

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

applause, unconditional acceptance. No, we have not and will not react in such a way, not because this is a United States proposal but because we adopt a serious and critical approach to any proposal. Those proposals which are really constructive and acceptable we accept, and in the case of those which are unacceptable to us we explain our motives in the most detailed manner possible. Let me recall once more that such comments were made by us in connection with the United States proposal concerning "open invitation" challenge inspection and that they can be read on pages 6 to 11 of the Russian text of document CD/PV.280. An English text certainly exists as well. Anyone can look and see why the Soviet delegation cannot accept this United States proposal.

And now my last point. The United States delegation has made an attempt to represent the United States position as being very flexible and constructive and going halfway to meet the positions of other delegations, including the Soviet Union, and the Soviet position as being rigid, stubborn and uncompromising. Is this really so, gentlemen? After all, in politics a State's position is judged not on the basis of self-advertisement but of comparison and of analysis of the development of the attitude of the State in question. And if you compare the position of the United States on the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons in 1984 with, say, the position it adopted during the bilateral negotiations in 1976-1980 or even in 1983, you will see it has become more rigid, more unyielding and more unacceptable to many States, including the Soviet Union. Take, for example, the famous proposal on "open invitation" challenge inspection. On the other hand, I challenge any delegation to consider the Soviet Union's and other socialist countries' 1972 draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, the 1982 Soviet draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, the way our position has moved forward to meet that of other delegations, including the delegation of the United States of America, and they will see whose position is flexible and whose position is unyielding. After all, we have to try to move towards one another, not away from each other. That is the ABC of diplomacy. Those are facts, and facts, Mr. President, are stubborn things, even in diplomacy.

The United States representative also said: "What my delegation is looking for is a problem-solving approach by our Soviet negotiating partners — for evidence of a commitment to try to work out mutually acceptable solutions that accommodate our concerns". I understand Mr. Lowitz has in mind, so to speak, "mutually acceptable solutions" — an approach which, so to speak, would be designed to "accommodate interests and concerns of all States participating in negotiations". We agree. That has always been our position. If the United States delegation will really follow such a course, then, I think, there will be progress in negotiations.