



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 30TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. CARASALES (Argentina)
(Vice-Chairman)

UN LIBRARY

NOV 16 1982

CONTENTS

UN/SA COLLECTION

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 57, 133, 136, 138 AND 139 (continued)

Draft resolutions were introduced by:

Mr. Chanana (India) - A/C.1/37/L.2
Mr. Nawaz (Pakistan) - A/C.1/37/L.14 and L.13
Mr. Rossides (Cyprus)

* 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 (Acos 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.1/37/PV.30
13 November 1982

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 to 57, 133, 136, 138 AND 139 (continued)

Mr. CHANANA (India): The subject matter of the draft resolution which India has sponsored with Mexico in document A/C.1/37/L.2 is "prevention of nuclear war". What do we mean by nuclear war, and why should we single out nuclear war for prevention? By nuclear war we mean a war in which nuclear weapons would be used. The use of these weapons of mass destruction may well mean the annihilation of mankind.

Why is it that non-aligned, neutral States and other States outside the two major military alliances are anxious to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war? Because its consequences would also be catastrophic for them, their peoples and the environment that sustains them. These countries have, therefore, a direct and legitimate interest in the prevention of nuclear war.

In 1978 the General Assembly at its first special session on disarmament declared that nuclear war posed a threat to the survival of mankind and that the most acute and urgent task of the day was to remove the danger of nuclear war. What has the General Assembly done since then, in practical terms, to prevent nuclear war?

Let us first examine what the nuclear-weapon States have done to prevent nuclear war, for clearly they have a special responsibility in this regard. As far as we are aware, there are said to be agreements between them, including hot-line communications, providing for instant consultation for the purpose of avoiding nuclear war by accident or mistake. In addition, two nuclear-weapon States have given unilateral pledges of non-first use of their nuclear weapons. But these measures in themselves do not create confidence that a nuclear war can be prevented.

(Mr. Chanana, India)

On the contrary, the climate of mistrust, fear and suspicion has been growing with continuation of the nuclear arms race. Nuclear-weapon testing also continues. Further refinements in weapon technology and the doctrines of their use carry the inherent danger of nuclear war.

Bilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament have not reduced that danger. Proposals by non-aligned, neutral and other non-nuclear countries outside the two major military alliances for a nuclear freeze, a nuclear test ban, a convention on non-use of nuclear weapons, etc. have been rejected by some nuclear-weapon States, so that they cannot be implemented. The net result of all these efforts is an ever-increasing danger of nuclear war.

This situation is unacceptable to our countries. Not a single proposal made by us relating to nuclear disarmament has been implemented. Since we are unable to stop the nuclear arms race, we should at the very least try to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war. This is a responsibility that is shared by all Member States, which have been charged by the United Nations Charter with saving succeeding generations from another world war.

In General Assembly resolution 36/31 B, adopted on 9 December 1981, Member States were asked to give their views on measures for preventing a nuclear war. The replies received so far contain nothing that is reassuring. They are simply a reiteration of the well-known positions of the nuclear-weapon States and other States.

What should we do in these circumstances? Have we exhausted all avenues of thought and action? Is the outbreak of nuclear war to be determined only by one or two States with regard only to their own security? Is their security of such paramount importance that the security and survival of the majority of mankind has to be sacrificed? May the right of self-defence be exercised in a manner that will jeopardize the survival of all States and peoples? Are we to do nothing against the possibility of massive violations of all humanitarian principles and the laws of war?

Several members have stated that we should avoid rhetoric, that we should stop reaffirming old resolutions and that we should instead take concrete, practical and realistic action. Regrettably, those members have not indicated the nature of such action.

(Mr. Chanana, India)

Since we are unable at present to halt the nuclear arms race, the least that we could do is to explore practical and political measures and procedures designed to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war. It is not enough to have a common perception of danger. We need advice on special measures and procedures - practical, political and legal - designed for the collective control, management and resolution of critical or confrontational situations which could escalate to nuclear war, in addition to those already provided for in the Charter of the United Nations.

No proposals of this nature are contained in the replies from Member States and therefore, in the first instance we think that it would be desirable to enlist the assistance of a group of wise men - public personalities of great eminence, including statesmen, scientists, physicians, jurists, religious leaders, etc., about 10 or 12 of them - who could meet together, discuss the present unprecedented situation in all its aspects and advise the General Assembly on various practical, political and legal measures that could be used to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war. We should not hesitate to take advantage of the views and opinions of public personalities of great eminence. We should have the opportunity to examine their advice on a later occasion. In the absence of any other thinking so far on this question, it seems useful to enlist the co-operation and wisdom that is available outside the United Nations.

It is our earnest hope that the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.2 will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. NAWAZ (Pakistan): Indeed, the purpose of my statement today is to introduce two draft resolutions submitted by my delegation. The first relates to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, and has been circulated in document A/C.1/37/L.14. The second relates to the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and has been circulated in document A/C.1/37/L.13.

I shall deal first with the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. Paragraph 60 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session states:

"The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned constitutes an important disarmament measure." (Resolution S-10/2)

Nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization. Nuclear weapons and everything relating to them therefore demand special treatment. As the Treaty of Tlatelolco puts it, such weapons

"... whose terrible effects are suffered, indiscriminately and inexorably, by military forces and civilian population alike, constitute, through the persistence of the radioactivity they release, an attack on the integrity of the human species..." (A/C.1/946, p. 3)

We must therefore endeavour to widen the zones of the world in which nuclear weapons are outlawed until the territories of the States which persist in possessing them become, as it were, islands under quarantine.

The nuclear-weapon-free zone concept also offers a vast field for co-operation among all States to make an effective contribution to the strengthening of international security. Furthermore, it is through such collateral measures that smaller States can enhance their survival and security.

(Mr. Nawaz, Pakistan)

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world is by no means a substitute for a global and comprehensive approach to disarmament. Pakistan remains firmly of the view that the most effective guarantees against the danger of nuclear war and the use of nuclear weapons are nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. However, it must be recognized that over the years no real progress has been possible in our quest for a world free of nuclear weapons. Pakistan, like many other small and medium-sized countries, believes that we must remain undaunted by the setbacks that we have had to face. These must not lead us to passivity. We must continue to make every effort to reach disarmament agreements, whether at the multilateral or bilateral level, or global or regional approach

It is our belief that the generally recognized conditions for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone exist in South Asia. All the States of the region have declared their opposition to the acquisition of nuclear weapons and to their introduction into the region. The declaration made by individual South-Asian States not to acquire nuclear weapons have persuaded us that the stage had been set for initiating further action for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. We also believe that the proximity of nuclear-weapon Powers to a given region should not be an inhibiting factor for the creation of such zones. In fact, that should not militate against, but be yet another reason for, the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

The Pakistan delegation has submitted the draft resolution relating to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia against the background that I have just given and in the spirit that I have just indicated. It is our hope that it will receive the full support of this Committee. In both its preambular and operative paragraphs, the draft resolution follows the one adopted by the General Assembly last year.

The second draft resolution that I wish to introduce falls under agenda item 53, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". For many years Pakistan has actively and vigorously pursued the question of

(Mr. Nawaz, Pakistan)

concluding effective international arrangements for what have come to be described as negative security assurances. In our statement in this Committee on 29 October we referred to the existence of continually expanding nuclear arsenals, especially those of the major nuclear Powers. The existence of those weapons, we said, posed a threat to the very survival of both nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States. In such circumstances, the non-nuclear-weapon States have the right to refuse to become victims of nuclear war which they have not sought and which they want to prevent. The numerous initiatives taken by the non-nuclear-weapon States to prevent a nuclear catastrophe bear witness to our vigorous efforts in this regard.

The most effective assurance against the nuclear threat remains the complete prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and their eventual elimination. However, interim arrangements can also play an important role in allaying the legitimate concern of the non-nuclear-weapon States as regards threat to their security. Such assurances have become all the more essential since meaningful progress on nuclear disarmament does not appear likely in the foreseeable future.

Following the first special session on disarmament the Ad Hoc Working Group on Negative Security Assurances in the Committee on Disarmament recorded some progress on this subject during its 1979 and 1980 sessions. This held out the encouraging possibility that the Committee might be able to agree on the necessary elements that could lead to effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons before the second special session on disarmament.

(Mr. Nawaz, Pakistan)

However, the negotiations undertaken in the Ad Hoc Working Group established by the Committee for the purpose in 1981 proved unproductive. That is why the Group of 21, in a statement at that session, urged the nuclear-weapon States to review their policies and to present revised positions on the subject to the second special session on disarmament. The second special session regretfully also failed to register any progress. There was no response at all to the concerns of the Group of 21 from some of the nuclear-weapon States concerned.

The unilateral declarations made by some nuclear Powers in this regard do not adequately meet the concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon States. Those declarations in fact reflect the security concerns of the nuclear-weapon Powers themselves. As such they cannot constitute a meaningful response to the search of the non-nuclear-weapon States for security against the nuclear threat. My delegation continues to believe that assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States, in order to be effective, must be unconditional and of a legally binding nature.

The draft resolution submitted by my delegation and contained in document A/C.1/37/L.13 has been prepared exactly along the lines of resolution 36/95 adopted last year on the same subject. The draft resolution has been updated in its pre-ambular paragraphs by including a reference to the recommendations of the Thirteenth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers held at Niamey from 22 to 26 August 1982. In its operative paragraphs it appeals to the nuclear-weapon States to demonstrate the political will necessary to reach agreement which could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character. The draft resolution recommends that further intensive efforts should be devoted to the search for a common formula and that various alternatives presented in this regard should be further explored in order to overcome the present difficulties.

My delegation believes that the objective of concluding effective **international** arrangements on the subject which has also been endorsed by the Final Document needs to be pursued with continued determination. It is therefore the hope of my delegation that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.13 will receive the unanimous support of this Committee.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Today I am introducing a draft resolution that is being cosponsored by other Member States and I shall explain its purpose.

It first recalls General Assembly resolutions 34/83 A of 11 December 1979, 35/156 J of 12 December 1980 and 36/97 J of 9 December 1981. The purpose of those resolutions was to promote the concept of international collective security through the United Nations as the important means for moving towards productive negotiations on disarmament and that the two efforts should be made in parallel.

Now

"Viewing with concern the aggravation of the deteriorating world situation which has reached the lowest possible ebb of understanding and co-operation for peace and security, thus making the survival of mankind extremely precarious," we are

"Alarmed by the recent repeated acts of aggression and the manifest incapacity of the United Nations" - and this is the important part - "to take decisive action, thus bringing into sharp focus the reality that the Security Council finds itself devoid of the means to give effect to its decisions, even unanimous." - in violation of the vital aspects of the Charter.

"Gravely concerned over the continuing stagnation in the disarmament effort, while the arms race has been rapidly escalating with threatening consequences,"

and here I should like to make a few explanations.

It is a matter of fact that the disarmament efforts started immediately after the end of the First World War and the arms race began soon after the end of the Second World War, with the establishment of the United Nations. This is a reality that is very significant, for the League of Nations presented peace as depending on the reduction of armaments and made such reduction binding on Member States on the basis of plans to be submitted by the League Council to the Members for their consideration and action.

Therefore, according to the Covenant, peace and security would flow from disarmament. No mention was made in the Covenant about international security, nor was there any Security Council in the League of Nations. The concept of international security was almost unknown to it. The consequence was that the League of Nations failed lamentably, and as a result there was no progress on disarmament whatsoever, there being no international security to make such progress possible.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Therefore the drafters of the Charter and founders of the United Nations in their wisdom and foresight radically changed that course. Disarmament was not made obligatory for Members and this is important .. as was the case with the Covenant, but was expected to flow from the system of collective security through the United Nations, and that system was made obligatory on Member States. The application of that system would render disarmament possible. Thus the negative concept of destroying weapons for peace was replaced by the positive concept of international collective security, which was made the main purpose of the United Nations, and this was necessary in order to sustain the main principles of the Charter, namely, the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations, as provided in Article 2 (4), which was followed by Article 2 (5) referring to enforcement action for the purpose of its effectiveness.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Since the establishment of the United Nations, these basic Charter provisions for a system of international security out of which disarmament will flow have not been adequately respected. The United Nations thus became meaningless in its primary purpose, and the Security Council, the main organ for international peace and security, has been left without the ability to take effective decisions. This goes fundamentally to the very function of the United Nations. For it is of vital importance that, in a world that has reached the present state of insecurity and anarchy, the United Nations should be made to function effectively. In this Committee and in the United Nations, we bear relevant responsibility if we remain silent in face of these realities.

In my humble submission, as the representative of a small country, I wish to point out that we are on a course leading to anarchy and destruction and that we already have clear indications of that course, on the one hand with regard to the intensification of the arms race within the new notions of supposedly limited nuclear war, and mini-nukes tending to make the concept of nuclear war acceptable, and on the other hand with regard to its preventing any progress on disarmament, as evidenced by the fact that over the past 35 years we have witnessed the staggering escalation of the arms race and the stagnancy of disarmament efforts. Are we going to continue in the same way to procrastinate and put off until next year in order to receive the opinions of States or make further studies? What is the purpose of procrastination when we are faced with the reality that the Charter is not being complied within its essential elements? That is the purpose of this draft resolution - to take insofar as possible and within the required time, remedial measures to enable the United Nations effective in its functioning and the Security Council an organ for international security in the real sense of the word.

Therefore, the draft resolution states that we are

"Gravely concerned over the continuing stagnation in the disarmament effort, while the arms race has been rapidly escalating with threatening consequences,"

and it goes on to note that we have become conscience of the need for a new approach to the whole problem of disarmament by rendering operable the collective security system provided for in the Charter parallel to the disarmament endeavour. The draft resolution continues:

"Convinced that to this end the first step is to restore to the Security Council its meaningfulness by making effective its decisions for the maintenance of international security and peace, as required by the Charter."

All we have to do is to comply with the Charter, which we all praise, and consider our solemn dedication to it as sacred. Let us do so in practice.

The draft resolution goes on:

"Recognizing that this process would create the necessary conditions for the cessation of the arms race and would facilitate productive negotiations on a comprehensive programme of disarmament" -

and here I wish to state most emphatically that we support all measures towards successful negotiations on disarmament and that we greatly appreciate the steps taken by Ambassador Garcia Robles, the representative of Mexico and Nobel laureate for his disarmament work. We support all such efforts for direct disarmament, and wish they could be productive. But we see that those efforts have certainly not been successful for dozens of years now. It is felt necessary, therefore, to consider national and positive steps to make those negotiations productive. To this end, parallel to disarmament efforts, there must be progress for international security through the effective implementation of the Security Council's decisions as the basis for rendering operable the security system provided for in the Charter.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The draft resolution continues:

Recognizing further that such an approach in its unfoldment would engender a climate of confidence in the United Nations thereby initiating a stable détente that would harmonize the actions of nations more significantly among the major Powers .. for co-operation towards peace and survival,

Recalling further the Concluding Document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly, stressing 'the need of strengthening the central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and the implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations' and in accordance with the Final Document,

Noting with deep appreciation the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization in which, inter alia, he emphasized that 'our most urgent goal is to reconstruct the Charter concept of collective action for peace and security so as to render the United Nations more capable of carrying out its primary function',

Noting further that the report appeals to all Governments to make a serious effort for a more stable system of collective international security and warns of 'the very great perils from failing to develop such a system', and further suggests that 'consideration should be given to the usefulness of holding a meeting of the Security Council at the highest possible level' to discuss in depth some of the relevant problems,

"1. Commends the forthright report of the Secretary-General on the existing capacity of the Organization to keep the peace in compliance with the Charter, thus opening the way to the cessation of the arms race, and disarmament;

"2. Urges the Secretary-General to take the needed initiatives within his authority under Article 99 of the Charter referred to in his report" and

"Endorses the suggestion of the Secretary-General made in the report that the Security Council hold an early meeting at the highest possible level to discuss in depth some of these problems".

The operative part of the draft resolution, therefore, is designed in the first place to strengthen the Secretary-General's laudable efforts to improve the situation by bringing to the urgent attention of the Security Council the need for consideration of the best means that would improve the effectiveness of the Security Council's decisions with a view to rendering operative the security system provided for in the Charter.

The remaining paragraphs in the draft resolution are self-explanatory since they are a follow-up of the main line of the previous resolutions mentioned in the preamble of the draft resolution.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

In the second part of the draft resolution the General Assembly

"Recommends that the Security Council - and more significantly its permanent members - proceed to the necessary measures in a sense of urgency for the effective implementation of the decisions of the Council in accordance with the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security;"

In paragraph 5, it

"Calls upon all Member States to join in rendering operative the system of collective security, as provided for in the Charter."

This is the draft resolution that we very humbly submit to this Committee for its consideration. In essence, it is to meet the present dangers; that is our primary and urgent task at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Chairman of this Committee announced on Friday that, following a request by the representative of Mexico, he intended to put to the vote today draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.12 submitted by the delegations of Mexico, Sweden, Indonesia and Yugoslavia. The Chairman has asked me to announce that he is engaged in consultations regarding the vote on this draft resolution and therefore the vote will not be taken today. The date for that will be announced later.

Mr. LENNUYEUX-COMNENE (France) (interpretation from French): Before you adjourn this meeting, Mr. Chairman, I should like to know whether you can tell us under which item of the agenda the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Cyprus is to be considered. At the conclusion of his statement he mentioned the implementation of General Assembly resolutions, and it is my understanding that he has asked for a special agenda item to be included on this question.

(Mr. Lennuyeux-Commene, France)

I should like to know whether the draft resolution was put forward on the initiative of Cyprus under an item heading which has not yet been approved by the General Assembly, or whether it will be considered under an existing agenda item of the First Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Since the text of the draft resolution put forward by the representative of Cyprus has not yet been handed in to the Secretariat, I should like to ask him to reply to the query of the representative of France, either now or at a later meeting.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): This Committee is working on disarmament and related international security matters, and the subject comes within that context. If I am asked under which item it comes, I say that it embraces all the items, because it includes basic provisions for moving towards disarmament. If anyone would like further particulars they will be provided later.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I am sure that there will be further opportunities to make clear under which specific agenda item this draft resolution will be considered.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.