

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



FIRST COMMITTEE  
51st meeting  
held on  
Monday, 27 November 1978  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 51ST MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATION OF WORK (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 125: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS  
ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION: REPORT OF THE  
SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

---

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/33/PV.51  
28 November 1978

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: As representatives will recall, this morning we will commence the voting procedure on the 40 or more draft resolutions and amendments which have been presented to this Committee. It is the intention of the Chair that this procedure be concluded during this week. For that purpose the Chair had occasion at our previous meeting to outline some preliminary ideas on how to make the voting as efficient as possible, thus enabling the Committee to discharge its duties efficiently. I shall not repeat all those considerations. Most of them were of a general nature. I wish to repeat at this time the core of the suggestions for the voting procedure which is as follows: that the Committee proceed to vote from top to bottom, so to speak. The draft resolutions would be taken up in the order of items and within the items in the order in which they have been presented to the Committee, in accordance with rule 131 of the rules of procedure.

We will, therefore, begin this morning with the draft resolutions presented under item 125. It is the hope of the Chair that we can conclude the consideration of, and decisions, on those draft resolutions in three meetings and finish by noon Tuesday in order to dispose of item 128 on Tuesday afternoon, and then go on in the prescribed order to other draft resolutions presented under items 35 through 49. At the end of the Friday meeting, the representative of Mexico, Ambassador Garcia Robles, was kind enough to suggest that representatives reflect on these suggestions during the weekend and that we take them up again first thing this morning.

Does any delegation wish to make comments, observations, suggestions or proposals? As there are none, I should like to emphasize again the flexibility of the Chairman at all times. In the interests of a more orderly procedure, at least for the first two days, I would suggest that we work on the basis of the Chair's suggestion.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 125 (continued)

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION (A/33/42, A/33/279, A/33/305, A/33/312, A/33/317)

The CHAIRMAN: We shall take up first for consideration and decision under item 125, "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session", the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.1 entitled "Military and nuclear collaboration with Israel". This draft resolution is sponsored by 37 countries.

Mr. BLUM (Israel): The submission by Iraq of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 to this Committee is, per se, a breach of a long-standing tradition and of a tacit understanding which permitted the First Committee of the General Assembly to devote itself entirely to the many aspects of disarmament as a global problem that could be solved only by the joint effort of all Member States.

The First Committee has hitherto refused to be drawn into the contesting claims about armament of any of the parties to the many international disputes that exist among Member States; although, for example, serious differences in the approach to disarmament are known to exist between different Powers, no draft resolution has ever been submitted here to censure any Power, though all sides have their sympathizers and allies represented in this Committee.

It is not my wish to enumerate the Member States that are currently involved in bitter disputes with each other or have been so for decades; or Member States that are actually in a state of armed conflict with one another. If each of these States were to submit draft resolutions demanding United Nations initiative to disarm the other, the proceedings of this Committee would degenerate into a sad political farce.

The Iraqi draft resolution, by asking the General Assembly to side with one party to the Arab-Israel dispute undermines therefore the very foundations upon which the United Nations rests its claim to speak for all mankind in the matter of disarmament.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1, without its political cosmetics, is very simply Iraq's appeal to Member States of the United Nations to ensure the disarmament of Israel. Indeed there is no doubt that Iraq would like to see Israel disarmed, preferably totally disarmed. This Committee should bear in mind that draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1, calling for an arms embargo on Israel, has been submitted by a Member State which not only considers itself to be in a state of war with Israel, but has also formally declared Israel's destruction to be its official goal. As members of the Committee will recall, Iraq declared war on Israel immediately on the establishment of the State of Israel and invaded Israel, together with other Arab armies, the next day. It refused to sign an armistice agreement with Israel, and still regards itself as being in a state of war with Israel.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

In June 1977 the Iraqi President Ahmad Hasan Al-Bakr asserted that.

"Efforts of the forces of peace, progress and revolution in the world must be consolidated ... to support the liquidation of the racist Zionist entity so as to build a democratic society."

Iraq has, in addition, rejected all United Nations efforts towards a peaceful settlement of the Israel-Arab dispute. Iraq rejected Security Council resolution 242 (1967), when it announced on 16 April 1969:

"Iraq affirms today the rejection of United Nations resolution 242 and all plans based on it, whether they come from inside or outside the Arab land, and no matter who has helped draft them."

On 22 October 1973, when the Security Council called for a cease-fire in the Yom Kippur War, the Baghdad Government announced:

"Iraq does not consider itself a party to any resolution, procedure or measure in armistice or cease-fire agreements or negotiations or peace with Israel, now or in the near future." (The New York Times, 28 November 1973)

More recently, the Iraqi Information Minister Qasim Hammudi, in an interview given to the newspaper Al-Qabas of 7 October 1978, reaffirmed that Iraq rejects any settlement based on United Nations Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). And even more recently, the Iraqi ambassador in New Delhi had the following to say at a Press conference reported by the Middle East News Agency on 24 October 1978:

"Iraq does not accept the existence of a Zionist state in Palestine ... the only solution is war."

This draft resolution must therefore be judged in the light of Iraq's official policy. In other words, this draft resolution, by demanding an arms embargo on Israel, is intended to pave the way for Iraq to accomplish its declared aim of destroying Israel. It also, in effect, asks all Member States to aid and abet Iraq in this gravest contravention of everything the Charter stands for.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

If adopted, the draft resolution would fly in the face of Article 51 of the Charter, which recognizes the inherent right of self-defence of Members of the United Nations. Similarly, by attempting to deprive Israel of this inherent right, it would violate the principle of the sovereign equality of all Members of the Organization which is inscribed in Article 2 (1) of the Charter

For this Committee to be able to appraise better the utmost gravity of this draft resolution, may I resort very briefly to an analogy taken from the lives of private individuals. A person harbouring a grudge against his neighbour decides to gang up with some of his friends with a view to murdering him. They manage to acquire a wide assortment of weapons - submachine guns, hand grenades, explosives, daggers, and so on. As they proceed with their preparations to carry out their criminal design they discover, much to their indignation, that their would-be victim keeps at his home a pistol for the defence of himself and his family. Outraged by this display of intolerable arrogance on the part of their intended victim, the entire group of bullyboys and thugs decide to petition the local police chief with a view to getting their intended target disarmed, so that they can carry out their criminal design without any risk and without any obstruction on the part of their victim.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Does the scenario I have just described seem absurd to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the members of the Committee? Yes, indeed it is. Do we recoil from condoning such a course of action in our private lives? Undoubtedly yes.

Yet that is precisely what the Iraqi draft resolution would have the General Assembly condone on the international plane. Here we have Iraq, the author and sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1, openly and unashamedly committed to the destruction of Israel. It and a number of other States equally inspired by this lofty and noble aim, discover much to their disgust, that the intended target is unwilling to oblige them and is determined to resist their criminal design. Feigning a sense of outrage, they therefore approach the world Organization, the Charter of which imposes on its Members the duty to refrain from the threat or use of force against another State, and commits the Organization to promoting the maintenance of international peace and security. Blandly and unashamedly they request that the world Organization recommend the disarming of their intended victim so as to facilitate the implementation of their illegal and openly avowed goal - the liquidation of a Member State of the United Nations.

It is a measure of the decline of the moral standards prevailing in this Organization that Member States dare even to contemplate submitting formally a draft resolution of such a preposterous and sinister nature. If such a resolution were in fact adopted that would clearly have to be regarded as yet another step in the all too well-known process of recent years of drawing the United Nations further and further away from the noble aims and principles enunciated in its Charter.

For many centuries the Jewish people suffered the fate of being the defenceless and disarmed victim of the bully boys and thugs of succeeding generations of international society. It was this state of defenceless that lay at the root of Jewish martyrdom that in our generation culminated in the bloodbath carried out by the Nazi fascist beast and cost the lives of one third of my people - 6 million innocent human beings, including 1.5 million children. Let me remind the Iraqi representative and the Committee that one of the staunch collaborators of Nazi Germany during that dark period of world history was the régime of Rashid Ali al-Khailani, Prime Minister of Iraq, under whose rule there also occurred the notorious anti-Jewish excesses and pogroms in Baghdad and elsewhere in Iraq.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

When, after many generations of statelessness, the Jewish people re-established the State of Israel in 1948, we vowed that that would mark the end of the state of defencelessness that had been the fundamental cause of the tragedy of my people and that the present-day bully boys of international society would have to realize that they could no longer engage with impunity in their assaults on Jewish lives and Jewish dignity. Apparently some of them do not like this change that has occurred in the status of the Jewish people. Supported by all those who have consistently fomented trouble in the Middle East and are now opposed to the peace-making process there, they would like again to reduce the Jewish people to that state of defencelessness that it shook off with the restoration of Jewish statehood in the land of Israel. Let the word therefore go forth clear and loud from this place: the days of Jewish defencelessness are for ever over, and the State of Israel is determined to resist every assault on its existence and its integrity.

In its preamble the Iraqi draft asks the General Assembly to be "gravely concerned over the continued and rapid Israeli build-up". I agree that there is good cause for the General Assembly's concern about an arms build-up and the acquisition within a very brief period of time of the most sophisticated weaponry on a scale unprecedented in the history of mankind. I am referring to the arms build-up on the part of most Arab States. This is not a statement made in the thrust of a debate to contest what has been said by the representative of Iraq. I propose that we leave the world of propagandistic claims and concentrate on cold figures presented by neutral sources of international repute.

The over-all picture is staggering. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) and the International Institute of Strategic Studies, in London, orders placed by Arab States since 1977, for arms to be supplied by 1980, so far amount to \$35 billion.

These days we live in a period of international inflation, and we may have lost our ability to gauge the relative value of nearly astronomical sums. To give these figures some tangible scale, suffice it to say that this sum would at present price levels, provide the United Nations with a regular budget for the next 70 years.

In this connexion it may not be out of place to mention that all those Arab States that have placed orders for the delivery of \$35 billion-worth of arms contribute less than 1 per cent of the United Nations budget.



(Mr. Blum, Israel)

If one were to pursue this method of comparison, and as this draft resolution refers to the Middle East, one may also be reminded that the annual budget of the United Nations Relief Works Agency (UNRWA) is \$139.8 million. In other words, 1 per cent of the amount now earmarked for arms by some Arab States would suffice to provide UNRWA with its budget for two and a half years, whereas less than one fifth of that enormous sum would secure total resettlement for all Arab refugees.

In terms of arms, this \$35 billion means hundreds of the most sophisticated combat aircraft, each so expensive that even some States permanent members of the Security Council that are the producers and exporters of some of these new types of aircraft can only afford to supply their own armies with relatively few of them.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Arab armies will, in the next 14 months, have hundreds of these planes. The same applies to thousands of tanks, armoured personnel carriers, thousands of the most sophisticated missiles of all kinds, communication systems and all the military infrastructure that goes with the maintenance of this military juggernaut.

It is important to bear in mind that this \$35 billion worth of arms is merely an addition to the existing formidable arsenal already at the disposal of six Arab States, which either have been directly involved in the five armed conflicts with Israel in the last 30 years, or which have openly declared their willingness to furnish any Arab States willing to attack Israel with the necessary matériel.

There exist today three systems of gigantic military alliances in the world: the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Warsaw Pact States and the Arab States. In terms of possession of certain types of military hardware the Arab States are fast reaching a point of parity - though not always of functional equivalence - with either NATO or the Warsaw Pact States. In certain types of weapons the total Arab strength has already exceeded either NATO or the Warsaw Pact States.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to go into some detail. The Permanent Representative of Israel, in his address at a plenary meeting of the recent special session had the following to say:

"... the Arab States have today 500,000 more men under arms and three times the artillery of the combined NATO forces. They also have 3,000 more tanks and several hundred more combat aircraft than NATO. What we call the Eastern front - Syria, Iraq, Jordan and Saudi Arabia - is alone currently equivalent to NATO in manpower and tanks, and already has twice as much artillery. By 1980 the air power of the Arab States will equal the combined Warsaw Pact forces and constitute double the air power of NATO and three times that of the People's Republic of China. In terms of ground forces, the Arab States have almost as many tanks as the United States of America and more artillery than the United States of America." (A/S-10/PV.12, pp. 62, 63)

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Among the modern arms at their disposal are the following: combat aircraft: MIG-23, Sukhoi-20, F-15, Mirage-5, F-5E; advanced bombers TU-22, Mirage-F-1 and Skyhawk; tanks: T-72, T-62, T-55, M-60, Chieftain, Leopard and Centurion, armoured carriers: M-113; helicopters, transport: Gazelle armed with "hot" missiles, C-130, Chinook and Super-Frelon; submarines: Russian-built F-class submarines, Komar and Osa missile boats, PR-72 fast patrol boats; air defence: SAM-6, SAM-3, SAM-2, Crotale and Hawk; anti-tank Missiles: Swingfire, Milan, Tow and Dragon; missiles: ground-to-ground SCUD and FROG.

If one takes a closer look at the arms build-up of Iraq, the initiator of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1, the following picture emerges: In the period between 1973 and 1978 Iraq doubled its army divisions. Their armoured units have been reinforced by the addition of 1,000 advanced tanks T-62 and T-72. Similarly, more than 1,000 armoured personnel carriers have been introduced into various infantry units of the Iraqi army. The strength of Iraq's artillery has been increased by 50 per cent. The number of ground-to-air missile batteries has jumped from 3 in 1973 to 50 in 1977, while 9 ground-to-ground SCUD launchers have been added to Iraq's missile power. The number of helicopter and missile boats has been tripled within the same period. This frantic drive in the acquisition of novel means of destruction has made Iraq today the most heavily armed Power in the Arab world.

It can, therefore, be said that over the past five years the arms acquisition by Arab States has outstripped both NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries in the ratio of their arms build-up.

Who is this enormous arsenal of arms directed against? Hardly against NATO or the Warsaw Pact countries. If one is to confine oneself solely to official statements of Arab Governments, there can be no shadow of doubt that some Arab States are investing their inflated oil revenues to acquire such an overwhelming superiority of arms against Israel as to be able to overrun it without undue risk.

Israel believes in its ability, if attacked, to resist this Goliath, as it did in days of old and more recently. However, since draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 wishes the General Assembly to express its concern about the arms build-up of David - not that of Goliath - some figures of comparison between the two will have to be quoted.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

The military confrontation of the Arab countries with Israel is truly monstrous in its disproportion. Their population numbers over 100 million - Israel's population is 3 million. They occupy a territory of 5,378,000 square miles - in other words, a territory the size of the whole of Europe and Russia, up to the Ural mountains, or, to put it differently, a territory roughly 50 per cent larger than the territory of the United States or China. By contrast, Israel's territory is approximately the size of the state of Maryland or New Hampshire.

Among the Arab States there are some of the richest countries in the world with a per capita income equal to or higher than that of the United States, outstripping in wealth and financial power some of the most industrialized countries in the world. A large amount of this income is, as I have pointed out, being spent on armament.

Though the representative of Israel in this Committee and in the plenary meetings of the special session had occasion in the past to refer to the following figures, it is of interest to recall the exact extent of Arab superiority, of only the so-called confrontation States, over Israel in the possession of modern armament and manpower by 1980, that is, merely 14 months from now. For the armed forces the ratio will be 6 to 1; for combat aircraft, 3.8 to 1, for tanks, 3.6 to 1; for artillery, 10 to 1; for surface-to-air missile batteries, 20 to 1.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

If the Vice-President of the United States of America felt obliged to express his concern at the special session over the balance of forces between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact countries, what should Israel's reaction be to these ratios of manifest imbalance between Israel and the Arab States?

If the United Nations had been that impartial tribunal of international equity its founders had hoped it would become, there would indeed have been a case for the United Nations to adopt a draft resolution asking the General Assembly to express its concern over the world's most gigantic acquisition of arms on the part of Arab States. The General Assembly would have been justified in expressing its alarm over the Arab arms build-up because, quite apart from the Israel-Arab dispute, the presence of so much powder so close to so much oil is indeed a cause for world concern.

Yet, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 does not call on the General Assembly to express grave concern over this colossal Arab arms build-up; it does not recognize "that the continued escalation" of Arab armament "constitutes a threat to international peace and security". No, it merely substitutes the word "Israel" for the word "Arab" and thus asks the General Assembly to become a party to an outrageous political hoax - a political hoax because the extent of Arab military superiority over Israel in terms of arms is not a secret; it is common knowledge, especially to a Committee of the General Assembly in which the representatives of Member States are no strangers to military statistics.

Last month, Syria and Iraq, citing the "great dangers" of the Camp David accords, announced that they had agreed to shelve their longstanding, often bloody differences and work together towards what they called a full military union against Israel.

The plans for military co-operation came under a so-called national charter for joint action signed at the end of a visit to Baghdad by Syrian President Hafez Assad. It is thus evident that Iraq's military potential must now be added to that of other States directly threatening Israel's security.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Much has been made by the representative of Iraq of the size of the Israel military budget. True, it was the biggest per capita -- I repeat, per capita -- military budget in the world. It is not any more. We have been overtaken by Saudi Arabia. Even so, it is much bigger than any Israeli would wish it to be. I doubt that there is another country in the world that is obliged to spend nearly 30 per cent of its gross national product on defence. Yes, my countrymen carry a very heavy burden. We would be very happy if we could devote much more of our resources to development, education and social welfare. However, if the tone adopted by some Arab representatives in this Committee is any indication of their countries' intentions towards Israel, it is little wonder that the Israel taxpayer has to carry so heavy a burden in order to survive.

In the course of the last year, institutions whose business it is to record figures relating to military budgets have taken note of an important development in this sphere in the Middle East. The London International Institute for Strategic Studies, in a publication entitled Military Balance 1978-1979, shows Israel spending \$3.13 billion on defence as compared to \$4.2 billion in the previous years. This represents a reduction of the military budget of Israel by 23 per cent, even if we disregard the depreciation in the value of United States currency.

Now, this Committee has for years been studying ways and means of reducing military budgets, and we all know the differences of opinion existing in this Committee on the modalities of how to effect these reductions. However, even if one were to use the more simplistic yardstick advocated by the Soviet Union, namely, the reduction of all military budgets by 10 per cent, Israel could be said to have exceeded this requirement by more than 100 per cent. In fact, Israel is, to the best of my knowledge, the only, or one of the very few countries in the world that can be said to have complied with the terms of resolution 32/85.

This little publicized fact is even more remarkable if one takes into account that this reduction has been decided on in spite of the feverish arms build-up on the part of some Arab countries.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

In an obvious ploy to assure African support for its draft resolution, Iraq has accused Israel of collaboration with South Africa in the nuclear field. This has been done before, and this allegation is included in a resolution adopted by the General Assembly. Given the automatic voting majority at the disposal of the Arab States, the presence of an accusation against Israel in a resolution of the General Assembly also ensures its almost automatic adoption, although, of course, it is in itself no proof of its veracity.

The circle thus created is truly vicious. First, an accusation - however unfounded and however untrue - is railroaded through the General Assembly; later, the authors of the slander need only quote a United Nations resolution to substantiate, as it were, their originally false allegations.

The Special Rapporteur of document E/CN.4/Sub.2/383/Rev.1, submitted to the Third Committee, is forced to admit on the matter of alleged co-operation between Israel and South Africa in military matters and in the nuclear field that "hard evidence that is not officially denied by one or both sides is difficult to come by". It is difficult to come by because it does not exist, except in the minds of those who stand to gain politically if their allegations are accepted.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

I should like to refer to the contents of the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1. What I have to say has been said repeatedly by representatives of Israel.

The Government of Israel has stated on several occasions that it would not be the first to introduce nuclear weapons into the Middle East. That is an official Government statement. It is an official undertaking of which responsible quarters the world over have duly taken note.

Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan, addressing the thirty-second session of the General Assembly last year, called on Israel's Arab neighbours

"to join it in direct negotiations with a view to establishing a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East." (A/32/PV.27, p. 71)

Mr. Dayan went on to say:

"Israel firmly believes that such negotiations should lead to the conclusion of a formal, contractual, multilateral convention between all the States of the region, on the lines of such notable precedents as the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America and the proposals for similar agreements in the areas of South Asia and the South Pacific. Unfortunately, the Arab States have totally rejected this call by Israel which, after all, is in the interests of all the people of the Middle East. On this occasion I repeat our proposal." (Ibid.)

On the general issues of disarmament, my Foreign Minister had the following to say in the course of the general debate in October:

"Israel is prepared to play its part in the reduction of the arms race and remains ready to enter into agreements on arms limitation with all States in the Middle East. There is no doubt, however, that the appropriate way to bring about an arms reduction in the Middle East is through peace treaties which would include limitations on armaments within their framework. Indeed, the mere transformation from a state of war to one of peace will move the States involved to dedicate their resources to economic development rather than military aims." (A/33/PV.26, p. 36)



(Mr. Blum, Israel)

I should like to add to my Government's official announcements a quotation from the preamble of an agreement reached between Egypt and Israel on 17 September of this year for a framework of peace in the Middle East. It reads as follows:

"Security is enhanced by a relationship of peace and by co-operation between nations which enjoy normal relations. In addition, under the terms of peace treaties, the parties can, on the basis of reciprocity, agree to special security arrangements such as demilitarized zones, limited armaments areas, early warning stations, the presence of international forces, liaison, agreed measures for monitoring, and other arrangements that they agree are useful."

The statements of the Government of Israel and the extract from the Camp David agreement which I have just quoted can be summed up as follows: It has been said that before disarmament can relax world tensions, world tensions will have to be relaxed to provide a propitious setting for disarmament. Israel's contribution to the reduction of tensions and to providing a propitious setting for disarmament in the Middle East has been threefold.

First, on a unilateral level, Israel has considerably reduced its military budget. The reduction of military budgets has been urged in this Committee, not only because it would signify a halt in the world's arms race, but also because of its beneficial psychological impact in areas of international tension. The Middle East is, prima facie, an area of international tension and Israel invites Iraq, the prime mover of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1, and all other Arab States, to follow suit and similarly cut their budgets by over 20 per cent. If they do so, it will be a considerably greater contribution to world peace than all the grandiose speeches in support of disarmament that we so often hear from the Arab side in this Committee.

Second, on a multilateral level, Israel has come out with a certain proposal towards the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. To our regret this proposal has been rejected out of hand by Arab Governments. Israel is still waiting for a favourable response on the part of Arab Governments to the offer extended to all Arab States by the Israel Minister of Foreign Affairs in October last year on the matter of arms reduction.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Third, on a bilateral level Israel's negotiations with Egypt, that led to the signing of the Camp David agreement, as well as negotiations that are presently being conducted, are intended to show the way to peace for all countries of the Middle East. Even in the field of arms control it means that less money will have to be spent by Cairo or Jerusalem on the acquisition of arms and that more money will go for development, education and health in both countries. Is this not what all our debates and resolutions in this Committee are about?

The task of peace will not be simple for either country. However, in the nature of things, there exist dynamics of peace, as there are dynamics of war. If Israel and Egypt can gradually undertake those very confidence-building measures described in the agreement just quoted, if both countries reach a point where neither fears the other, then they will have succeeded in the field of disarmament where 300-odd General Assembly resolutions have so far failed.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 was submitted with the express purpose of harming the process of peace. Instead of establishing a framework for peace, as the Camp David agreement did, Iraq, by its own admission, seeks to establish a framework for war, and draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 is an integral part of it.

If Iraq or any Arab State thinks that it has reason, in the words of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 to be "alarmed" or "concerned" about Israel's intentions, why does it not emulate the example of Egypt and see whether or not, through negotiations, these fears may be dispelled?

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

If there is a grain of truth in Iraq's posture of alarm, as expressed in the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, why do not Iraq and the other Arabsponsors of this draft resolution respond favourably to the offer made by the Foreign Minister of Israel at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly and negotiate with Israel and other countries of the region "Tlatelolco" for the Middle East, as the countries of Latin America have so wisely done for their region.

Israel is acutely aware of the tragic futility of an armament race which is turning the Middle East into a laboratory for the world to experiment with novel methods of destruction. Israel does not feel that the Middle East is under an obligation to provide the world's armament industry with constant profits, nor to guarantee it a market for weapons for years to come. We would prefer to boost the import into the Middle East of the modern equivalent of "plowshares" and "pruning hooks", and we call on our Arab neighbours to join us in a common regional effort to make Isaiah's vision a living reality.

I am well aware that most members of this Committee tacitly agree with what has just been said. Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 is not a popular draft resolution. The procedural vote that took place in this Committee on the matter before us three weeks ago clearly demonstrated that fact. If voting on draft resolutions in the United Nations were secret, the Iraqi draft would have few supporters indeed. I call upon Member States to address themselves to the real meaning of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 within the context of present developments in the Middle East. I call on them to reject this act of war-mongering calculated to undermine the peace-making process, and to vote instead for peace.

Mr. AL-ATTIYYAH (Iraq): My delegation will be succinct in delivering this statement. To start with, I should like to clarify a few points. Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 is actually a draft resolution previously submitted during the special session devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Al-Atiyvah, Iraq)

At the time it met with widespread support. Not only was there the consensus of all the Arab countries, but that of the non-aligned and other countries as well, which are aware of the justice of the Palestinian problem. Those countries, in co-operation, voted for the draft resolution which now stands before the Committee.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 is a draft resolution of 36 countries - I repeat, 36 countries - not of Iraq only. What the Committee has before it is a draft resolution which actually runs along similar lines to a previous resolution adopted by the General Assembly a few years ago: namely, the resolution concerning the military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa. The Committee might notice that even the title runs along a similar line: 'Military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa'.

What we have before us now is a draft resolution which refers only to Israel. This actually is the crux of the matter. Are we not here facing a situation which is definitely similar to that which we have been facing in South Africa? In South Africa the super-war machine there, with the assistance of certain States, is defying all the African countries: not 20 African countries, but more than 40 African countries. If we accept the terms of analogy, of course we will come to the fact that there are probably more soldiers in Africa than in South Africa. But that is beside the point, and all representatives here are aware of the misinterpretation of that analogy.

We are faced in Africa with a country which is defying 40 African countries, and is still defying them. Here we stand in the Middle East to face a similar situation with a single country, whose admission to the United Nations was conditional. Actually, it is the only country whose admission to the United Nations was conditional on acceptance of certain United Nations resolutions calling for the return of the Palestinians to their land, or compensation being given to those who would chose not to return.

(Mr. Al-Atiyyah, Iraq)

Nevertheless, we are faced here with a situation in which one country in the Middle East is defying not only the Arab countries but all United Nations resolutions. We were told a short while ago that there should be respect for the United Nations, respect for United Nations resolutions. This, definitely, is also the problem. What respect has the Israeli Government for the United Nations resolutions? There are more than 220 resolutions calling on Israel to abide by United Nations resolutions. And what are we faced with? We are faced with a position of defiance, of arrogance, which reached a stage where the representative of Israel stood a few years ago and tore apart a United Nations resolution in front of the General Assembly. Do we call that respect for United Nations resolutions?

I shall go even further than that. Even today we have heard mention of the term "automatic" or "mechanical" majority. Is there any respect for the 100 countries or more which supported the resolution concerning South Africa in referring to them as countries which are simply abiding by the will of others? What about their dignity? What about their sovereignty? This definitely shows no respect for the United Nations Members.

As far as concerns the details and the amount of armaments, and the amount of monies spent, we definitely have a reply to this. Actually we submitted a study concerning Israeli armaments during the special session, and it was distributed, so I do not wish to take up more of the valuable time of the Committee by giving more and more evidence. Who would believe what has just been heard, when a country which was actually able to occupy the territory of three Arab countries, and has actually been able to expand three-fold, now stands up and says that it is arming so as to defend itself? The point that I should like to make -

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the representative of Israel wishes to intervene on a point of order.

Mr. FILAN (Israel): I should indeed like to intervene on a point of order and to ask for elucidation. I should like to ask you, Sir, whether the representative of Iraq is speaking now on the draft resolution or in exercise of his right of reply.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the representative of Israel would agree with me that it is the duty of the Chairman, according to the rules of procedure, to see that speakers do indeed speak on the subjects under discussion. Unless they do so, the Chairman is bound to interrupt, and I shall do so if occasion arises.

I apologize for the interruption and ask the representative of Iraq to continue his statement.

Mr. AL-ATIYYAH (Iraq): The point I was making was that the fact that a country is able to defy more than 220 resolutions raises a question, and I should like to ask why Israel is able to defy all those resolutions. We can find no other answer to that other than that Israel, being armed to the teeth not only with conventional weapons but even with nuclear weapons, could in that way defy not only the Arab countries but the whole world; and, if it talks about peace, the peace it is talking about is the acceptance by the neighbours of Israel of a Zionist hegemony in the area and if we do not accept it Israel will simply say, "Take it or leave it", meaning, "If you do not accept the hegemony of Israel you will simply have to face the consequences of Israel's superior war machine".

In draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 there is a definite reference to Israel's nuclear endeavours. In this field several sources, official and unofficial, statements even by Heads of Government of Israel, have stated that it will maintain its nuclear option. Iraq has acceded to, signed and ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Most of the Arab countries followed suit, but

(Mr. Al-Atiyah, Iraq)

Israel refused to sign and adhere to that Treaty. We in the Arab world suffered long from colonialism and backwardness. Yes, we do now have the riches which used to be utilized by the colonial Powers, but unfortunately, instead of being allowed the opportunity to use those riches to develop our countries, we have to face an aggressor neighbour, and aggressor country which is decided on expanding at the expense of adjacent Arab territories.

I should like to point out that if we would really like to be consistent with the aims and principles of the Charter, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.1 is a clear example of how we could facilitate that work. Israel will continue to defy the whole world unless the point is reached where the whole world will put pressure on that country by putting a limit on its armaments. Of course, Israel is aware of this, and that is why it is building its own national armaments industry. Now we hear that it is exporting armaments to countries which are well known not for their democratic and liberal attitude but rather for the dictatorial nature of their régimes. The amount of the exports of Israeli armaments to other countries has now reached a sum in the neighbourhood of \$80 million a year.

All this calls for swift and drastic action to limit the escalation of armaments. We in the Arab world are arming ourselves because our land is occupied; we are defending ourselves. What about the other side? Whose land is occupied? Is it the Israeli land or the Arab land that is occupied? Those lands are occupied not only by means of the nuclear threat but also actually by conventional weapons. Here again, when we refer to conventional weapons in the draft resolution we are referring to an actual situation, namely, that the existence of Israeli armaments is actually perpetuating and consolidating the expansionist policy of the Zionist Government of Israel.

I shall conclude, because we have other things to do. We hope that all countries will see that we are faced with a situation which is a real threat to peace, not only in the Middle East but also in the whole region and in the world at large.

The CHAIRMAN: In this instance I have quite deliberately allowed both the representative of Israel and the representative of Iraq more latitude, as far as both content and length of statement are concerned, than would be normal at this point in the proceedings of the Committee. I have done so because of the background to this particular decision and also because Israel is the only subject of the draft resolution under consideration. However, this might be as good a time as any to say that on other draft resolutions I would expect statements to be concerned exclusively with the draft resolutions rather than with the vaster subject of substance behind them. That is the practice, and the only practice by which the Committee will be able to act efficiently in this voting procedure.

I understand the representative of Yemen wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. AL HADDAD (Yemen): I do not think the Zionist representative has a right to make a choice for other representatives here as to how they should vote on such a draft resolution. We are all representatives of sovereign, independent States Members of this Organization and we should respect that fact.

Secondly, the Zionist representative told the Committee, in the most arrogant language, how his country defies the United Nations. Admittedly, he said that the 130 resolutions ...

The CHAIRMAN: I think that the statement the representative is making would come more appropriately under a right of reply than a point of order. I would draw his attention to the fact that rights of reply are exercised at the end of the afternoon meeting, so he might like to ask to speak at that time.

Before the Committee proceeds to the vote on the draft resolution, I shall call upon those representatives who have asked to speak in explanation of their vote before the vote.



Mr. PEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): Speaking on behalf of the nine countries of the European Community, I should like to state our common position on the draft resolution before us bearing the title "Military and nuclear collaboration with Israel". The nine countries of the European Community will vote against the text contained in document A/C.1/33/L.1.

In the view of the Nine, this draft resolution is incompatible with the achievement of the objective of a just, comprehensive and durable peace. The Nine have repeatedly outlined their policy concerning the Middle East and have pursued a consistent line on the elements of a just and durable peace. This was repeated by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany speaking on behalf of the Nine before the General Assembly on 26 September this year.

Moreover, for action under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter it would be for the competent body of the United Nations, namely the Security Council itself, to consider the matter.

Under the circumstances, we deem it inappropriate to treat the subject in this Committee of the General Assembly.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I would like to explain the vote of the United States Government against draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 which, in the view of the United States, would lead us towards confrontation rather than conciliation in the Middle East.

The United States has consistently favoured balanced efforts to limit the types and quantities of weapons in arsenals in the Middle East. Moreover, our views on the desirability of a Middle East nuclear-weapon-free zone are also well known to members of this Committee, and at an appropriate time we propose to support the draft resolution before the Committee calling for negotiations to establish such a zone.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 also calls, in a contentious and polemic manner, for one-sided action to cease conventional arms co-operation with Israel. United States has consistently favoured balanced negotiated measures to limit and reduce weapons inventories on a regional basis, including the Middle East, but we will not take part in any efforts to achieve disarmament by decree.

The way to achieve the objective of limiting and reducing the types and quantities of weapons in the Middle East is not the draft resolution before us which has nothing to do with disarmament. Indeed, that draft resolution is inconsistent with paragraph 127 of the Final Document of the special session under which this Committee should deal only with questions of disarmament and related international security questions. The attempt to use this Committee for a thinly disguised political attack notwithstanding this new mandate can only have the effect of undermining this Committee's efforts to engage in serious discussions of arms control issues. The way to achieve stability in the Middle East with less dependence on arms is for Israel and its Arab neighbours to resolve their differences through negotiations and to enter into peace agreements with each other which may lead to a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute. This is indeed the objective of the Camp David accords and of the present peace talks in Washington between Egypt and Israel.

The United States is strongly opposed to this draft resolution which is hostile to the overriding requirements to achieve a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute. Its main point is a request to the Security Council for the application of a mandatory arms embargo under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter against only one State in the Middle East, Israel. This would undermine the security of one State in that region, create a fundamental imbalance in the Middle East and thus contribute significantly to a dangerous destabilization of the situation. The United States wishes to make its position perfectly clear that it will not support any such Chapter VII action.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

Since the draft resolution before us was presented in that Committee by the delegation of Iraq at the special session on disarmament last June, we have had the Camp David accords and the follow-up negotiations. These actions have opened up a new and more hopeful chapter in the history of the Middle East. We find it extremely regrettable that we are now being asked to approve this draft resolution at the very time that this major step towards peace and reconciliation is under way.

My delegation will vote against the draft resolution and we hope that other Member States will join us in rejecting it. In this way the United Nations, this Committee and the General Assembly will be seen as turning away from the politics of confrontation and towards the true interests of all of us, peace and reconciliation in the Middle East.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I have carefully studied the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.1 co-sponsored by a great number of members, including Egypt. I am also aware that this draft resolution has the blessing of the Non-aligned Group of Countries. However, I received Telex instructions from my Government only a few minutes ago that in view of the negotiations now going on between Egypt and Israel following the Camp David accords, and because we consider that this draft resolution is perhaps a little too radical, we shall not be in a position to support it.

However, Mauritius is in favour of the Middle East remaining a nuclear-free zone.

The CHAIRMAN: That exhausts the list of speakers who wish to speak in explanation of their vote before the vote. I now put to the vote the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Barbados, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Greece, Iceland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 was adopted by 68 votes to 24, with 33 abstentions.

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

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The main reason my delegation has been compelled to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 is that we consider that as long as there is no specific pronouncement on the part of the Security Council on the application of Chapter VII of the Charter the General Assembly lacks the necessary powers to address to "all States" a call such as is contained in the operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): In explanation of our vote, I wish to place it on record that as a matter of consistent policy the President of Liberia has advocated conciliation rather than confrontation. While Liberia fully supports any attempt anywhere to bring about the elimination of all nuclear weapons, we feel that the present draft resolution would defeat the purpose of bringing about conciliation rather than confrontation. In view of that, despite our full support and solidarity with the non-aligned and African countries which voted for this resolution, we could not at this point vote in favour of it.

Mr. CAMPS (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Uruguay felt it necessary to abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1, despite the fact that we agree with many of the concepts contained in it because we have serious doubts that as worded it would meet the wish of the Government of my country on the question of the Middle East that a just solution should be reached which would be based on respect for the principles of justice and international law. Uruguay, which, as I say, subscribes to many of the concepts contained in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1, would have voted in favour of it were it not for its serious doubt and concern that the draft resolution may go beyond and depart from principles of international law and the procedures it prescribes. Moreover, the current discussions on an agreement between the parties are encouraging. Also, since this is an important question under the terms of article 18 of the Charter - as the text of the draft resolution itself establishes in its various paragraphs - we would have wished the resolution adopted to make an appeal to the parties within the framework of Chapter VI of the Charter, especially as provided for in Article 33, which says:

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

"1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

"2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means."

We believe that we would have thus contributed towards a just solution and the maintenance of peace. We would have dispelled the possibilities of a destructive war and would have acted in favour of the inalienable right of the people of Palestine to have a free and independent nation.

Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation, on the instructions of the Government of Guatemala voted against the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.1. We consider that it concerns unilateral effort that in no way can help bring about a solution to the problems that exist in that conflict-ridden region of the world.

Since we are a peace-loving nation we should like to see the appropriate bodies establish ways in which negotiations may lead to compliance with the tenets of the Charter. We therefore voted against the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.1.

The CHAIRMAN: As no other delegation has asked to speak, the Committee has thus concluded its consideration of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.1. It will now consider the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.2, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". The draft concerns the non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war. It has 36 sponsors, and was introduced by the representative of India at the eighteenth meeting of the First Committee, on 27 October 1978. The sponsors have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus.

Mr. CHAKRAKHAN (India): When the First Committee adjourned on Friday evening, Mr. Chairman, you were good enough to announce that the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.2 and L.3 would be meeting this morning at 9.30. Unfortunately today's Journal contained an unfortunate error. It announced that the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.1 and L.2 were to meet this morning for informal consultations. As a result of this mistake in the Journal many of the sponsors did not attend the morning consultations. I would therefore ask, Mr. Chairman, at least as far as draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3 is concerned, if you could possibly give us some time for informal consultations.

As far as draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.2 is concerned, perhaps we could dispense with the need for consultations among the sponsors.

I should like to read out a small drafting change to operative paragraph 2 of the draft. That paragraph should be reworded to read as follows:

"Requests all States, particularly nuclear-weapon States, to submit to the Secretary-General, before the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, proposals concerning the non-use of nuclear weapons ..."

the rest of that paragraph remaining unchanged.

That is a very small change, and it does not at all affect the substance of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of India for his clarification. If I understood him correctly, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.2 have nothing against the Committee proceeding to consider that draft resolution as amended by the representative of India. For the sake of clarity I shall now read out his amendment. The paragraph should read:

"Requests all States, particularly nuclear-weapon States, to submit to the Secretary-General, before the thirty-fourth session of the General assembly, proposals ..."

and so on. That is the only change.

I would ask the representative of India whether that is correct.

Mr. CHAKRAKHAN (India): Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is correct.

I would take this opportunity to state that if the draft resolution is not to be adopted by consensus my delegation would appreciate a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union considers that the question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons must be considered and decided upon in connexion with the non-use of force in international relations and the strengthening of international legal guarantees of the security of States. Such an approach is in total accord with the decisions of the United Nations, and in particular with General Assembly resolution 2936 (XNVII) on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons which was adopted, as will be recalled, at the twenty seventh session of the General Assembly.



(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

That principle was reflected as well in a number of provisions of the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament. On the basis of those provisions and decisions, the Soviet Union, as is known, introduced for consideration in the United Nations a draft universal treaty on the non-use of force in international relations, article 1 of which provides that parties to the treaty shall refrain from the use of armed force involving the use of any types of weapons, including nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. The conclusion of such a treaty in accordance with United Nations decisions would, in our opinion, be a major step towards the solution of the question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

Unfortunately, in the draft resolution before us, document A/C.1/33/L.2, the question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons is artificially divorced from the question of the adoption of international political and legal measures to strengthen security for all States and from the question of the non-use of force by States in international relations.

In view of this, the Soviet delegation will abstain in the vote on this draft resolution.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States would like to explain the vote that it will cast against the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.2. This vote is based, in large part, on operative paragraph 1 of this draft resolution which purports to outlaw the use of nuclear weapons, under any circumstances, as a violation of the Charter.

The United States cannot find the basis for this draft resolution in the Charter. The Charter provides that all States must not use or threaten to use force in their relations with other States except in self defence or in other situations permitted under the Charter. The United Nations Charter does not outlaw nuclear means for deterrence or defence against an attack against the United States or its allies.

The United States has previously referred to the facts of nuclear deterrence. These are not pleasant facts but we cannot overlook the fact that in many areas of the world nuclear weapons are part of the security arrangements that have kept the peace. This fact exists, as does its frightening corollary, the number of nuclear weapons and weapon systems deployed on both sides. They cannot be made to disappear by the passage of a resolution by the United Nations.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

The United States is, of course, aware of the necessity of reducing the problem with which we are all faced caused by the vast accumulation of nuclear weapons, a problem which must be dealt with by nuclear disarmament carried out in carefully conceived and implemented stages.

The United States is also aware that even prior to the completion of this process the nuclear-weapon States should give appropriate attention to the concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon States for assurances as to the non-use of nuclear weapons. The United States has done so in the Presidential Declaration read out by Secretary Vance during the special session on disarmament. This solemn declaration should increase the confidence of non-nuclear-weapon States in their security against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The United States believes that this approach is more realistic, and more apt to preserve the peace, than a generalized but ineffective, declaration purporting to outlaw nuclear weapons forever.

The CHAIRMAN: Since draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.2 will not be adopted by consensus in accordance with the request of the representative of India, the Committee will proceed to a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.2 was adopted by 84 votes to 16, with 18 abstentions.

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

Mr. HSU (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation is of the view that the desire of many countries for the non-use of nuclear weapons is just. China has consistently stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and has repeatedly declared that China will at no time and under no circumstances use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States. It is known to all that the most effective way to eliminate the danger of a nuclear war is the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. Before this objective is realized, the two super-Powers possessing the largest nuclear arsenals should be the first to undertake unconditionally that at no time and under no circumstances will they use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States or nuclear-free zones, and should proceed forthwith to reduce substantially their nuclear weapons.

As no reference is made in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.2 to this fundamental question, the Chinese delegation did not participate in the vote on this draft resolution and requests that this statement of the Chinese delegation be reflected in the records.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): The question of non-use of nuclear weapons has been discussed a number of times in United Nations forums, and my country has consistently taken the position that a commitment to the non-use of nuclear weapons will never be genuinely effective unless it is backed up by the implementation of concrete measures of nuclear disarmament and effective international control.

Furthermore, it is well understood by all members present here that the Charter of the United Nations has a legally binding provision in Article 2, paragraph 4, that

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

The Government of Japan therefore believes that the question of non-use of nuclear weapons should be considered by the United Nations only after progress has been made on concrete measures of disarmament and arms control, such as SALT II and III, a comprehensive test-ban, prohibition of chemical weapons, a cut-off of fissionable materials, and so forth.

For this reason, my delegation abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.2.

Sir Derek ASHE (United Kingdom): The views of my Government on the issues raised in this draft resolution are too well known for me to need to make more than the briefest explanation of why my delegation has voted against it.

We of course agree on the supreme importance of ensuring that nuclear weapons never need to be used, but a ban on use is not a practical measure for Western countries in an area where nuclear weapons exist in large numbers and where there is a heavy conventional imbalance, so that security for the present rests on nuclear deterrence. Deterrence of aggression is essential to international security until nuclear disarmament has been achieved. Any non-use pledge would weaken the credibility of deterrence and increase the chances of aggression.

Mr. RAJAKOJKI (Finland): The Finnish delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.2. We did so because of operative paragraph 1 (a), and more specifically because of the mention that "The use of nuclear weapons will be a violation of the Charter". We think that this mention does not accurately reflect reality.

Having said that, I should like to add that my delegation would have been happy to vote in favour of it could the aforementioned inconsistency with the Charter have been avoided. The main purpose of the draft resolution is, in our view, certainly quite positive and thus meets the concerns of the Finnish Government as far as the danger of nuclear war is concerned.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): It is in the interest of the survival of mankind that nuclear weapons not be used. There is also a certain logical link between non-use and non-proliferation which must be kept in mind. Thus the issue of non-use merits the highest attention. The latest occasion when it was discussed in depth was during the deliberations of the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

I wish to recall what is said in paragraph 58 of the Final Document on that issue. Those deliberations have however also reminded us of all the practical difficulties involved. It is all too evident that the problems inherent in the nuclear arsenals and their related military doctrines cannot be solved simply by a declaration of non-use. It is in fact necessary to grapple with the concrete reality of deployed nuclear forces and of the doctrines for their possible use which go deeply into the general military dispositions of the leading military Powers and concern conventional forces as well.

Just as in the case of security guarantees, a declaration of non-use which could gain general acceptance can under no circumstances serve as a substitute for measures on nuclear disarmament. Unfortunately, in the absence of substantial results in the efforts undertaken so far to restrain the nuclear arms race, and in view of the differences in force postures and doctrines already mentioned, the issue of a non-use declaration tends too easily to become less a clear way to greater security for all than a divisive issue between the nuclear-weapon States.

That must be avoided, and for those various reasons my delegation abstained in the vote.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

I wish to conclude by recalling once again the Final Document of the special session. The question of non-use is too important to be left aside, and the non-nuclear-weapon States have a legitimate right to expect constructive actions in order to halt the nuclear arms race.

Mr. NGUYEN VAN LUU (Viet Nam) (interpretation from French): The delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.2, it being understood that under its terms recourse to nuclear weapons in case of aggression is a violation of the Charter and a crime against humanity.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now heard all delegations wishing to explain their votes after the vote..

I should like to take this opportunity to direct a query to the representative of India. He mentioned a moment ago that, as far as draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3 was concerned, it would normally be the first order of business this afternoon but that some consultations were still needed. May I have an indication as to whether those consultations could possibly be completed before the afternoon meeting?

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): With a view to expediting the work of the Committee, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3 would be prepared to have a vote on it even now, if that were possible and if the necessary time were available. The consultations which we thought necessary could perhaps be dispensed with in the interest of our work.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

But if we proceed to the vote at this stage, then I should like to make just one small announcement regarding the amendments submitted by the Liberian delegation in document A/C.1/33/L.36. So if your intention is that we should vote now, Mr. Chairman, I could proceed with our position regarding the Liberian amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not my intention to proceed now to vote on document A/C.1/33/L.3 which might considerably exceed the time which we still have at our disposal this morning, but rather to begin with that draft resolution immediately at the beginning of the afternoon meeting.

I am most grateful to the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3 for this effort in order to help the Committee to proceed in its work as expeditiously as possible.

I should like to call now on the representative of Poland, Ambassador Wyzner, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.39 on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons.

Mr. WYZNER (Poland): The purpose of my statement today is to introduce to the First Committee a draft resolution on the disarmament measure of utmost importance - the elimination of chemical weapons from the military arsenals all over the world.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

As a result of extensive consultations with many delegations and owing to the spirit of understanding and common purpose which they invariably demonstrated, I now have the privilege and particular pleasure to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.39 on behalf of Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia.

I also have the pleasure in welcoming among the sponsors Bolivia, Congo, Mauritius, Pakistan and Venezuela.

I trust that the active involvement of my delegation in the preparation and presentation of the draft resolution before us comes as no surprise to the members of the Committee. For a number of years now Poland has demonstrated its vivid interest in that particular subject and has spared no efforts to bring closer the conclusion of an agreement on the complete elimination of chemical weapons.

As it is well known, the United Nations has been seized of that question for well over a decade. As a result of long and comprehensive discussions on the subject of the prohibition of chemical weapons in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, frequently coupled with the deliberations of experts, the positions of States have been explicitly presented and three formal draft agreements as well as numerous working documents received. Moreover, intensive bilateral negotiations have been conducted between the Soviet Union and the United States of America with the aim of working out a joint initiative on the prohibition of chemical weapons and submitting it for the consideration of the multilateral organ for disarmament negotiations. After the General Assembly at its thirty-second session had adopted by consensus its chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons resolution, the tenth special session, in its Final Document, affirmed that the complete



(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction represented one of the most urgent measures of disarmament, which should be accorded high priority in disarmament negotiations - the idea, which is reflected in the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

Taking into account all those encouraging developments it is the co-sponsors belief that the time has come for the effective elaboration of an agreement on the prohibition of all chemical weapons and their destruction.

That is the essential message which the co-sponsors wish to convey through the text of the draft resolution now before the First Committee. We do not feel, therefore, that there is any need to go further into detail on various paragraphs of the draft, which indeed speaks for itself. May I only re-emphasize the contents of the first three operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, which all serve the purpose of reaching early agreement on the elimination of all chemical weapons, through the submission of a joint USSR-United States initiative to the Committee on Disarmament - paragraph 2 - and through negotiations to be undertaken in that Committee at the beginning of its 1979 session - paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. The Committee will easily note a sense of urgency transpiring from the wording of those paragraphs.

The new impetus in disarmament negotiations and the collective political will generated by the tenth special session of the General Assembly compel us to believe that there exist now all the conditions necessary to make 1979 a year of the achievement of our common goal: the significant progress in chemical disarmament. At a time when the international community is increasingly aware of the disastrous effects of the potential use of chemical weapons, that devastating weapon of mass destruction, and alarmed by illnesses and sufferings caused even by accidental release of toxic chemical agents, there can be no excuse for failure to make relentless efforts to eliminate chemical weapons from the arsenals of all States once and for all.

(Mr. Wyzner, Poland)

Therefore, I speak for all the 36 co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.39, when I commend it warmly to the First Committee for adoption by consensus. Such an endorsement of the document would be a fitting manifestation of both the importance and urgency attached by the Committee and the General Assembly to the achievement of the elimination of chemical weapons.

Finally, I should like to reiterate my deep appreciation of the valuable contributions from many delegations received in the process of the preparation of the text of the draft resolution, and to all co-sponsors for their unfailing support and co-operation. Special mention and gratitude are due to the Canadian and Ukrainian delegations, both instrumental in initiating the draft and engendering for it a wide measure of support.

Mrs. de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to announce that my delegation would like to become a sponsor of certain of the draft resolutions. They are: draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1 on "Disarmament and Development", to which concept we adhere without reservation; draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.13/Rev.1, on "Monitoring of Disarmament Agreements and Strengthening of Security", which we also consider to be very important and necessary; and draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.14 on the "Programme of research and studies on disarmament". I trust that France and the other sponsors, which took the initiative of preparing these texts, will accept this.

We wish also to join in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.39, submitted recently and so eloquently introduced by the representative of Poland, which deals with the urgent matter of the elimination of chemical and bacteriological weapons.

Mr. CAMPS (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to join in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.39, which is now under discussion. Also it has become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1, L.14, L.17/Rev.1, L.19, L.23, L.34 and L.40.

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting I wish to announce the following additional sponsors of draft resolutions: Tunisia, A/C.1/33/L.3/Rev.1 and L.11/Rev.1; Japan, A/C.1/33/L.22; New Zealand, A/C.1/33/L.29; Togo, A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1, L.13/Rev.1 and L.14; France, A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1; Sri Lanka, A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1, L.13/Rev.1 and L.14; Costa Rica, A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1, L.13/Rev.1, L.14 and L.39; Uruguay, A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1, L.14, L.17/Rev.1, L.19, L.23, L.34, L.39 and L.40.

Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to announce Ecuador's sponsorship of draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.14, L.23, L.39 and L.40.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.