmament.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): My delegation has had occasion, both in the course of the general debate and during consideration of specific draft resolutions, to put forward its views on the proposal initially made by the delegation of Denmark in document A/C.1/36/L.3.

In tackling the question of drawing up the general approach, scope and structure of a study on all aspects of disarmament relating to conventional weapons, we have cautioned against attempts to sidestep the United Nations Disarmament Commission, particularly since it had only last year been asked by the General Assembly to set out the general approach, scope and structure of such a study. We expressed our concern that nothing should be done which would be seen as affecting the credibility of the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body or in its discharge of the responsibility assigned to it by the General Assembly.

(Mr. Venkateswaran, India)

We note that draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3 as now revised has addressed some of these preoccupations. The draft now calls upon the United Nations Disarmament Commission to complete such consideration at its 1982 session. We sincerely hope that the Disarmament Commission will be in a position to accomplish the task of drawing up the general approach, scope and structure of such a study. We are firmly of the view that such a study should be undertaken only after these questions are fully discussed and agreed upon.

During the last session of the Disarmament Commission, my delegation presented its views in working paper A/CN.10/27 dated 20 May 1981, and that document had been considered, along with other working papers, by a working group of the Disarmament Commission under the chairmanship of the representative of the Bahamas. The Working Group had tried to arrive at agreement on the broad parameters for such a study, but unfortunately, given the time available, it was not possible to arrive at an agreed approach. We feel that the Disarmament Commission should now try to complete this task during the 1982 session so that an agreed approach to a study can be arrived at.

We wish to make it very clear that on the substantive question we cannot submit to any concept of a "conventional arms race" in which all or a majority of countries are supposedly engaged. It is a well known fact that it is the five or six most heavily armed States which have the largest and most increasingly sophisticated and growing arsenals of conventional weapons. Any call or analysis of the question of disarmament relating to conventional weapons should take this pre-eminent fact fully into account.

We feel that the limitation and reduction of conventional weapons must be pursued within the framework of progress towards general and complete disarmament and must adopt a global approach. The achievement of nuclear disarmament has universally been accorded the highest priority and the achievement of nuclear disarmament measures can under no circumstances be predicated upon progress in conventional disarmament. Attempts at promoting such concepts as "balance" or "linkage" as between nuclear and conventional weapons are misleading. The highest priority in disarmament negotiations has always been the elimination of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons. Any approach to the question of limitation and reduction of conventional weapons must therefore not lose sight of this correct and comprehensive perspective.

(Mr. Venkateswaran, India)

Any proposal for a study would clearly need to take into account the primary responsibility for disarmament that rests with States having the largest military arsenals and the fact that the vast proportion of conventional weapons, both in qualitative and quantitative terms, are produced, developed, retained and deployed by the nuclear-weapon States and their allies.

While the question of international trade in conventional weapons - or conventional arms transfers, as it is now euphemistically called - is being discussed, such a study should take into account all kinds of military alliance arrangements pertaining to conventional weapons which would need to be carefully gone into -- for example, gifts, offsets, deployment, prepositioning, coproduction, standardization and technological co-operation. It would be one-sided to consider merely those transfers of conventional weapons which affect the non-aligned and formerly colonially dominated countries and which continue to struggle in order to safeguard their hard won independence. Furthermore, such an analysis should not be restricted to the superficial aspects of the transfer of arms but must address the underlying causes that lead to the acquisition of arms by States. Consideration of the question of the limitation and reduction of conventional weapons should be based on the principle of ensuring the security of all States.

Not only is it essential that none of the alliance arrangements pertaining to conventional weapons are considered as being either sacred or beyond the pale of an objective, comprehensive study on conventional disarmament, but progress in measures relating to the limitation and reduction of conventional weapons between such States and their alliance arrangements would in fact constitute the indispensable first step towards strengthening peace and security in the world.

No article of the United Nations Charter can be invoked to prevent a probe into various military alliance arrangements, including military doctrines regarding conventional weapons; nor can shelter be taken behind the argument of lack of effective verifiability.

We believe that any partial discriminatory study of conventional disarmament, besides being seriously flawed, would lack credibility and serve no useful purpose. Given these arguments, my delegation will abstain in the vote.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation took a favourable view of the changes made in the draft resolution by the delegation of Denmark on the question of a study on conventional disarmament. At the same time, we find a reference in operative paragraph 3 of the Disarmament Commission's proposals to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly which sets forth a number of provisions relating to the scope and structure of a future study with which we cannot agree. The one-sided nature of those provisions, in our view, lies in the fact that they provide for the need for priority consideration to be given to the questions connected with various aspects of the conventional arms race: the nature of military alliances and political doctrines, questions connected with technological research and modifications in the realm of conventional weapons and so forth.

The accent in this is laid on the collection of data about conventional weapons and military alliances and not on producing and coming to agreement in the field of limiting and reducing conventional weapons.

However, it is precisely the task of promoting disarmament relating to conventional weapons that should be absolutely fundamental to and the primary goal of this proposed study. That is why we cannot express our support for the Danish draft resolution and we shall abstain in the vote on it.

At the same time, our delegation would like to state that it is ready to continue discussion of the question about the mandate of the Group of Experts in the course of the forthcoming session of the Group in 1982.

Mr. de la FUENTE (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): In an earlier statement before this Committee, the delegation of Peru said that it had serious reservations about the drafting and implications of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3 in its original version. With the amendments which have been introduced and accepted, which renew the mandate of the Disarmament Commission and make it possible for it to continue work until completion of an agreement and for proper consideration of the conclusions of a group of experts, my delegation now feels that this draft is acceptable. The intention of perfecting the study is now possible. This study must meet the interests of the entire



(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

international community in the area of disarmament. It would be ideal if a consensus could be achieved on this point. Peru will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1 and the amendment in A/C.1/36/L.55.



Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan): The Pakistan delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1 calling for the commissioning of a study on conventional disarmament. During the general debate, my delegation had the opportunity to express its view that the deep concern over the nuclear arms race should not obscure the dangers arising from an unbridled accumulation of conventional armaments, which has contributed and is contributing to a considerable measure to world tension and conflict, thus causing immense suffering to mankind.

The amended version of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1 has removed any ambiguity, if there was any, regarding the mandate of the Disarmament Commission to deliberate on the general approach of the proposed study and the actual commissioning of the study itself by the General Assembly.

My delegation considers that the expert group can benefit greatly from the useful paper in Annex 3 of the report of the Disarmament Commission, which was compiled by Mr. Hepburn of the Bahamas in his capacity as chairman of the Working Group set up during the 1981 session of the Commission with a view to elaborating the elements for a study on conventional disarmament. We also agree with the Brazilian amendment, which would provide the expert group the necessary flexibility in utilizing the guidelines considered at the 1981 session of the Commission.

During its 1982 session, the Disarmament Commission can do further work on the subject and transmit its recommendations to the expert group. We consider that a study on conventional disarmament, like the several studies already completed on various aspects of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, will contribute to a better understanding of the dangers of the conventional arms race and of possibilities for bringing it under restraint. My delegation will therefore support draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1.

Miss SEGARRA (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to make a few brief comments to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1, which was introduced by the representative of Denmark, Ambassador Michaelsen, yesterday afternoon. First of all, my delegation is pleased that, as the result of a frank and constructive dialogue, patient negotiations and, above all, a spirit of conciliation, practical and positive results can be achieved, which is what we all want in the area of disarmament.

May I congratulate the representatives of Egypt and Denmark on the efforts that they have made to harmonize opinions and to meet legitimate concerns which are shared by a large majority of countries regarding the need to safeguard the competence of the Disarmament Commission in matters entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

The delegation of Ecuador believes that the revised text of the draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1, particularly operative paragraphs 2 and 3, make it perfectly clear that this draft resolution is compatible with draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.4, sponsored by Egypt and adopted by consensus in this Committee. Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3 as amended, requests the Disarmament Commission to complete its consideration of the general approach to the study, its structure and scope its substantive session in 1982, and that the substantive work of the group of experts will begin only after the conclusion of the session to which I have just referred, and that the group will take into consideration such conclusions as the Commission may submit to it and the deliberations at the 1981 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, in particular reflected in paragraph 21 and Annex III of the report of that session. We hope that the Disarmament Commission will have the time to achieve a consensus and make a substantive contribution to the work of the group of experts.

(Miss Segarra, Ecuador)

Generally speaking, I should like to say that the delegation of Ecuador shares the concern which has been expressed in our debate regarding the conventional arms race. Due to the notable scientific and technological advances which have been made, these weapons have become more and more deadly and they are the basis for many conflicts which have afflicted mankind since the end of the Second World War. In addition, the manufacture and acquisition of these kinds of weapons represent a large proportion of military expenditures in the world and are a heavy economic burden on many developing countries.

My delegation believes that a study of this kind can contribute to a better understanding of and more information on, the various aspects of this disturbing arms race which, over and above the requirements of legitimate defence that we are witnessing in many areas of the world today.

I should like to take this opportunity to repeat the view of the delegation of Ecuador that, in the area of disarmament, priority should go to nuclear disarmament. That is the position that my country has taken, and it is reflected in the votes that we have cast on draft resolutions relating to the achievement of complete nuclear disarmament. In the light of these considerations, my delegation, which voted in favour of draft resolution A/35/156 A last year, will also vote in favour of A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1 as amended.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to remind the members of the Committee that a recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1, as amended, was adopted  
by 98 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes after the voting.

Mr. ECONOMIDES (Italy): My delegation supported and voted in favour of the draft resolution entitled, "Study on conventional disarmament", contained in document A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1, as it did last year in respect of resolution 35/156 A. The fact is that we firmly believe that a study on all aspects of conventional disarmament is of fundamental importance for the substantive clarification it can provide in an area still largely unexplored and where greater understanding is particularly important for the achievement of effective progress in the field of disarmament.

The draft resolution just adopted undoubtedly marks a step forward in our work on this matter. We note that operative paragraph 1 requests the Secretary-General to establish the group and that, in operative paragraph 3, the General Assembly agrees that the experts should pursue their work after the 1982 session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. While we would have preferred that the study be initiated immediately, we recognize the relevance of the suggestions aimed at giving the United Nations Disarmament Commission the opportunity to complete its work in 1982. On this basis, we will certainly contribute actively to reaching agreed conclusions in the Commission.

However, as I have already stated, should the United Nations Disarmament Commission experience difficulties in its work, we are confident that, on the basis of operative paragraph 3, the group of experts will be in a position to pursue its work, taking into consideration

"the deliberations at the 1981 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, in particular reflected in paragraph 21 and Annex III of the report of that session". (A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1, op. para. 3)

Mr. BUCBY (United States of America): The United States supports the objective of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1, as amended, and therefore voted in favour of it.

I should like to state for the record that, with regard to the financial implications of the study to be carried out pursuant to this draft resolution, we assume that the projected expenditures will be made without prejudice to the zero-growth budgetary policy of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1, as further revised by the incorporation of the Brazilian amendment, A/C.1/36/L.55.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.